Statistics reporting the general, social and economic characteristics of the black population in the U.S. are presented in this document, the sixth in a series on the subject. The report focuses, in general, on the changes which have occurred in the last five years in income, employment, education, housing, health and other major aspects of life. During the 1960's, blacks made substantial social and economic gains in many of the areas mentioned above; in recent years progress continued in some areas--notably, education. In some other areas, no improvements were noted, and in 1973, blacks still remained behind whites in most social and economic areas. (Author/RJ)

Issued July 1973

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Social and Economic Statistics Administration
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS
PREFACE

This report was planned and prepared by Nampeo D. R. McKenney, Special Assistant on Racial Statistics, with the assistance of Olga V. Fonville, Patricia A. Johnson, and Virginia H. Williams of Population Division. General direction was provided by Meyer Zitter, Chief, and Charles Johnson, Assistant Chief of Population Division. Most of the chapter on Employment was developed in the Division of Economic Studies of the Bureau of Labor Statistics by Harvey R. Hamel, assisted by Claudia O. Ellis, under the direction of Robert L. Stein, Chief.

Camilla A. Brooks and Sandra L. Parker, with the assistance of several other staff members of the Statistical Methods Division, conducted the sampling review of the report. Clerical assistance was provided by Veronica Arehart, Mary B. Williams, and June Cowles and editorial assistance by Vivian Brown of Population Division. Many individuals within the Publications Services Division made significant contributions in the areas of publication planning and design, editorial review, composition and printing procurement. Special acknowledgment is due to other staff members of the Bureau of the Census who assisted in various phases of the report.

Appreciation is expressed to the personnel of several government and private agencies who contributed data willingly and with outstanding judgment. The agencies are Civil Service Commission, National Center for Health Statistics of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Joint Center for Political Studies.

The cover was designed by James A. Davis, Advertising and Design.
NOTE

In both text and tables of this report, the terms "Black" or "Negro" are used interchangeably. They are used only when the relevant data are available exclusively for Negroes. The term "Negro and other races" describes persons of all races other than white and is used whenever data for blacks alone are not available over the period of time shown. Generally, statistics for the national population of Negro and other races reflect the condition of the black population, since about 90 percent of the population of Negro and other races is black.
CONTENTS

Introduction .................................................. 1

I. Population Distribution .................................. 7

II. Income .................................................. 15

III. Employment ........................................... 35

IV. Education ............................................... 58

V. The Family ............................................... 66

VI. Housing ................................................ 76

VII. Health ................................................ 86

VIII. Voting ............................................... 95

Appendix ................................................... 102

References for Tables ....................................... 103

Definitions and Explanations ............................... 106

Sources and Reliability of the Data ....................... 107

INTRODUCTION

Statistics describing the general, social, and economic characteristics of the black population in the United States are presented in this report, which is the sixth in a series on the subject. In general, the report focuses on the changes which have occurred within the last five years in income, employment, education, housing, health, and other major aspects of life. The most current data available are presented here.

During the 1960's, blacks made substantial social and economic gains in many of the areas mentioned above. In recent years, progress continued in some areas—notably, education; however, in some other areas, no improvements were noted. And in 1973, blacks still remained behind whites in most social and economic areas.

POPULATION AND MIGRATION

The black population increased by 1.8 million during the last five years and numbered 23.4 million in April 1972. The majority of blacks were metropolitan, central city dwellers.

Between 1965 and 1970 there was a substantial movement of about one-quarter of a million black migrants from the South to central cities in the North and West; about one-half of whom were from nonmetropolitan areas of the South.

The migration of the black population has been predominantly from the South to the North. Of the 13.0 million blacks (5 years old and over) born in the South, 3.2 million had migrated and were living in other parts of the country in 1970. In contrast, less than 200,000 blacks born in the North and West were living in the South.

The majority of black persons who moved to the South between 1965 and 1970 (113,000 out of 171,000) were returning to their region of birth.

INCOME

The median income of black families in 1972 was about $6,900 and for white families $11,500, providing a black to white median ratio of 59 percent. This ratio was about the same as it was in 1967, but was higher than the ratio of 54 percent in 1964 (the first year for which corresponding survey data on blacks was available).

Although the overall ratio did not change, improvements have been noted for some types of families during the five-year period. The median income ratio was higher in 1972 (0.75) than in 1967 (0.67) for those families headed by men. Among those male headed families with a wife present, the rise in the black to white income ratio occurred only for those with a wife in the paid labor force.

The proportion of Negro and other races families with incomes above $10,000 rose from 22 percent in 1966 to 30 percent in 1971. However, the proportion is still well below that for white families (54 percent).

In 1971, among husband-wife families, the median incomes of blacks and whites were more comparable for those where both spouses were earners than for those in which the husband was the only earner (black-white ratios of 0.86 and 0.68, respectively). Nationally, the mean earnings of black wives about equaled that of white wives ($3,600 and $3,700, respectively).

The young black families (head under 35) in the North and West where both husband and wife were earners had, in 1971, achieved income parity with their white counterparts. However, these young black husband-wife
families comprised a relatively small proportion of all black families. The working wife (and the number who worked year round) was a major factor contributing to the income equality of the young black and white families. The earnings of young black wives residing in the North and West were substantially higher than their white counterparts, and they contributed more to the family income. A higher proportion of black than white wives worked year round.

At all educational levels, the earnings of black male workers 25 to 34 and 35 to 54 years old (who worked year round) were substantially below that of the comparable group of whites. Generally, improvements were noted for the younger men (25 to 34) who had college education. Among college educated men, the younger blacks had earnings in 1969 that were closer to that of the comparable whites than did older blacks. In contrast to black men, black women with at least some years of college had median earnings that about equalled that of their white counterparts, in both age groups.

Approximately 7.7 million black persons and 16.2 million white persons were below the low-income level in 1972. These figures represented a decline in the number of poor for both populations since 1967. However, within the last year, there is some evidence that the number of black poor increased, whereas the number of low-income whites declined substantially.

The 1.5 million low-income black families were about 29 percent of all black families in 1972. The number of low-income black families did not change from 1967 to 1972. However, during the same period, the decline was substantial for low-income white families.

By 1972, about two-thirds of low-income black families were headed by women; and within the last year, the number of these families headed by women increased. There was no change in the number of low-income families headed by men.

Of the low-income black population, about half were children under 18 years of age and about one-fifth were heads of families.

About one-third of black women with own children under 18 years old were below the low-income level in 1971. Approximately 45 percent of these mothers worked at some time during 1971, and 19 percent worked year round. Of those not working, about three-fourths gave "keeping house" as their main reason for not working.

One-fourth of black families received public assistance income in 1971; of these about 61 percent were below the low-income level. Five percent of white families had income from public assistance; of those receiving it, 45 percent were below the low-income level.

EMPLOYMENT

Employment of Negro and other races expanded at a slightly slower pace than that for white workers during the five-year period 1967 to 1972 (8 percent for Negro and other races versus 10 percent for whites). In 1972, about 8.6 million persons of Negro and other races were employed, up about 2 percent from the 1971 level; for whites, employment increased by 3 percent.

The 1972 jobless rate for Negro and other races remained at the 1971 level of about 10 percent; in contrast, there was a decline for whites from 5.4 to 5.0 percent. Thus, the Negro and other races to white jobless ratio rose to 2.0:1 in 1972.

Workers of Negro and other races were more likely than whites to experience long-term unemployment (15 weeks or more) and multiple periods of unemployment in 1971.

Labor force participation rates for Negro and other races were related to level of school attained. Negro and other races 25 to 54 years of age who had achieved higher levels of schooling were more likely to be in the labor force. At all educational levels, women of Negro and other races were more likely than white women to be in the labor force.

Persons of Negro and other races were more prevalent among discouraged workers—those not in the labor force who were not looking for work due to discouragement over job prospects.
Persons of Negro and other races have made gains in moving into the white-collar jobs. The proportion in these jobs increased from 23 percent in 1967 to 30 percent in 1972. However, differences still existed in job patterns as Negro and other races were underrepresented in the higher-paying jobs in 1972.

In 1969, for most occupations, the earnings of black women 25 to 54 years, who worked year round, were closer to that of the comparable group of white women than black men to white men. However, the average earning level of the young black men 25 to 34 years old who worked year round was about equal (ratios of 0.90 or more) to that of white men for a few specific occupations -- engineers, teachers, except college and university; engineering and science technicians, bus drivers, taxi drivers and chauffeurs, protective workers, and policemen and detectives. The average earning level of both the younger and older black women who worked year round was equal (ratio of 1.00 or more) to that of white women for those specific occupations -- secretaries, stenographers, typists, dressmakers and seamstresses, and workers in health services.

**EDUCATION**

Blacks have made significant advances in education during the five-year period, 1967 to 1972.

About one-half million, or 18 percent of all blacks, 18 to 24 years old, were enrolled in college in 1972 -- a substantial gain over the 1967 figures. The 1972 proportion of whites 18 to 24 years old remained at about the same level as it was in 1967. Overall, there were 727,000 blacks enrolled in college in 1972, about double the 1967 level.

The dropout rate for blacks declined between 1967 and 1972 -- from 22.8 to 17.5 (for those 14 to 24 years old). However, blacks were still more likely than whites to be high school dropouts.

About 90 percent of the black 16- and 17-year-olds were enrolled in school in 1972 compared to 84 percent in 1967; and for the first time in 1972, the enrollment rates for black and white 16- and 17-year-olds were at the same level.

The rising educational attainment of young black men and women in this country is further evidenced by the recent gains in the proportions who were high school or college graduates. The proportion of 20- to 29-year-olds who were high school graduates rose from 54 percent in 1967 to 65 percent in 1972. During the same period, the proportion of those 25 to 34 years old with four years of college or more increased from 5 to 8 percent. Despite these gains, the proportion of blacks completing high school or college is below that of whites.

**FAMILY**

In 1973, about three-fifths of all black families were husband-wife families. About 35 percent of black families were headed by a woman; this is an increase over the comparable proportion five years earlier. Within the last year, the proportion of black families headed by women increased from 32 to 35 percent.

Blacks were less likely than whites to have their first marriage intact, and more likely to have been widowed or divorced in 1970.

The proportion of men who were married and living with their spouses was closely related to their income and educational levels. Black men 25 to 54 years old with incomes of $10,000 or more in 1969, were more likely than men with lower income -- under $3,000 -- to have a wife living with them. Likewise, those black men who had completed high school were more likely than those without a high school education to have their first wife living with them.

Between 1967 and 1972, the proportion of own black children living with both parents decreased from 68 to 61 percent. Among whites, 89 percent of own children lived with both parents in 1972; it was 92 percent in 1967.

In 1970, among women who have almost completed their child-bearing years (35 to 44 years old), the fertility level (children ever born) of blacks surpasses that of whites at all
educational levels below college. On the other hand, black women with college training had a lower fertility rate than white women in the same educational group.

HEALTH

For both Negro and other races and whites, major cardiovascular diseases and malignant neoplasms were the two leading causes of death in 1969. However, the death rate for both diseases was higher for Negroes than for whites.

The next three major causes of death among Negro and other races in rank order were--accidents (including motor vehicle), influenza and pneumonia, and homicide.

Although significant reductions have been made in the infant mortality rate for Negro and other races during the last three decades, both neonatal mortality (under 28 days) and post-neonatal mortality (28 days to 11 months) were much higher for Negro and other races children than for white children in 1971. In 1968 (latest year data available), the maternal mortality rate for mothers of Negro and other races and white mothers was very low--below 1.0 per 1,000 live births.

In 1970, three out of five persons of Negro and other races under 65 years of age compared to four out of five whites in this age category had hospital insurance. With the introduction of Medicare, almost all persons 65 years old and over have health insurance coverage. The proportion of blacks and whites with hospital insurance coverage varied according to family income level and region of residence. Lowest rates were observed for persons in the under $5,000 income level and for persons who lived in the South.

HOUSING

The median monthly gross rent ($89) paid by black renters was lower than that ($112) paid by white renters. However, blacks paid a larger proportion of their income for rent than did whites in 1970--about 43 percent of black households and 35 percent of white households expended at least one-fourth of their income for gross rent.

Home ownership rates tended to increase as income levels rose for both black and white households. However, at all income levels, home ownership rates were lower for black than for white households in 1970.

About 63 percent of the black owned households were mortgaged properties. For white households, the proportion was similar. The annual housing cost was at least one-fourth of the income for 30 percent of these black households, compared to 18 percent for the comparable group of white households in 1970.

Black owned homes were older than those owned by whites--about 59 percent of the black homes were built before 1950 compared to 45 percent of the white homes.

VOTING

The reported voter participation rate for blacks of voting age in the 1972 Presidential election was about 6 percentage points lower than that in the two preceding Presidential elections--52 percent in 1972 compared to 58 percent in 1968 and 1964. The proportion of whites who reported that they voted also dropped.

The proportion of voting age blacks who were registered was about the same in 1972 as it was in 1968. Most of the blacks who were registered reported that they voted in 1972, but the proportion was somewhat lower than that in 1968.

Notable gains have been made in the number of blacks elected to public office. In 1972, the count was 2,600, more than double that for 1968. However, black elected officials
comprised less than one-half of one percent of all elected officials in the Nation. 2

2Joint Center for Political Studies, Focus, Volume 1, No. 7.

Between 1968 and 1972, the number of blacks in Congress increased from 10 to 16; the number elected to State legislatures rose from 172 to 238; and those serving as mayors increased from 29 to 83.

Changes in these and other measurable aspects of the living conditions of blacks in the United States, are indicated in the tables of this report.
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Table
In April 1972, the black population numbered approximately 23.4 million and comprised 11.3 percent of the total population. The black population has increased by an estimated 1.8 million during the last five years and by about 4.5 million since 1960. Almost all of the growth can be attributed to natural increase, excess of births over deaths, although immigration from abroad has been of some importance in recent years.

Table 1. Total and Black Population: 1900, 1940, 1950, 1960, and 1966 to 1972

(Numbers in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Percent black</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>131.7</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>150.7</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>179.3</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>195.0</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>197.0</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>198.9</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>200.9</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>203.2</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>205.7</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>207.8</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Data are for resident population as of April 1 for each year. Data for 1966-1969, 1971, and 1972 are estimates.

1Data exclude Alaska and Hawaii.

Due to the continuing net out-migration of blacks from the South, the proportion of blacks living outside the South is approaching one-half. In 1972, the Northeast and North Central regions each contained about one-fifth of the blacks; approximately 8 percent resided in the West.

Table 2. Percent Distribution of the Population by Region: 1950, 1960, 1970, and 1972

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>1950</th>
<th>1960</th>
<th>1970</th>
<th>1972</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BLACK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States, millions.</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent, total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States, millions.</td>
<td>134.9</td>
<td>158.8</td>
<td>177.7</td>
<td>179.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent, total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Data exclude Alaska and Hawaii.

Migration of the black population from the South to other regions has been the major factor contributing to the decline in the proportion of the population in the South which is black, and to the corresponding rising trend in the North.

The proportion of blacks ranged from 5 percent in the West to 19 percent in the South in 1972.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>1950</th>
<th>1960</th>
<th>1970</th>
<th>1972</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data exclude Alaska and Hawaii.

The migration stream of the black population has been a predominantly one-way movement—from the South; and this movement has been basically to the North. In 1970, 3.2 million of the 13.0 million blacks (5 years old and over) born in the South were living in other parts of the country. In contrast, less than 200,000 blacks born outside the South were living in the South in 1970.

The majority of the black persons who moved to the South between 1965 and 1970 (113,000 out of 171,000) were returning to their region of birth.

Table 4. Region of Residence in 1970 and 1965 of the Black Population, by Region of Birth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region of residence in 1970, by region of residence in 1965</th>
<th>United States</th>
<th>Born in--</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Living in South, 1970</td>
<td>9,975</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,785</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living in South 1970 and 1965</td>
<td>9,379</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,263</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living in different region in 1965</td>
<td>171</td>
<td></td>
<td>113</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living in North, 1970</td>
<td>6,862</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,566</td>
<td>4,272</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living in North 1970 and 1965</td>
<td>6,171</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,183</td>
<td>3,972</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living in different region 1985</td>
<td>341</td>
<td></td>
<td>275</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>314</td>
<td></td>
<td>264</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living in West, 1970</td>
<td>1,347</td>
<td></td>
<td>678</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living in West 1970 and 1965</td>
<td>1,121</td>
<td></td>
<td>536</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living in different region 1985</td>
<td>156</td>
<td></td>
<td>108</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Data are for the black population 5 years old and over.

1Includes those persons abroad in 1965 and those whose 1965 residence was not reported.

Of the more than one million black residents of central cities who moved from one county to another between 1965 and 1970, about two-thirds (67 percent) reported a metropolitan residence in 1965. In the South, however, only about 57 percent of black central city residents who moved between counties during this period reported a metropolitan area as their residence in 1965.

Between 1965 and 1970 there was a movement of about one-quarter of a million black migrants from the South to central cities in the North and West, with about one-half of this movement originating in the nonmetropolitan parts of the South.


(Numbers in thousands. Persons 5 years old and over)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence in 1965</th>
<th>Residence in 1970</th>
<th>Central cities in the South</th>
<th>Central cities in the North and West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>1,011</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan areas</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside metropolitan areas</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan areas</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside metropolitan areas</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North and West.</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan areas</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside metropolitan areas</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The black population is considerably younger than the white population, due, in part, to higher fertility rates among blacks. In 1972, the median ages were 21.3 and 23.7 years for black males and females, respectively; whereas the median ages for their white counterparts were 27.8 and 30.6 years, respectively.

In 1972, a larger proportion of blacks (about 34 percent) than of whites (about 27 percent) were 14 years of age and under. There were relatively fewer persons 65 years old and over among blacks than among whites. Only small variations existed for the intermediate age groups ranging from 20 to 44 years.

Table 6. Population by Age and Sex: 1972

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age and sex</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White¹</th>
<th>Percent distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male, all ages</td>
<td>11,138</td>
<td>90,072</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 5 years</td>
<td>1,275</td>
<td>7,569</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9 years</td>
<td>1,332</td>
<td>8,273</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 14 years</td>
<td>1,409</td>
<td>9,203</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 19 years</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>8,801</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 24 years</td>
<td>1,003</td>
<td>7,841</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 34 years</td>
<td>1,305</td>
<td>11,885</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 44 years</td>
<td>1,080</td>
<td>9,999</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 54 years</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>10,328</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 to 64 years</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>8,231</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years and over</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>7,933</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median age</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>(X)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Female, all ages                    | 12,228| 94,324 | 100      | 100     |
| Under 5 years                       | 1,262 | 7,217  | 10       | 8       |
| 5 to 9 years                        | 1,326 | 7,926  | 11       | 8       |
| 10 to 14 years                      | 1,404 | 8,811  | 11       | 9       |
| 15 to 19 years                      | 1,309 | 8,516  | 11       | 9       |
| 20 to 24 years                      | 1,092 | 7,942  | 9        | 8       |
| 25 to 34 years                      | 1,531 | 12,068 | 13       | 13      |
| 35 to 44 years                      | 1,311 | 10,344 | 11       | 11      |
| 45 to 54 years                      | 1,176 | 11,039 | 10       | 12      |
| 55 to 64 years                      | 878   | 9,198  | 7        | 10      |
| 65 years and over                   | 938   | 11,263 | 8        | 12      |
| Median age                          | 23.7  | 30.6   | (X)      | (X)     |

Note: Estimates of resident population.

X Not applicable.

¹Includes persons of "other races."
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Since 1964 (the first year for which corresponding survey data on income for Negroes were available) the income difference between Negro and white families has narrowed. The ratio of Negro to white family income rose from 0.54 in 1964 to 0.61 in 1969 and 1970.

In 1972, the Negro-white ratio of 0.59 was about the same as it was 5 years earlier, but was higher than the 1964 level. Negro families who lived in the North and West in 1972 had higher incomes than those who lived in the South and their incomes were closer to that of whites.

Table 7. Median Income of Families: 1950 to 1972
(In current dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Race of head</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negro and</td>
<td>Negro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>other races</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>21,869</td>
<td>(NA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>2,032</td>
<td>(NA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>2,338</td>
<td>(NA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>2,461</td>
<td>(NA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>2,410</td>
<td>(NA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>2,548</td>
<td>(NA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>2,528</td>
<td>(NA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>2,764</td>
<td>(NA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>2,711</td>
<td>(NA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>3,161</td>
<td>(NA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>3,233</td>
<td>(NA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>3,191</td>
<td>(NA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>3,320</td>
<td>(NA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>3,465</td>
<td>(NA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>3,839</td>
<td>(NA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>3,994</td>
<td>(NA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>4,674</td>
<td>(NA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>5,094</td>
<td>(NA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>5,590</td>
<td>(NA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>6,191</td>
<td>(NA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>6,516</td>
<td>(NA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>6,714</td>
<td>(NA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>6,714</td>
<td>(NA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Most of the tables of this section show income data for the year 1971. Income figures for 1972 from the Current Population Survey conducted in March 1973, which recently became available, have been included in tables 7 and 8 of this section. Data for 1959 are from the 1960 census; figures for the remaining years are from Current Population Surveys.

NA Not available. The ratio of Negro to white median family income first became available from this survey in 1964.

1Revised, based on processing corrections.

2Based on 1970 census population controls; therefore, not strictly comparable to data for earlier years. See Definitions and Explanations section for more details.

Negro families with a male head had a median income in 1972 that was closer to comparable white families than did the Negro families with a female head. The ratio of Negro to white family income was 0.75 for families with a male head, but only about 0.62 for families with a female head. Between 1967 and 1972, the ratio of black to white median family income rose for families with male heads. Among those male headed families with a wife present, the rise in the black to white income ratio occurred only for those with a wife in the paid labor force.

Although the ratio of black to white family income was at about the same level in 1972 as in 1967, the index of income overlap, another measure of income comparability, rose from 0.69 in 1967 to 0.72 in 1972, indicating some narrowing of the differences between black and white income size distributions.

Table 8. Measures of Income in 1967 and 1972 of Families, by Type of Family and Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Median income</th>
<th>Ratio: Negro to white</th>
<th>Index of income overlap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negro</td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967¹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All families</td>
<td>$4,875</td>
<td>$8,234</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>3,953</td>
<td>7,359</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>5,644</td>
<td>8,659</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>6,402</td>
<td>8,350</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>6,511</td>
<td>8,808</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of family:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male head</td>
<td>5,737</td>
<td>8,557</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife in paid labor force</td>
<td>7,272</td>
<td>10,196</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife not in paid labor force</td>
<td>4,662</td>
<td>7,743</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female head</td>
<td>3,004</td>
<td>4,855</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All families</td>
<td>$6,864</td>
<td>$11,549</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>5,763</td>
<td>10,465</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>7,816</td>
<td>12,307</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>8,318</td>
<td>11,947</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>8,313</td>
<td>11,724</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of family:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male head</td>
<td>9,037</td>
<td>12,102</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife in paid labor force</td>
<td>11,336</td>
<td>14,148</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife not in paid labor force</td>
<td>6,900</td>
<td>10,806</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female head</td>
<td>3,840</td>
<td>6,213</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The Index of Income Overlap of White and Black is a statistical measure which summarizes the degree of overlap between the two distributions and is equal to 1.00 when the two distributions are identical. Specifically, the index, which was computed on the basis of detailed income intervals, measures the sum of the commonalities expressed in terms of percents shared between whites and blacks for each income class interval. For a more detailed explanation of Index of Income Overlap, see Bureau of the Census Technical Paper No. 22 "Measures of Overlap of Income Distribution of White and Negro Families in the United States."

¹Revised, based on processing corrections.
²Includes other male heads not shown separately.

Family incomes for Negro and other races and whites have risen substantially over the 20-year period, 1951 to 1971. The proportion of families of Negro and other races with incomes below $3,000 (in constant 1971 dollars) declined from 47 percent in 1951 to 19 percent in 1971. The proportion with incomes of $10,000 or more increased from 3 percent to 30 percent during this time period.

Table 9. Distribution of Families by Income in 1951, 1961, and 1971

(Adjusted for price changes in 1971 dollars. Families as of following year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Negro and other races</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of families...thousands..</td>
<td>(NA)</td>
<td>4,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent...</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under $3,000</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,000 to $4,999</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000 to $6,999</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$7,000 to $9,999</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 to $11,999</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$12,000 to $14,999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000 and over</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Income</td>
<td>$3,171</td>
<td>$4,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net change, 1951-1971:</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>(X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>(X)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NA Not available.
X Not applicable.
Z Less than 0.5 percent.

In the last five years, the percent of families of Negro and other races with incomes of $10,000 or more (in constant 1971 dollars) increased from 22 percent to 30 percent. In 1971, however, this proportion is still below the 54 percent for white families. The families of Negro and other races who lived in the North and West were about twice as likely to have incomes at this level (40 percent) as were those who lived in the South (20 percent).

Table 10. Percent of Families With Income of $10,000 or More, by Region: 1966 to 1971

(Adjusted for price changes in 1971 dollars. A $10,000 income in 1971 was equivalent in purchasing power to about $8,000 in 1966)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area and year</th>
<th>Negro and other races</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNITED STATES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH AND WEST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since 1959, significant gains in closing the income gap between blacks and whites have been made by husband-wife families in the North and West and South. However, in the North and West, in 1971, the median income of husband-wife families was more comparable to that of white families than was the case in the South where black income (in this category) was two-thirds of white income.

Among all husband-wife families in 1971, the ratio of black to white income was higher for those families in which the head was young (under 35) than for those families where the head was older. Outside the South, the ratio of black to white median income of families where the head was under 35 and both husband and wife were present, was 93 percent in 1971. The comparable ratio (74 percent) was lower in the South.

Table 11. Median Family Income in 1959 and 1969 to 1971 for All Negro Families and Negro Husband-Wife Families as a Percent of Corresponding White Families by Age of Head and Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area and year</th>
<th>All families</th>
<th>Husband-wife families</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Head under 35 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNITED STATES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959...........</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969...........</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970...........</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971...........</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959...........</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969...........</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970...........</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971...........</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH AND WEST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959...........</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969...........</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970...........</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971...........</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The median income in 1971 of black families in which both the husband and wife were earners was $10,400, 54 percent higher than the $6,700 for black families where only the husband had earnings. The income differentials between black and white husband-wife families were substantially smaller for those where both the husband and wife had earnings. The same pattern was evident for the North and West and South.

Outside the South, the young husband-wife families (head under 35 years) where both the husband and wife were earners had achieved income parity with their white counterparts. The ratio of Negro to white income was 105 percent in 1971. The comparable ratio (75 percent) for the South was substantially lower. These young black husband-wife families in the North and West whose incomes equalled that of whites comprised a relatively small proportion, 6 percent, of the 5.2 million black families in the country in March 1972.

Table 12. Median Income in 1971 of Husband-Wife Families, by Age of Head, Earning Status of Husband and Wife, and Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race and earnings status of husband and wife</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Head under 35 years old</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>North and West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro, total 1</td>
<td>$8,177</td>
<td>$10,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband only earner</td>
<td>6,742</td>
<td>7,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband and wife both earners</td>
<td>10,374</td>
<td>12,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, total 1</td>
<td>11,124</td>
<td>11,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband only earner</td>
<td>9,900</td>
<td>10,203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband and wife both earners</td>
<td>13,025</td>
<td>13,562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEGRO AS A PERCENT OF WHITE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband only earner</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband and wife both earners</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Includes other combinations not shown separately.

Nationally, black wives were more likely than white wives to have earnings in 1971, and the earnings accounted for a greater share of the family income. The mean earnings of black wives about equaled that of whites ($3,600 and $3,700, respectively).

In the North and West, the working wife (and the number who worked year round) was a major factor contributing to the income equality of the young black and white families. The mean earnings of young black wives (husband under 35 years) residing in the North and West were higher than the earnings of their white counterparts. The same pattern existed among these wives who worked year round—51 percent of blacks compared to 41 percent of whites worked 50 to 52 weeks in 1971. The young black wives in the North and West contributed more to the family income than white wives.

The relationships between black and white wives observed in the North and West were not evident in the figures for the South, where young black and white husband-wife families with two earners have not closed the income gap. (See tables 13 and 14.)

Table 13. Distribution of Husband-Wife Families, by Earning Status of Husband and Wife in 1971, Age of Head, and Region

(Families as of following year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Head under 35 years old</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EARNING STATUS OF HUSBAND AND WIFE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro, husband-wife families . thousands</td>
<td>3,289</td>
<td>1,595</td>
<td>1,694</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband only earner</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband and wife both earners</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other combinations</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, husband-wife families . thousands</td>
<td>42,039</td>
<td>29,514</td>
<td>12,525</td>
<td>12,228</td>
<td>8,322</td>
<td>3,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband only earner</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband and wife both earners</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other combinations</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORK EXPERIENCE OF WIFE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro, wives with earnings . thousands</td>
<td>1,804</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked 50 to 52 weeks</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked 27 to 49 weeks</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked 1 to 26 weeks</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, wives with earnings . thousands</td>
<td>18,549</td>
<td>12,853</td>
<td>5,696</td>
<td>6,656</td>
<td>4,417</td>
<td>2,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked 50 to 52 weeks</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked 27 to 49 weeks</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked 1 to 26 weeks</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14. Earnings in 1971 of Husband and Wife for Families in Which Both Husband and Wife Had Earnings, by Age of Head and Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Earning status of husband and wife and work experience of wife</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Husband under 35 years old</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>North and West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEGRO</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean family income</td>
<td>$11,103</td>
<td>$13,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean earnings of husband</td>
<td>6,579</td>
<td>7,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean earnings of wife</td>
<td>3,563</td>
<td>4,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earnings as a percent of family income</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife worked 50 to 52 weeks</td>
<td>$34,872</td>
<td>$35,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earnings as a percent of family income</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife worked 27 to 49 weeks</td>
<td>$32,849</td>
<td>$33,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earnings as a percent of family income</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife worked 1 to 26 weeks</td>
<td>$31,232</td>
<td>$31,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earnings as a percent of family income</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WHITE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean family income</td>
<td>$14,184</td>
<td>$14,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean earnings of husband</td>
<td>9,162</td>
<td>9,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean earnings of wife</td>
<td>3,667</td>
<td>3,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earnings as a percent of family income</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife worked 50 to 52 weeks</td>
<td>$35,570</td>
<td>$35,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earnings as a percent of family income</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife worked 27 to 49 weeks</td>
<td>$32,047</td>
<td>$33,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earnings as a percent of family income</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife worked 1 to 26 weeks</td>
<td>$31,052</td>
<td>$31,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earnings as a percent of family income</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RATIO: NEGRO TO WHITE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean family income</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean earnings of husband</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean earnings of wife</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife worked 50 to 52 weeks</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife worked 27 to 49 weeks</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife worked 1 to 26 weeks</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B Base too small for figures to be shown.
It is well known that income levels tend to rise with increased education. Thus, the median earnings of black men 25 to 34 years of age who worked year round in 1969, and had completed high school was about $6,800; but for those with four years of college, it was $8,700.

At the high school level and below, the ratios of black to white earnings were about the same or similar for the young (25 to 34 years) and older men (35 to 54 years) who worked year round in 1969. On the other hand, increased education beyond the high school level generally improved the relative earnings levels of blacks to whites for the younger men. Among the male workers with four years of college, young blacks had median earnings in 1969 which were closer to those of comparable whites with the same educational level than did older blacks. The same pattern was observed in both the South and the North and West. The advantage of recent education for young blacks was more pronounced in the North and West than in the South.

In contrast to black men, the earnings in 1969 of black female workers with education above the high school level about equalled the earnings of their white counterparts, regardless of age. (See tables 15 and 16.)

Table 15. Median Earnings in 1969 and Educational Attainment of Persons 25 to 34 Years Old, Who Worked Year Round in 1969, by Sex and Region: 1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area and education</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negro</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Ratio: Negro to White</td>
<td>Negro</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Ratio: Negro to White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNITED STATES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$6,346</td>
<td>$8,839</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>$4,403</td>
<td>$5,175</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary: 8 years or less</td>
<td>4,743</td>
<td>6,618</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>2,935</td>
<td>3,980</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school: 1 to 3 years</td>
<td>5,749</td>
<td>7,910</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>3,671</td>
<td>4,282</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>6,789</td>
<td>8,613</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>4,592</td>
<td>5,037</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College: 1 to 3 years</td>
<td>7,699</td>
<td>9,190</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>5,344</td>
<td>5,724</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>8,715</td>
<td>11,312</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>6,971</td>
<td>7,206</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years or more</td>
<td>9,955</td>
<td>11,808</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>7,957</td>
<td>8,128</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH AND WEST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$7,478</td>
<td>$9,127</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>$5,156</td>
<td>$5,400</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary: 8 years or less</td>
<td>6,314</td>
<td>7,278</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>4,021</td>
<td>4,185</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school: 1 to 3 years</td>
<td>6,737</td>
<td>8,319</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>4,328</td>
<td>4,467</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>7,650</td>
<td>8,838</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>5,219</td>
<td>5,187</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College: 1 to 3 years</td>
<td>8,233</td>
<td>9,383</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>5,952</td>
<td>5,895</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>9,747</td>
<td>11,394</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>8,086</td>
<td>7,501</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years or more</td>
<td>11,099</td>
<td>11,927</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>8,459</td>
<td>8,258</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$5,226</td>
<td>$8,090</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>$3,657</td>
<td>$4,749</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary: 8 years or less</td>
<td>4,220</td>
<td>5,782</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>2,330</td>
<td>3,745</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school: 1 to 3 years</td>
<td>4,872</td>
<td>6,938</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>3,064</td>
<td>4,071</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>5,783</td>
<td>7,987</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>3,866</td>
<td>4,736</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College: 1 to 3 years</td>
<td>6,525</td>
<td>8,669</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>4,645</td>
<td>5,370</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>7,372</td>
<td>10,738</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>6,394</td>
<td>6,660</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years or more</td>
<td>8,784</td>
<td>11,439</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>7,522</td>
<td>7,563</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Data are for persons in experienced civilian labor force who worked 50 to 52 weeks in 1969 and had earnings.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area and education</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Ratio: Negro to white</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Ratio: Negro to white</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negro</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>Negro</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNITED STATES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$6,403</td>
<td>$8,736</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,801</td>
<td>$4,966</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary: 8 years or less</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>7,422</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>2,630</td>
<td>4,036</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school: 1 to 3 years</td>
<td>6,462</td>
<td>8,775</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>3,807</td>
<td>4,471</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College: 4 years</td>
<td>7,400</td>
<td>9,651</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>4,583</td>
<td>5,112</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College: 5 years or more</td>
<td>8,193</td>
<td>11,500</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>5,870</td>
<td>7,776</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH AND WEST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$7,724</td>
<td>$10,054</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>$4,783</td>
<td>$5,132</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary: 8 years or less</td>
<td>6,874</td>
<td>7,971</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>3,631</td>
<td>4,202</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school: 1 to 3 years</td>
<td>7,378</td>
<td>9,010</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>4,364</td>
<td>4,588</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College: 4 years</td>
<td>8,069</td>
<td>9,831</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>5,155</td>
<td>5,204</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College: 5 years or more</td>
<td>8,723</td>
<td>11,738</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>6,121</td>
<td>7,865</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$5,084</td>
<td>$8,902</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>$2,888</td>
<td>$4,633</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary: 8 years or less</td>
<td>4,437</td>
<td>6,252</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>2,123</td>
<td>3,784</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school: 1 to 3 years</td>
<td>5,365</td>
<td>8,132</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>2,780</td>
<td>4,298</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College: 4 years</td>
<td>6,072</td>
<td>9,040</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>3,718</td>
<td>4,833</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College: 5 years or more</td>
<td>6,989</td>
<td>10,655</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>4,546</td>
<td>5,566</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Data are for persons in experienced civilian labor force who worked 50 to 52 weeks in 1969 and had earnings.

**Source:** U.S. Department of Commerce, Social and Economic Statistics Administration, Bureau of the Census.
Negro families were more likely than white families to be dependent upon wages and salaries as their only source of income in 1969--56 percent and 44 percent, respectively. However, the ratio of Negro to white family income was higher for those with wage or salary earnings only, 0.73, than it was for those with wage or salary earnings and some other income, 0.51.

### Table 17. Sources of Income in 1969 of Families

(Families as of the following year)

| Sources of income | Negro | | | | | | White | | | | Ratio: Negro to white median income |
|------------------|-------|--|-----|------|----------------|-------|--|-----|------|----------------|-------|--|-----|------|----------------|
|                  | Number (thousands) | Percent distribution | Median income | Number (thousands) | Percent distribution | Median income |
| Total.............. | 4,872 | 100.0 | $6,079 | 45,734 | 100.0 | $9,977 | 0.61 |
| Earnings only........ | 2,900 | 59.5 | 7,227 | 23,650 | 51.7 | 9,048 | 0.73 |
| Wage or salary only....... | 2,705 | 55.5 | 7,214 | 10,067 | 43.7 | 9,019 | 0.73 |
| Self-employed income only.... | 46 | 1.0 | 4,540 | 1,169 | 2.6 | 7,711 | 0.59 |
| Wage or salary and self-employment income........ | 148 | 3.0 | 8,276 | 2,515 | 5.5 | 10,550 | 0.78 |
| Earnings and income other than earnings........ | 1,357 | 27.9 | 5,060 | 18,091 | 39.6 | 11,740 | 0.51 |
| Wage or salary and other income...... | 1,251 | 25.7 | 5,911 | 14,629 | 32.0 | 11,588 | 0.51 |
| Self-employment income and other income........ | 29 | 0.6 | 3,653 | 1,094 | 2.4 | 8,116 | 0.45 |
| Wage or salary self-employment and other income........ | 77 | 1.6 | 8,321 | 2,369 | 5.2 | 9,646 | 0.86 |
| Other income only, no earnings... | 525 | 10.8 | 2,016 | 3,702 | 8.1 | 3,154 | 0.64 |
| With no income........ | 90 | 1.9 | (X) | 90 | 0.6 | (X) | (X) |

X Not applicable.

There were 7.7 million Negroes and 16.2 million whites below the low-income level in 1972. About 33 percent of all Negroes and 9 percent of all whites were below the low-income level. These figures represent declines in the number and percent of poor for both populations since 1967.

There is some evidence of an increase between 1971 and 1972 in the number of Negroes below the low-income level; whereas the number of low-income whites declined.

Table 18. Persons Below the Low-Income Level: 1959 to 1972
(Persons as of the following year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number (millions)</th>
<th>Percent below the low-income level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negro and other races</td>
<td>Negro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>(NA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>(NA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>(NA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>(NA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>(NA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>(NA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Most of the tables on the low-income population in this section show data for the year 1971. Figures for 1972 from the Current Population Survey conducted in March 1973, which recently became available, have been included in tables 18 to 20 of this section.

The low-income threshold for a nonfarm family of four was $4,275 in 1972, $4,137 in 1971, and $3,973 in 1959. Families and unrelated individuals are classified as being above or below the low-income threshold, using the poverty index adopted by a Federal Interagency Committee in 1969. This index centers around the Department of Agriculture's Economy Food Plan and reflects the differing consumption requirements of families based on their size and composition, sex and age of the family head, and farm-nonfarm residence. The low-income cutoffs for farm families have been set at 85 percent of the nonfarm levels. These cutoffs are updated every year to reflect the changes in the Consumer Price Index. The low-income data exclude inmates of institutions, members of Armed Forces living in barracks, and unrelated individuals under 14 years of age. For a more detailed explanation, see Current Population Reports, Series P-60, No. 86.

NA Not available.
1Beginning with the March 1967 CPS, data based on revised methodology for processing income data.
2Based on 1970 census population controls; therefore, not strictly comparable to data for earlier years. See Definitions and Explanations for more details.

There were 1.5 million black families below the low-income level in 1972 comprising about 29 percent of all black families. Among whites, there were 3.4 million low-income families—about 7 percent of all white families.

The apparent decrease in low-income black families between 1967 and 1972 was not statistically significant, whereas the decline was substantial for whites.

About two-thirds of Negro families below the low-income level were headed by women, and within the last year, the number of these families headed by women increased. There was no change in the number of low-income black families headed by men. Black families with a female head were far more likely to be below the low-income level than those headed by a man in 1972 (53 and 16 percent, respectively).

Table 19. Families Below the Low-Income Level, by Sex of Head: 1959 and 1967 to 1972

(Families as of the following year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>All families</th>
<th>Families with male head</th>
<th>Families with female head</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negro</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Negro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19691</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19701</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19711</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19721</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number (millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Negro</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Negro</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19691</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19701</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19711</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19721</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent below the low-income level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Negro</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Negro</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19691</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19701</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19711</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19721</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on 1970 census population controls; therefore, not strictly comparable to data for earlier years. See Definitions and Explanations for more details.

Approximately 89 percent of blacks below the low-income level in 1972 were in families compared to 76 percent of their white counterparts. Among the low-income Negroes, about 52 percent were children under 18 years old, whereas about 36 percent of all low-income whites were children.

### Table 20. Distribution of Persons Below the Low-Income Level in 1959, 1967, and 1972 by Family Status

(Persons as of following year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family status and year</th>
<th>All races</th>
<th>Negro</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Negro as a percent of all races</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total...................</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent..................</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In families...............</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head.....................</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years and over........</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children under 13 years</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other family members.....</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrelated individuals....</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total...................</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent..................</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In families...............</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head.....................</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years and over........</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children under 18 years</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other family members.....</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrelated individuals....</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total...................</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent..................</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In families...............</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head.....................</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years and over........</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children under 18 years</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other family members.....</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrelated individuals....</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X Not applicable.

About three-fourths of both black and white men who were heads of low-income families worked in 1971 and about one-half of those working had a full-time job the year round. Among female heads of low-income families, about two-fifths of both blacks and whites worked in 1971. However, black female heads were more likely than white female heads to have worked year round.

The majority of men below the low-income level, regardless of race, reported illness or disability as their main reason for not working; however, the proportion was greater for black men than for white men—79 and 63 percent, respectively. Of the female heads of low-income families who did not work, 7 out of 10 black and 8 out of 10 white non-workers reported that they were keeping house.

Table 21. Persons 14 to 64 Years Old Below the Low-Income Level in 1971 by Work Experience and Family Status

(Numbers in thousands. Persons as of the following year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work experience</th>
<th>Negro</th>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>1,901</td>
<td>549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 to 52 weeks</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full time</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 49 weeks</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not work</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>1,127</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main reason: Ill or disabled</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping house</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In school</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to find work</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Armed Forces</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Represents zero.

In 1971 there were 1.1 million black women and 2.3 million white women with own children under 18 years old below the low-income level. Approximately 43 percent of low-income black mothers worked at some time in 1971 compared to 36 percent of low-income white mothers. Of these low-income mothers who worked, a greater proportion of Negroes than whites worked year round, full time.

The low-income rate for Negro mothers who did not work was 48 percent compared to 23 percent for those who worked. In contrast, about 11 percent of white mothers who did not work and 6 percent of white mothers who worked fell below the low-income level.

In 1971, there were 3.3 million low-income Negro children under 18 years old living in families with a mother present. Of these children, about 44 percent had mothers who worked. The comparable proportion for whites was 35 percent.

Table 22. Work Experience of Women With Own Children Under 18 Years Old Below the Low-Income Level in 1971

(Persons as of the following year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work experience of mother</th>
<th>Number below low-income level (thousands)</th>
<th>Percent below low-income level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negro</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WOMEN WITH OWN CHILDREN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,095</td>
<td>2,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wives</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>1,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female head</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent worked year-round full-time</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not work</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>1,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main reason for not working:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping house</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OWN CHILDREN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,283</td>
<td>6,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with both parents</td>
<td>1,256</td>
<td>3,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with mother only</td>
<td>2,028</td>
<td>2,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother worked</td>
<td>1,457</td>
<td>2,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother did not work</td>
<td>1,826</td>
<td>3,912</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X Not applicable.

Overall, the proportion of black families receiving Social Security was not much different from that for white families in 1971, except for female headed families where the proportion of blacks was about half that of whites (21 and 39 percent, respectively). For both black and white families, the proportion who received Social Security was greater for female heads than for male heads.

A higher percentage of black families than white families who received Social Security was below the low-income level in 1971. The proportions were 32 and 11 percent, respectively.

Table 23. Selected Characteristics of Families and Unrelated Individuals Receiving Social Security Income in 1971

(Numbers in thousands. Families and unrelated individuals as of the following year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected characteristics</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Male head¹</th>
<th>Female head¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negro</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Negro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAMILIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>9,591</td>
<td>591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of all families</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With related children under 18 years</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>1,982</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean number of related children under 18 years</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With head 65 years and over</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>5,999</td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of all families with head 65 years and over</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median family income</td>
<td>$4,694</td>
<td>$6,518</td>
<td>$4,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent below low-income level</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNRELATED INDIVIDUALS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>5,473</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of all unrelated individuals</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years and over</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>4,772</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent 65 years and over</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent below low-income level</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹For unrelated individuals, sex of individual.

About 25 percent of all black families received public assistance in 1971 as compared with 5 percent of white families. Negro families receiving public assistance had lower family incomes than did comparable white families, and they were more likely to be below the low-income level.

Table 24. Selected Characteristics of Families and Unrelated Individuals Receiving Public Assistance Income in 1971

(Numbers in thousands. Families and unrelated individuals as of the following year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected characteristics</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Male head</th>
<th>Female head</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negro</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Negro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAMILIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,301</td>
<td>2,156</td>
<td>421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of all families</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With related children under 18 years</td>
<td>1,067</td>
<td>1,471</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean number of related children under 18 years</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median age of head</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>54.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent with head 65 years and over</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median family income</td>
<td>$3,353</td>
<td>$4,117</td>
<td>$4,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent below low-income level</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNRELATED INDIVIDUALS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of all unrelated individuals</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median age</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>54.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent 65 years and over</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent below low-income level</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1For unrelated individuals, sex of individual.

III EMPLOYMENT
Employment has expanded at a relatively slower pace for workers of Negro and other races than for white workers during the last five years—Negro and other races employment increased by about 8 percent compared to about 10 percent for whites.

At 8.6 million, employment for Negro and other races in 1972 was up 180,000, or 2 percent from the 1971 level, while white employment increased by 2.1 million, or 3 percent.

Unemployment among Negro and other races was about the same between 1971 and 1972, while during the same period, the white jobless level declined by 200,000.

Table 25. Number of Employed and Unemployed Persons: 1960 to 1972
(Numbers in thousands. Annual averages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negro and other races</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>6,927</td>
<td>56,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>6,832</td>
<td>56,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>7,004</td>
<td>59,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>7,140</td>
<td>60,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>7,383</td>
<td>61,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>7,643</td>
<td>63,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>7,875</td>
<td>65,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>8,011</td>
<td>66,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>8,169</td>
<td>67,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>8,384</td>
<td>69,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>8,445</td>
<td>70,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>8,403</td>
<td>70,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>8,628</td>
<td>73,074</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Based on 1970 census population controls; therefore not strictly comparable to data for earlier years. For example, the total employment level for whites was raised by about 255,000, while that for blacks was increased by 45,000 as a result of the census adjustment. See Definitions and Explanations section for more details.

The unemployment rate for both Negro and other races and whites was higher in 1972 than it was five years earlier.

The 1972 jobless rate for Negroes and other races remained at the 1971 level of about 10 percent; in contrast, there was a decline in the jobless rate for whites from 5.4 to 5.0 percent. Consequently, in 1972, the Negro and other races to white jobless ratio was 2.0:1; it had been 1.8:1 both during 1970, a recession year, and during 1971.

Table 26. Unemployment Rates: 1960 to 1972
(Annual averages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Negro and other races</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Ratio: Negro and other races to white</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The unemployment rate is the percent of the civilian labor force that is unemployed.

Jobless rates are significantly higher for workers of Negro and other races than for white workers regardless of age, but the difference is greatest among teenagers. In 1972, the jobless rate for Negro and other races youth averaged 33.5 percent compared with 14.2 percent for whites. The unemployment rate for men of Negro and other races was 6.8 percent, while the comparable rate for whites was 3.6 percent. For adult women, jobless rates were 4.9 and 8.8 percent for whites and Negro and other races, respectively.

The relationship of Negro and other races-to-white unemployment rates varies by age. In 1972, the overall ratio was 2 to 1, about the same as for adult men (1.9 to 1.0) and adult women (1.8 to 1.0). Among teenagers the Negro and other races-to-white jobless ratio (2.4 to 1.0) exceeded the overall ratio, as it has for the past several years.

Generally, over time, the ratio has narrowed for adult men and widened for teenagers.

Table 27. Unemployment Rates by Sex and Age: 1960, 1967, and 1970 to 1972
(Annual averages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEGRO AND OTHER RACES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teenagers</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult women</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult men</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WHITE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teenagers</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult women</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult men</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RATIO: NEGRO AND OTHER RACES TO WHITE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teenagers</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult women</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult men</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unemployment rates for married men with spouse present are the lowest in the labor force for both Negro and other races and whites. However, the 1972 jobless rate for married men of Negro and other races, 4.5 percent, was higher than the 2.6 percent for white married men. The ratio of Negro and other races to white unemployment for married men was 1.7 to 1.0 in 1972, unchanged over the year.

Table 28. Unemployment Rates for Married Men, With Spouse Present: 1962 to 1972
(Annual averages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Negro and other races</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Ratio: Negro and other races to white</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Data on unemployment for married men, with spouse present first became available in 1962.

In October 1972, teenagers of Negro and other races enrolled in school were only about half as likely to be in the labor force as their white counterparts; however, young Negro and other races students who were in the labor force were much more likely than whites to be unemployed.

Similarly, Negro and other races teenagers who were not enrolled in school (includes both high school graduates and dropouts) were less likely than whites to be in the labor force, but more likely to be unemployed. About 35 percent of the out-of-school Negro and other races youth compared to 25 percent of the whites were neither employed nor looking for a job.

Table 29. Work and School Status of Persons 16 to 19 Years Old: October 1972
(Numbers in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Negro and other races</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enrolled in school</td>
<td>Not enrolled in school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,501</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking for full-time work</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking for part-time work</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in labor force</td>
<td>1,189</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of population in labor force</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>64.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 1972, the unemployment rate for Negro and other races men 20 to 29 years old who were Vietnam era veterans (12.6 percent) was not statistically different from that for non-veterans. The Negro and other races to white unemployment ratio was about 1.8 to 1.0 for both veterans and nonveterans.

Table 30. Unemployment Rates of Men 20 to 29 Years Old, by Vietnam Era Veteran-Nonveteran Status and Age: 1970 to 1972

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age and year</th>
<th>Negro and other races</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vietnam era veterans</td>
<td>Nonveterans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 20 to 29 years</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 24 years</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 29 years</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unemployment rates varied considerably by occupation. In 1972, comparatively low jobless rates for workers of Negro and other races were recorded among those in professional and managerial occupations. Relatively high rates were recorded among operatives (except transport equipment operatives), nonfarm laborers, and sales workers.

For all major occupation groups, the unemployment rate was higher among Negro and other races than among white workers. However, there was substantial occupational variation in the Negro to white jobless ratio. Among sales workers, for example, the ratio stood at about 3 to 1, while the Negro and other races to white jobless gap was considerably narrower for craftsmen and operatives—about 1.5 to 1.0.

Table 31. Unemployment Rates by Occupation and Sex: 1972

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negro and other races</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Negro and other races</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, all civilian workers</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced labor force</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White-collar workers</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and technical workers</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers and administrators except farm</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales workers</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical workers</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue-collar workers</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsmen and kindred workers</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives, except transport</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport equipment operatives</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonfarm laborers</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service workers</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private household</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>(B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm workers</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B Base too small for figures to be shown.

Patterns of labor force participation for the Negro and other races and white populations varied by sex and age. Negro and other races men in nearly every age group, including those in the prime working ages (25 to 54 years), were less likely to be working or looking for work than whites in 1972. In marked contrast, labor force participation of Negro and other races women 25 to 54 years of age was higher than that for their white counterparts.

For teenagers, labor force participation rates were substantially lower for those of Negro and other races than for whites.

Table 32. Civilian Labor Force Participation Rates, by Age and Sex: 1972

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negro and other races</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, 16 years old and over..</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>79.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 to 19 years</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>60.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 24 years</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>84.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 54 years</td>
<td>90.3</td>
<td>95.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 34 years</td>
<td>92.7</td>
<td>96.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 44 years</td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td>97.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 54 years</td>
<td>86.1</td>
<td>94.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 to 64 years</td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td>81.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years and over</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The civilian labor force participation rate represents the proportion of the civilian noninstitutional population that is in the labor force.

For both Negro and other races and white adults in the prime working ages (25 to 54 years), labor force participation rates, in March 1972, varied by level of schooling achieved; generally, those who had attained higher levels of education were more likely to be in the labor force. This pattern did not prevail among persons 18 to 24 years old, however, as many were still attending school, and thus, may not have had the opportunity or the desire to enter the work force.

At each level of schooling, Negro and other races adult women (25 to 54 years old) were more likely than their white counterparts to be working or looking for a job in March 1972; the opposite pattern prevailed among men, however.

Table 33. Civilian Labor Force Participation Rates by Educational Attainment, Age, and Sex: March 1972

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of school completed and sex</th>
<th>18 years and over</th>
<th>18 to 24 years</th>
<th>25 to 54 years</th>
<th>55 years and over</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negro and other races</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Negro and other races</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Negro and other races</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total...</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>90.2</td>
<td>95.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary: 8 years or less...</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school: 1 to 3 years......</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>95.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years................</td>
<td>85.6</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>92.7</td>
<td>97.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College: 1 to 3 years......</td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td>81.7</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>95.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years or more...</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>80.9</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>97.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WOMEN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total...</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>50.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary: 8 years or less...</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>40.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school: 1 to 3 years......</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years................</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College: 1 to 3 years......</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years or more...</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>61.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Base too small for figures to be shown.*

Working men of Negro and other races were less likely than their white counterparts to have year-round, full-time jobs. In 1971, about three-fifths of the Negro and other races men compared with two-thirds of the white men were working year round, full time. On the other hand, the proportion of women with that work pattern in 1971 was about the same for both racial groups—42 percent.

Table 34. Persons Who Worked During 1971, by Full- and Part-Time Job Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work experience</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negro and other races</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, all workers</td>
<td>5,620</td>
<td>50,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year round, full time</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>66.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part year, full time</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-49 weeks</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-26 weeks</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part time</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Persons of Negro and other races not only have higher unemployment rates than whites at any single point in time, but they were also more likely than whites to experience joblessness at some time during the year. About 23 percent of Negro and other races compared to 16 percent of white workers were unemployed at some time during 1971.

Among the 1971 jobless who also worked during the year, long-term unemployment (15 weeks or more) was experienced to a greater extent among Negro and other races than whites, 42 percent and 36 percent, respectively.

Jobless workers of Negro and other races were also more likely than their white counterparts to experience multiple periods of unemployment; 37 percent of the Negro and other races compared to 32 percent of the white jobless had 2 or more periods of unemployment during 1971.

Table 35. Extent of Unemployment During 1971, by Sex

(Numbers in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent of unemployment</th>
<th>Both sexes</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negro and other races</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Negro and other races</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total who worked or looked for work during the year</td>
<td>10,949</td>
<td>86,236</td>
<td>5,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent with unemployment</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total with unemployment</td>
<td>2,525</td>
<td>13,326</td>
<td>1,291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not work but looked for work</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>1,585</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With work experience</td>
<td>1,962</td>
<td>11,731</td>
<td>1,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year-round workers with 1 or 2 weeks unemployment</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-year workers with unemployment</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>92.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With unemployment of:</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4 weeks</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-14 weeks</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent with 2 spells or more of unemployment</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 spells</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 spells or more</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Worked 50 or 51 weeks.
2Worked less than 50 weeks.

Among persons who were not in the labor force, reasons for no-participation differed substantially between Negro and other races and whites. Adult men of Negro and other races (25 years and over) were more likely than their white counterparts to be out of the labor force in 1972 because of discouragement over job prospects (believed they could not get a job), ill health, or disability, but less likely to be retired or think themselves too old to work.

Although home responsibilities was the major reason that both Negro and other races and white adult women were not in the labor force, the proportion was much higher for whites than for Negro and other races. Paralleling the situation for men, women of Negro and other races were more likely than whites to be outside the work force because of discouragement, ill health, or disability.

Table 36. Reasons for Nonparticipation in Labor Force by Sex and Age: 1972

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nonparticipants by reason for status</th>
<th>16 years old and over</th>
<th>16 to 24 years</th>
<th>25 to 59 years</th>
<th>60 years and over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negro and other races</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Negro and other races</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number not in the labor force</td>
<td>1,901</td>
<td>12,291</td>
<td>3,738</td>
<td>4,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In school</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ill health, disability</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>59.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home responsibilities</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement, old age</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>64.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think cannot get job</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other reasons</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| FEMALE                              |                       |               |               |                 |
| Total number not in the labor force | 4,482                 | 38,110        | 6,623         | 2,068           | 1,135           | 12,464        |
| Percent                             | 100.0                 | 100.0         | 100.0         | 100.0           | 100.0           | 100.0         |
| In school                           | 14.5                  | 7.9           | 47.8          | 42.9            | 1.8             | 0.9           |
| Ill health, disability              | 12.9                  | 4.8           | 3.3           | 1.7             | 15.0            | 4.7           |
| Home responsibilities               | 62.2                  | 80.0          | 45.2          | 74.6            | 69.9            | 54.6          |
| Retirement, old age                 | 2.1                   | 2.3           | 2.3           | 2.3             | 8.5             | 7.1           |
| Think cannot get job                | 3.0                   | 1.0           | 4.3           | 3.3             | 1.2             | 1.3           |
| All other reasons                   | 5.3                   | 3.9           | 9.4           | 8.8             | 5.3             | 4.1           |

- Represents or rounds to zero.

The proportion of Negro and other races employed in white-collar jobs has increased from 23 percent in 1967 to 30 percent in 1972. For whites, the increase was less—from 49 percent in 1967 to 50 percent in 1972.

Despite a greater degree of occupational upgrading among Negro and other races than white workers which has resulted in a more equitable distribution of employment, marked contrasts in Negro and other races to white job patterns persist. In 1972, Negro and other races still comprised a disproportionately small share of employed persons holding high-paying, high-status jobs; about 4 percent of Negro and other races compared to 11 percent of whites were employed as managers and administrators, and about 10 percent of Negro and other races versus 15 percent of whites were employed as professional and technical workers. Similarly, a smaller proportion of Negro and other races than white workers were employed as craftsmen or in related skilled trades. Conversely, in 1972, the proportion of Negro and other races employed in the lower-paying, lower-status occupational categories (service, farm, and nonfarm laborer jobs combined) was about double that of the comparable group of whites—40 percent compared with 20 percent.

(Annual averages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negro and</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Negro and</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>other races</td>
<td></td>
<td>other races</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number employed</td>
<td>6,927</td>
<td>56,850</td>
<td>8,011</td>
<td>66,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White-collar workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals and technical</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers and administrators,</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>except farm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales workers</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical workers</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue-collar workers</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsman and kindred workers</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives, except transport.</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport equipment operators</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonfarm laborers</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service workers</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private household</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm workers</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Beginning with 1971, occupational employment data are not strictly comparable with statistics for 1970 and earlier years as a result of changes in the occupational classification system for the 1970 Census of Population that were introduced in January 1971, and the addition of a question to the CPS in December 1971 relating to major activities and duties. For an explanation of these changes, see Bureau of the Census Technical Paper No. 26 and Bureau of Labor Statistics, Employment and Earnings, Volume 17, No. 8 and Volume 18, No. 8.

The Negro and other races-to-white differences in occupational distribution were evident for men and women alike. The greatest disparities generally occurred among the highest and lowest level job categories. For example, nearly twice the proportion of white than Negro and other races men were employed in professional and technical, managerial and administrative, or craftsmen jobs. Among laborers and service workers, however, the opposite relationship held. Similarly, for women, whites were more likely than Negro and other races to be employed as professional and technical workers, managers and administrators, sales, or clerical workers, while the women of Negro and other races were relatively more extensively employed as service workers, particularly in private households.

Table 38. Percent Distribution of Employed Workers, by Occupation and Sex: 1972

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Negro and other races</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total employed.............thousands..</td>
<td>4,861</td>
<td>3,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent..........................</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White-collar workers..............</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and technical workers.</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers and administrators, except</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>farm..............................</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical workers..................</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue-collar workers..............</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsmen and kindred workers.......</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives, except transport.......</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport equipment operatives.....</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonfarm laborers..................</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service workers...................</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private household................</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other............................</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm workers....................</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Negroes continue to be overrepresented in lower-paying, less-skilled jobs and underrepresented in the better-paying, higher-skilled occupations. In 1972, for example, although Negro and other races constituted about 11 percent of the total employed population, they comprised only 7 percent of the professional workers, 4 percent of the managers and administrators, and 7 percent of the craftsmen. In sharp contrast, 19 percent of the Nation’s service workers (excluding private household), 20 percent of the nonfarm laborers, and about 40 percent of all private household workers were persons of Negro and other races.

Table 39. Occupation of the Employed Population: 1972

(Numbers in thousands. Annual averages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Negro and other races</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Percent Negro and other races of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total employed</td>
<td>81,702</td>
<td>8,628</td>
<td>73,074</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White-collar workers</td>
<td>39,092</td>
<td>2,575</td>
<td>36,517</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and technical engineers</td>
<td>11,459</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>10,638</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health workers</td>
<td>1,102</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1,063</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers, except college</td>
<td>2,841</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2,580</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other professional and technical</td>
<td>5,029</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>5,258</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers and administrators, except farm</td>
<td>8,032</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>7,711</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales workers</td>
<td>1,724</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1,633</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail trade</td>
<td>3,107</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>2,963</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical workers</td>
<td>4,095</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>3,807</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue-collar workers</td>
<td>28,576</td>
<td>3,440</td>
<td>25,136</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsmen and kindred workers</td>
<td>10,810</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>10,061</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenters</td>
<td>1,045</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanics and repairmen</td>
<td>2,768</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>2,588</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal craftsmen</td>
<td>1,095</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1,030</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foremen, not elsewhere classified</td>
<td>2,241</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>2,084</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other craftsmen</td>
<td>2,241</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>2,084</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives, except transport</td>
<td>10,340</td>
<td>1,356</td>
<td>8,974</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport equipment operatives</td>
<td>3,209</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>2,734</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonfarm laborers</td>
<td>4,217</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>3,367</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>1,008</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other industries</td>
<td>2,333</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>1,896</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service workers</td>
<td>10,966</td>
<td>2,350</td>
<td>8,616</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private household</td>
<td>1,437</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm laborers and foremen</td>
<td>1,381</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>1,172</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For both the younger and older men who worked year round in 1969, the earning level of whites was substantially above that of blacks. Generally, blacks and whites are concentrated in different occupations within the major occupation categories and the level of earnings may vary with the specific occupation; these factors may account for some of the earning differences. The earnings of young black men 25 to 34 years old who worked year round were about equal (ratio of 0.90 or more) to those of young white men for a few specific occupations—engineers, teachers (except college and university), engineering and science technicians, bus drivers, taxicab drivers and chauffeurs, protective workers, and policemen and detectives.

For most occupations, the earnings of black women who worked year round in 1969, regardless of age, were closer to that of white women than those of black men to white men. The average earning level of black women was equal to that of white women for these occupations—secretaries, stenographers, typists, dressmakers and seamstresses, and health service workers. (See tables 40 and 41.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Number of year-round workers (thousands)</th>
<th>Median earnings in 1969</th>
<th>Ratio: Median earnings black to white</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25 to 34 years</td>
<td>35 to 54 years</td>
<td>25 to 34 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>$6,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, technical and kindred workers</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>8,606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physicians, dentists and related practitioners</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers, except college and university</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and science technicians</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers and administrators, except farm</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales workers</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical and kindred workers</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>6,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsmen and kindred workers</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>6,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5,824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenters</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanics and repairmen, except auto</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6,812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automobile</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives, except transport</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>6,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport equipment operatives</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>6,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus drivers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8,271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi drivers and chauffeurs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck drivers</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>5,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers, except farm</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>5,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers and farm managers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm laborers and farm foremen</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2,689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service workers, except private</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>5,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective workers</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policemen and detectives</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private household workers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3,403</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Data are for persons in experienced civilian labor force who worked in 1969 and had earnings.


(See tables 40 and 41.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Number of year-round workers (thousands)</th>
<th>Median earnings in 1969</th>
<th>Ratio: Median earnings black to white</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25 to 34 years</td>
<td>35 to 54 years</td>
<td>25 to 34 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>$4,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, technical, and kindred workers...</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>6,619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered nurses, dietitians and therapists...</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6,469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health technologists &amp; technicians.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5,824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers, except college and universities........</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers and administrators, except farm........</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales workers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical and kindred workers.</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>5,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretaries</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stenographers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typists</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsmen and kindred workers.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4,594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives except transport.</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>4,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assemblers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4,606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dressmakers and seamstresses, except factory....</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport equipment operatives.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers except farm</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3,926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers and farm managers.</td>
<td>(Z)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm laborers and farm foremen.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service workers except private household........</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>3,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning service workers.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food service workers.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health service workers.</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4,213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal service workers.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private household workers.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>1,795</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Data are for persons in experienced civilian labor force who worked in 1969 and had earnings. Z Less than 500.

In 1970, more than one of every four Negro and other races and white workingmen were union members; however, racial differences were apparent in various occupational groupings. Among white-collar workers, men of Negro and other races were proportionately more likely than white men to be union members; the opposite pattern held true for the comparable groups in the blue-collar category. For women, union membership rates were higher for Negro and other races than for whites.

Table 42. Labor Union Membership Rates of Wage and Salary Workers by Occupation and Sex:
March 1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation of longest job held in 1970</th>
<th>Both sexes</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negro and other races</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Negro and other races</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All occupations¹</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White-collar workers</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, technical, and</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers, officials, and proprietors</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical and kindred workers</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales workers</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue-collar workers</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonfarm laborers</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service workers, including private</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>household</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Base too small for figures to be shown.
¹Includes farm workers not shown separately.

Regardless of labor union membership status, the 1970 annual earnings of year-round, full-time wage and salary workers of Negro and other races were less than those of their white counterparts. However, the ratio of Negro and other races to white earnings for men was larger for union than for nonunion members; for women, there is some evidence that this same relationship was true.

Table 43. Median Earnings of Year Round, Full-Time Wage and Salary Workers by Occupation Group, Labor Union Membership, and Sex: March 1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation group of longest job held in 1970</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negro and other races</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN LABOR UNIONS</td>
<td>$7,732</td>
<td>$9,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White-collar workers</td>
<td>8,883</td>
<td>9,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue-collar workers</td>
<td>7,772</td>
<td>9,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service workers</td>
<td>6,335</td>
<td>8,682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT IN LABOR UNIONS</td>
<td>$5,906</td>
<td>9,478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White-collar workers</td>
<td>8,330</td>
<td>11,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue-collar workers</td>
<td>5,469</td>
<td>7,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service workers</td>
<td>5,319</td>
<td>6,929</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RATIO: MEDIAN EARNINGS OF UNION TO NONUNION WORKERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All occupations</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White-collar workers</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue-collar workers</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service workers</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X Not applicable.
1Includes farm workers not shown separately.

In May of 1972, blacks represented 15.1 percent of all full-time Federal employees compared with 14.9 percent in November 1967. Also, in 1972, blacks held 11.5 percent of all Federal jobs paid under the Federal Classification Act; 20.4 percent under Wage Systems; 18.6 percent under Postal Field Service Rates; and 6.8 percent under all other pay systems. For the Classification Act and "other pay systems," these figures represent an increase over the comparable 1967 proportions.

In the 5-year period, 1967 to 1972, the number of blacks in grades GS-12 to 15, under the Federal Classification Act, increased from 1.8 percent to 3.0 percent; in the highest grades, GS-16 to 18, the increase was from 1.2 percent to 2.3 percent.

Table 44. Federal Employment Pay Plan and Grade Grouping: 1967 and 1972

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pay system and grade grouping</th>
<th>May 1972</th>
<th>Percent Negro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Negro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, all pay plans</td>
<td>2,575,144</td>
<td>387,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Schedule and Similar</td>
<td>1,330,754</td>
<td>153,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-1 to 4</td>
<td>395,840</td>
<td>66,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 8</td>
<td>393,766</td>
<td>59,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 to 11</td>
<td>319,036</td>
<td>18,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 to 15</td>
<td>306,389</td>
<td>9,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 to 18</td>
<td>5,783</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wage Systems, total</td>
<td>504,837</td>
<td>102,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular nonsupervisory</td>
<td>385,480</td>
<td>85,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>141,025</td>
<td>56,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95,020</td>
<td>18,649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>144,416</td>
<td>10,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5,279</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Leader</td>
<td>14,610</td>
<td>2,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,664</td>
<td>2,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,852</td>
<td>532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5,934</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Supervisory</td>
<td>41,192</td>
<td>4,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9,773</td>
<td>2,238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27,464</td>
<td>1,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,450</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>505</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other wage systems</td>
<td>63,555</td>
<td>10,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal Field Service</td>
<td>684,894</td>
<td>127,329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>570,404</td>
<td>111,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92,694</td>
<td>14,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21,181</td>
<td>1,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>535</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total other pay systems</td>
<td>52,315</td>
<td>3,558</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Represents zero
- NA Not available.

1Includes other pay plans, not shown separately.
2In 1970-71 the majority of Federal employees under wage systems were converted to one of the Coordinated Federal Wage Systems (CFWS)--Regular Nonsupervisory, Regular Leader, and Regular Supervisor. The remaining employees were in "other wage systems," which will eventually be converted to the CFWS.
3Includes 4th class postmasters and rural carriers.
4In 1967 there were 20 PFS grades.

Source: U.S. Civil Service Commission.
The 7.4 million employed blacks constituted 10 percent of all employed persons in 1970. The largest proportion of both blacks and whites were located in the manufacturing and professional and related services industries.

Two other industries—retail trades and other personal services, including private household—contained 11 and 12 percent, respectively, of the employed blacks. About 16 percent of the employed whites were in retail trade, but, in contrast to blacks, only 3 percent of the employed whites were in other personal services.

There were 254,000 self-employed Negroes, constituting only 4 percent of all self-employed workers. Two-thirds of the self-employed blacks were concentrated in four industries—agriculture, private household and other personal services, retail trade, and construction.

Table 45. Industry Group of Employed and Self-Employed Persons: 1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>All employed persons</th>
<th>Self-employed workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negro (numbers in thousands)</td>
<td>Negro as a percent of all employed persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, 16 years old and over............</td>
<td>7,403</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, forestry, and fisheries...</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining...</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction...</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special trade contractors...</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing...</td>
<td>1,789</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durable goods...</td>
<td>1,034</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor vehicle and motor vehicle equipment...</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondurable goods...</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and kindred products...</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, communications, and other public utilities...</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation...</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale trade...</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail trade...</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food stores...</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating and drinking places...</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automotive dealers and gasoline stations...</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance, insurance, and real estate...</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business services...</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automobile services...</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other repair services...</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel and lodging places...</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other personal services, incl...</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private household...</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment and recreation services...</td>
<td>1,442</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and related services...</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health services, incl. hospitals...</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government...</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare, religious, and nonprofit membership organizations...</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Rounds to zero.
- X Not applicable.
- Z Less than 500.
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During the last five years, the number of blacks and whites enrolled in school has increased, reaching a total of 8.0 million blacks and 51.3 million whites in 1972. Black enrollment in high school and college increased faster than white enrollment during this period. Between 1967 and 1972, the number of blacks in college about doubled.

Table 46. School Enrollment of Persons 3 to 34 Years Old, by Level: 1967 and 1972

(Numbers in thousands. Minus sign (-) denotes decrease)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of school and race</th>
<th>1967</th>
<th>1972</th>
<th>Percent change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BLACK</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6,826</td>
<td>7,959</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursery</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary school</td>
<td>4,618</td>
<td>4,573</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>1,651</td>
<td>2,025</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>96.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WHITE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43,816</td>
<td>51,314</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursery</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>1,079</td>
<td>91.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>2,840</td>
<td>2,633</td>
<td>-7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary school</td>
<td>28,415</td>
<td>27,185</td>
<td>-4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>11,997</td>
<td>12,959</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>5,905</td>
<td>7,458</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over the last five-year period, there have been improvements in enrollment rates for black students in some age groups outside the compulsory attendance ages, 6 to 15 years old. Gains were noted in the enrollment level of black youth, 16 and 17 years old, between 1967 and 1972. About 90 percent of the black youth were enrolled in school in 1972 compared to 84 percent in 1967. During the same period, the rate for the comparable group of whites remained about the same. For the first time, the enrollment rates for black and white 16- and 17-year-olds were about the same.

There is some evidence that the enrollment rates increased for blacks 20 to 24 years old. Among blacks, the proportion rose from 13 to 17 percent, whereas among whites, the proportion changed from 20 to 22 percent. Thus, in 1972, the enrollment rate for blacks in this age group was closer to that of whites.

Substantial increases in the proportion of 3-, 4-, and 5-year-olds enrolled in nursery, kindergarten, or elementary school have been noted among both black and white children. Nursery school or kindergarten would include "Head Start" and similar programs sponsored by local agencies to provide preschool education to young children.

Table 47. Percent Enrolled in School by Age: 1967, 1970, and 1972

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 and 4 years</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 15 years</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 and 17 years</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 and 19 years</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 24 years</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Larger numbers of blacks 18 to 24 years old are now attending college. Over one-half million blacks, or 18 percent of all blacks in this age group, were enrolled in college in 1972. This proportion represented an increase over the 13 percent enrolled in 1967. A greater proportion of black men than black women in this age group were attending college in 1972.

Among young whites, the proportion of 18- to 24-year-olds attending college has remained at about the same level in 1972 as in 1967.

Table 48. College Enrollment of Persons 18 to 24 Years Old: 1967 and 1972

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex and race</th>
<th>1967</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>1972</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total, 18 to 24 years old</td>
<td>Enrolled in college</td>
<td>Total, 18 to 24 years old</td>
<td>Enrolled in college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent of total</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent of total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black........</td>
<td>2,281</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2,986</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male..........</td>
<td>1,032</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1,373</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female........</td>
<td>1,249</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,613</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White........</td>
<td>17,501</td>
<td>4,710</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21,315</td>
<td>5,624</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male..........</td>
<td>7,864</td>
<td>2,761</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10,212</td>
<td>3,195</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female........</td>
<td>9,637</td>
<td>1,949</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11,103</td>
<td>2,428</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Young blacks 14 to 24 years old were less likely to be high school dropouts in 1972 than in 1967. About 17.5 percent of these black men and women were high school dropouts in 1972. This represented a substantial decline from the rate five years earlier when it was about 22.8 percent. The dropout rate for whites (14 to 24 years old) was 12.4 in 1967 and 11.3 in 1972. Thus in 1972, blacks were still more likely to be high school dropouts.

Among blacks 16 and 17 years old, about 8 percent had dropped out of school in 1972 as compared with 13 percent five years earlier. Also, for both black men and women 20 to 24 years old, the dropout rate had declined to about 27 percent in 1972, which was well below the 1967 levels.

Table 49. Percent High School Dropouts Among Persons 14 to 24 Years Old, by Sex and Age: 1967 and 1972

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age and sex</th>
<th>1967</th>
<th>1972</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, 14 to 24 years</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 and 15 years old</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 and 17 years old</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 and 19 years old</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 24 years old</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, 14 to 24 years</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 and 15 years old</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 and 17 years old</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 and 19 years old</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 24 years old</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Dropouts are persons who are not enrolled in school and who are not high school graduates.

The rising educational attainment of young black men and women in this country is evidenced by recent gains in the proportions who were high school graduates or who had some college education. In 1972, about 65 percent of young blacks 20 to 29 years old were high school graduates. This proportion had increased considerably from 1967 when about 54 percent were high school graduates. Also, among blacks 20 to 29 years old, the proportion of men and women who had completed at least one year of college increased from about 15 percent to about 22 percent during this time period. However, young adult blacks were still less likely than whites to have completed high school or to have some college education.

Table 50. Level of Schooling Completed by Persons 20 to 29 Years Old by Sex: 1960, 1967, 1970, and 1972

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent completed 4 years of high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school or more:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent completed 1 year of college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or more:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Includes persons of "other races."

Young black adults 25 to 34 years old have made gains in completing their college education. During the five-year period 1967 to 1972, the proportion rose from 5 to 8 percent.

Among whites 25 to 34 years old, about 19 percent had completed 4 years of college or more in 1972, compared to a lower proportion of 15 percent in 1967.

In 1972, as in previous years shown, white men (25 to 34 years old) were more likely than white women to have completed college—about 23 and 15 percent, respectively; whereas, among black men and women, the apparent differences were not statistically significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Within the last five-year period, 1968 to 1973, the proportion of Negro husband-wife families declined from 68 to 61 percent, whereas the percent headed by a woman rose from about 28 to 35 percent. Among white families, a slight increase was noted in the proportion with a female head—9 percent in 1968 to 10 percent in 1973.

Between 1972 and 1973, the proportion of Negro families headed by a woman increased from 32 to 35 percent.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total all families (thousands)</th>
<th>Percent of all families</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Husband-wife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>3,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>3,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>4,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>4,752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>5,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>5,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>5,413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>5,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>5,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>NEGRO AND OTHER RACES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>4,589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>4,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>4,928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>5,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>5,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>NEGRO</strong></td>
<td>35,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>36,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>40,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>43,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>44,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>46,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>46,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>47,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>48,477</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Most of the tables in this section show data on families for the year 1972. Figures on families from the March 1973 Current Population Survey, which recently became available, have been included in this table in this section.

A family consists of two or more persons living together and related by blood, marriage, or adoption.

Female heads of families include widowed and single women whose husbands are in the Armed Service or otherwise away from home involuntarily, as well as those separated from their husbands through divorce or marital discord.

Based on 1970 census population controls. See Definitions and Explanations section for more details.

Black women who were heads of families in 1972 were more likely to be separated or single and less likely to be divorced or widowed than white women who were heads of families. Among these 1.6 million black women, about 35 percent were separated and 18 percent were single. Among the comparable group of white women, about 15 percent were separated and 9 percent were single.

Among all female heads of families, a higher proportion of blacks than of whites had a disrupted marriage. However, among the younger age group (under 45) marital disruption was more prevalent among white female heads of families than among black female family heads.

Table 53. Marital Status of Female Heads of Families: 1972

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital status</th>
<th>Head, all ages</th>
<th>Head under 45 years old</th>
<th>Head over 45 years old</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negro</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Negro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, female head....thousands.</td>
<td>1,642</td>
<td>4,489</td>
<td>1,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With disrupted marriage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single (never married)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband temporarily absent</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Armed Forces</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reasons</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Categories refer to marital status at time of enumeration.
- Rounds to zero.

In 1970, blacks were less likely than whites to have their first marriage intact. Among the ever-married men, 60 percent of the blacks compared to 77 percent of the whites were living with their first wife. The comparable proportions for black and white women were 48 and 65 percent, respectively.

The disruption of marriage by divorce or dissolution of marriage by widowhood was more prevalent among blacks than among whites in 1970. Among ever-married persons, the proportion known to have been widowed was highest for black women 45 years and over; whereas, the proportion known to have been divorced was highest for black men in the same age group.

Table 54. Persons Ever Married 14 Years Old and Over, by Marital Status, Whether Married More Than Once, Whether Known to Have Been Widowed or Divorced, and Sex: 1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race, sex. and age</th>
<th>Total (thousands)</th>
<th>Percent of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Married once, spouse present</td>
<td>Married more than once</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEGRO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 to 24 years...</td>
<td>4,525</td>
<td>60.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 44 years...</td>
<td>1,913</td>
<td>68.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 years and over.</td>
<td>2,217</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 to 24 years...</td>
<td>5,794</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 44 years...</td>
<td>2,396</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 years and over.</td>
<td>2,714</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 to 24 years...</td>
<td>45,971</td>
<td>76.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 44 years...</td>
<td>18,486</td>
<td>82.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 years and over.</td>
<td>24,037</td>
<td>71.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 to 24 years...</td>
<td>53,826</td>
<td>65.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 44 years...</td>
<td>19,864</td>
<td>78.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 years and over.</td>
<td>28,242</td>
<td>53.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Persons shown as "known to have been widowed" include widowed persons and those currently married or divorced persons whose first marriage ended in widowhood. Persons shown as "known to have been divorced" include divorced persons and those currently married or widowed persons whose first marriage did not end in widowhood.

- Rounds to zero.

Black men 25 to 54 years of age who had not completed high school were less likely than those who had attained a higher educational level to have their first wife living with them. Similar differences also existed among the white men in the same age category.

For the black men with disrupted marriages, those who were not high school graduates were more likely to be separated than divorced (8 and 4 percent, respectively). For the men with 1 year of college or more, the proportions separated and divorced were about the same. These patterns were not evident among the white men.

Table 55. Years of School Completed by Males 25 to 54 Years Old, by Marital Status: 1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Total¹ (thousands)</th>
<th>Single</th>
<th>Married spouse, present</th>
<th>Separated</th>
<th>Divorced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Married once</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEGRO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, 25 to 54 years old</td>
<td>3,276</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not high school graduate</td>
<td>2,029</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate</td>
<td>1,247</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College, 1 year or more</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College, 4 years or more</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, 25 to 54 years old</td>
<td>30,845</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not high school graduate</td>
<td>10,950</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate</td>
<td>19,895</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College, 1 year or more</td>
<td>9,428</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College, 4 years or more</td>
<td>5,457</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: High school graduates are those persons who had completed 4 years of high school or some college.
¹Includes married spouse absent (exc. separated) and widowed, not shown separately.

The proportion of men 25 to 54 years old married and living with their wives was closely related to their income levels in 1969. Men, regardless of race, with higher incomes were more likely than men with lower incomes to have a wife living with them in 1969. More specifically, among those who had incomes of $10,000 or more in 1969, the proportion who were married with spouse present was 83 percent for blacks and 92 percent for whites. By contrast, for the men who had incomes below $3,000, about 49 percent of the blacks and 56 percent of the whites were in the comparable marital status category.

Among black men with disrupted marriages, those with lower incomes—under $10,000—were more likely to be separated than divorced. In the $10,000 and over category, similar proportions were separated or divorced. This situation was not true for white men.

Table 56. Income in 1969 of Males 25 to 54 Years Old, by Marital Status
(Persons as of following year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Total1 (thousands)</th>
<th>Percent of total</th>
<th>Married, spouse present</th>
<th>Single</th>
<th>Married once</th>
<th>Separated</th>
<th>Widowed</th>
<th>Divorced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEGRO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, 25 to 54 years old</td>
<td>3,112</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under $3,000</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,000 to $4,999</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000 to $6,999</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$7,000 to $9,999</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 and over</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 to $14,999</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000 or more</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, 25 to 54 years old</td>
<td>30,323</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under $3,000</td>
<td>2,202</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,000 to $4,999</td>
<td>2,526</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000 to $6,999</td>
<td>4,607</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$7,000 to $9,999</td>
<td>8,969</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 and over</td>
<td>12,020</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 to $14,999</td>
<td>7,912</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000 or more</td>
<td>4,108</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Based on persons reporting income. Includes "married, spouse absent," not shown separately.

At the beginning of the 1960 decade, about three-fourths of own black children were living with both parents. Within the last five-year span, 1967 to 1972, the proportion of own black children living with both parents decreased from 68 percent to 61 percent. During the same period, the proportion of own white children living with both parents showed a slight decline—decreasing from 92 to 89 percent.

Table 57. Percent of Children Living With Both Parents: 1960 to 1972

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Negro and other races</th>
<th>Negro</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>(NA)</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>(NA)</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>(NA)</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>(NA)</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>(NA)</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Universe is own unmarried children under 18 years old living in families. "Own" child is a single (never married) son, daughter, stepchild, or adopted child of a married couple or of a family head or subfamily head.

NA Not available.

The differentials in fertility in 1970 between black and white women (35 to 44 years old) were influenced by urban-rural residence and educational characteristics of the mother. The disparity in fertility rates between black and white women in this age category was lowest in the urbanized areas and highest in the farm areas.

The fertility level of black women 35 to 44 years old surpasses that of whites at all educational levels below college. Conversely, black women with college training had a lower fertility rate than white women in the same educational group. For example, black women who had completed 4 years of college or more had 1.9 children per woman, a lower rate than the 2.3 for white women in the same educational group.

Both black and white women in the labor force had lower fertility than those not in the labor force.

Table 58. Number of Children Ever Born, Per Woman 35 to 44 Years Old, by Selected Characteristics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>1970</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All women</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women ever married</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of residence:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanized area</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other urban</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural nonfarm</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural farm</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years of school completed:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary: Less than 8 years</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 years</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school: 1 to 3 years</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College: 1 to 3 years</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years or more</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Labor force status:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In labor force</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in labor force</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From 1967 to 1972, the average number of total births expected by black wives 18 to 39 years old declined from 3.7 to 3.2. For white wives in the corresponding age category, the decline was from 3.1 to 2.6.

Among the younger wives 18 to 24 years old, the apparent difference in 1972 in the average number of births expected by blacks (2.4) and their white counterparts (2.2) may be due to sampling variability. However, total birth expectations were higher for black wives than for white wives 30 years old and over, primarily because black wives have already had more children than white wives.

With regard to the timing of fertility, by 1972, black wives (18 to 39 years old) had already borne more than four-fifths of their total expected births; this proportion was greater than the three-fourths among white wives in the same age group.

Table 59. Selected Data on Birth Expectations for Reporting Wives, 18 to 39 Years Old: 1967 and 1972

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Total, 18 to 39 years</th>
<th>Age of wife</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18 to 24</td>
<td>25 to 29</td>
<td>30 to 34</td>
<td>35 to 39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967 Total number of reporting wives:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro...thousands.</td>
<td>1,280</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>321</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White...thousands.</td>
<td>14,440</td>
<td>3,798</td>
<td>3,420</td>
<td>3,390</td>
<td>3,831</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of births to date:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro...</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White...</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of total births</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expected:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro...</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White...</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of expected children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>already born:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro...</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White...</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972 Total number of reporting wives:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro...thousands.</td>
<td>1,449</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>346</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White...thousands.</td>
<td>16,681</td>
<td>4,670</td>
<td>4,392</td>
<td>3,909</td>
<td>3,711</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of births to date:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro...</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White...</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of total births</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expected:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro...</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White...</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of expected children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>already born:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro...</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White...</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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In both 1960 and 1970, for Negroes, homeownership rates were highest in the suburbs and lowest in the central cities.

During the decade, the rate of owner occupancy for Negro households increased in all areas, however the rates for Negroes were still lower than those for whites in 1970.

### Table 60. Tenure of Occupied Housing Units, Inside and Outside Metropolitan Areas: 1960 and 1970
(Numbers in thousands. Metropolitan areas as defined in respective censuses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of residence and year</th>
<th>1960</th>
<th>1970</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Owner occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent of total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>5,144</td>
<td>1,974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan areas</td>
<td>3,486</td>
<td>1,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central cities</td>
<td>2,844</td>
<td>892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside central cities</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside metropolitan areas</td>
<td>1,658</td>
<td>749</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1The 1960 data include "other races."

Between 1960 and 1970, the difference between Negro and white households in the proportion of housing units with complete plumbing was reduced considerably, most notably in the central cities. In 1970, as in 1960, the difference was greatest in nonmetropolitan areas where the proportion of households with complete plumbing was lowest.

Table 61. Percent of Occupied Housing Units, by Availability of Complete Plumbing Facilities, Inside and Outside Metropolitan Areas: 1960 and 1970

(Metropolitan areas as defined in respective censuses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of residence and year</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>With all plumbing facilities</td>
<td>Lacking some or all plumbing facilities</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>With all plumbing facilities</td>
<td>Lacking some or all plumbing facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States............</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan areas.......</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In central cities.........</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside central cities...</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside metropolitan areas.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States............</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan areas.......</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In central cities.........</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside central cities...</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside metropolitan areas.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: In this table, 1970 data for white households include "other races"; the 1960 data for black households include "other races."

Overall, at each income level and for each type of residence, the owner occupancy rates were lower for black than for white households in 1970. For both blacks and whites, home ownership rates tended to increase as the income levels rose. For example, the 1970 owner occupancy rate for black households with incomes $15,000 and over was 70 percent, about twice the 33 percent for those with incomes under $3,000.

Table 62. Percent of Housing Units Which are Owner Occupied by Income in 1969, Inside and Outside Metropolitan Areas: 1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Less than $3,000</th>
<th>$3,000 to $4,999</th>
<th>$5,000 to $6,999</th>
<th>$7,000 to $9,999</th>
<th>$10,000 to $14,999</th>
<th>$15,000 or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BLACK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States................</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan areas...........</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In central cities............</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside central cities......</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside metropolitan areas..</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITE¹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States..............</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan areas.........</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In central cities...........</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside central cities.....</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside metropolitan areas.</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Income refers to the income of the family or primary individual occupying the housing unit.

¹Includes persons of "other races."

Overall, black owned homes were older than those owned by whites. About three-fifths of the black households compared to less than one-half of the white households were built prior to 1950. Even among the housing units valued the highest ($20,000 or more), those owned by blacks were less likely than those owned by whites to have been constructed within recent years.

Table 63. Year Structure Built by Value of Owner Occupied Housing Units: 1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year structure built</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Less than $5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specified black occupied...thousands..</td>
<td>2,079</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent, total......</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969 to March 1970</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965 to 1968</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960 to 1964</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950 to 1959</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949 or earlier</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent by value......</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specified white occupied...thousands..</td>
<td>29,647</td>
<td>1,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent, total......</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969 to March 1970</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965 to 1968</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960 to 1964</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950 to 1959</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949 or earlier</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent by value......</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Data are limited to one-family homes on less than 10 acres and no business on property. Year structure built refers to when the building was first constructed, not when it was remodeled, added to, or converted. "Value" is the respondent's estimate of how much the property (house and lot) would sell for if it were for sale.

1Includes persons of "other races."

About 63 percent of black households were mortgaged properties in 1970. The proportion was about the same for white households. The value of the mortgaged properties was much higher than that of the nonmortgaged properties for both black and white homeowners.

The annual housing cost was a greater proportion of the income for black than for white homeowners with mortgages. The housing cost was at least one-fourth of the income for 30 percent of the black households compared to 18 percent for white households with mortgages.

Table 64. Mortgage Status of Properties, by Selected Characteristics: 1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total properties</td>
<td>Non-mortgaged properties</td>
<td>Mortgaged properties</td>
<td>Total properties</td>
<td>Non-mortgaged properties</td>
<td>Mortgaged properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VALUE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total..........thousands</td>
<td>1,975</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>1,251</td>
<td>29,170</td>
<td>11,321</td>
<td>17,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent.................</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $5,000..........</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000 to $7,499..........</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$7,500 to $9,999..........</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 to $14,999........</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000 to $19,999........</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 to $24,999........</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 to $39,999........</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 or more...........</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported.............</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median.............$12,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,700</td>
<td>$14,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELECTED ANNUAL HOUSING COST AS PERCENT OF INCOME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total..........thousands</td>
<td>1,786</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>26,776</td>
<td>10,918</td>
<td>15,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent.................</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10 percent.....</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 14 percent.........</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 19 percent.........</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 24 percent.........</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 34 percent.........</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 percent or more.......</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported or not completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median................. 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Information about mortgages was obtained from the owner and lender in a Residential Finance Survey. Included as mortgages are all forms of debt where the property is pledged as security for repayment of debt. The category "mortgages" also includes debt arrangements as contracts to purchase, contracts for deed, assumption agreements, and land contracts. Annual housing cost includes the sum of payments for real estate taxes, special assessments (if any), property insurance, utilities, fuel, water, ground rent (if any), and interest and principal payments on all mortgages (if property mortgaged), plus any other items included in the mortgage payment. Cost excludes taxes and insurance.

Z Less than 0.5 percent.

1Includes persons of "other races."

The median gross rent for black occupied households was lower than that for white households in 1970. However, black renters paid a larger proportion of their income for rent than did white renters—about 43 percent of the black renters compared to 35 percent of the white renters paid at least one-fourth of their income for rent.

Black families with low incomes paid a larger percentage of their total income for rent than did black families with higher incomes. The same was true for white families. At the under $5,000 income level, 68 percent of the black households and 73 percent of the white households expended at least one-fourth of their income for gross rent.

Table 65. Gross Rent as a Percent of Income for Households: 1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Less than $5,000</th>
<th>$5,000 to $9,999</th>
<th>$10,000 to $14,999</th>
<th>$15,000 to $24,999</th>
<th>$25,000 or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BLACK</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, renter occupied........... thousands..</td>
<td>3,607</td>
<td>2,034</td>
<td>1,112</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent, renter occupied...............</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross rent as percent of income:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specified renter occupied1, thousands..</td>
<td>3,413</td>
<td>1,890</td>
<td>1,074</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent, total......................</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 15 percent..............</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 19 percent..................</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(Z)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 24 percent..................</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Z)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 34 percent..................</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Z)</td>
<td>(Z)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 percent or more................</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(Z)</td>
<td>(Z)</td>
<td>(Z)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median gross rent...........</td>
<td>$89</td>
<td>$77</td>
<td>$99</td>
<td>$115</td>
<td>$129</td>
<td>$121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WHITE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, renter occupied............. thousands..</td>
<td>19,953</td>
<td>7,300</td>
<td>7,170</td>
<td>3,583</td>
<td>1,533</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent, renter occupied...............</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross rent as percent of income:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specified renter occupied1, thousands..</td>
<td>18,920</td>
<td>6,888</td>
<td>6,783</td>
<td>3,426</td>
<td>1,472</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent, total......................</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 15 percent...............</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 19 percent..................</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 24 percent..................</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 34 percent..................</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 percent or more................</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Z)</td>
<td>(Z)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median gross rent...............</td>
<td>$112</td>
<td>$90</td>
<td>$112</td>
<td>$135</td>
<td>$162</td>
<td>$208</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: "Income" refers to the income in 1969 of the family or primary individual occupying the housing unit. "Gross rent" is the contract rent plus the estimated average monthly cost of utilities and fuel, if these items are paid for by the renter in addition to rent.

2 Less than 0.5 percent.

1 Excludes one-family homes on 10 acres or more. Includes the category "not computed," not shown separately.

2 Includes persons of "other races."

For both black and white households, renters in metropolitan areas paid a larger proportion of their income for rent than those in nonmetropolitan areas. Among black renters, about 45 percent in metropolitan areas as compared to 35 percent in nonmetropolitan areas paid at least one-fourth of their income for rent.

In nonmetropolitan areas where the ratio of gross rent to income was lower, the amount of income spent on rent by black households was more comparable to that of white households.

Table 66. Gross Rent as a Percent of Income for Renter Occupied Households, by Metropolitan-Nonmetropolitan Residence: 1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gross rent as percent of income</th>
<th>Income in 1969</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INSIDE METROPOLITAN AREAS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specified renter occupied...</td>
<td>2,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent, total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 15 percent</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 24 percent</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 34 percent</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 percent or more</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>White</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specified renter occupied...</td>
<td>14,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent, total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 15 percent</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 24 percent</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 34 percent</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 percent or more</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OUTSIDE METROPOLITAN AREAS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specified renter occupied...</td>
<td>553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent, total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 15 percent</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 24 percent</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 34 percent</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 percent or more</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>White</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specified renter occupied...</td>
<td>4,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent, total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 15 percent</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 24 percent</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 34 percent</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 percent or more</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: "Income" refers to the income in 1969 of the family or primary individual occupying the housing unit. "Gross rent" is the contract rent plus the estimated average monthly cost of utilities and fuel, if these items are paid for by the renter in addition to rent.

Z Less than 0.5 percent.
1Excludes one-family homes on 10 acres or more. Includes the category "not computed," not shown separately.
2Includes persons of "other races."

The range of gross monthly rent for black renters was below that for white renters regardless of the age of the structure in which they lived. A larger proportion of black households than white households had rents under $100 (58 and 38 percent, respectively). Approximately 9 percent of black renters compared to 54 percent of white renters paid at least $150 monthly for rent.

For both blacks and whites, the majority of renter occupied structures were built before 1950; however, a higher proportion of those rented by blacks were older. Where the gross rent was under $100, the units rented by whites were more likely than those rented by blacks to have been built before 1950. The converse was true for the higher rents ($100 and over)—the structures rented by blacks were older.

### Table 67. Year Structure Built of Renter Occupied Units by Gross Rent: 1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gross rent</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Less than $60</th>
<th>$60 to $79</th>
<th>$80 to $99</th>
<th>$100 to $119</th>
<th>$120 to $149</th>
<th>Over $150 or more</th>
<th>No cash rent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specified black occupied...thousands..</td>
<td>3,413</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent, total........................</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969 to March 1970....................</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965 to 1968.........................</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960 to 1964.........................</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950 to 1959.........................</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949 or earlier......................</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent by gross rent................</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969 to March 1970....................</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965 to 1968.........................</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960 to 1964.........................</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950 to 1959.........................</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949 or earlier......................</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specified white* occupied...thousands..</td>
<td>18,920</td>
<td>1,738</td>
<td>2,427</td>
<td>3,023</td>
<td>2,803</td>
<td>3,210</td>
<td>4,471</td>
<td>1,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent, total........................</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969 to March 1970....................</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965 to 1968.........................</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960 to 1964.........................</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950 to 1959.........................</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949 or earlier......................</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent by gross rent................</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969 to March 1970....................</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965 to 1968.........................</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960 to 1964.........................</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950 to 1959.........................</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949 or earlier......................</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Data excludes one-family homes on 10 acres or more. "Gross rent" is the contract rent plus the estimated average monthly cost of utilities and fuels, if these items are paid for by the renter in addition to the rent. Year structure built refers to when the building was first constructed, not when it was remodelled, added to, or converted.

*Includes persons of "other races."
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The average life expectancy at birth in 1968 was 60.1 years for Negro and other races males and 67.5 years for Negro and other races females. These figures were less than those for the corresponding group of whites.

Among Negro and other races, expectation of life at birth between the period 1959-61 and 1968 increased slightly for females, whereas that for males declined. This decline for males reflects the increase in the age-specific death rates which has occurred for most age groups during that period.

Table 68. Average Remaining Life Expectancy at Selected Ages, 1959-61, and 1968

(Additional years of life expected)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age and sex</th>
<th>1959-61</th>
<th>1968</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 years (at birth)</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>-6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>-4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 years</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>-4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 years</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>-4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 years</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>-3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1959-61</th>
<th>1968</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEGRO AND WHITE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 years (at birth)</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>74.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>74.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 years</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>61.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 years</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 years</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13-year average.

In every age group from infancy through the 65 to 74 age group, mortality rates were higher for Negro and other races than for whites.

Even though most age-specific death rates were substantially higher for Negro and other races than for whites, the crude death rates for the two groups were nearly identical in 1969. This was due to the younger age structure of the Negro and other races population than of the white population.

Between 1960 and 1969, age-specific death rates increased noticeably for several age groups in the Negro and other races population—15 to 24, 25 to 34, 35 to 44, and 65 to 74 years. For the white population only slight increases were observed in the age groups ranging from 15 to 44 years.


(Age-specific death rates per 1,000 population in specified group)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>1960</th>
<th></th>
<th>1969</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negro and other races</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Negro and other races</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 1 year</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 4 years</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 14 years</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 24 years</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 34 years</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 44 years</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 54 years</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 to 64 years</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 to 74 years</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 to 84 years</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td>69.3</td>
<td>79.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 years and over</td>
<td>139.1</td>
<td>203.5</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>202.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Crude death rate, unadjusted for differences in age structure.

Major cardiovascular diseases and malignant neoplasms were the two leading causes of death in 1969, for both the Negro and other races and white populations. However, the death rate from both diseases was higher for Negro and other races than for whites--34 percent greater for major cardiovascular diseases and 25 percent higher for malignant neoplasms.

Among the major cardiovascular diseases, mortality differentials between Negro and other races and whites were most evident for hypertension. Although mortality due to hypertension was relatively low (9.5 per 100,000 population) for Negro and other races in 1969, it was about 4 times greater than that for whites (2.4).

In 1969, deaths from accidents and homicide were markedly higher for Negro and other races than for whites, and ranked third and fifth as causes of death among the former group. Suicide, also classified under violent causes of death, was a greater hazard among the white population in 1969.

Influenza and pneumonia ranked fourth as the causes of death of persons of Negro and other races. In 1969, mortality among Negro and other races from all forms of anemia (including sickle cell anemia) was relatively low, about 2.9 per 100,000 persons; however, the rate was about 3 times as great as that for whites.

Table 70. Age Adjusted Death Rates for Selected Causes for the Population: 1969

(Based on age-specific death rates per 100,000 population in specified group. Computed by the direct method, using as the standard population the age distribution of the total population of the United States as enumerated in 1940)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cause of death</th>
<th>Negro and other races</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All causes........................................</td>
<td>1,046.2</td>
<td>1,300.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major cardiovascular diseases.......................</td>
<td>457.9</td>
<td>534.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diseases of heart...................................</td>
<td>312.8</td>
<td>378.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypertension........................................</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerebrovascular disease................................</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>62.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arteriosclerosis....................................</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malignant neoplasms, incl. neoplasms of lymphatic and hematopoietic tissues.............</td>
<td>158.6</td>
<td>194.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leukemia............................................</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accidents...........................................</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td>118.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influenza and pneumonia................................</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>54.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes mellitus....................................</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cirrhosis of liver...................................</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronchitis, emphysema, and asthma....................</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suicide..............................................</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certain causes of mortality in early infancy........</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homicide............................................</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>72.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congenital anomalies................................</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peptic ulcer........................................</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infections of kidney................................</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuberculosis, all forms................................</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anemias.............................................</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A significant reduction in maternal mortality has been achieved for both Negroes and whites. Since 1965, the rate for mothers of Negro and other races has been below 1.0 per 1,000 live births.

There have been sharp declines in infant mortality during the last three decades. Despite this, in 1971, the infant mortality rate for Negro and other races was 30.2, a level higher than the 1950 white rate. In 1971, the infant mortality rate for whites was about one-half the black rate.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Negro and other races</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maternal</td>
<td>Infant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under 1 year</td>
<td>Under 28 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>73.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>40.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>(NA)</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>(NA)</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>(NA)</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Data for 1969, 1970, and 1971 are provisional.

NA Not available.

Persons of Negro and other races were less likely than white persons to have visited a physician or dentist in 1971.

A lower proportion of both blacks and whites in the under $5,000 income category than in the upper income group, $10,000 and over, made at least one visit to the physician in 1971. However, among those who made visits, persons in the under $5,000 category made more visits, on the average, than those at the $10,000 and over level.

The majority of all persons in the lower income category (under $5,000) received care in the physician's office. However, about one-fourth of the blacks at this income level compared to one-tenth of whites received physician's care in a clinic.

In 1971, for both races, the usual pattern of increased physician visits for elderly persons was evident. Among Negro and other races, the average number of physician visits per person, per year was 4.2 for the under 65 years old age group, compared to 7.1 for those 65 years and over.

Table 72. Percent of Population With One or More Physician or Dentist Visits by Income and Age: 1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Family income</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Under $5,000</td>
<td>$5,000 to $9,999</td>
<td>$10,000 and over</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEGRO AND OTHER RACES</td>
<td>25,267</td>
<td>9,745</td>
<td>8,533</td>
<td>5,184</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent with one or more visits to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physician................</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentist..................</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of physician visits per person:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total ....................</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 65 years...........</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years and over........</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total physician's visits thousands</td>
<td>110,410</td>
<td>49,455</td>
<td>32,678</td>
<td>21,610</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent ..................</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home ....................</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physician's office.......</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital clinic..........</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other and unknown........</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITE</td>
<td>177,093</td>
<td>31,221</td>
<td>55,861</td>
<td>79,097</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent with one or more visits to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physician................</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentist..................</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of physician visits per person:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total ....................</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 65 years...........</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years and over........</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total physician's visits thousands</td>
<td>888,879</td>
<td>181,015</td>
<td>268,539</td>
<td>389,889</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent ..................</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home ....................</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physician's office.......</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital clinic..........</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other and unknown........</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Negro and other races population averaged 18 days of restricted activity per person, per year, in 1971. Included in these 18 days were 8 days of bed disability and a like number of work-loss days for those currently employed.

For each age group, except children under 17 years old, persons of Negro and other races had higher rates than whites for total disability days.

### Table 73. Days of Disability Per Person Per Year, by Type of Disability and Age: 1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Restricted activity days</th>
<th>Bed-disability days</th>
<th>Work-loss days</th>
<th>School-loss days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEGRO AND OTHER RACES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 17 years</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 to 44 years</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 64 years</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years and over</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 17 years</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 to 44 years</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 64 years</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years and over</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: A day of restricted activity is defined as a day on which a person reduced his normal activities for the entire day as a result of illness or injury.

X Not applicable.

1Per currently employed persons. 2Includes children 6 to 16 years of age only.

In 1970, persons of Negro and other races under 65 years of age were less likely to have hospital insurance coverage than whites—3 out of 5 Negro and other races compared to 4 out of 5 whites. With the introduction of Medicare, almost all persons 65 years old and over have health insurance coverage.1

Hospital insurance coverage for persons under 65 years old tends to be related to income levels. In 1970, at the under $5,000 income level, 38 percent of Negro and other races and 50 percent of whites had hospital coverage. At the $10,000 and over level, 87 percent of Negro and other races and 90 percent of all whites were covered with hospital insurance.

There were notable regional differences in hospital insurance coverage for the populations. Larger proportions of Negro and other races in the North and West than in the South were insured—about 65 and 55 percent, respectively. A similar pattern of coverage existed for the white population with proportions of 82 percent in the North and West compared to 76 percent in the South.

Table 74. Persons Under 65 Years of Age by Hospital Insurance Coverage, by Age and Family Income, by Region: 1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Negro and other races</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family income</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under $5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000 to $9,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$10,000 and over</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under $5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000 to $9,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$10,000 and over</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNITED STATES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons under 65 years old</td>
<td>23,216</td>
<td>157,652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thousands...</td>
<td>8,651</td>
<td>23,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With hospital insurance</td>
<td>13,900</td>
<td>126,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coverage...</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>11,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of persons under 65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent in each age group with</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hospital insurance coverage:</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>under 17 years...</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 to 24 years...</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 44 years...</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 64 years...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons under 65 years old</td>
<td>11,590</td>
<td>46,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thousands...</td>
<td>5,542</td>
<td>9,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With hospital insurance</td>
<td>6,371</td>
<td>35,337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coverage...</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>4,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of persons under 65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH AND WEST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons under 65 years old</td>
<td>11,626</td>
<td>111,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thousands...</td>
<td>3,110</td>
<td>13,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With hospital insurance</td>
<td>7,528</td>
<td>91,412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coverage...</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>6,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of persons under 65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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In the last two presidential elections, 1968 and 1972, about the same proportion, two-thirds of the black population of voting age, reported that they registered to vote. Blacks were less likely than whites to be registered to vote.

In the South, the percentage of voting-age blacks who were registered was about the same in 1968 and 1972, but the proportion in the North and West dropped from 72 to 67 percent over the same period.

Table 75. Reported Voter Registration for Persons of Voting Age, by Region: 1968 and 1972

(Numbers in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Presidential elections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All persons of voting age:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>10,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>5,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North and West</td>
<td>4,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number who reported they registered:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>7,238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>3,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North and West</td>
<td>3,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of voting-age population:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North and West</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among the voting-age population, the overall reported voter participation rate for blacks in the 1972 presidential election was about 6 percentage points lower than that in the two preceding presidential elections—52 percent in 1972 compared to 58 percent in 1968 and 1964. The reported rate (64 percent) for whites was also lower in 1972 than in either 1968 or 1964.

In the North and West, the percentage of blacks who reported that they voted dropped in both the 1968 and 1972 elections from the high 1964 level. However, in the South, a larger proportion of blacks reported that they voted in 1968 than in 1964, and there is some evidence that the proportion was lower in 1972 than in 1968.

For both blacks and whites, most of the people who reported that they were registered reported that they voted in 1972; however, about 80 percent of registered blacks compared to 88 percent of the whites voted. These figures represent a decline from 1968.

Table 76. Reported Voter Participation and Registration of the Population of Voting Age, by Region: 1964, 1968, and 1972

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number who reported that they voted:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>6,048</td>
<td>6,300</td>
<td>7,033</td>
<td>70,204</td>
<td>72,213</td>
<td>78,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>5,276</td>
<td>3,094</td>
<td>3,324</td>
<td>15,813</td>
<td>17,853</td>
<td>20,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North and West</td>
<td>5,891</td>
<td>3,206</td>
<td>3,707</td>
<td>54,392</td>
<td>54,362</td>
<td>57,966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of voting age population who</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reported that they voted:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North and West</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of registered population who</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reported they voted:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>(NA)</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>(NA)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>(NA)</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>(NA)</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North and West</td>
<td>(NA)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>(NA)</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NA Not available.
\(^1\)Includes persons of "other races."

Generally, voter participation varied by age in 1972. The participation was lowest for the youngest age group—about one-third of blacks 18 to 24 years of age reported that they voted. Blacks 45 to 64 years of age were more likely than those in other age groups to have voted in 1972; about three-fifths in this age group voted.

Table 77. Reported Voter Participation for the Black Population of Voting Age in the 1972 Election, by Region and Age

(Number in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>United States</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>North and West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 years and over</td>
<td>7,033</td>
<td>3,324</td>
<td>3,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 to 24 years</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 44 years</td>
<td>2,851</td>
<td>1,327</td>
<td>1,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 64 years</td>
<td>2,326</td>
<td>1,108</td>
<td>1,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years and over</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent in each age group who reported that they voted:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>United States</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>North and West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 years and over</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 to 24 years</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 44 years</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 64 years</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years and over</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of black elected officials was about 2,600 in 1972, more than double the 1968 count. Gains were noted at all levels—Federal, State, city, and local.

The majority of black officials elected for the first time during the period 1968 to 1972 were in the South. Four of the 6 black Congressmen, 37 of the 66 black State legislators, and 32 of the 54 black mayors elected were in the southern region.

Table 78. Black Legislators and Blacks Elected to Other Public Office: 1964, 1968, 1970, and 1972

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>1964</th>
<th>1968</th>
<th>1970</th>
<th>1972</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>1,125</td>
<td>1,860</td>
<td>2,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Senate:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House of Representatives:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Legislatures:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayors:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>(NA)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>(NA)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>(NA)</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>1,567</td>
<td>2,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>(NA)</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>1,242</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Figures for the years 1964 and 1968 represent the total number of elected blacks holding office at that time, not just those elected in those years. The 1970 and 1972 figures represent the number of elected blacks holding office as of March 1971 and March 1973, respectively.

- Represents zero. NA Not available.

1Includes all black elected officials not included in first four categories.

Source: Potomac Institute and Joint Center for Political Studies.
Most of the black elected officials held offices in city government, law enforcement, and educational type positions in 1972. Only about 10 percent held positions at the State and Federal level.

Thirteen States had at least 100 elected black officials in 1972.

Table 79. Black Elected Officials by State: March 1972

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>1970 percent black</th>
<th>Black elected officials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Congress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>2,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Figures shown represent the total number of elected blacks holding office as of March 1973.

- Represents zero.
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Definitions and Explanations

Most of the statistics in this report are from the Bureau of the Census, but some are from other government and private agencies. Specific sources are given in the section "References for Tables."

The 1970 data from the Census Bureau are from the 1970 Census of Population and Housing and Current Population Surveys (CPS). It should be noted that the data obtained from the CPS and the data obtained from the Census are not entirely comparable, due to different enumeration procedures and population coverage.

The data collected from the March 1972 and 1973 Current Population Surveys shown in this report are, in some instances, not entirely comparable to earlier years because of revisions in the Current Population Survey. Starting in January 1972, 1970 census-based population controls, metropolitan residence definition, and other materials were introduced into the sample and estimation procedures. The major item affecting comparability at the overall national level is the introduction of population controls based on the 1970 census. Figures for previous years, except where noted, are tied in with 1960 census-based population controls. Basically, these changes should have no substantial impact on summary measures, such as medians and means, and on proportional measures, such as percent distributions. However, the changes may have more impact on the population levels in different subgroupings or within some particular category. Specific instances in the tables of this report are footnoted accordingly. A detailed description of the changes appears in the Bureau of Labor Statistics report, Employment and Earnings, Vol. 18, No. 8, February 1972.

Another change in the Current Population Survey beginning as of December 1971, which affects occupational data only, is the inclusion of a supplemental question, "What were your most important activities or duties?", which provided additional information for classifying persons by occupation. Additionally, changes in the occupational classification for the 1970 Census of Population were introduced in the Current Population Survey in January 1971. For a further explanation of these changes see Bureau of the Census Technical Paper No. 26, "1970 Occupation and Industry Classification Systems in Terms of Their 1960 Occupation and Industry Elements" and Bureau of Labor Statistics, Employment and Earnings, Volume 17, No. 8 and Volume 18, No. 8.

Data on income covers money income only, prior to deduction for taxes, received from such sources as wages or salaries, net income from self-employment, Social Security, dividends, interest, public assistance and welfare, unemployment compensation, government pensions, veterans payments, etc. (Certain money receipts such as capital gains are not included). Therefore, money income does not reflect the fact that many families receive part of their income in the form of nonmoney transfers such as food stamps, health benefits, and subsidized housing; that many farm families receive nonmoney income in the form of rent-free housing and goods produced and consumed on the farm; or that nonmoney incomes are also received by some nonfarm residents which often take the form of the use of business transportation and facilities, full or partial payments by business for retirement programs, medical and educational expenses, etc. These elements should be considered when comparing income levels. For a more detailed explanation, see Current Population Reports, Series P-60, Nos. 85 and 87.
Poverty index--Families and unrelated individuals are classified as being above or below the low-income level, using the poverty index adopted by a Federal Interagency Committee in 1969. This index centers around the Department of Agriculture's Economy Food Plan and reflects the differing consumption requirements of families based on their size and composition, sex and age of the family head, and farm-nonfarm residence. The low-income cutoffs for farm families have been set at 85 percent of the nonfarm levels. These cutoffs are updated every year to reflect the changes in the Consumer Price Index. The poverty threshold for a nonfarm family of four was $4,275 in 1972, $4,137 in 1971, and $2,973 in 1959. The low-income (poverty) data exclude inmates of institutions, members of Armed Forces living in barracks, and unrelated individuals under 14 years of age. For a more detailed explanation, see Current Population Reports, Series P-60, No. 86.

Data for standard metropolitan statistical areas (SMSA's), except where noted, are defined as of 1970. The standard Census definition is used for the four regions of the country. In that definition, the South includes the District of Columbia and the States of Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas.

Statistics on Federal employment cover only Federal civilian employees on a full-time status as of the given date. The Classification Act (General Schedule and Similar) salary schedules are based on 1972 pay rates which start at $4,564 a year for a GS-1 employee and increase for each grade to $36,000 for GS-18 at the entering level. Pay rates by grade for Postal Field Service, Regular Nonsupervisory, Regular Leader, and Regular Supervisory are not standard nation-wide. For example, the WG-1 salary varies by geographic areas, because in each wage area, the rates are determined by the prevailing rate in the private sector.

Individual figures are generally rounded to the nearest thousand without being adjusted to group totals, which are independently rounded; percentages are based on the unrounded numbers. In general, percentages which round to less than 0.5 are treated as zero.

Source and Reliability of the Data

Source of data. Most of the estimates in this report are based on data from the Decennial Censuses of Population, the Current Population Survey, the 1970 Residential Finance Survey, and the Survey of Economic Opportunity, all of which were conducted by the Bureau of the Census. Other data were provided by various governmental agencies including the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor; the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and the Civil Service Commission. A complete list of sources for the tables is shown on pages 103 to 105 of this report.

Decennial Census of Population. Decennial census data in this report are based on complete counts or on the samples associated with the census as indicated in the list of sources. All data in this report from the 1950 or earlier decennial censuses are based on complete counts. Descriptions of the 5-, 15-, and 20-percent samples from the 1970 Census are found in the appropriate census publications. The 1960 1-in-1,000 sample is a stratified systematic sample of .001 of the households enumerated in the 1960 Census.

Current Population Survey (CPS). Data collected from the Current Population Survey (CPS) from August 1972 to the present are based on a sample spread over 461 areas comprising 923 counties and inde-
pendent cities with coverage in each of the 50 States and the District of Columbia. Approximately 47,000 occupied households are eligible for interview each month. Of this number, 2,000 occupied units, on the average, are visited, but interviews are not obtained because the occupants are not found at home after repeated calls or are unavailable for some other reason. In addition to the 47,000, there are also about 8,000 sample units in an average month which are visited but are found to be vacant or otherwise not to be interviewed.

Data collected from 1967 through July 1972 from the CPS were based on a sample spread over 449 areas comprising 863 counties and independent cities with coverage in each of the 50 States and the District of Columbia; from 1967 through July 1971 approximately 50,000 households were eligible for interview each month and from August 1971 through July 1972, the corresponding number was 47,000. Data collected in 1962 through 1966 were based on a sample spread over 357 areas comprising 701 counties and independent cities with coverage in each of the 50 States and the District of Columbia; approximately 35,000 occupied households were eligible for interview each month. Data collected before May 1956 were based on a sample of 21,000 households.

The estimating procedure used in the Current Population Survey involves the inflation of the weighted sample results to independent estimates of the civilian non-institutional population of the United States by age, race, and sex. These independent estimates are based on statistics from the previous decennial census of population, statistics of births, deaths, immigration and emigration, and statistics on the strength of the Armed Forces.

Survey of Economic Opportunity. The 1967 Survey of Economic Opportunity sample was interviewed in the 357 area sample design used for CPS from 1962 through 1966, but the sample selected within these areas differed in size and composition. Approximately 29,000 occupied households were eligible for interview. Of this number about 2,500 of the occupied units were visited, but interviews were not obtained because the occupants were not found at home after repeated calls or were unavailable for some other reason. In addition to the 29,000, there are also about 6,000 sample units which were visited, but were found to be vacant or otherwise not to be interviewed.

The sample was selected to have a disproportionately large sample of Negroes. The weights applied to each sample case were adjusted to reflect this. This sampling procedure results in more reliable estimates for Negroes but at the expense of reduced reliability for estimates of totals for all races and for estimates of whites. The estimation procedure was similar to the one used for CPS.

Residential Finance Survey. Data obtained from the 1970 Residential Finance Survey are based on a sample spread over the 357 strata used for CPS comprising 701 counties and independent cities with coverage in each of the 50 States and the District of Columbia. Approximately 64,800 properties were designated for the sample. Of this number, data were obtained from about 26,600 homeowner properties, 6,800 rental properties with 1-4 units, 4,300 rental properties with 5-49 units, and 11,400 rental properties with 50 or more units. The remaining 15,700 properties included those not within the scope of this survey (13,700) and those for which no data were obtained (2,000). Out of scope properties include those on a farm, mobile homes, condominiums, publicly owned units and those largely occupied by transients. The estimates for this survey were obtained by using ratio estimators.

Health Interview Survey. Data obtained from the Health Interview Survey were based on a sample selected from 357 strata. The HIS
sample consisted of approximately 57,000 assigned households, 11,000 of which were visited but were found to be vacant or otherwise not to be interviewed. The 46,000 eligible occupied households yield a probability sample of about 134,000 persons in 44,000 interviewed households during the course of one year. The estimation procedure was similar to the one used for CPS.

Reliability of the Estimates. Estimates based on a sample may differ somewhat from the figures obtained if a complete census had been taken using the same schedules, instructions, and enumerators. As in any survey work, the results are subject to errors of response and of reporting as well as being subject to sampling variability.

The standard error is primarily a measure of sampling variability; that is, of the variations that occur by chance because a sample rather than the whole of the population is surveyed. The chances are about 68 out of 100 that an estimate from the survey differs from a complete census figure by less than the standard error. The chances are about 90 out of 100 that this difference would be less than 1.6 times the standard error, and the chances are about 95 out of 100 that the difference would be less than twice the standard error.

All statements of comparison appearing in the text are significant at a 1.6 standard error level or better, and most are significant at a level of more than 2.0 standard errors. This means that for most differences cited in the text, the estimated difference is greater than twice the standard error of the difference. Statements of comparison qualified in some way (e.g., by the use of the phrase, "some evidence") have a level of significance between 1.6 and 2.0 standard errors.

The figures presented in all the standard error tables are approximations to the standard errors of various estimates shown in this report. In order to derive standard errors that would be applicable to a wide variety of items (for a given subject matter) and could be prepared at a moderate cost, a number of approximations were required. As a result, the tables of standard errors provided are an indication of the order of magnitude of the standard errors for a given subject matter rather than the precise standard error for any specific item.

The reliability of an estimated percentage, computed by using sample data for both numerator and denominator depends upon both the size of the percentage and the size of the total upon which the percentage is based. Estimated percentages are relatively more reliable than the corresponding estimates of the numerators of the percentages, particularly if the percentages are 50 percent or more.

Data obtained from Current Population Surveys, Decennial Censuses, Survey of Economic Opportunity, and other governmental sources are not entirely comparable. This is due in large part to differences in interviewer training and experience and in the differing survey processes. This is an additional component of error not reflected in the standard error tables. Therefore, caution should be used in comparing results between these different sources.

Data based on the CPS sample. Tables of standard errors for estimates and percentages for characteristics pertaining to Total or White population (Tables A and C) and to Negro and Other Races (Tables B and D) are presented below.
Table A. Standard Errors of Estimated Numbers, Total or White Population

Current Population Survey

(68 chances out of 100)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of estimate (thousands)</th>
<th>Standard error (thousands)</th>
<th>Size of estimate (thousands)</th>
<th>Standard error (thousands)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B. Standard Errors of Estimated Numbers, Negro and Other Races

Current Population Survey

(68 chances out of 100)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of estimate (thousands)</th>
<th>Standard error (thousands)</th>
<th>Size of estimate (thousands)</th>
<th>Standard error (thousands)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table C. Standard Errors of Estimated Percentages, Total or White

Current Population Survey

(68 chances out of 100)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated percentage</th>
<th>Base of percentage (thousands)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 or 98...</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or 95...</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or 90...</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 or 75...</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50...</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table D. Standard Errors of Estimated Percentages, Negro and Other Races

Current Population Survey

(68 chances out of 100)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated percentage</th>
<th>Base of percentage (thousands)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 or 98...</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or 95...</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or 90...</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 or 75...</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,........</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table E presents factors which are to be applied to the figures in Tables A, B, C, and D, to produce standard errors for the various subject matter areas. For example, to produce approximate standard errors for total or white estimates for low-income persons based on data collected in the CPS after January 1967, multiply the appropriate figures in Tables A or C by the factor 1.8. These tables present approximate sampling errors for all estimates based on the CPS and the 1-in-1,000 sample from the 1960 Census. If race is not specified for a particular data type in table E (for example: voting-regions), then the appropriate factor should be applied to tables A and C, and the resulting standard errors used for all races.

Illustrations: The source of table 53 in this report is the Current Population Survey. The table shows that in 1972 there were 1,642,000 black female heads of families. Table B shows the standard error on an estimate of this size to be approximately 62,000. Table E shows the factor for estimates of household and family characteristics for families of Negro and other races is 0.7. Applying this factor to the standard error obtained from table D provides an approximation to the standard error of about 43,000. This means the chances are about 68 out of 100 that the estimate would have differed from a complete census figure by less than 43,000. The chances are 95 out of 100 that the estimate would differ from a complete census figure by less than 86,000.

Of these 1,642,000 black female heads, 1,039,000, or 63.3 percent, were under 45 years of age. Interpolation in table D shows the standard error of 63.3 percent on a base of 1,642,000 to be approximately 2.1 percentage points. Table E shows the factor for estimates of household and family characteristics for families of Negro and other races is 0.7. Applying this factor to the standard error obtained from table D provides an approximation to the standard error of the 63.3 percentage of approximately 1.5 percentage points. Consequently, chances are 68 out of 100 that the estimated 63.3 percent would be within 1.5 percentage points of a complete census figure and chances are 95 out of 100 that the estimate would be within 3.0 percentage points of a complete census figure, i.e., this 95 percent confidence interval would be from 60.3 to 66.3 percent.

Differences: For a difference between two sample estimates, the standard error is approximately equal to the square root of the sum of the squares of the standard errors of each estimate considered separately. This formula will represent the actual standard
### Table E. Factors to be Applied to Tables A, B, and D to Estimate Standard Errors of Current Population Survey and 1960 Census 1-in-1,000 Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of data</th>
<th>CPS data collected Jan. 1967 to present</th>
<th>CPS data collected May 1956 thru Dec. 1966</th>
<th>CPS data collected prior to May 1956</th>
<th>1960 census 1-in-1,000 data²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Persons¹</td>
<td>Families</td>
<td>Persons¹</td>
<td>Families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total U.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total or white.</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro and other.</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regions</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated numbers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total or white.</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro and other.</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated percentages</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-income²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated numbers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total or white.</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro and other.</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated percentages</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status, household and family characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total or white.</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro and other.</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fertility³</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment (annual averages)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment (annual averages)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational attainment</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Represents zero.

¹Factors found in this column should also be used for unrelated individuals for all except the marital status category. For this category use family standard errors for unrelated individuals.

²To obtain the factors for income and low-income data collected in 1966, multiply the factors for the period January 1967 to the present by 1.2.

³Standard errors for estimated fertility rates are given in table J.
error quite accurately for the difference between two estimates of the same characteristic in two different areas, or for the difference between separate and uncorrelated characteristics in the same area. If, however, there is a high positive correlation between the two characteristics, the formula will overestimate the true standard error.

Illustration of the computation of the standard error of a difference. Table 53 shows that in 1972 there were 4,489,000 white female heads of families. The apparent difference in the number of black and white female heads of families is 2,847,000. Table A shows the factor for estimates of household and family characteristics for white families is 0.8. Applying this factor to the standard error obtained from table A provides an approximation to the standard error of 4,489,000 of about 75,000. The standard error of the 1,642,000 black female heads is approximately 43,000, as shown above. The standard error of the estimated difference of 2,847,000 is about $\sqrt{(43,000)^2 + (75,000)^2}$. This means the chances are 68 out of 100 that the estimated difference based on the sample would be less than 86,000. The 68 percent confidence interval around the 2,847,000 difference is from 2,761,000 to 2,933,000, i.e., $2,847,000 \pm 86,000$. A conclusion that the average estimate of the difference derived from all possible samples lies within a range computed in this way would be correct for roughly 68 percent of all possible samples. The 95 percent confidence interval is 2,675,000 to 3,019,000 or 2,847,000 $\pm$ 172,000; thus, we can conclude with 95 percent confidence that in 1972 the number of black female family heads was less than the number of white female family heads.

Data based on 1970 Residential Finance Survey. Tables F and G show standard errors for estimated numbers and percentages of homeowner properties with total or white owners. Tables H and I show the comparable standard errors for black-owned properties.

Data based on samples from the 1970 Decennial Census. Sampling errors of most data from the 5-, 15-, and 20-percent samples of the decennial census shown in this report are small enough to be disregarded and the standard errors of these data are not provided. These standard errors may be found in the appropriate census volumes, PC(1)C General Social and Economic Characteristics, United States Summary, and HC(1)B Detailed Housing Characteristics, United States Summary. For sampling errors of fertility rates, apply factor .04 to table J.

Fertility rates. Table J shows standard errors of estimated fertility rates of women in a given class. Factors are also given which should be applied to Table J to obtain standard errors for Negro women or for data based on other years. The sampling variability of the ratio of children per 1,000 women depends on the shape of the distribution on which the rate is based, the size of the sample, the sample design and the use of ratio estimates.

Illustration: Table 59 of this report shows that in 1972 there were an estimated 1,449,000 black wives, age 18 to 39. These women had an average of 2.7 births per woman or about 2,700 children per 1,000 women. Table J shows the standard error of a rate of 2,700 children on a base of 1,449,000 women to be approximately 92. Since this rate is for 1,449,000 black women (which is less than 2,000,000), a factor of 1.1 should be applied to this standard error to produce the final standard error of 101. This means the chances are 68 out of 100 that the estimate would have shown a fertility rate differing from a complete census figure by less than 101. The chances are 95 out of 100 that the estimate would have shown a fertility rate differing from a complete census figure by...
### Table F. Standard Error of Estimated Number of Homeowner Properties

*Residential Finance Survey, 1970*

*(68 chances out of 100)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated number of properties</th>
<th>United States</th>
<th>Estimated number of properties</th>
<th>United States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000,000</td>
<td>87,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>8,000,000</td>
<td>97,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>106,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>15,000,000</td>
<td>118,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>20,000,000</td>
<td>121,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>38,000</td>
<td>33,000,000</td>
<td>87,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>73,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table G. Standard Error of Estimated Percent of Homeowner Properties

*Residential Finance Survey, 1970*

*(68 chances out of 100)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base of percent (properties)</th>
<th>2 or 98</th>
<th>5 or 95</th>
<th>10 or 90</th>
<th>25 or 75</th>
<th>50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000,000</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33,000,000</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table H. Standard Error of Estimated Number of Homeowner Properties With Negro Owner

*Residential Finance Survey, 1970*

*(68 chances out of 100)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated number of properties</th>
<th>Standard error</th>
<th>Estimated number of properties</th>
<th>Standard error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>27,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>38,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>48,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>57,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table I. Standard Error of Estimated Percent of Homeowner Properties With Negro Owner

Residential Finance Survey, 1970

(68 chances out of 100)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base of percent (properties)</th>
<th>Estimated percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 or 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table J. Standard Errors of Estimated Fertility Rates

Current Population Survey

(68 chances out of 100)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of women</th>
<th>Children ever born per 1,000 women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750,000</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000,000</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000,000</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000,000</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: For 1969 CPS data, multiply these standard errors by a factor of 1.0 for total or white women and for Negro women where number of women is greater than 2,000,000. Use a factor of 1.1 for Negro women where number of women is 2,000,000 and smaller.

For 1967 Survey of Economic Opportunity data, use a factor of 1.6 for total or white and 1.2 for Negro women.
less than 202 (twice the standard error); i.e., the
95 percent confidence interval would be
between 2,498 and 2,902 children ever born
per 1,000 black wives reporting their birth
expectations, age 18 to 39.

Data based on the Health Interview Survey.
To obtain the standard errors to be applied
to data from the Health Interview Survey,
the reader should consult the publication
Current Estimates from the Health Inter-
view Survey, United States-1971. This is
published by the U.S. Department of Health,
Education, and Welfare, Public Health Serv-
ice, Health Services and Mental Health Ad-
ministration, National Center for Health
Statistics, Rockville, Maryland.

Medians. The sampling variability of an
estimated median depends upon the form as
well as on the size of the distribution from
which the median is determined. An approxi-
mate method for measuring the reliability of
a median is to determine an interval about the
estimated median, such that there is a stated
degree of confidence that the median
based on a complete census lies within the
interval. The following procedure may be
used to estimate confidence limits of a
median based on sample data: (1) From
tables C and D and the factor Table E,
determine the standard error of a 50 percent
characteristic using the appropriate base;
(2) add to and subtract from 50 percent the
standard error determined in step (1); and
(3) using the distribution of the characteristic,
read off the confidence interval corresponding
to the two points established in step (2). A
two standard error confidence interval may be
determined by finding the values corre-
sponding to 50 percent plus and minus twice
the standard error determined in step (1).

Illustration of the computation of the standard
error of a median. Table 9 shows that the
median income of families of Negro and other
races was $6,714 in 1971. The size, or base,
of the distribution from which this median
was determined is 5,655,000 families.

1. Table D in conjunction with the ap-
propriate factor from table E shows that the
standard error of 50 percent on a base of
5,655,000 is about 0.8 percent.

2. To obtain a two-standard error con-
fidence interval on the estimated median,
initially add to and subtract from 50 percent
twice the standard error found in step (1).
This yields percentage limits of 51.6 and 48.4.

3. From table 9 it can be seen that 37 per-
cent (2,092,000) had incomes under $5,000
and 15 percent (848,000) had incomes between
$5,000 and $6,974. By linear interpolation
the lower limit on the estimate is found to be about:

\[
\$5,000 + (\$2,000) \left( \frac{48.4 - 37.0}{15} \right) = \$6,520
\]

Similarly, the upper limit may be found by
linear interpolation to be about:

\[
\$5,000 + (\$2,000) \left( \frac{51.6 - 37.0}{15} \right) = \$6,947
\]

Thus, the 95 percent confidence interval
ranges from $6,520 to $6,947.