BOOK REVIEW

POPULATION MOBILITY WITHIN THE UNITED STATES

HENRY S. SHRYOCK, JR.

Chicago, Ill., Community and Family Study Center, University of Chicago, 1964, 470 pp., \$5.50.

li w.

<u> Da`</u>

i ili

ar.

....

8

1

1

This book is a striking demonstration of the progress that has been made in the last 20 years in the study of internal migration in the United States. Dr. Shryock disarmingly tells us in his preface that there was "so much ground to be covered that strip-mining as opposed to drilling deep shafts seemed to be what was called for at the time I began my writing." The new data published in recent years presented a challenge; in any one of several departments of the subject it would have been interesting to carry out statistical testing of various hypotheses or to do a multiple regression analysis of the determinants of the propensity to migrate. The author expresses his regret that he did not have the time to elaborate the treatment in this way. Desirable though such extensions would be in their own right—and no one is more competent than Dr. Shryock to undertake them-nevertheless we can be glad that he resisted the temptation, for they would have upset the design of the work and made us wait longer for it. This volume is an outstanding contribution to the literature of demography.

The introductory chapters on the nature of the underlying data and the problems of measurement set the stage admirably for a brief historical record of mobility within the United States. It is a clear and authoritative statement of the essential points. The long-period survey makes it clear that the highest rates of internal mobility were experienced during the 1850s and World War II. Among the noteworthy trends in recent decades is the tendency toward net migration of whites into some of the Southern States and the fact that an increasing number of Negroes from the South are going to the West rather than to the North. This book gives a detailed analysis of geographical variations in mobility rates, gross and net migration, comparative "effectiveness" of migration for whites and nonwhites, and motivation in change of residence.

狐

7

Ď.

ΞĖ

ŠŽ.

-7

ii.

Ė.

in.

The author gives special attention to the time-oriented figures on mobility from the 1950 and 1940 Censuses and from the Current Population Survey. Over the 11 consecutive years for which annual observations were available, the striking thing about the rates of various types of mobility was their stability: "About one-fifth of the population had lived in a different house a year ago. Of these movers, about two-thirds moved only within the same county and less than one-sixth moved from one state to another. These results confirm other findings that mobility within a country is mostly short-distance mobility. If movers were simply distributed in proportion to the population at each potential destination within the country, the majority of movers would move to a noncontiguous state" (p. 411).

A measure of the "effectiveness" of migration is obtained by adding the number of net in-migrants over all areas, dividing by the total number of interarea migrants, and multiplying the quotient by 100. The results for recent periods for whites and nonwhites are as follows:

	Effectiveness Index	(Interstate Migration)
	White	Nonwhite
1949-1950	7.9	10.9
1935-1940	21.5	31.5

The exodus of Negroes from the Deep South to the northern industrial states, which was the outstanding characteristic of the

pre-war period, was much less apparent in the years 1949–1950; the southward return migration in that year produced low effectiveness rates for both whites and nonwhites. The analysis brings out the fact that out-migration from Kentucky, a Border State, was more effective for nonwhites than for whites, because this state received a large inflow of Negroes from states farther south. One would have liked to have a deeper investigation into the time-pattern of the streams of Negro migration. Research on the half century up to the 1920s has shown that the propensity of Negroes to move out of the South varied inversely with the volume of immigration from abroad. It would appear that the upward phase in the long swing in immigration meant a worsening in the economic conditions of Negroes, and this would help to explain why the variations in the natural increase of nonwhites were inverse to those of whites. The period since the Immigration Restriction Act of 1924 needs to be re-examined, in order to test the hypothesis that the former competitive relationship between nonwhites and foreign immigrants has in the last three decades been re-enacted interregionally within the United States. The book under review is a valuable guide to the data required for such an exercise.

Students of demography will pay special heed to Dr. Shryock's authoritative concluding statement on the next steps in the study of population mobility. He makes a number of important recommendations concerning future inquiries in this field. If the authorities will take action along the lines required, the study of internal migration in the United States, far from being the stepchild of demography, is likely to become a favorite son.

BRINLEY THOMAS