Hitotsubashi Journal of Social Studies 18 (1986) 29–41. © The Hitotsubashi Academy

A NOTE ON RECENT TRENDS OF MIGRATION IN THE UNITED STATES

MASATOSHI YORIMITSU*

I. *Introduction*

In this article a set of tables are presented to exhibit recent trends on internal migration in the United States. We have discussed and evaluated various models on the determinants of migration (M. Yorimitsu, 1985). The purpose of this paper is to arrange the data concerning the redistribution of population in order to investigate the underlying factors which affect geographical mobility of population.

In the process of industrialization almost all countries experienced the concentration of population at different levels in large cities and urbanized areas. The simplistic views of economists over the rationale for the existance and growth of cities point out the following factors: economies derived from specialization, external economies came out of the increased specialization, economies accrued from agglomeration, and economies produced by the provision of infrastructure and social overhead capital in the urbanized areas.

However, limits to the extent of such economies would occur and eventually urban areas began to produce both internal and external diseconomy which caused inefficiencies in production in the urbanized areas (R. W. Vickerman, 1984, pp. 9–10). Nevertheless, the increasing concentration of people in and around large cities has been considered as an almost inevitable and continuous process extending into future.

From the viewpoint of demography, the reasons for a concentration of the population in large cities and urbanized areas is considered to be a combination of two factors: natural increase of population and net in-migration. Natural increase of the urban population in the advanced industrialized countries has been diminished greatly because of the sharply declining birth rates after the baby boom period immediately following the end of World War II. The relatively diminishing importance of the natural increase in the urban population growth has resulted in a greater contribution of migration, from rural to urban migration, to the urban growth.

Beale and Fuguitt mentioned that in the 1960's the United States passed through a time of acute consciousness of the movement of people from rural and small towns into metropolitan areas. This brought about a growing awareness of increasing urban problems of

* This research was partially supported by the Grant-in-Aid for Research of the Ministry of Education, No. 60539924, and by the Seimeikai Foundation. I would like to express my appreciation to Celia G. Boertlein, U.S. Bureau of the Census, for sending me copies of Current Population Reports.

poverty, pollution, crime, congestion, and other real and anticipated effects of large-scale massing of people (Beale & Fuguitt, 1978, p. 158).

Since 1970, changes in rural and urban migration flow have occurred in the United States deeply connected with the economic and social situations mentioned above, and new trends of both deconcentration of large urban cores and repopulation of remote rural regions can be observed. It goes without saying that the reversal of relative growth rates between metropolitan and non-metropolitan areas is associated with change in the relative importance of natural increase and net migration to the regional population growth. Net migration has taken over, in most areas, as the prime determinant of local population change (Brown & Wardwell, 1980, p. 5). Our attention in this paper is mainly directed toward the changing pattern of internal migration in the United States.

TABLE 1. URBAN AND RURAL POPULATION OF THE UNITED STATES, 1790–1980

Year	Total		Urban		Rural		Percent of Total	
	Population (million)	Percent change over preceding census	Popolation (million)	Percent change over preceding census	Population (million)	Percent change over preceding census	Urban	Rural
Current urban definition								
1980	226.5	11.4	167.1	11.9	59.5	10.4	73.7	26.3
1970	203.2	13.4	149.3	19.2	53.9	−0.3	73.5	26.5
1960	179.3	18.5	125.3	29.3	54.1	−0.8	69.9	30.1
1950	151.3	×	96.8	×	54.5	×	64.0	36.0
Previous urban definition								
1940	132.2	7.2	74.7	7.9	57.5	6.4	56.5	43.5
1930	123.2	16.1	69.2	27.3	54.0	4.4	56.2	43.8
1920	106.0	14.9	54.3	29.0	51.8	3.2	51.2	48.8
1910	92.2	21.0	42.1	39.3	50.2	9.0	45.7	54.3
1900	76.2	20.7	30.2	36.4	46.0	12.2	39.7	60.3
1890	63.0	25.5	22.1	56.4	40.9	13.4	35.1	64.9
1880	50.2	26.0	14.1	42.7	36.1	25.7	28.2	71.8
1870	39.8[1)]	26.6	9.9	59.3	28.7	13.6	25.7	74.3
1860	31.4	35.6	6.2	75.4	25.2	28.4	19.8	80.2
1850	23.2	35.9	3.5	92.1	19.6	29.1	15.3	84.7
1840	17.1	32.7	1.8	63.7	15.2	29.7	10.8	89.2
1830	12.9	33.5	1.1	62.6	11.7	31.2	8.8	91.2
1820	9.6	33.1	0.7	32.0	8.9	33.3	7.2	92.8
1810	7.2	36.4	0.5	63.0	6.7	34.7	7.3	92.7
1800	5.3	35.1	0.3	59.4	5.0	33.7	6.1	93.9
1790	3.9	×	0.2	×	3.7	×	5.1	94.9

Source: *Historical Abstract of the United States, Colonial Times to 1970,* Part I, p. 8 and pp. 11–12; *Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1982–83,* p. 21.

Notes: × denotes not applicable.
− denotes decrease.
1) Includes 1,260,000 persons for whom urban-rural residence is not applicable.

II. *Redistribution of Population in the United States*

(1) Rural and Urban Population Change

When the first population census was taken in 1790 the United States was overwhelmingly a rural nation with around 95 percent of the people living in the countryside. Since then, the urban population has grown more rapidly than the rural population in every succeeding decade except for the period 1810–1820.

Although the rural population continued to grow, since 1880 the increase in the rural population has gradually diminished. In 1920 the urban population of the United States first exceeded the rural population, as exhibited in Table 1. On the one hand, the urban growth continued with double digits percent changes over preceeding censuses, while rural population, on the other hand, showed slight growth and eventually decreased in the 1950's. As mentioned above, it has been assumed that the increasing concentration of people in and around urban territories would be a continuous process and counties with no settlement of population as large as 2,500 which are not adjacent to a metropolitan area may be thought of as isolated and unlikely to grow (Long & DeAre, 1982, p. 1112).

Census data from 1980 and data from the Current Population Surveys disclosed a reversal of this historic pattern of migration. What was not changed was the continued spacial and demographic expansion of metropolitan areas. What was different from the former pattern was that the total population within the updated metropolitan boundaries grew less rapid than the residual (nonmetropolitan) territories (Long & DeAre, 1982, pp. 1111–1112).

TABLE 2. METROPOLITAN[1] AND NONMETROPOLITAN AREA POPULATION, 1940 TO 1980

Item	1940[2]	1950	1960	1970	1980[3]
Metropolitan areas:					
Number of SMSAs	168	168	212	243	318
Population (1,000)	69,535	84,854	112,885	139,419	169,431
Percent change over previous year shown	×	22.0	33.0	23.6	21.5
Percent of total U.S. population	52.8	56.1	63.0	68.6	74.8
Land area, percent of U.S. Land area	7.0	7.0	8.7	11.0	16.0
Nonmetropolitan areas:					
Population (1,000)	62,135	66,472	66,438	63,793	57,115
Percent change over previous year shown	×	2.0	−0.1	−4.0	−10.5
Percent of total U.S. population	47.2	43.9	37.0	31.4	25.2

Source: *Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1982–83*, p. 14.

Notes: × denotes not applicable.
− denotes decrease.
1) Metropolitan area definition as of year shown, except as noted.
2) 1950 metropolitan area definition.
3) 1981 metropolitan area definition.

TABLE 3. POPULATION BY METROPOLITAN-NONMETROPOLITAN AREA, 1970 AND 1980

Area	Population (million)		Percent change
	1970[1)]	1980	
Total	203.3	226.5	11.4
Inside SMSAs	153.7	169.4	10.2
Central cities	67.9	68.0	0.2
Outside central cities	85.8	101.5	18.2
Outside SMSAs	49.6	57.1	15.1

Source: *Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1982–83*, p. 15.
Notes: 1) Population as defined in terms of 1980 SMSA area.

TABLE 4. POPULATION CHANGE IN METROPOLITAN AND NONMETROPOLITAN SETTINGS, 1960 TO 1980

Populations	Change in population (%)		Population in 1980 (in thousands)
	1960 to 1970	1970 to 1980	
United States	13.4	11.4	226,505
Nonmetropolitan counties not adjacent to a metropolitan area			
Largest settlement			
Under 2,500	−4.2	14.6	4,543
2,500 to 9,999	−2.1	13.1	10,255
10,000 to 24,999	5.3	13.7	7,120
25,000 or more	8.6	15.0	4,124
Nonmetropolitan counties adjacent to a metropolitan area			
Largest settlement			
Under 2,500	−0.8	19.0	3,157
2,500 to 9,999	3.5	17.0	13,236
10,000 to 24,999	9.0	17.8	12,467
25,000 or more	10.9	12.2	5,610
Metropolitan areas			
Under 100,000	14.8	20.4	3,611
100,000 to 249,999	16.2	17.8	18,461
250,000 to 499,999	17.0	16.9	24,883
500,000 to 999,999	17.0	11.6	28,640
1,000,000 to 2,999,999	23.8	12.2	50,524
3,000,000 or more	11.1	−0.8	39,875

Source: L. Long and D. DeAre, 1982, p. 1112.
Notes: Metropolitan area boundaries are as of 1 January 1980. Population size categories are as of 1970.

(2) Metropolitan and Nonmetropolitan Population

The changes of metropolitan and nonmetropolitan population in the initial tabulated count defined by each census as exhibited in Table 2 indicate that although the population of metropolitan areas continued to grow, decreases in the population of nonmetropolitan areas have been strengthened since 1950. But, figures of population in Table 2 are quite misleading because of the changing metropolitan area boundaries. While in 1950 land area of metropolitan areas occupied 7.0 percent of total U.S. land area, this increased to 16.0 percent in 1980. Even though the land expansion continued, it must be mentioned that about three quarters of the U.S. population were residing in the metropolitan areas.

Table 3 shows the revisions of the 1970 population count as defined by the standard of the 1980 metropolitan areas. This table clearly exhibits that a turnaround occurred in the 1970's as the growth rate of nonmetropolitan territories rose and exceeded the metropolitan growth rate, in spite of the slow population growth in the United States. This turnaround was an unprecedented phenomena in the history of the United States.

It is necessary to breakdown the metropolitan and nonmetropolitan areas by population size. Table 4 is a reproduction of the revisions made by Long and DeAre. Table 4 tells us two tales. First is the repopulation in nonmetropolitan areas. The repopulation in these areas extended to counties not adjacent to 1980 metropolitan areas and remote areas formerly thought of as isolated and unlikely to grow. Second is the changes in metropolitan areas. During 1960 to 1970, the larger metropolitan areas increased more rapidly than the areas with smaller populations except for the largest metropolitan areas with a population of more than three million. In the 1970's smaller metropolitan areas grew faster than larger ones, and during this period the largest metropolitan areas eventually lost their population. It may be reasonable to state that not only was growth shifting toward the nonmetropolitan sector but within both the metropolitan and the nonmetropolitan sectors growth was also shifting toward less urbanized settings (Long & DeAre, 1982, p. 1112).

(3) Regional Distribution of Population

It is said that the economic power bloc among the U.S. regions during the mid-20th century was the southern New England, Middle Atlantic and Great Lakes states that made up the manufacturing belt of the nation (W. Issel, 1985, p. 71). Table 5 exhibits the changing distribution of population in four major regions since 1950. We can observe a clear pattern in the redistribution of population between regions. While the Northeast and North Central regions maintained 26.1 percent and 29.4 percent of total U.S. population, respectively, in 1950, the percent of population in borh regions declined in 1980 to 21.7 percent and 26.0 percent, respectively. On the other hand, the South and West regions increased their population shares from 31.2 percent in 1950 to 33.3 percent in 1980 and from 13.3 to 19.1 percent, respectively.

If we look at the change of population in each region, the distinction between growing and declining regions is clear. The rates of increase of the population in the Northeast and North Central regions were less than the national average rates, and during 1970–1980 the Northeast region showed the lowest population increase rate of 0.2 percent. On the

TABLE 5. POPULATION CHANGE BY REGION

Regions	Population (millions)				Percent Distribution (%)				Percent Change (%)		
	1950	1960	1970	1980	1950	1960	1970	1980	1950–1960	1960–1970	1970–1980
Northeast	39.5	44.7	49.1	49.1	26.1	24.9	24.1	21.7	13.2	9.8	0.2
North Central	44.5	51.6	56.6	58.9	29.4	28.8	27.8	26.0	16.1	9.6	4.0
South	47.2	55.0	62.8	75.4	31.2	30.7	30.9	33.3	16.5	14.3	20.0
West	20.2	28.0	34.8	43.2	13.3	15.6	17.1	19.1	38.9	24.2	23.9
Total U.S.	151.3	179.3	203.3	226.5	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	18.5	13.4	11.4

Source: *Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1982–83*, pp. 9–11.

other hand, the West region always gained population increases in quite high rates, and since 1960 the South region began to have higher rates of increase than the national average.

These changes in regional population distribution were considered as a direct consequence of labor migration, which, in turn, was rendered by the shifts of jobs between regions.

III. *Internal Migration in the United States*

(1) General Pattern of Internal Migration

There are marked trends of internal migration in the United States listed below:

(a) In a typical 12-month period, around 16–20 percent of the total population 1 year old and over changed their place of residence.

(b) Nearly two-third of these movers were movers within the same county.

(c) The remaining one-third of all movers crossed a county line, and slightly more than half of these migrants found their new housing in the same state.

(d) Nearly half of the migrants who moved between counties made interstate moves.

TABLE 6. MIGRATION RATES

Period	Total Movers		Percent Distribution			
	Number (1,000)	Mobility Rate[1)]	Same County	Same State	Different State	Movers from Abroad
1950–1951	31,158	21.0	66.4	16.9	16.7	1.0
1960–1961[2)]	36,533	20.6	66.5	15.0	15.8	2.7
1970–1971	37,705	18.7	61.1	16.4	18.4	4.1
1980–1981	38,200	17.2	60.5	19.9	16.2	3.4
1981–1982	38,127	17.0	60.5	19.2	17.4	2.9
1982–1983	37,408	16.6	61.1	19.8	16.5	2.6

Source: *Historical Abstract of the United States, Colonial Times to 1970*, Part I, p. 96; *Current Population Reports*, Series P-20, No. 393, p. 1.

Notes: 1) Based on the population one year old and over.
2) First year for which figures include Alaska and Hawaii.

One of the characteristics of historical trends of migration is that the number of movers were almost constant as Table 6 shows. This means a decreasing annual mobility rate as the population increased during the post-war period. For example, about 20 percent of the population one year old and over changed their residence within the United States between 1960 and 1961, compared with about 16 percent between 1982 and 1983. It is frequently pointed out that higher geographical mobility rates are associated with higher levels of educational attainment. The figures of Table 6 do not confirm this argument if we take into consideration the remarkable improvement in the level of educational attainment from 1950 to the present time (*Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1982–83*, p. 133). The difference of mobility rates among different educational level groups will be discussed later.

As for the percentage of the distribution of the movers by mobility status, the percent of movers within the same county declined and the percent of movers crossing county lines

but not crossing state lines increased. On the other hand, the percent of interstate migrants diminished.

Although diversity of mobility rates for different age groups existed, there were consistent tendencies for both adults and children; the rates of mobility decreased with increasing age. Adults in their twenties showed the highest rate of moving. High frequency of moving for young adults arose from the various reasons connected with their life-cycle stages; changes in their educational and occupational situations and changes in marital status. Children's rates of moving followed those of their parents. Younger children showed higher rates of moving than older children in their school ages. As Table 7 exhibits, the difference in mobility rates between male and female was not so significant.

TABLE 7. MOBILITY RATES[1)] BY AGE AND SEX, 1982–1983

Age	Both Sexes	Male	Female
Total, 1 Year old and over	16.1	16.5	15.7
Under 5 Years	24.8	25.4	24.2
5 to 9 Years	18.1	17.8	18.5
10 to 14 Years	13.2	13.3	13.1
15 to 19 Years	14.9	13.5	16.2
20 to 24 Years	33.7	31.8	35.6
25 to 29 Years	29.8	30.2	29.3
30 to 34 Years	20.0	21.3	18.7
35 to 44 Years	12.6	14.0	11.3
45 to 54 Years	8.0	8.6	7.4
55 to 64 Years	5.8	5.9	5.7
65 to 74 Years	4.7	4.7	4.7
75 Years and over	4.9	3.8	5.6

Source: *Current Population Reports*, Series P-20, No. 393, p. 15.
Notes: [1)] Excluding movers from abroad.

TABLE 8. MOBILITY RATES BY EDUCATIONAL LEVEL, 1982–83

Years of School Completed	Total, 18 years and over (1,000)	Total Movers[1)] (1,000)	Percent Movers	Percent Distribution			
				Total Movers	Same County	Same State	Different State
Total, 18 years old and over	167,067	26,502	15.9	100.0	61.6	21.3	17.1
Elementary: 0 to 8 years	21,846	2,202	10.1	100.0	73.9	14.9	11.2
High School: 1 to 3 years	23,013	3,869	16.8	100.0	67.0	18.8	14.2
4 years	65,218	10,317	15.8	100.0	62.5	21.2	16.4
College: 1 to 3 years	29,058	5,267	18.1	100.0	60.7	22.5	16.8
4 years	16,375	2,993	18.3	100.0	51.2	25.4	23.4
5 years or more	11,558	1,854	16.0	100.0	50.4	24.9	24.7

Source: *Current Population Reports*, Series P-20, No. 393, p. 50.
Notes: 1) Excluding movers from abroad.

Levels of educational attainment had been connected with the mobility rates in two aspects. First, higher levels of educational attainment were associated with higher mobility rates. College graduates were expected to be more likely to move than high school grad-

uates, who, in turn, were believed to migrate more frequently than persons with only an elementary education. Second, highly educated persons were more likely to move between states or long distance than persons with limited amounts of education. Since the proportion of persons with high education has been increasing, one would expect the increase of mobility rates and the heightening of interstate migration.

At least in a typical 12-month period the difference in moving rates among educational levels are maintained. Persons with only an elementary education were less mobile than high school graduates, while college graduates showed the highest mobility rates, as indicated in Table 8.

However, we must point out the failure in this theory concerning the increase in the general mobility rates, as illustrated in Table 6. The tendency of rising levels of educational attainment to raise rates of long-distance migration has not been maintained. Table 9 shows mobility rates by educational level in the period during 1969 to 1970. Although comparison between Table 8 and Table 9 is difficult due to the difference in their statistical population bases, it is still possible to detect the tendency shown. The percent of interstate migrants among college graduates declined during the periods between 1969–1970 and 1982–1983, despite the increasing percent of persons with college educations.

TABLE 9. MOBILITY RATES BY EDUCATIONAL LEVEL, 1969–1970

Years of School Completed	Total, 25 years old and over (1,000)	Total Movers[1] (1,000)	Percent Movers	Percent Distribution			
				Total Movers	Same County	Same State	Different State
Total, 25 Years old	109,311	15,822	14.5	100.0	64.7	17.4	17.9
Elementary: 0 to 8 years	30,267	3,646	12.0	100.0	71.9	17.4	10.9
High School: 1 to 3 years	18,683	2,756	14.8	100.0	73.0	13.6	13.4
4 years	37,134	5,229	14.1	100.0	63.9	18.0	18.1
College: 1 year or more	23,227	4,190	18.0	100.0	54.0	19.1	26.9

Source: *Current Population Reports*, Series P-20, No. 210, p. 12.
Notes: 1) Excluding movers from abroad.

(2) Inter-regional migration

Until about 1950 migrants had been heading out of the South region and into the Northeast and North Central regions. In the 1950's this pattern of migration changed. Net out-migration from the South reversed itself, and the Northeast and North Central regions increasingly became migration origins rather than destinations (J. R. Weeks, p. 157).

The Current Population Survey of 1983 reveals that Americans continued to shift between the four major regions of the United States in line with patterns that existed during preceeding decades. The Northeast and North Central regions lost more people than they gained from migration with net losses of 186,000 and 286,000, respectively, during 1982–83. The South and West regions continued to have net gains of migrants of 238,000 and 235,000, respectively, during 1982–83. In the later half of the 1950–60 decade the South began to change from its long-standing pattern of net out-migration to net in-migration (*Current Population Reports*, Series P-20, No. 285, p. 2).

The number of in-migrants to each region from other regions are shown in Table 11

TABLE 10. INTERREGIONAL MIGRATION, 1965–1983

(in thousands)

Region, Migration Status		1965–1970[1)]	1970–1975[2)]	1975–1980[2)]	1982–1983[3)]
Northeast:	In-migrants	1,273	1,057	1,106	439
	Out-migrants	1,988	2,399	2,592	625
	Net migration	−715	−1,342	−1,486	−186
North Central:	In-migrants	2,024	1,731	1,993	661
	Out-migrants	2,661	2,926	3,166	947
	Net migration	−637	−1,195	−1,173	−286
South:	In-migrants	3,142	4,082	4,204	1,211
	Out-migrants	2,486	2,253	2,440	973
	Net migration	657	1,829	1,764	238
West:	In-migrants	2,309	2,347	2,838	880
	Out-migrants	1,613	1,639	1,945	645
	Net migration	695	708	893	235

Source: *Current Population Reports*, Series P-20, No. 292, p. 24; No. 393, pp. 8–9; *Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1982–83*, p. 14.

Notes: 1) Civilian noninstitutional population 5 years old and over, living in the U.S. at both dates.
2) Population 5 years old and over, living in the U.S. at both dates.
3) Population 1 year old and over, living in the U.S. at both dates.

TABLE 11. IN-MIGRANTS[1)] BY REGION

(in thousands)

Region of Residence	1966–67	1975–76	1982–83
Northeast: in-migrants from North Central	130 (25.3)	126 (27.8)	86 (19.6)
South	275 (53.5)	246 (54.3)	266 (60.6)
West	109 (21.2)	81 (17.9)	87 (19.8)
Total in-migrants	514 (100.0)	453 (100.0)	439 (100.0)
North Central: in-migrants from Northeast	143 (15.2)	135 (20.2)	97 (14.7)
South	518 (54.9)	309 (46.3)	370 (56.0)
West	282 (29.9)	224 (33.5)	194 (29.3)
Total in-migrants	943 (100.0)	668 (100.0)	661 (100.0)
South: in-migrants from Northeast	370 (35.0)	361 (30.3)	324 (26.8)
North Central	420 (39.8)	535 (44.9)	522 (43.1)
West	266 (25.2)	295 (24.8)	365 (30.1)
Total in-migrants	1,056 (100.0)	1,191 (100.0)	1,211 (100.0)
West: inmigrants from Northeast	139 (13.6)	170 (17.6)	205 (23.3)
North Central	369 (36.1)	362 (37.4)	339 (38.4)
South	514 (50.3)	435 (45.0)	337 (38.3)
Total in-migrants	1,022 (100.0)	967 (100.0)	881 (100.0)

Source: *Current Population Reports*, Series P-20, No. 171, p. 47; No. 305, pp. 6–7; No. 393, pp. 8–9.

Notes: 1) Excluding movers from abroad.

between three periods, 1966–67, 1975–76, and 1982–83. It is possible to estimate the net migration in each region from other regions distinctively.

The periods 1966–67 and 1975–76 showed a similar pattern of migrants flow with some difference in their magnitude. Greater portions of in-migrants to the West region came from the South and North Central regions. The West region gained net migration from

the other three regions, but the volumes of net migration from these regions changed during this period; increasing net migration from the Northeast and North Central regions and decreasing net migration from the South region. Net migration for the South region from the Northeast and North Central regions were increased in number during the periods 1966–67 and 1975–76. While the West region continued to be a destination of many migrants, the strong westward movement has yielded to a strong southward population movement. Net migration to the North Central from the Northeast region was considerably small and stable between 1966–67 and 1975–76.

The interregional migration pattern between regions changed slightly in 1982–83 from the preceeding period. The South region began to gain net migration from the West region. but the attractive power of the South for the Northeast and North Central regions were diminishing. Although the West region experienced net out-migration to the South, the West continued to gain net migration from the Northeast and North Central regions, with a small increase in number. Although the North Central region gained net migration from Northeast, the number of interregional migrants between Northeast and North Central dwindled.

(3) Metropolitan-Nonmetropolitan migration

The population in metropolitan areas, which grew from 69.5 million in 1940 to 169.4 million in 1980, made up 74.8 percent of the total U.S. population in 1980 as compared with the figure of 52.8 percent in 1940, as exhibited in Table 2.

One of the most established patterns of internal migration in the United States has been the concentration of population in metropolitan areas. Another important pattern of migration was the growth of population in the suburbs. The movement of population from cities to suburbs had a long history dating back to the nineteenth century. But the United States became a suburban nation only in the years after 1945 (W. Issel, p. 87).

Since 1970 an important change has taken place in this historic pattern; metropolitan areas were no longer growing faster than nonmetropolitan areas. The report on geographical mobility based on the 1973 Current Population Survey showed the first observed net loss for metropolitan areas and net gain for nonmetropolitan areas due to migration within the United States. This report pointed out that "during the 3-year period from March 1970 to March 1973, the estimates from the Current Population Survey indicated that more people moved from metropolitan areas than moved to metropolitan areas, yielding a net loss to metropolitan areas of 944,000." Although the report revealed the changing pattern of migration, it considered this change represented continued urban development around the fringes of metropolitan areas. (*Current Population Reports*, Series P-20, No. 262, p. 1).

Table 12 exhibits the changing percent of movers by mobility status classified on the basis of a comparison between the place of residence of each individual in the beginning of the period and the place of residence in the end of the period. Nearly half of the total movers changed their residence within the same SMSA, and around one-fourth of the movers were living outside the SMSAs at both dates. Thus, the percent of movers between metropolitan areas and nonmetropolitan areas was not large.

However, increasing awareness of the limits on continued growth of large urban areas encouraged to bring forward the opinion that the increase of population in rural America

TABLE 12. DISTRIBUTION OF MOVERS BY MOBILITY STATUS

(in thousands)

Mobility Status	1970–1975[1]		1975–1980[1]		1980–1981[2]		1981–1982[2]		1982–1983[2]	
Different house in the U.S.	79,838	(100.0)	91,146	(100.0)	36,887	(100.0)	37,039	(100.0)	36,430	(100.0)
Within same SMSA	36,710	(47.0)	41,619	(45.6)	18,000	(44.8)	17,795	(48.0)	17,658	(48.5)
Within central city	14,733		15,765		7,434		7,480		7,360	
Within balance of SMSA	13,797		17,292		6,852		6,565		6,461	
Central city to balance of SMSA	6,056		6,069		2,534		2,654		2,581	
Balance of SMSA to central city	2,123		2,493		1,179		1,096		1,256	
Between SMSAs	12,252	(15.4)	14,551	(16.0)	5,111	(13.9)	5,212	(14.1)	5,060	(13.9)
Between central cities	2,380		3,391		1,282		1,349		1,425	
Between balance of SMSAs	4,458		5,195		1,813		1,781		1,641	
Central city to balance of SMSA	3,709		3,957		1,310		1,347		1,329	
Balance of SMSA to central city	1,705		2,007		706		735		664	
From outside SMSAs to SMSAs	5,127	(6.4)	5,993	(6.6)	2,156	(5.8)	2,217	(6.0)	2,088	(5.7)
To central cities	2,159		2,391		880		862		813	
To balance of SMSAs	2,967		3,602		1,276		1,355		1,276	
From SMSAs to outside SMSAs	6,721	(8.4)	7,337	(8.0)	2,350	(6.4)	2,366	(6.4)	2,066	(5.7)
From central cities	3,240		3,211		1,157		1,201		1,054	
From balance of SMSAs	3,481		4,127		1,193		1,165		1,012	
Outside SMSAs at both dates	19,029	(23.8)	21,647	(23.8)	9,271	(25.1)	9,451	(25.5)	9,558	(26.2)

Source: *Current Population Reports*, Series P-20, No. 285, No. 368, No. 377, No. 384, No. 393.
Notes: 1) 5 years old and over, living in the U.S. at both dates.
2) 1 year old and over, living in the U.S. at both dates.

was not just the result of suburbanization and urban sprawl. In fact, during the periods of 1970–75 and 1975–80 nonmetropolitan areas gained net migtarion from both central cities and suburbs, as Table 13 shows. According to the argument of Easterlin, the geographical distribution of American population has gone through two great epochs; agricultural settlement and cityward movement. Now the geographical distribution appears to be on the verge of a third epoch; resettlement of rural areas (R. A. Easterlin, p. 305).

Among several factors involved in this rural population turnaround were economic deconcentration, preference for rural living, and modernization of rural life (Brown & Wardwell, pp. 12–14).

According to Table 13, nonmetropolitan areas continued with an increase in net migration until 1982, but net migration for nonmetropolitan areas reversed once again to be negative during 1982–83. It is impossible to present a decisive view on this new movement at the present time. There is a need to watch carefully for this movement in the future. We must be satisfied at this time with the reproduction of the following statement of *Current Population Reports*, Series P-20, No. 393.

TABLE 13. CENTRAL CITY, SUBURBAN AND NONMETROPOLITAN MIGRATION

(in thousands)

Item	1970–1975[1)]	1975–1980[1)]	1980–1981[2)]	1981–1982[2)]	1982–1983[2)]
Net Migrations of Central Cities	−7,018	−6,346	−2,236	−2,509	−2,231
To suburbs	−5,937	−5,526	−1,959	−2,170	−1,990
To Non-SMSAs	−1,081	−820	−277	−339	−241
Net Migration of Suburbs	5,423	5,001	2,042	2,360	2,254
To Central Cities	5,937	5,526	1,959	2,170	1,990
To Non-SMSAs	−314	−525	83	190	264
Net Migration of Non-SMSAs	1,594	1,344	194	149	−22
To Central Cities	1,081	820	277	339	241
To Suburbs	314	525	−83	−190	−264

Source: *Current Population Reports*, Series P-20, No. 285, No. 368, No. 377, No. 384, No. 393.
Notes: — denotes net out-migration.
1) 5 years old and over, living in the U.S. at both dates.
2) 1 year old and over, living in the U.S. at both dates.

"The very small net loss for nonmetropolitan areas shown in this report and the small net gain for nonmetropolitan areas in the 1981 and 1982 CPS reports are not statistically significant. However, they do represent at least a leveling off of net population movement between metropolitan and nonmetropolitan areas." (p. 2).

IV. *Concluding Remarks*

This paper provided data concerning new trends of geographical mobility in the United States. The repopulation of rural areas, remote from any large urban centers, was not forecasted and the nonmetropolitan migration turnaround in the United States took nearly everyone by surprise.

There is a conflict of interpretations of this new trend. Statistical data collected at the time of writing show that the amount of movers between metropolitan and nonmetropolitan areas were not so large.

An important task to develop and empirically test a model of this migration turnaround is remaining to be untouched. Consideration of the differences and similarities of migration in the United States and Japan will be done in the next issue of this Journal.

HITOTSUBASHI UNIVERSITY

REFERENCES

Beale, Calvin L. (1978), "People on the Land," Thomas R. Ford, ed., *Rural U.S.A., Persistence and Change*, Ames: Iowa State University Press.

Beale, Calvin L. and Glenn V. Fuguitt (1978), "The New Pattern of Nonmetropolitan Population Change," K. E. Taeuber, L. L. Bumpass, J. A. Sweet, eds., *Social Demography*, New York: Academic Press.

Brown, David L. and John M. Wardwell, eds., (1980), *New Directions in Urban-Rural Migration, The Population Turnaround in Rural America*, New York: Academic Press.

Easterlin, R. A. (1980), "American Population since 1940," Martin Eeldstein, ed., *The American Economy in Transition*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Issel, William (1985), *Social Change in the United States, 1945–1983*, London: Macmillan.

Long, Larry and Diana DeAre (1982), "Repopulating the Countryside: A 1980 Census Trend," *Science*, Vol. 217.

Vickerman, R. W. (1984), *Urban Economies, Analysis and Policy*, Oxford: Philip Allen.

Weeks, J. R. (1981), *Population*, Belmont, CA.: Wadsworth.

Yorimitsu, M. (1985), "A Review on the Determinants of Migration," *Hitotsubashi Journal of Social Studies*, Vol. 17, No. 1.

STATISTICS

U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *Current Population Reports, Population Characteristics*, Series P-20,

1968, No. 171, *Mobility of the Population of the United States, Match 1966 to March 1967.*

1971, No. 210, *Mobility of the Population of the United States, March 1969 to March 1970.*

1975, No. 279, *Population Profile of the United States: 1974.*

1975, No. 285, *Mobility of the Population of the United States, March 1970 to March 1975.*

1976, No. 292, *Population Profile of the United States: 1975.*

1977, No. 305, *Geographical Mobility: March 1975 to March 1976.*

1981, No. 368, *Geographical Mobility: March 1975 to March 1980.*

1983, No. 377, *Geographical Mobility: March 1980 to March 1981.*

1984, No. 384, *Geographical Mobility: March 1981 to March 1982.*

1984, No. 393, *Geographical Mobility: March 1982 to March 1983.*

U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census (1975), *Historical Statistics of the United States, Colonial Times to 1970.*

U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census (1982), *Statistical Abstracts of the United States, 1982–83.*