Geographic Labor Mobility in the United States: Recent Findings*

THIS ARTICLE presents the major conclusions of a study recently completed by the University of Michigan Survey Research Center and reported in *The Geographic Mobility of Labor*,[1] as yet unpublished. The study, supported in part by a research grant from the Social Security Administration, makes a significant contribution toward understanding the relationship between geographic mobility and the economic well-being of American workers, a matter of long-standing interest to the Social Security Administration.

A comparison of Negro-white differences in geographic mobility, also drawn from the Survey Research Center study, will appear in a future issue of the BULLETIN.

SCOPE OF THE STUDY

For the purposes of this investigation a move was defined as a change of residence between labor-market areas. As is the practice of the Department of Labor, the labor-market areas is considered to be the metropolitan area; outside metropolitan areas, it is the county. The definition of a move used by the Survey Research Center is similar to, but not identical with, that used by the Bureau of the Census, which also considers intercounty movement within metropolitan areas as migration.

To obtain the data on which its study is based, the Survey Research Center conducted six sample surveys of adults living in private households in 1962–63. In families selected for interview, the respondent was either the household head or his wife, on a random basis.

Three waves of interviews with cross-sections of the United States population, conducted in August–September 1962, November–December 1962, and November 1963, yielded information from nearly 4,000 respondents. Of these, about 3,570 were white, 350 were Negro, and 50 were other nonwhite. There were also three special samples involving: (1) interviews with 433 families living in redevelopment areas in September–October 1962; (2) reinterviews, in September–October 1962 and February 1963, with a total of 189 individuals who reported in the 1962 or 1963 Survey of Consumer Finance that they had moved in the year before they were questioned; and (3) reinterviews in August 1963 with 1,750 persons who had been interviewed in the first cross-section or the first special sample. This final sample was designed to determine the accuracy of predictions of annual mobilty made on the basis of variables measured in the first interview.

The use of such a small sample[2] ordinarily might preclude a close reading of the resulting data, especially those figures developed for subgroups within the population. Recognizing this, the Survey Research Center compared many of its statistical findings with those available from other sources and, after adjusting for differences in methodology and definition, found very close similarities. Furthermore, whatever degree of precision was lost by limiting the analysis to an in-depth study of a small number of respondents was more than compensated for by the fact that it made possible the measurement of a far greater number of variables—including social, psychological, and demographic factors—than a larger sample would have permitted.

---

*Prepared by Robert E. Marsh, Publications Staff, Office of Research and Statistics, from abstracts provided by the Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.

[1] This research project was conducted under the direction of John B. Lansing and Eva Mueller. They were assisted by Nancy Barth, William Ladd, and Jane Lean. Appreciation is extended to the authors for their help in readying this article for publication. The full report has been scheduled for publication by the University of Michigan's Institute for Social Research at Ann Arbor. Copies will soon be available from the Institute's publications division.

[2] By contrast, a recent study of labor mobility by Lowell E. Gallaway is based on a statistical evaluation of the 1-percent continuous work-history sample from the earnings records of the Social Security Administration, which, in 1957–60, included more than 300,000 individuals. This monograph, entitled *Interindustry Labor Mobility in the United States, 1957 to 1960*, will be released shortly by the Office of Research and Statistics as Research Report No. 18. An abstract of the larger study, "Interindustry Labor Mobility Among Men, 1957–60," appeared in the *Social Security Bulletin*, September 1966.

EXTENT OF GEOGRAPHIC MOBILITY

Survey questionnaires were designed to provide estimates of intercounty mobility for periods of 1 year, 5 years, 12–13 years (from 1950 to the date of interview, either 1962 or 1963), and over the lifetime of those interviewed. Other questions asked by the interviewers made possible estimates of the ratio of moves that were returns to a former place of residence, repetitive movements on the part of those family heads who had moved at least once in a given period, intracounty or "residential" moves, temporary moves, commuting over long distances, and desires and plans to move.

Rate of Intercounty Movement

The proportion of the population that moves from one labor-market area to another naturally varies widely according to the period under study. It was found to be considerable even during a 1-year period and, over the lifetime of adults, to affect a majority of the population. The specific rates of intercounty mobility in the various periods are described below.

One year.—From 5 to 6.8 percent of the population moves from one labor-market area to another in a typical 1-year period. The lower estimate was made by the Survey Research Center on the basis of interviews in 1962 and reinterviews in 1963 with a cross-section of the United States population. The higher figure comes from the Bureau of the Census and indicates the proportion of migrants (including those who moved from one county to another within a metropolitan area) for roughly the same period.

Five years.—In recent 5-year periods (1957–62 or 1958–63, depending on when the interviews took place) the proportion of family heads who moved between labor-market areas was 15 percent, or three times the proportion who reported having moved in 1 year's time. Close to a 3-to-1 ratio was also found by the 1960 Census, which collected data on place of residence in 1955 and was therefore able to make a 5-year comparison. In the latter case, the 5-year mobility rate was 17.5 percent.

Twelve–thirteen years.—In the period of 12–13 years from early 1950 to the date of interview, 29 percent of family heads moved from one labor-market area to another.

Lifetime mobility.—Sixty-eight percent of family heads, or more than 2 out of every 3, were at the time of the Survey Research Center study found to be living in a labor-market area other than the one in which they were born. Of the remainder, 5 percent reported that at one time they had lived elsewhere but had returned. Twenty-one percent were living 1,000 miles or farther from their place of birth.

Other measures of lifetime mobility show smaller but nonetheless significant rates of movement. Another Survey Research Center question revealed that 57 percent of all family heads were in a different labor-market area than the one in which they were living when they graduated from high school or terminated their formal education.

Data from the 1960 Census cited in the report show that proportion of the native poulation born in one State and living in another in 1960 was only 25.5 percent, but this measure of lifetime mobility includes children, who often are too young to have moved, and does not reflect moves between labor-market areas within States. The data also indicate that there has been remarkably little change in this kind of lifetime mobility over a long period: in 1850, 24 percent of native-born Americans were living in States other than those in which they were born; 110 years later the figure had risen by only 1.5 percentage points.

Other Indicators of Mobility

Statistical analysis of other mobility indicators —residential, return, and temporary moves, repetitive movement, commuting over long distances, and desires and plans to move—revealed the following rates:

Residential mobility.—The 1960 Census (which included data on place of residence in 1955) found that 43 percent of the population had moved to a new address within the previous 5 years. As noted earlier, the proportion of intercounty migrants in the same period was 17.5 percent.

Return moves.—The Survey Research Center found that 20 percent of all moves were returns to a place where the head of the family had lived at some time; 15 percent were to a place where he had lived since 1950; 12 percent were to the particular labor-market area where he resided in January 1950; and 9 percent were to his birthplace.

Repetitive movement.—In the 12- or 13-year period from 1950 to the time of interview, the mean number of moves made by family heads who moved at all was 2.1. This figure, however, is strongly influenced by a small number of people who shift from place to place in quick succession.

Temporary moves and commuting.—In the 12- or 13-year period cited above, 13 percent of family heads either commuted long distances (50 miles or more) or left home to work elsewhere temporarily. This category was composed of 6 percent who reported that they had commuted long distances in the period but had not gone away temporarily to work, 5 percent who had worked away from home but had not commuted, and 2 percent who had done both.

Desires and plans to move.—Asked whether they would stay in their present area or move away if they could do as they pleased, 20 percent of the respondents said they would prefer to move. The proportion who actually expected to relocate in the following year was only half as large—about 11 percent. The latter category was composed of 3 percent who said they definitely would move, 2 percent who said they probably would, and 6 percent who indicated they were uncertain or that "it depends." It is perhaps significant that the proportion who actually did move—5 percent—is equal to the proportion who indicated they definitely or probably would relocate.

DETERMINANTS OF MOBILITY

From an economic standpoint, it would be well if everyone who should move actually did so. As Lowell E. Gallaway points out, mass relocations to appropriate labor-market areas could reduce unemployment, encourage economic growth, and ease inflationary pressure.[3] Economic analysis, however, cannot determine human action. Some people intend to move but never follow through with their plans. Others who would be economically better off elsewhere have never even considered relocating because of strong family ties, preference for a particular community, or some other noneconomic factor.

Age and education have an especially strong bearing on mobility. Older persons, especially those with job seniority or accrued pension benefits, are generally reluctant to move to other areas; young adults—who have nothing to take with them but their ambitions—are the most mobile of all groups. The college-educated have a higher rate of mobility than those with only a high school or elementary education because their specialized knowledge and skills are more likely to be in demand in other areas.

Specific factors that help determine whether a given individual will or will not move include personal economic incentives, economic differences between labor-market areas, family and community ties, vested interests in homeownership, pension plans and unemployment insurance, and individual psychological characteristics. The Survery Research Center examined these determinants separately.

[3] "Interindustry Labor Mobility Among Men, 1957–60," *Social Security Bulletin*, September 1966, page 10.

Personal Economic Incentives

Most people in the labor force who had crossed county lines gave job-related reasons for moving. And, on the basis of their responses to direct questions, it appeared that people with the strongest economic positions in terms of skill level and education were most likely to respond to economic incentives such as the opportunity for a better-paying job.

On direct investigation, however, the influence of employment or income opportunities on mobility became less clear. The unemployed were found to be moderately more mobile than the employed. In the early 1960's family heads with unemployment experience may have been as much as twice as likely to move as family heads with steady employment, and as many as one-fourth of all moves may have been related to unemployment. Neverthless, most families that have encountered unemployment did not move, and the mobility induced by unemployment has not been great enough to eliminate wide discrepancies in unemployment rates between areas.

Survey Research Center analysts offered two explanations for the weak relationship of unemployment to mobilty. First, unemployment rates are highest for people with low mobility characteristics—older persons, the less-skilled or less-educated, and Negroes—all of whom may be induced to move, if at all, only as their joblessness becomes a severe hardship. Second, the low level of aggregate demand in the period covered by the survey meant that the majority of workers was not attracted by job opportunities elsewhere. The unemployed who did move were shown to have relatively more education, better skills, or other relative advantages in the labor market.

There was little evidence that mobility *per se* resulted in income gains, once occupation and other factors were taken into account. The reasons for this situation were: misinformation prompted many abortive moves, some income increases came about too late to be measured in the study, and many moves were made for noneconomic or only partly economic reasons.

Apparently, many movers tend to give a more economic rationale for their moves than actually exists. Furthermore, when economic opportunities did guide mobility they did so largely for people who already had relative advantages in the labor force. For those people who might have benefited most by a move—those who lack skills, education, or other economic advantages—moving did not provide a ready means of economic adjustment.

Economic Differences Between Areas

Prevailing economic conditions in an area do not have a symmetrical effect on in- and out-migration. The study found that, while high levels of economic activity and income do attract in-migration, opposite conditions do not bring about the converse. Low levels of employment opportunity or income do not stimulate out-migration, and high levels of economic activity do not inhibit it.

Since the level of aggregate demand was inadequate during much of 1957–63, economic differences between areas had only a moderate influence on mobility in the period. Most of the workers who did move between areas for economic reasons were attracted by lower unemployment rates, rather than by higher pay scales.

Researchers concluded that large numbers of people will not move between areas merely because their present location is economically less favorable than another. Mass movements require a more positive incentive—an active demand for labor. When this condition is achieved, it also appears to induce a large volume of cross-movement from other nearby and economically well-off locations.

Two groups were found to account for much of the movement that does occur between areas with economic differentials. These are young people, who respond most readily to economic incentives to move, and those suffering extreme economic hardship. People whose characteristics give them a low mobility potential—blue-collar workers, older people, the poorly educated, and Negroes—cannot be induced to move to another area merely because slightly more favorable economic conditions prevail there.

Family and Community Ties

The location of relatives can either inhibit or facilitate mobility. If a man's relatives all live near him, he may be reluctant to move away. If they all have migrated to another area, his ties to his current place of residence are likely to be weakened.

Of those persons who had moved in the 5-year period before being interviewed, 24 percent reported that their most recent move was made wholly or in part for family reasons, chief among which was to be reunited with relatives from whom they had been separated geographically. Statistical analysis indicates that people who have all their close relatives living elsewhere are more likely to move than are others with similar characteristics who have not been separated from their families. Of those who do move, 46 percent go to locations where some member of their family already lives.

The location of close friends and community considerations were shown to have lesser, but nevertheless significant, effects on mobility. Twenty percent of the people who had moved in the 5-year period before being interviewed reported that their most recent move was wholly or partly for community reasons. Here the emphasis is on "partly," for community considerations were usually mentioned in addition to economic or family considerations rather than as the sole reason for a move. The reasons given for being attracted to an area were about evenly divided between climate or other features that might appeal to everyone and specific appeals for particular individuals, such as pleasant recollections of an earlier residence there or reunion with friends.

The persistence of family and community ties is reflected in the travel patterns of recent movers. Despite the fact that within 2 years the newcomers belong to as many formal organizations as their neighbors, they make more trips than do other persons who are similar to them in income, education, and other characteristics but who have not moved recently. Typically, it takes from 2 to 4 years before people report that most of their close friends live in the same area as they do.

Homeownership, Pension Plans, and Unemployment Insurance

Equity in a home, pension-plan benefits, and rights under unemployment insurance laws are three security factors affected by a move to another geographic area. The survey evidence indicates, however, that none of these ties to a present job or place of residence are as yet strong barriers to mobility.

Though homeownership and low geographic mobility are associated, the direction of causality between them is difficult to establish, partly because the type of person who is not very mobile is also apt to be a homeowner and partly because expectations of future mobility may deter or delay such a significant purchase. Nevertheless, homeownership *per se* seems to make for some reluctance to move.

The reason seems to be at least partly economic. A considerable proportion of those persons who had owned a home before they moved reported that they did not sell it or sold it at a loss; only 4 out of 10 received what they felt their property was worth. There is no way of estimating the number of persons whose moving plans were thwarted by difficulties encountered in attempting to sell their homes.

The statistical evidence that pension rights—vested or unvested—or unemployment insurance coverage inhibit mobility, if significant at all, is very weak. The Survey Research Center points out that many other factors, some strongly associated with these two economic ties, are more important in prompting a decision to move or not to move. Coverage provisions also tend to be highly complex and are not always clearly understood.

Psychological Characteristics

The study also found little or no relationship between the overall probability that a person will move and either of the two measures of personality that were considered—(1) the sense of personal effectiveness and (2) "achievement versus security" orientation. The sense of personal effectiveness, however, can be correlated with the reasons given for the most recent move, especially among respondents with no more than a grade school education. Those people who generally have low effectiveness scores, such as the undereducated, are less likely to give economic reasons and more likely to give community reasons for moving and are also more likely to report that their most recent move was a return to a former place of residence.

The fact that the psychological meaning of mobility varies from one situation to another probably accounts for the very weak relationship found in this area. For example, a move may be a return after an unsuccessful attempt to advance in a new locality, or an escape from a difficult marital situation, or a search for a better climate. It may also be an advancement in recognition of personal success, or part of a routine shift of personnel by an employer. In the view of the researchers, important relationships between personality characteristics and mobility are more likely to appear when attention is restricted to situations that are similar from the point of view of the people involved.

In addition to the foregoing determinants of mobility, two potential facilitators were investigated—ownership of an automobile and the availability of liquid assets. Upon analysis, car ownership was shown to be irrelevant, but it was concluded that those who have some liquid reserves probably find it easier to move, although the statistical evidence on this point was inconclusive.

THE PROCESS OF MOVING

Another factor that might either facilitate or inhibit geographic mobility is the actual physical process of moving. Is it relatively easy and inexpensive, or does it create yet another barrier for those people who should migrate but do not do so? In attempting to answer this question, the Survey Research Center evaluated the decision-making process, sources of job information, and the use made of them by migrants, as well as a number of related topics.

How Moving Decisions Are Made

Generally speaking, American workers find it difficult to leave accustomed surroundings even when they know a move would be in their best interests. The study found that about 30 percent of those in the labor force were aware of better economic opportunities elsewhere but had not moved to take advantage of them. Moreover, most people who preferred another area did not plan on moving into it, and most of those who thought they might move in the next year did not do so. About 80 percent of those who had not moved in the period 1957–62 had never even thought of moving. Indisposition to move of such a magnitude clearly has an adverse effect on the needed economic adjustments in individual cases and between areas.

This inertia should not be confused with caution, however, for the general level of deliberation about moving is low. Many moves take place on short notice, without consideration of alternate locations or after only a few sources of information have been investigated. The planning period was found to be 1 month or less for about one-third of the moves reported; alternatives were not even considered in two-thirds of them; and, in over half of the cases, family heads who relocated consulted only one or even no other sources of job information.

The foregoing ratios may be somewhat misleading, however, for they do not take into account the fact that long deliberation as to the merits of a move is not always necessary. Some circumstances such as familiarity with moving or with the new area and information and help from friends and relatives replace part of the need for deliberation. Other circumstances—the press of unemployment, for example, or the receipt of a tempting job offer or transfer—may shorten deliberation or preclude consideration of alternatives.

Well-educated, highly skilled workers are less affected by inertia and also tend to deliberate more about moving than do their less-advantaged contemporaries, who are further limited by consideration of a narrower range of choices. At the lower education and skill levels, heavy reliance is often placed on general job information and tips from friends and relatives. By contrast, white-collar workers have greater access to specific information, often gained through special field trips to the new market area.

Information Flows

On the face of it, a program to increase and make more readily accessible information about job opportunities in alternate locations, perhaps through State employment agencies, would help improve the efficiency of mobility, particularly for blue-collar workers and the less-educated. The researchers concluded, however, that the usefulness of such a program most likely would be limited by the low level of deliberation that precedes most moves.

At present, they point out, people seem to consider only a narrow range of choices, and there is no guarantee that better job information would make them less impulsive where mobility is concerned. Furthermore, information provided by State agencies would be more helpful to potential movers if it included more detailed, precise information about opportunities in other labor-market areas and other States.

For some special groups—Negroes and those living in depressed areas, for example—more specialized guidance about the location of economic opportunities and help in finding a job would be needed.

The Cost of Moving

Moving involves a relatively modest outlay even for high-income earners who travel long distances to accept new assignments: The average cost of transfers from one locale to another within business organizations, usually paid for at least in part by employers, was $500 in the period under study. The mean cost of other moves—counting both the expenses of moving families and their possessions—was found to be $180, but 60 percent of such moves cost less than $100, an indication that a number of relatively expensive moves are included. In general, the cost of moving increases with the age of the family head. Young people pay the least to move and the cost rises as families become larger and many belongings are accumulated.

Moving costs are also low in relation to the earning capacity of migrants: In 83 percent of the cases analyzed, expenses involved less than 10 percent of 1 year's income. If the measure of a successful move is that the new job pays the direct costs of relocation, only a modest income increase in the new area is therefore necessary.

In connection with the cost of moving, it has been suggested that those who cannot afford to move but should do so be given financial assistance, including possibly a resettlement allowance and funds to enable them to investigate employment opportunities in the area before moving.

The Survey Research Center feels that the idea has merit, provided such assistance is given in selected situations where there is a good chance that the moves would make economic sense. Because the sums involved probably would not exceed a few hundred dollars per family, the policy might therefore be successful even if some of the moves turned out to be failures.

MOBILITY AND THE POVERTY PROBLEM

In an attempt to establish a relationship between poverty and low rates of geographic movement, the researchers studied the mobility characteristics of three groups known to contain a large number of indigent persons—the Negro population, the residents of depressed areas, and welfare recipients. These groups obviously are not mutually exclusive, for a large percentage of welfare recipients live in depressed areas and Negroes fall into both the other categories. As a consequence, some of the findings in each individual category also apply to the others.

Because Negro-white differences in geographic mobility have widened in recent years and have become a source of special concern, they will be examined separately in an article in a future issue of the BULLETIN. Highlights of the analysis of mobility in depressed areas and among welfare recipients follow.

Mobility in Depressed Areas

Although economic conditions in 1957–63 were even more unfavorable in depressed areas than they were in other parts of the country, there was little evidence that of themselves they stimulated out-migration in that period or even earlier in the 1950's. The relatively poor economic opportunities that prevailed did, however, deter significant in-migration and therefore brought about a net out-migration.

Low aggregate demand for labor and the selectivity of previous out-migration have left depressed areas with a labor force that is relatively older, less educated, less skilled, and more likely to be poor, to have a history of low mobility, and to have relatives nearby. And current out-imigration is continuing this trend.

The best educated, younger, most highly skilled workers tend to leave depressed areas to take advantage of better job opportunities elsewhere. The in-migration that does occur does not fully compensate for these losses, both because it is smaller than the out-migration and because the in-migrants have more of a tendency to resemble the stayers than the movers.

Under these circumstances, geographic mobility as a mechanism of economic adjustment obviously leaves much to be desired. It works in the right direction, since net out-migration occurs, but in the process drains the areas of their most valuable human capital.

Effect of Aid on Mobility

The survey uncovered no evidence that public or private welfare reduces the recipient's rate of geographic mobility below that of other low-income people. If anything, such aid may may be indicative of extreme financial circumstances that provide some moderate incentive to move, but this incentive was not shown conclusively.

Survey Research Center analysts explained the apparent association between low past mobility and the receipt of aid by noting that the one affects eligibility for the other. Furthermore, they point out, most people who receive assistance from public welfare agencies are not in the labor force or for reasons of age or lack of education are not likely to be highly mobile. Existing welfare systems therefore do not appear to constitute an additional barrier to mobility for low-income people.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE POLICY

As has already been noted, the researchers concluded that a comprehensive job information program, operating across State lines, might improve the efficiency of migration among labor-market areas and that financial assistance to needy would-be movers on a selective basis would aid in their successful resettlement. Other suggestions offered by the Survey Research Center include the following:

1. A program to assist people in selling their

(Continued on page 55)

TABLE Q-17.—OASDHI: Estimated number of families and beneficiaries receiving benefits and average monthly benefit in current-payment status, by family group, at end of June 1964 and 1965

Family classification of beneficiaries receiving benefits	June 30, 1964			June 30, 1965		
	Number of families (in thousands)	Number of beneficiaries (in thousands)	Average monthly amount per family	Number of families (in thousands)	Number of beneficiaries (in thousands)	Average monthly amount per family
Total	14,442.9	19,470.3		15,042.2	20,156.9	
Retired-worker families	10,481.8	13,501.6		10,842.6	13,873.8	
Worker only	7,807.4	7,807.4	$73.60	8,157.3	8,157.3	$74.40
Male	3,946.3	3,946.3	83.20	4,060.1	4,060.1	84.10
Old-age benefit not actuarially reduced	3,173.6	3,173.6	86.00	3,124.7	3,124.7	87.60
Old-age benefit actuarially reduced	772.7	772.7	71.70	935.4	935.4	72.30
Female	3,861.0	3,861.0	63.90	4,097.2	4,097.2	64.80
Old-age benefit not actuarially reduced	2,107.7	2,107.7	68.20	2,130.6	2,130.6	69.80
Old-age benefit actuarially reduced	1,753.3	1,753.3	58.60	1,966.6	1,966.6	59.30
Worker and wife (aged 62 and over [1])	2,380.7	4,761.4	130.10	2,388.8	4,777.6	131.40
Old-age benefit not actuarially reduced	2,166.0	4,332.0	131.50	2,108.8	4,217.6	133.40
Old-age benefit actuarially reduced	214.7	429.4	116.40	280.0	560.0	116.80
Worker and wife (under age 65 [2])[3]	1.7	3.4	110.40	1.8	3.5	110.40
Worker and aged dependent husband	12.4	24.9	111.20	11.7	23.4	112.70
Worker and 1 or more children	79.1	179.5	120.50	84.2	191.0	120.10
Worker, wife (aged 62 and over [1]), and 1 or more children	29.7	91.7	161.40	30.3	93.8	162.80
Worker, wife (under age 65 [2]), and 1 or more children	170.7	633.1	149.50	168.5	626.8	149.50
Worker, husband, and 1 or more children	.1	.3	112.70	.1	.4	113.50
Survivor families	3,099.2	4,452.5		3,255.9	4,634.9	
Aged widow only	2,057.9	2,057.9	67.40	2,195.7	2,195.7	68.40
Aged widow and 1 or more children	25.4	52.1	125.90	28.5	58.3	127.00
Aged widow and 1 aged dependent parent	.5	1.0	171.00	.5	1.0	177.00
Aged widow, 1 or more children and 1 aged dependent parent	([4])	([4])	245.00	([4])	([4])	245.00
Aged dependent widower	2.6	2.6	63.60	2.7	2.7	64.60
Widower and 1 or more children	.1	.2	115.90	.1	.2	117.80
Widowed mother only [3]	2.3	2.3	61.50	2.7	2.7	61.50
Widowed mother and 1 child	190.9	381.8	140.40	191.4	382.8	142.60
Widowed mother and 2 children	132.8	398.4	192.80	134.2	402.6	194.10
Widowed mother and 3 or more children	140.4	685.1	191.10	142.8	698.3	193.10
Widowed mother, 1 or more children, and 1 or 2 aged dependent parents	.4	1.5	216.00	.4	1.4	226.00
Divorced wife and 1 or more children	.5	1.3	174.00	.5	1.3	174.20
1 child only	319.6	319.6	63.90	327.3	327.3	64.80
2 children	112.7	225.4	130.00	113.8	227.6	131.60
3 children	47.8	143.4	175.10	49.4	148.2	181.00
4 or more children	30.8	143.1	170.20	32.2	149.3	173.20
1 or more children and 1 aged dependent parent	.7	1.7	160.40	.6	1.3	161.00
1 aged dependent parent	32.6	32.6	70.40	31.9	31.9	70.90
2 aged dependent parents	1.2	2.4	113.40	1.2	2.4	115.60
Disabled-worker families	861.9	1,516.2		943.7	1,648.2	
Worker only	623.9	623.9	88.90	688.1	688.1	89.30
Male	430.9	430.9	93.40	468.5	468.5	94.00
Female	193.0	193.0	79.00	219.6	219.6	79.40
Worker and wife (aged 62 and over [1])	27.2	54.5	138.20	28.7	57.4	138.50
Worker and wife (under age 65 [2])[3]	.6	1.1	141.00	.7	1.5	138.00
Worker and aged dependent husband	.5	1.0	122.00	.5	1.0	122.50
Worker and 1 or more children	63.2	172.2	155.80	69.0	188.1	155.50
Worker, wife (aged 62 and over [1]), and 1 or more children	.4	1.4	165.00	.5	1.6	160.00
Worker, wife (under age 65 [2]), and 1 or more children	146.1	662.2	193.40	156.2	710.5	194.30

[1] Excludes wife aged 62–64 with entitled children in her care.
[2] With entitled children in her care.
[3] Benefits of children being withheld.
[4] Less than 50.

GEOGRAPHIC LABOR MOBILITY

(Continued from page 20)

homes when they are contemplating migration might very possibly be the most helpful policy toward lowering the barriers to mobility. At present, a large proportion of potential migrants encounter difficulties in this respect, with the result that a great deal of planned migration does not take place. Such a policy would, of course, only encourage or assist otherwise planned or considered mobility and would not, in itself, provide the impetus to move.

2. Federal assistance to education in depressed areas would improve the quality of the labor force in these localities and ultimately contribute to their economic growth. According to the Survey Research Center, such support should not be limited to short-run training courses, although these admittedly have value, but should also involve contributions toward the cost of improving the quality and raising the general level of education in low-income areas. This might in the end facilitate migration, but it does not prejudge the question of whether people should migrate. To the extent that the people involved move away from the depressed areas after they have been educated, it is assumed that they will make a greater contribution elsewhere.