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## Historical Migration of the Young, Single, and College Educated: 1965 to 2000

By Justyna Goworowska and Todd K. Gardner
The migration rates of the young, single, and college educated have been consistently higher than those of the general population since the late 1960s. The group also has made residential choices that are different from those of the overall population, with the result that some areas have attracted young, single, college-educated migrants despite a net domestic out-migration among the general population. Among the young, those with different marital statuses (single versus married) and levels of educational attainment (college educated versus those without a bachelor's degree) have demonstrated different migration rates and patterns.

In 2003, the U.S. Census Bureau released several special reports highlighting migration patterns based on Census 2000 data. The reports, covering the period from 1995 to 2000, detailed migration patterns associated with a variety of characteristics, including race and Hispanic origin, age, and nativity status of the migrants, as well as their geographic origins and destinations. Also included in this set was the report Migration of the Young, Single, and College Educated: 1995 to 2000, which generated substantial interest following its publication. ${ }^{1}$

This current report expands upon the findings of the earlier one by incorporating additional migration data from the 1970, 1980, and 1990 censuses. Placing the Census 2000 findings in historical context allows us to examine how the migration patterns of this subset of the population have changed over time. Moreover, since the publication of the earlier report, the definitions of metropolitan statistical areas have changed, and micropolitan statistical

[^0]Figure 1.
The Young, Single, and College-Educated Population: 1970 to 2000


Young, single, and college educated as percentage of the total population


[^1]
## Common Migration Terms

Migration is commonly defined as moves that cross jurisdictional boundaries (counties in particular), while moves within a jurisdiction are referred to as residential mobility.

A migrant is a person who makes a relatively permanent change of residence across jurisdictional lines during a specified period.

Movers can be classified by type of move and are categorized as to whether they moved within the same county, to a different county within the same state, to a different county from a different state or region, or were movers from abroad.

In-migration is the number of migrants who moved into an area during a given period.
Out-migration is the number of migrants who moved out of an area during a given period.
Net migration is the difference between in-migration and out-migration during a given time. A positive net, or net in-migration, indicates that more migrants entered an area than left during that time. A negative net, or net out-migration, means that more migrants left an area than entered it.

Net Migration Rate for 1995 to 2000 for the young, single, and college educated is based on an approximated 1995 population so characterized in 2000. This approximated population is the sum of people who reported living in the area in both 1995 and 2000, and those who reported living in that area in 1995 but lived elsewhere in 2000. The net migration rate is the 1995-to-2000 net migration divided by the approximated 1995 population and then multiplied by 1,000 . A similar approach is used for 1990, 1980, and 1970 and for the total population.
areas were introduced. (The text box "Core Based Statistical Areas" presents these concepts.) This report uses a single set of metropolitan and micropolitan statistical area definitions for all four census decades, one published as of June 2003. ${ }^{\text {² }}$

This report begins by examining the growth of the young, single, college-educated population from 1970 to 2000. It then compares migration of the young, single, and college educated with that of other segments of this age group. Finally, migration destinations of young, single, college-educated people are shown for states and selected metropolitan statistical areas and compared to the migration destinations for the general population.

The migration data used in this report are derived from the 1970, 1980, 1990, and 2000 decennial census longform sample question asking where the respondent lived 5 years prior to the census. ${ }^{3}$ The Census Bureau has devoted considerable resources to making historical decennial census microdata files available for research purposes. This report presents findings based on custom tabulations of these microdata files using multiple decennial census years in a time-series analysis. Expanding on these migration data to also include data on the mover's age, marital status, and educational attainment provides a fuller picture of the characteristics of specific migration streams.

Young people are defined in this report as those between the ages of 25 and 39 at the time of the census. The single population includes those who have never married, as well as those who were widowed or divorced. The college educated are those with at least a bachelor's degree. A mover is anyone who reported a different residence 5 years prior to the census than the one reported when the census was taken. Movers, then, may have changed their residence multiple times during the 5 -year period. Moves for young people may be post-college moves or moves due to career, housing, or lifestyle changes. Finally, a migrant is a person who makes a relatively permanent change of residence across jurisdictional lines during a specified period. ${ }^{4}$

[^2]Table 1.
Population by Sex, Age, Marital Status, and Educational Attainment: 1970 to 2000
(Numbers in thousands)

| Year and population | Both sexes |  | Male |  | Female |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| 1970 total population | 203,210 | 100.0 | 98,882 | 100.0 | 104,328 | 100.0 |
| Young (born 1931-1945) | 35,995 | 17.7 | 17,607 | 17.8 | 18,388 | 17.6 |
| Single. | 5,740 | 2.8 | 2,974 | 3.0 | 2,766 | 2.7 |
| College educated | 1,023 | 0.5 | 588 | 0.6 | 435 | 0.4 |
| Not college educated | 4,718 | 2.3 | 2,386 | 2.4 | 2,331 | 2.2 |
| Married. | 30,254 | 14.9 | 14,633 | 14.8 | 15,621 | 15.0 |
| College educated | 4,327 | 2.1 | 2,714 | 2.7 | 1,613 | 1.5 |
| Not college educated | 25,927 | 12.8 | 11,919 | 12.1 | 14,008 | 13.4 |
| 1980 total population | 226,545 | 100.0 | 109,957 | 100.0 | 116,587 | 100.0 |
| Young (born 1941-1955) | 51,165 | 22.6 | 25,299 | 23.0 | 25,866 | 22.2 |
| Single. | 13,585 | 6.0 | 7,053 | 6.4 | 6,532 | 5.6 |
| College educated | 3,506 | 1.5 | 1,961 | 1.8 | 1,545 | 1.3 |
| Not college educated | 10,079 | 4.4 | 5,092 | 4.6 | 4,987 | 4.3 |
| Married. | 37,581 | 16.6 | 18,246 | 16.6 | 19,334 | 16.6 |
| College educated | 8,156 | 3.6 | 4,692 | 4.3 | 3,464 | 3.0 |
| Not college educated | 29,425 | 13.0 | 13,554 | 12.3 | 15,870 | 13.6 |
| 1990 total population | 248,710 | 100.0 | 121,172 | 100.0 | 127,537 | 100.0 |
| Young (born 1951-1965). | 63,407 | 25.5 | 31,588 | 26.1 | 31,819 | 24.9 |
| Single. | 21,975 | 8.8 | 11,823 | 9.8 | 10,152 | 8.0 |
| College educated | 5,298 | 2.1 | 2,764 | 2.3 | 2,534 | 2.0 |
| Not college educated | 16,677 | 6.7 | 9,059 | 7.5 | 7,618 | 6.0 |
| Married. | 41,431 | 16.7 | 19,764 | 16.3 | 21,667 | 17.0 |
| College educated | 9,852 | 4.0 | 4,970 | 4.1 | 4,882 | 3.8 |
| Not college educated | 31,579 | 12.7 | 14,794 | 12.2 | 16,785 | 13.2 |
| 2000 total population | 281,422 | 100.0 | 137,916 | 100.0 | 143,506 | 100.0 |
| Young (born 1961-1975). | 62,661 | 22.3 | 31,374 | 22.7 | 31,286 | 21.8 |
| Single. | 23,766 | 8.4 | 12,747 | 9.2 | 11,019 | 7.7 |
| College educated | 6,199 | 2.2 | 3,117 | 2.3 | 3,082 | 2.1 |
| Not college educated | 17,567 | 6.2 | 9,629 | 7.0 | 7,937 | 5.5 |
| Married. | 38,895 | 13.8 | 18,628 | 13.5 | 20,267 | 14.1 |
| College educated | 10,678 | 3.8 | 4,943 | 3.6 | 5,736 | 4.0 |
| Not college educated . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 28,217 | 10.0 | 13,685 | 9.9 | 14,532 | 10.1 |

Note: The young are those who were aged 25 to 39 ; the single are those who were never married or were widowed or divorced; the married are those who were married or separated; and the college educated are those who had at least a bachelor's degree. Each of these characteristics is measured at the time of the census.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Decennial Census of Population and Housing, 1970 to 2000.

## INCREASES IN THE YOUNG, SINGLE, COLLEGE-EDUCATED POPULATION: 1970-2000

The young, single, college-educated population has grown numerically and in percentage terms in recent decades, from 1 million in 1970 to more than 6 million in 2000 (Table 1). This group represented 0.5 percent of the total population in 1970 and 2.2 percent in 2000 . The steady increase took place despite a small decline in the 25 -to-39-year-old population overall from 1990 to 2000, a decline that followed rapid increases between 1970 and 1990 when this population grew from 36 million to more than 63 million (Figure 1). During these decades, a substantial portion of this age cohort included parts of the post-World War II Baby Boom generation, which comprises those born between 1946 and 1964. From 1990 to 2000, however, the 25 -to-39-year-old population declined to just under 63 million.

The total U.S. population was majority female for all census years between 1970 and 2000. However, young and single men consistently outnumbered young and single women between 1970 and 2000, both numerically and as a percentage of the total population. In 1970 , there were 3.0 million young and single men and 2.8 million young and single women. In 2000, the numbers were 12.7 and 11.0 million, respectively. Among the young, men who were single and college educated outnumbered single and college-educated women in each census from 1970 to 2000. However, while men outnumbered women among the young, married, and college educated in 1970, women who were young, married, and college educated exceeded the corresponding number of men in 2000.

The number of single 25-to-39-year-olds increased in each decade, from 6 million in 1970 to 24 million in 2000; and among the young, the percentage who were single increased in every decade as well, rising from 16 percent to 38 percent (Table 2). The increase in the number and percentage of singles corresponds to the increases in median age at first marriage occurring during this period. In 1970, the median age at first marriage was 23.2 for men and 20.8 for women, whereas by 2000 , age at first marriage had risen to 26.8 and 25.1 , respectively. ${ }^{5}$ The number of college-educated 25- to 39-year-olds increased as well, rising every decade from 1970 to 2000; and the percentage with at least a bachelor's degree increased from 15 percent in 1970 to 27 percent in 2000 . In sum, the share of 25 - to 39 -year-olds who were both single and college educated increased from 3 percent in 1970 to 10 percent in 2000.

The sex composition of the young, single, college-educated population has changed in recent decades (Figure 2). In 1970, the young, single, college-educated population was majority male, with a sex ratio of 135 , indicating that there were 135 males for every 100 females. This group's sex ratio has fallen since then to 127 in 1980, 109 in 1990, and 101 in 2000. In 30 years, the young, single, college-educated population has changed from maleskewed to near parity. An even stronger shift from majority male to majority female took place for the young, married, college-educated population. In 1970, there were 168 males for every 100 females in the young, married, college-educated group. It steadily dropped to 135 in 1980, nearly reaching parity with a ratio of 102 in 1990 and becoming majority female in 2000 with 86 males per 100 females. On the other hand, a reverse trend dominates the young and single without a college degree, where the sex ratio shifted from near parity in 1970 to male majority in 2000.

[^3]Table 2.
Population Aged 25 to 39 by Marital Status and Educational Attainment: 1970 to 2000
(Numbers in thousands)

| Marital status and educational attainment | 1970 |  | 1980 |  | 1990 |  | 2000 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Total population aged 25-39 | 35,995 | 100.0 | 51,165 | 100.0 | 63,407 | 100.0 | 62,661 | 100.0 |
| Single. | 5,740 | 15.9 | 13,585 | 26.6 | 21,975 | 34.7 | 23,766 | 37.9 |
| College educated. | 5,350 | 14.9 | 11,662 | 22.8 | 15,150 | 23.9 | 16,877 | 26.9 |
| Single and college educated . . . . . . . . | 1,023 | 2.8 | 3,506 | 6.9 | 5,298 | 8.4 | 6,199 | 9.9 |

Note: The young are those who were aged 25 to 39; the single are those who were never married or were widowed or divorced; and the college educated are those who had at least a bachelor's degree. Each of these characteristics is measured at the time of the census.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Decennial Census of Population and Housing, 1970 to 2000.

Figure 2.
Sex Ratios of the 25- to 39-Year-Old Population by Marital Status and Educational Attainment: 1970 to 2000


Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Decennial Census of Population and Housing, 1970 to 2000.

From 1970 to 2000, whether single or married, young people with college degrees were more likely to have changed residences in the 5 years preceding the census than those without degrees (Appendix Table A-1). In 1970, the most mobile group among young people were those who were married and college educated, with 79 percent reporting that their residences in 1965 and 1970 were different. The corresponding figure for the young, single, college-educated population was 73 percent. In 2000, however, those who were single had the highest mobility rate, 75 percent compared with 72 percent among those who were married. In 1970, young, married college graduates were most likely to have moved across state lines. By 2000, the young, single, college-educated population was most likely to have moved across state lines in the 5 -year period prior to the decennial census. In 1970 and 1980, college education, or lack thereof, was a dominant factor in mobility of the young population of both marital statuses. College education continued to have the most influence on the mobility of the young through Census 2000, with marital status playing a lesser role. The young, single, and college educated presumably have more liberty in their residential choices than their married counterparts.

## MOBILITY AND MIGRATION PATTERNS OF THE YOUNG, SINGLE, COLLEGE-EDUCATED POPULATION: 1965-2000 ${ }^{6}$

States displayed a wide range of migration rates for the young, single, and college educated, both between 1995 and 2000 and in earlier decades (Appendix Table A-2). Georgia and Nevada had high net in-migration rates (above 100 per 1,000 people) from 1965 to $2000 .{ }^{7}$ In contrast, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, South Dakota, and Wisconsin had high net out-migration rates (below -100 per 1,000 people) in the same period. Less than a fifth of the states have seen a consistent net in-migration of the young, single, college-educated population in the 1965-to- 2000 period, whereas roughly half of the states had consistent net out-migration of this population. ${ }^{8}$ The states with consistent net in-migration were located in the South Atlantic division and the West region of the United States. Those with consistent net out-migration were predominantly located in the Midwest (Figure 3). ${ }^{9}$

[^4]Figure 3.
Domestic Migration of the Young, Single, College-Educated Population by State: 1965 to 2000


Note: Based on their net migration rates for the four decades, states were classified into one of four categories: consistent gainer, consistent decliner, inconsistent gainer, and inconsistent decliner. Four decades of positive net migration rates resulted in a classification as consistent gainer, whereas four decades of out-migration resulted in a consistent decliner classification. States with both positive and negative net migration rates fell into the inconsistent categories, with the prevalence of each deciding on whether the state was classified as a gainer or decliner. If a state had an even number of positive and negative net migration rates, the rate recorded in Census 2000 was the determining factor.
Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Decennial Census of Population and Housing, 1970 to 2000.
Percen to 2000
(Numbers in thousands)

| CBSA status and size | 1970 |  |  | 1980 |  |  | 1990 |  |  | 2000 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Young, single, collegeeducated population | Total population | Percentage young, single, college educated | Young, single, collegeeducated population | Total population | Per- <br> centage young, single, college educated | Young, single, collegeeducated population | Total population | Per- <br> centage young, single, college educated | Young, single, collegeeducated population | Total population | Per- <br> centage young, single, college educated |
| Metro areas |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5,000,000 and over | 293 | 43,380 | 0.7 | 885 | 45,305 | 2.0 | 1,413 | 49,783 | 2.8 | 1,624 | 55,643 | 2.9 |
| 2,500,000 to 4,999,999 | 216 | 30,665 | 0.7 | 765 | 34,431 | 2.2 | 1,212 | 40,415 | 3.0 | 1,431 | 47,312 | 3.0 |
| 1,000,000 to 2,499,999 | 152 | 32,541 | 0.5 | 568 | 36,166 | 1.6 | 883 | 40,199 | 2.2 | 1,065 | 46,269 | 2.3 |
| 500,000 to 999,999 | 84 | 18,978 | 0.4 | 309 | 21,594 | 1.4 | 468 | 24,000 | 1.9 | 506 | 26,992 | 1.9 |
| 250,000 to 499,999 | 71 | 18,836 | 0.4 | 285 | 22,190 | 1.3 | 409 | 24,843 | 1.6 | 462 | 28,522 | 1.6 |
| Less than 250,000. | 65 | 19,775 | 0.3 | 254 | 22,945 | 1.1 | 331 | 24,701 | 1.3 | 371 | 27,842 | 1.3 |
| Micro areas |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 100,000 and over. | 9 | 3,365 | 0.3 | 35 | 3,937 | 0.9 | 45 | 4,337 | 1.0 | 52 | 4,943 | 1.1 |
| 50,000 to 99,999 | 22 | 9,602 | 0.2 | 83 | 10,946 | 0.8 | 100 | 11,376 | 0.9 | 113 | 12,425 | 0.9 |
| Less than 50,000. | 21 | 9,355 | 0.2 | 74 | 10,425 | 0.7 | 89 | 10,622 | 0.8 | 100 | 11,587 | 0.9 |
| Outside CBSA . . . . | 34 | 16,714 | 0.2 | 129 | 18,607 | 0.7 | 152 | 18,433 | 0.8 | 127 | 19,887 | 0.6 |
| Notes: <br> Metropolitan and micropolitan statistical areas defined by the Office of Management and Budget as of June 2003. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The young are those who were aged 25 to 39 ; the single are those who were never married or were widowed or divorced; and the college educated are those who had at least a bachelor's degree. these characteristics is measured at the time of the census. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Decennial Census of Population and Housing, 1970 to 2000. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 4.
Domestic Migration of the Young, Single, College-Educated Population and Total Population by Core Based Statistical Area (CBSA) Status and Size Category: 1965 to 2000
(Rates per 1,000 people aged 25 to 39 for the young, single, and college educated; and per 1,000 people aged 5 and older for the total population)

| CBSA status and size | Young, single, and college-educated net migration rate ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  | Total population net migration rate ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{array}{r} 1965 \text { to } \\ 1970 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1975 \text { to } \\ 1980 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1985 \text { to } \\ 1990 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1995 \text { to } \\ 2000 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1965 \text { to } \\ 1970 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1975 \text { to } \\ 1980 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1985 \text { to } \\ 1990 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1995 \text { to } \\ 2000 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Metro areas |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5,000,000 and over | 180.4 | 59.1 | 72.2 | 76.9 | 46.6 | -40.7 | -38.9 | -34.0 |
| 2,500,000 to 4,999,999 | 278.9 | 132.4 | 138.0 | 135.8 | 92.7 | 6.6 | 18.5 | 5.2 |
| 1,000,000 to 2,499,999 | 97.1 | 17.7 | 33.3 | 60.1 | 70.3 | 2.7 | 13.9 | 14.3 |
| 500,000 to 999,999 | -7.3 | -63.7 | -53.4 | -81.8 | 65.7 | 3.1 | 7.5 | -0.6 |
| 250,000 to 499,999 | -39.2 | -64.6 | -74.0 | -114.7 | 70.2 | 24.2 | 24.7 | 13.9 |
| Less than 250,000. | -193.9 | -189.1 | -243.2 | -272.3 | 54.6 | 23.4 | 12.5 | 14.1 |
| Micro areas |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 100,000 and over. | -128.2 | -114.1 | -130.1 | -170.8 | 53.0 | 23.6 | 37.3 | 21.6 |
| 50,000 to 99,999 | -229.5 | -183.2 | -269.9 | -260.0 | 38.3 | 18.7 | 3.3 | 10.0 |
| Less than 50,000. | -255.6 | -204.0 | -281.2 | -265.0 | 26.6 | 9.0 | -15.7 | 0.4 |
| Outside CBSA | -71.9 | -48.2 | -150.0 | -118.0 | -0.1 | 0.5 | -23.7 | 0.5 |

${ }^{1}$ For 1995 to 2000, the net migration rate for the young, single, and college educated is based on an approximated 1995 population so characterized in 2000. This approximated population is the sum of people who reported living in the area in both 1995 and 2000, and those who reported living in that area in 1995 but lived elsewhere in 2000. The net migration rate is the 1995-to-2000 net migration, divided by the approximated 1995 population, and then multiplied by 1,000 . A similar approach is used for earlier periods and for the total population.

Notes:
A negative value for the net migration rate is indicative of net outmigration, meaning that more migrants left an area than entered it, in a given period. Positive values reflect net inmigration to an area.

Decennial census migration data include Puerto Rico among all movers from abroad. Because this table focuses solely on domestic migration, Puerto Rico has been excluded. Puerto Rico migration data from Census 2000 are available on the U.S. Census Bureau's Web site at <www.census.gov/population/www/cen2000 /migration/index.html>.

Metropolitan and micropolitan statistical areas defined by the Office of Management and Budget as of June 2003.
The young are those who were aged 25 to 39 ; the single are those who were never married or were widowed or divorced; and the college educated are those who had at least a bachelor's degree. Each of these characteristics is measured at the time of the census.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Decennial Census of Population and Housing, 1970 to 2000.

State-level analysis of migration of the young, single, college-educated population provides a snapshot of variation in patterns at one scale, but it obscures some of the more complex local migration dynamics occurring within states. Metro areas were the choice destination for a majority of all domestic migrants in each decade from 1965 to 2000 (Figure 4). Between 1965 and 1970, 82 percent of U.S. migration was to metro areas. The draw to metro areas was particularly strong for the young, single, and college educated. Between 1995 and 2000, 92 percent of this group migrated to metro areas, with a mere 2 percent migrating to areas outside core based statistical areas (CBSAs).

For the young and college educated, destinations within metro areas varied based on their marital status. Between 1995 and 2000, young and college-educated migrants who were single were more likely to move into principal cities ( 55 percent) than to areas outside principal cities ( 37 percent). A larger percentage of married people migrated to areas outside principal cities (54 percent) than to principal cities (34 percent). Among the young without a college degree, single migrants have consistently been more likely to move to metro areas and principal cities than those who were married. The young, married, not-college-educated population was just as likely as the general population to move to areas outside CBSAs.

The 1980 census recorded a phenomenon termed the "nonmetropolitan turnaround," which is evident in the migration patterns shown in Figure 4. (The textbox "Nonmetropolitan Turnaround of the 1970s" addresses this event). Among migrants of all ages, higher shares moved to micro areas and outside CBSA territory between 1975 and 1980 than did so in the other periods. This was also true among college-educated 25-to 39-year-olds, regardless of marital status. Relative to 1980, the percentage of migrants to micro areas and outside CBSA areas decreased in 1990 and 2000 for the college-educated 25 -to-39-year-old population.

Figure 4.
Percentage of Domestic Migrants to Specified Destinations: 1965 to 2000


Note: Movers within a destination (a single metro area, for example) are not included; only migrants to a specified destination are shown. Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Decennial Census of Population and Housing, 1970 to 2000.

As young, single, college-educated individuals are often drawn to metro areas, their share of the population was higher in metro areas than in micro areas and outside CBSAs (Table 3). The percentage of young, single, collegeeducated residents generally increased with the population size of a metro or micro area-the larger an area's population, the greater the share of its young, single, college-educated population. In 2000, the percentage of young, single, college-educated residents was higher in every metro area size category than in any micro area size category; the lowest percentage of young, single, college-educated residents was located outside CBSAs.

Examining migration rates for CBSAs by size category, we see young, single, college-educated net in-migration for only the two largest metro area classes (population of $2,500,000$ or more as of 2000) (Table 4). Even though metro areas in the 1 -to- 2.5 -million size category also appear to have had positive net migration rates between

## Nonmetropolitan Turnaround of the 1970s

During the 1970 s, demographers and geographers noticed an unexpected increase in population growth in nonmetropolitan territory, to the point where the nonmetro population in the United States began growing faster than the metro population. This sudden shift in population growth, known as the "nonmetropolitan turnaround," was largely a result of more migrants moving from metropolitan to nonmetropolitan territory than in the opposite direction.

## Core Based Statistical Areas

Metropolitan and micropolitan statistical areas-metro and micro areas-are geographic entities defined by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget for use by federal statistical agencies in collecting, tabulating, and publishing federal statistics. Metro and micro areas are collectively known as core based statistical areas (CBSAs). A metro area contains a core urban area population of 50,000 or more. A micro area contains a core urban area population of at least 10,000 (but less than 50,000 ). Each metro or micro area consists of one or more counties and includes the counties containing the core urban area, as well as any adjacent counties that have a high degree of social and economic integration (as measured by commuting to work) with the urban core.

The largest city in each metropolitan or micropolitan statistical area is designated a principal city. Additional cities qualify if specified requirements are met concerning population size and employment.

1965-1970 and 1995-2000, the rates are not all statistically significant. Across the four decades, it appears that the highest net in-migration rates were in metro areas with 2.5 to 5 million residents. However, the decade-todecade differences in net migration rates between the three largest metro size categories are not statistically significant. The three smaller metro area size categories (fewer than $1,000,000$ population), as well as micro areas and outside CBSAs, consistently experienced net out-migration rates among the young, single, college-educated population from 1965 to $2000 .{ }^{10}$ In general, larger metro areas were more likely to have consistent net in-migration of the young, single, and college educated; and smaller metro areas, micro areas, and outside CBSA territory were more likely to experience net out-migration.

These migration trends for the young, single, and college educated are nearly opposite those for the total population. It was micro areas of 100,000 or more population that had consistently high overall net in-migration between 1965 and 2000. Metro areas of the two smallest size categories (less than 500,000 residents) and those in the 1-to-2.5-million size category also had positive migration rates for the total population, but not nearly as high as the large micro areas. The largest metro areas, with populations of 5 million or more, have seen overall net domestic out-migration of the total population in three out of the four decades; while in-migration of the young, single, and college educated occurred in all four decades.

Of the 20 largest metro areas in 2000, only one-Pittsburgh, PA—had experienced nondecreasing net out-migration of the young, single, college-educated population (Appendix Table A-3). (Two detailed tables containing data for all metro areas are available on the U.S. Census Bureau's Web site at <www.census.gov/population/www/cen2000/ migration/index.html>.) Between 1965 and 1970, the net migration rate for the young, single, college-educated population of Pittsburgh, PA, was -16 , and by 2000, it had decreased to -129 . With a few exceptions, most of the 20 largest metro areas maintained positive migration rates for the young, single, college-educated population across the four decades. Most of these metro areas were located in states that were consistent decliners or inconsistent gainers in terms of domestic migration of the young, single, college-educated population, with the largest metro area-New York-Northern New Jersey-Long Island, NY-NJ-PA-serving as an example.

Among the largest metro areas with positive migration rates for the young, single, and college educated in consistent gainer states were Seattle-Tacoma-Bellevue, WA; Phoenix-Mesa-Scottsdale, AZ; and Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Marietta, GA (Figure 3 and Appendix Table A-3). These three metro areas, along with Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington, TX,

[^5]and Minneapolis-St. Paul-Bloomington, MN-WI, had positive net migration rates in 2000 for both the young, single, college-educated population and the total population. However, these areas were the exception. Out of the 20 largest metro areas in 2000, a majority were migration destinations for the young, single, college-educated population and, at the same time, areas of out-migration for the total population. Clearly, migration destinations for the young, single, and college educated differ from the choice destinations for the total population.

## SUMMARY

Examining the historical data of the last 4 census years, this report finds that the population of the young, single, and college educated is more mobile than the rest of the population and often chooses destinations that are areas of out-migration for the total population. The young, single, college-educated population has grown between 1970 and 2000, despite a decrease in the number of 25 - to 39 -year-olds in the 1990-2000 period. The number of singles within the 25-to-39-year-old group has also grown with the increase in age at first marriage. Moreover, the young, single, college-educated population's sex ratio shifted from a male majority to near parity in 30 years.

Regardless of marital status, young people with a bachelor's degree or higher were more likely to have changed residences in the 5 years preceding the census than those without a degree. In 1970, the young, married, and college educated were more mobile than the young, single, and college educated; whereas the opposite was true in 2000. Across the decades, the young, single, and college educated consistently chose to migrate to only a handful of states in the West region and a few in the South Atlantic division. Metro areas around the country, especially those with populations exceeding 2.5 million, were also destinations for the young, single, and college educatedan overwhelming majority of this group migrated to metro areas. These were often areas of out-migration for the total population. Because of the group's human capital, as well as its potential impact on population growth-both for destinations and origins-the group warrants continued study.

## METHODOLOGY AND SOURCES OF DATA

This report used 100 percent-count and sample decennial census data for the years 1970 through 2000. The population universe is the resident population of the United States ( 50 states and the District of Columbia). Migration from outside the United States, including Puerto Rico and the U.S. island areas (American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, Guam, and the U.S. Virgin Islands), and by the U.S. population abroad was treated as international migration.

All derived values were computed using unrounded data. For readability, most whole numbers in the text were rounded to the nearest hundred or thousand, and most decimal numbers were rounded to the nearest whole number. In the tables, whole numbers are expressed in thousands and percentages are rounded to the nearest tenth.

## ACCURACY OF THE ESTIMATES

The data contained in this report are based on the sample of households that responded to the long-form questionnaire from the 1970, 1980, 1990, and 2000 censuses. In the 1970 census, 20 percent of households received the long form; some long-form questions were asked of 15 percent of households, other long-form questions were asked of 5 percent of households, and others were asked of the entire 20 percent sample. The question about residence in 1965 was included in the 15 percent sample. More recent censuses have sampled roughly 1 in 6 households, but small governmental units have been sampled at a higher rate, as high as 1 in 2 households. As a result, the sample estimates may differ somewhat from the 100 percent figures that would have been obtained if all housing units, people within those housing units, and people living in group quarters had been enumerated using the same questionnaires, instructions, enumerators, and so forth. The sample estimates also differ from the values that would have been obtained from different samples of housing units and the people within those housing units and people living in group quarters. The deviation of a sample estimate from the average of all possible samples is called the sampling error.

In addition to the variability that arises from the sampling procedures, both sample data and 100 percent data are subject to nonsampling error. Nonsampling error may be introduced during any of the various complex operations used to collect and process data. Such errors may include not enumerating every household or every person in the population, failing to obtain all required information from the respondents, obtaining incorrect or inconsistent information, and recording information incorrectly. In addition, errors can occur during the field review of the
enumerators' work, during clerical handling of the census questionnaires, or during the electronic processing of the questionnaires.

Nonsampling error may affect the data in two ways: (1) errors that are introduced randomly will increase the variability of the data and, therefore, should be reflected in the standard errors; and (2) errors that tend to be consistent in one direction will bias both sample and 100 percent data in that direction. For example, if respondents consistently tend to underreport their incomes, then the resulting estimates of households or families by income category will tend to be understated for the higher income categories and overstated for the lower income categories. Such biases are not reflected in the standard errors.

While it is impossible to completely eliminate error from an operation as large and complex as the decennial census, the Census Bureau attempts to control the sources of such error during the data collection and processing operations. The primary sources of error and the programs instituted to control error in Census 2000 are described in detail in Summary File 3 Technical Documentation under Chapter 8, "Accuracy of the Data," located at <www.census.gov/prod/cen2000/doc/sf3.pdf>.

All statements in this report have undergone statistical testing and all comparisons are significant at the 90 percent confidence level, unless otherwise noted. The estimates in tables, maps, and other figures may vary from actual values due to sampling and nonsampling errors. As a result, estimates in one category may not be significantly different from estimates assigned to a different category. Further information on the accuracy of the data is located at <www.census.gov/prod/cen2000/doc/sf3.pdf>.For further information on the computation and use of standard errors, contact the Decennial Statistical Studies Division at 301-763-4242.

## FOR MORE INFORMATION

More detailed information on Census 2000 migration products, including additional tables and other product announcements, is available via the Census Bureau's decennial migration Web page at <www.census.gov /population/www/cen2000/migration.html>.

The decennial migration Web page contains additional detailed migration tables not included in this report as well as migration-related Census 2000 Special Reports. For more information on decennial migration products, please contact:

Population Distribution Branch
Population Division
U.S. Census Bureau

301-763-2419
Additional migration data are available via the Census Bureau's geographic mobility/migration Web page at <www.census.gov/population/www/cen2000/migration/index.html>.

Information on other population and housing topics is presented in the Census 2000 Brief Series and Census 2000 Special Reports Series, located on the Census Bureau's Web site at <www.census.gov/population/www/cen2000 /briefs/>. These series present information about race, Hispanic origin, age, sex, household type, housing tenure, and other social, economic, and housing characteristics.

Census 2000 information and data can also be accessed via the Census 2000 Gateway Web page at <www.census .gov/main/www/cen2000.html>.

Additional historical decennial census population and housing reports and data are available via the Census Bureau's Web page at <www.census.gov/population/www/censusdata/hiscendata.html>.

For more information about Census 2000, including data products, call the Customer Services Center at 1-800-923-8282. You can also visit the Census Bureau's Question and Answer Center at <ask.census.gov> to submit your questions online.


Appendix Table A-1.
Geographic Mobility by Age, Marital Status, and Educational Attainment: 1965 to 2000
(Numbers in thousands)

| Year and population | Total population | Same residence | Movers |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Total | Same county | Domestic migrants |  | From abroad $^{1}$ | Moved, residence 5 years ago not reported |
|  |  |  |  |  | Same state | Different state |  |  |
| 1965-1970 Number |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Population aged 5 and older | 186,095 | 98,564 | 87,531 | 43,357 | 15,656 | 16,081 | 2,697 | 9,741 |
| Population aged 25 to 39. | 35,995 | 12,588 | 23,407 | 11,144 | 4,241 | 4,761 | 1,039 | 2,223 |
| Single. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 5,740 | 2,338 | 3,402 | 1,476 | 549 | 667 | 198 | 511 |
| College educated | 1,023 | 275 | 748 | 211 | 159 | 253 | 56 | 68 |
| Not college educated | 4,718 | 2,063 | 2,654 | 1,265 | 390 | 414 | 143 | 443 |
| Married | 30,254 | 10,250 | 20,004 | 9,668 | 3,692 | 4,093 | 840 | 1,711 |
| College educated. | 4,327 | 896 | 3,432 | 1,104 | 776 | 1,168 | 166 | 218 |
| Not college educated. | 25,927 | 9,354 | 16,573 | 8,564 | 2,916 | 2,925 | 675 | 1,494 |
| 1965-1970 Percent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Population aged 5 and older | 100.0 | 53.0 | 47.0 | 23.3 | 8.4 | 8.6 | 1.4 | 5.2 |
| Population aged 25 to 39. | 100.0 | 35.0 | 65.0 | 31.0 | 11.8 | 13.2 | 2.9 | 6.2 |
| Single. | 100.0 | 40.7 | 59.3 | 25.7 | 9.6 | 11.6 | 3.5 | 8.9 |
| College educated. | 100.0 | 26.9 | 73.1 | 20.6 | 15.6 | 24.8 | 5.4 | 6.7 |
| Not college educated | 100.0 | 43.7 | 56.3 | 26.8 | 8.3 | 8.8 | 3.0 | 9.4 |
| Married . . . | 100.0 | 33.9 | 66.1 | 32.0 | 12.2 | 13.5 | 2.8 | 5.7 |
| College educated. | 100.0 | 20.7 | 79.3 | 25.5 | 17.9 | 27.0 | 3.8 | 5.0 |
| Not college educated | 100.0 | 36.1 | 63.9 | 33.0 | 11.2 | 11.3 | 2.6 | 5.8 |
| 1975-1980 Number |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Population aged 5 and older | 210,323 | 112,695 | 97,628 | 52,750 | 20,588 | 20,358 | 3,932 | (X) |
| Population aged 25 to 39. . | 51,165 | 17,241 | 33,924 | 17,997 | 7,212 | 7,254 | 1,462 | (X) |
| Single. | 13,585 | 4,521 | 9,063 | 4,760 | 1,868 | 2,051 | 384 | (X) |
| College educated. | 3,506 | 833 | 2,673 | 1,033 | 673 | 849 | 118 | (X) |
| Not college educated | 10,079 | 3,689 | 6,390 | 3,727 | 1,195 | 1,202 | 266 | (X) |
| Married | 37,581 | 12,720 | 24,861 | 13,236 | 5,344 | 5,203 | 1,078 | (X) |
| College educated | 8,156 | 1,919 | 6,237 | 2,573 | 1,552 | 1,816 | 297 | (X) |
| Not college educated. | 29,425 | 10,801 | 18,624 | 10,664 | 3,792 | 3,387 | 781 | (X) |
| 1975-1980 Percent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Population aged 5 and older | 100.0 | 53.6 | 46.4 | 25.1 | 9.8 | 9.7 | 1.9 | (X) |
| Population aged 25 to 39. . | 100.0 | 33.7 | 66.3 | 35.2 | 14.1 | 14.2 | 2.9 | (X) |
| Single. | 100.0 | 33.3 | 66.7 | 35.0 | 13.8 | 15.1 | 2.8 | (X) |
| College educated. | 100.0 | 23.7 | 76.3 | 29.5 | 19.2 | 24.2 | 3.4 | (X) |
| Not college educated | 100.0 | 36.6 | 63.4 | 37.0 | 11.9 | 11.9 | 2.6 | (X) |
| Married | 100.0 | 33.8 | 66.2 | 35.2 | 14.2 | 13.8 | 2.9 | (X) |
| College educated. | 100.0 | 23.5 | 76.5 | 31.5 | 19.0 | 22.3 | 3.6 | (X) |
| Not college educated | 100.0 | 36.7 | 63.3 | 36.2 | 12.9 | 11.5 | 2.7 | (X) |
| 1985-1990 Number |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Population aged 5 and older. | 230,446 | 122,797 | 107,649 | 58,676 | 22,279 | 21,585 | 5,109 | (X) |
| Population aged 25 to 39. | 63,407 | 22,474 | 40,932 | 22,176 | 8,458 | 8,300 | 1,999 | (X) |
| Single. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 21,975 | 7,784 | 14,191 | 7,668 | 2,931 | 2,953 | 639 | (X) |
| College educated. . | 5,298 | 1,485 | 3,813 | 1,526 | 917 | 1,175 | 196 | (X) |
| Not college educated | 16,677 | 6,299 | 10,378 | 6,142 | 2,014 | 1,779 | 443 | (X) |
| Married | 41,431 | 14,690 | 26,742 | 14,508 | 5,527 | 5,347 | 1,360 | (X) |
| College educated. | 9,852 | 2,797 | 7,055 | 3,033 | 1,662 | 1,955 | 405 | (X) |
| Not college educated. | 31,579 | 11,893 | 19,687 | 11,475 | 3,865 | 3,392 | 955 | (X) |
| 1985-1990 Percent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Population aged 5 and older | 100.0 | 53.3 | 46.7 | 25.5 | 9.7 | 9.4 | 2.2 | (X) |
| Population aged 25 to 39. | 100.0 | 35.4 | 64.6 | 35.0 | 13.3 | 13.1 | 3.2 | (X) |
| Single. | 100.0 | 35.4 | 64.6 | 34.9 | 13.3 | 13.4 | 2.9 | (X) |
| College educated. | 100.0 | 28.0 | 72.0 | 28.8 | 17.3 | 22.2 | 3.7 | (X) |
| Not college educated | 100.0 | 37.8 | 62.2 | 36.8 | 12.1 | 10.7 | 2.7 | (X) |
| Married | 100.0 | 35.5 | 64.5 | 35.0 | 13.3 | 12.9 | 3.3 | (X) |
| College educated. | 100.0 | 28.4 | 71.6 | 30.8 | 16.9 | 19.8 | 4.1 | (X) |
| Not college educated. | 100.0 | 37.7 | 62.3 | 36.3 | 12.2 | 10.7 | 3.0 | (X) |

See footnotes at end of table.

Appendix Table A-1.
Geographic Mobility by Age, Marital Status, and Educational Attainment: 1965 to 2000Con.
(Numbers in thousands)

| Year and population | Total population | Same residence | Movers |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Total | Same county | Domestic migrants |  | From abroad | Moved, residence 5 years ago not reported |
|  |  |  |  |  | Same state | Different state |  |  |
| 1995-2000 Number |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Population aged 5 and older. | 262,375 | 142,027 | 120,348 | 65,435 | 25,327 | 22,089 | 7,496 | (X) |
| Population aged 25 to 39. | 62,661 | 22,016 | 40,645 | 21,374 | 8,697 | 7,754 | 2,820 | (X) |
| Single. | 23,766 | 8,023 | 15,743 | 8,314 | 3,342 | 3,102 | 985 | (X) |
| College educated. | 6,199 | 1,552 | 4,647 | 1,784 | 1,117 | 1,399 | 347 | (X) |
| Not college educated. | 17,567 | 6,471 | 11,096 | 6,530 | 2,225 | 1,703 | 637 | (X) |
| Married | 38,895 | 13,993 | 24,902 | 13,060 | 5,356 | 4,651 | 1,835 | (X) |
| College educated. | 10,678 | 2,957 | 7,722 | 3,236 | 1,841 | 1,984 | 660 | (X) |
| Not college educated | 28,217 | 11,036 | 17,180 | 9,824 | 3,515 | 2,667 | 1,175 | (X) |
| 1995-2000 Percent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Population aged 5 and older . | 100.0 | 54.1 | 45.9 | 24.9 | 9.7 | 8.4 | 2.9 | (X) |
| Population aged 25 to 39. . | 100.0 | 35.1 | 64.9 | 34.1 | 13.9 | 12.4 | 4.5 | (X) |
| Single. . | 100.0 | 33.8 | 66.2 | 35.0 | 14.1 | 13.1 | 4.1 | (X) |
| College educated. | 100.0 | 25.0 | 75.0 | 28.8 | 18.0 | 22.6 | 5.6 | (X) |
| Not college educated. | 100.0 | 36.8 | 63.2 | 37.2 | 12.7 | 9.7 | 3.6 | (X) |
| Married | 100.0 | 36.0 | 64.0 | 33.6 | 13.8 | 12.0 | 4.7 | (X) |
| College educated. | 100.0 | 27.7 | 72.3 | 30.3 | 17.2 | 18.6 | 6.2 | (X) |
| Not college educated. | 100.0 | 39.1 | 60.9 | 34.8 | 12.5 | 9.5 | 4.2 | (X) |

## (X) Not applicable.

${ }^{1}$ This category includes movers from foreign countries, as well as movers from Puerto Rico, U.S. island areas, and U.S. minor outlying islands.
Note: The young are those who were aged 25 to 39; the single are those who were never married or were widowed or divorced; the married are those who were married or separated; and the college educated are those who had at least a bachelor's degree. Each of these characteristics is measured at the time of the census.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Decennial Census of Population and Housing, 1970 to 2000.

Appendix Table A-2.

## Domestic Migration of the Young, Single, College-Educated Population by State: 1965 to 2000

(Rates per 1,000 people aged 25 to 39)

| State | Young, single, and college-educated net migration rate ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1965 to 1970 | 1975 to 1980 | 1985 to 1990 | 1995 to 2000 |
| Alabama | -123.8 | -82.2 | -84.0 | -116.3 |
| Alaska | 193.2 | 313.4 | -67.2 | 38.9 |
| Arizona | 69.2 | 144.3 | 51.2 | 109.9 |
| Arkansas | -139.2 | -79.5 | -106.3 | -90.4 |
| California | 185.9 | 116.1 | 113.1 | 92.7 |
| Colorado | 153.0 | 100.8 | -57.1 | 157.7 |
| Connecticut | -6.9 | -74.0 | 4.2 | -69.7 |
| Delaware | 181.9 | -111.2 | 68.6 | -13.9 |
| District of Columbia | 193.1 | 111.2 | 7.6 | 2.5 |
| Florida . . . . . . . . | 113.5 | 51.6 | 130.6 | 40.1 |
| Georgia | 135.9 | 105.5 | 175.7 | 150.5 |
| Hawaii | 192.5 | 43.1 | 39.5 | -69.8 |
| Idaho | -137.0 | 99.3 | -104.7 | 5.9 |
| Illinois. | 9.2 | -33.7 | 22.5 | 12.4 |
| Indiana. | -198.3 | -126.8 | -130.6 | -142.3 |
| lowa. | -248.1 | -111.3 | -243.3 | -220.1 |
| Kansas. | -154.0 | -117.5 | -107.2 | -104.7 |
| Kentucky | -118.9 | -59.1 | -76.0 | -62.0 |
| Louisiana | -82.0 | 6.4 | -197.7 | -130.2 |
| Maine. | -235.6 | -58.5 | 13.1 | -80.1 |
| Maryland | 116.7 | 23.5 | 150.2 | 32.2 |
| Massachusetts. | -29.5 | -59.5 | 8.2 | -4.6 |
| Michigan | -58.1 | -119.4 | -80.0 | -86.7 |
| Minnesota | -29.8 | 8.8 | -9.0 | 15.5 |
| Mississippi . | -196.7 | -88.2 | -126.0 | -134.1 |
| Missouri . | -76.9 | -34.4 | -28.2 | -47.0 |
| Montana. | -218.2 | -22.8 | -270.0 | -161.5 |
| Nebraska | -167.1 | -118.0 | -145.3 | -130.3 |
| Nevada | 139.2 | 570.9 | 232.2 | 281.8 |
| New Hampshire. | -212.6 | -34.9 | 52.9 | -114.8 |
| New Jersey | 18.1 | -39.6 | 18.8 | -13.0 |
| New Mexico | 30.7 | 71.0 | 6.7 | -93.3 |
| New York | 29.1 | -45.4 | -35.8 | -11.3 |
| North Carolina | -117.2 | -62.5 | 12.5 | 50.2 |
| North Dakota . | -274.4 | -95.2 | -287.1 | -282.0 |
| Ohio. | -91.3 | -106.8 | -83.8 | -88.2 |
| Oklahoma | -188.5 | -25.0 | -203.4 | -125.9 |
| Oregon. | -52.4 | 101.5 | -0.7 | 103.5 |
| Pennsylvania | -100.1 | -103.9 | -79.6 | -112.4 |
| Rhode Island | -144.8 | -139.0 | -94.3 | -147.0 |
| South Carolina. | -188.6 | -32.4 | -44.8 | -40.7 |
| South Dakota. | -333.4 | -148.9 | -214.7 | -215.9 |
| Tennessee. | -145.0 | -10.3 | -1.7 | 15.2 |
| Texas. | 27.2 | 140.7 | -15.7 | 48.7 |
| Utah. | -182.2 | -28.1 | -141.2 | -69.8 |
| Vermont. | -188.1 | -133.1 | -49.9 | -143.5 |
| Virginia. | 220.9 | 123.8 | 140.9 | 38.4 |
| Washington | 64.7 | 157.4 | 121.7 | 96.5 |
| West Virginia | -270.4 | -94.4 | -217.6 | -197.1 |
| Wisconsin | -106.8 | -116.1 | -157.1 | -107.7 |
| Wyoming . . . . . . . | -85.9 | 175.3 | -227.9 | -109.2 |

${ }^{1}$ For 1995 to 2000, the net migration rate for the young, single, and college educated is based on an approximated 1995 population so characterized in 2000. This approximated population is the sum of people who reported living in the area in both 1995 and 2000, and those who reported living in that area in 1995 but lived elsewhere in 2000. The net migration rate is the 1995-to-2000 net migration, divided by the approximated 1995 population, and then multiplied by 1,000 . A similar approach is used for earlier periods.

Notes:
A negative value for the net migration rate is indicative of net outmigration, meaning that more migrants left an area than entered it, in a given period. Positive values reflect net inmigration to an area.

Decennial census migration data include Puerto Rico among all movers from abroad. Because this table focuses solely on domestic migration, Puerto Rico has been excluded. Puerto Rico migration data from Census 2000 are available on the U.S. Census Bureau's Web site at <www.census.gov/population/www /cen2000/migration/index.html>.

The young are those who were aged 25 to 39; the single are those who were never married or were widowed or divorced; and the college educated are those who had at least a bachelor's degree. Each of these characteristics is measured the time of the census.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Decennial Census of Population and Housing, 1970 to 2000.

Appendix Table A-3.

## Domestic Migration of the Young, Single, College-Educated Population and Total Population for the 20 Largest Metropolitan Statistical Areas in 2000: 1965 to 2000

(Rates per 1,000 people aged 25 to 39 for the young, single, and college educated; and per 1,000 people aged 5 and older for the total population)


${ }^{1}$ For 1995 to 2000, the net migration rate for the young, single, and college educated is based on an approximated 1995 population so characterized in 2000 This approximated population is the sum of people who reported living in the area in both 1995 and 2000, and those who reported living in that area in 1995 but lived elsewhere in 2000. The net migration rate is the 1995-to-2000 net migration, divided by the approximated 1995 population, and then multiplied by 1,000. A similar approach is used for earlier periods and for the total population.

Notes:
A negative value for the net migration rate is indicative of net outmigration, meaning that more migrants left an area than entered it, in a given period. Positive values reflect net inmigration to an area.

Decennial census migration data include Puerto Rico among all movers from abroad. Because this table focuses solely on domestic migration, Puerto Rico has been excluded. Puerto Rico migration data from Census 2000 are available on the U.S. Census Bureau's Web site at <www.census.gov/population/www/ cen2000/migration/index.html>.

Metropolitan and micropolitan statistical areas defined by the Office of Management and Budget as of June 2003.
The young are those who were aged 25 to 39; the single are those who were never married or were widowed or divorced; and the college educated are those who had at least a bachelor's degree. Each of these characteristics is measured at the time of the census.

Migration data for all metropolitan statistical areas for the young, single, and college educated, as well as for the total population, are available on the U.S. Census Bureau's Web site at <www.census.gov/population/www/cen2000/migration/index.html>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Decennial Census of Population and Housing, 1970 to 2000.


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Available on the Census Bureau's Internet site at <www.census.gov/prod/2003pubs/censr-12.pdf>.

[^1]:    Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Decennial Census of Population and Housing, 1970 to 2000.

[^2]:    ${ }^{2}$ Retabulating 1970, 1980, and 1990 decennial data in the 2003 definitions may, in some cases, result in an overbounding of areas to include counties that were not yet metropolitan or micropolitan, but a closer examination of the 1970 migration data using the 1970 metropolitan area definitions found the variations, generally, to be minor.
    ${ }^{3}$ See the "Accuracy of the Estimates" section for information on the size of the long-form sample.
    ${ }^{4}$ Peter A. Morrison, Thomas Bryan, and David A. Swanson, 2004, "Internal Migration and Short-Distance Mobility," The Methods and Materials of Demography, Jacob S. Siegel and David A. Swanson (ed.).

[^3]:    ${ }^{5}$ Jason Fields, 2004, America's Families and Living Arrangements: 2003, P20-553, U.S. Census Bureau, Washington, DC, <www.census.gov/prod/2004pubs/p20-553.pdf>.

[^4]:    ${ }^{6}$ Census migration data, as opposed to population characteristics data, are captured for a reference period rather than for a specific point in time (census day). The migration data are based on a question regarding residence 5 years prior to the census. Statements addressing migration data in this report will therefore always refer to a 5 -year period, even if that is not explicitly stated in each instance.
    ${ }^{7}$ The net migration rate for Nevada in 1970 (139.2) is not statistically significant.
    ${ }^{8}$ Based on their net migration rates for the four decades, states were classified into one of four categories: consistent gainer, consistent decliner, inconsistent gainer, and inconsistent decliner. Four decades of positive net migration rates resulted in a classification as consistent gainer, whereas four decades of out-migration resulted in a consistent decliner classification. States with both positive and negative net migration rates fell into the inconsistent categories, with the prevalence of each deciding on whether the state was classified as a gainer or decliner. If a state had an even number of positive and negative net migration rates, the rate recorded in Census 2000 was the determining factor.
    ${ }^{9}$ See Appendix Figure A-1 for a map showing states in each region and division.

[^5]:    ${ }^{10}$ With the exception of the 1965-1970 net migration rate for metro areas of 500,000 to 1 million residents ( -7.3 ), which is not statistically significant.

