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IN THIS REPORT an analysis of divorce and annulment totals is presented for the United States, individual States, and standard metropolitan statistical areas, as well as an analysis of the 1964 and 1965 detailed divorce statistics for the 22 States included in the divorce-registration area.
The national divorce rate, which showed little variation for more than a decade, has been increasing in recent years, and this increase cannot be completely explained by the growth in the number of young married couples. Simultaneously, the median age at the time of the decree and the median duration of marriage showed a decline. The average number of children reported per decree declined slightly, reflecting the decrease in births in recent years.
Total numbers and rates for metropolitan areas, national estimates of age-specific divorce rates, and data on age and on the duration of marriage by color and marriage order are presented here for the first time.

| SYMBOLS |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Data not available-------------------------- | --- |
| Category not applicable-------------------- | . . |
| Quantity zero------------------------------- | - |
| Quantity more than 0 but less than 0.05---- | 0.0 |
| Figure does not meet standards of reliability or precision | * |

# DIVORCE STATISTICS ANALYSIS 

Alexander A. Plateris, Ph.D., Division of Vital Statistics

## TOTALS AND RATES

## National Trend

The number of divorces and annulments granted annually in the United States has been steadily rising in recent years from the postWorld War Il low point of 368,000 in 1958. This number increased to 450,000 in 1964 and 479,000 in 1965, 499,000 in 1966, 523,000 in 1967, and a provisional estimate of 582,000 in 1968. The total increase during the 10 -year period (1958-67) was 155,000 or 42.1 percent. The highest annual divorce totals observed prior to 1964 were 610,000 for 1946, 485,000 for 1945. and 483,000 for 1947, and divorce totals in recent years arein the same order of magnitude.

These increases cannot be explained solely either by the growth of the total population or of the number of married couples, because divorce rates are also increasing though to a lesser degree than the annual number (table 1 and fig. 1). The crude divorce rate per 1,000 population which from 1955 through 1963 varied between 2.1 and 2.3 grew to 2.4 in 1.964 and 2.5 in 1965. The annual rates were 2.5 in 1966 and 2.6 in 1967, with a provisional rate of 2.9 in 1968. The rate per 1,000 married women aged 15 years and over increased from 9.6 in 1963 to 10.0 in 1964 and 10.6 in 1965; a rate of this magnitude had not occurred since 1949. Furthermore, these increases cannot be completely explained by increased numbers of young married persons,
among whom divorce occurs more frequently than in the total married population. When 1965 agespecific divorce rates, discussed later in this report, were applied to the numbers of married women under 25 years of age, as estimated by the Bureau of the Census, 146,100 divorces were obtained for 1965 and 128,000 for 1960-an increase of 18,100 , which represents only 21.0 percent of the total increase of 86,000 decrees between the two years.

These data indicate that the recent increases in the number and rates of divorces are not due exclusively to changes in the population, but are also, at least in part, due to a higher likelihood of the occurrence of divorce. The last year when a decline took place was 1962. From 1962 to 1965 the divorce total increased by. 66,000 , or 16 percent. The rate increased 0.3 points per 1,000 total population, or 14 percent, and the rate per 1,000 married women, increased by 1.2 points, or 13 percent. Thus after a period of generally little change in the late 1950's and early 1960's, divorces have resumed an upward trend, which was characteristic of the 80 -year period, 1867 1946.

In addition to husbands and wives, children are also usually involved in divorce cases. The total number of persons involved including children was $1,513,000$ in 1964 and $1,588,000$ in 1965 . This figure has increased 44.2 percent during the 11-year period, from $1,101,000$ in 1955 (table 2 ). The rate per 1,000 population increased from 6.5 in 1958, when it was lowest, to 8.2 in 1965.


Figure 1. Divorce rates: United States, 1920-65.

## International Comparisons

Since 1962, the divorce rate has been higher in the United States than in any country for which information was reported to the Statistical Office of the United Nations, though a few small nonsovereign areas may have had still higher rates. Prior to 1962, the rate for Egypt was higher than that for the United States, but, since then, the Egyptian rate has declined and that of the United States has increased. Countries shown in table 3 are listed in the descending order of magnitude of the latest available rate. It can be seen that the American and Egyptian rates are followed by several Eastern European countries, while Venezuela, Canada, and the Netherlands have the lowest rates among those included in the table. The very pronounced difference between the rate for the United States and for Canada is characteristic for all years for which information is available. Several European, Latin American,
and Asiatic countries have no provisions for granting divorces, though some annulments may have been granted.

The international data in table 3 indicate that the increase of the divorce rate in the years following 1962 was not limited to the United States. When rates for two consecutive years were compared; it was found that from 1961 to 1962 the rates increased in nine countries, but from 1964 to 1965 they increased in 16 countries, while the number of countries with declining rates was 11 and 2 , respectively.

## Regions, Divisions, and States

The numbers of divorce and annulment decrees granted in 1965 were larger than the 1964 figures in all regions, in eight out of nine geographic divisions, and in 37 States and the District of Columbia, while they declined in 13 States.

In 12 States changes were minimal- 50 decrees or less in either direction. The divorce rate per 1,000 population increased in three regions (in the Northeast it did not change) and in most geographic divisions, as shown in table 4. The rate also increased in 23 States and the District of Columbia, declined in nine and did not change in 16 , while this information was not computed for two States. The largest increases occurred in North Carolina, where the annual total grew by 54 percent and the rate by 0.8 points, in California, where the number of di-
yorces increased 18 percent and the rate 0,5 points, and in Indiana where the increases were 16 percent and 0,5 points. The largest declines were found in Nevada ( 16 percent of the total and 5,3 points of the rate) and Hawaii (34 percent and 0.8 points). Changes in North Carolina and in Hawaii are associated with amendments to the State divorce laws.

As in previous years, the State divorce rates were low in the East and North and high in the West and South (fig. 2). The divorce rate for the West was four times that for the Northeast, and


Figure 2. Divorse rates per 1,000 population: each State, 1965.
the rate for the South almost three times as high. The largest rate for a geographic division was 5.0 for the Mountain Division, more than six times that for the Middle Atlantic (0.8). In figure 2 , States are classified by the size of their rate; 17 States and the District of Columbia had rates below 2.0, 17 States had rates ranging from 2.0 to 3.0 , and 16 States had rates above 3.0. The distribution of these States by region is as follows:

| Total | Below <br> 2.0 | $2.0-$ <br> 3.0 | Above <br> 3.0 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| United States-- | 50 | 17 | 17 | 16 |
| Northeast---- | 9 | 7 | 2 | - |
| North Central-- | 12 | 6 | 5 | 1 |
| South----- | 16 | 3 | 8 | 5 |
| West------- | 13 | 1 | 2 | 10 |

## Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas

Population estimates for 1965 for standard metropolitan statistical areas (SMSA's) and for each constituent county ${ }^{2}$ made it possible to compute divorce rates for each SMSA. Since in New England, SMSA's do not follow county lines, population figures for the corresponding State economic areas were published instead. Some adjustments of these figures were necessary, since the 1965 definitions of the SMSA's were used by the Bureau of the Census, while it is the policy of the Division of Vital Statistics to compile data for SMSA's as defined in 1960.

About two of three divorces granted in the United States ( 67.4 percent in 1965) were granted within the SMSA's. This percentage varied from 57.0 percent in the South to 77.2 percent in the West. Most decrees- 58.5 percent of the national total-were granted in counties that include the central cities and only 8.8 percent in suburban counties. This distribution indicates the place where the decree was granted rather than the place of residence of the parties to divorce, and it is possible that in States where residence in the county is not mandatory some residents of the suburban or nonmetropolitan counties obtained their divorces in the central cities, while in a few cases the contrary seems to be true.

Divorce rates were computed for 200 SMSA's, as defined in 1960, for divorces granted both in 1960 and in 1965 (table 5). As expected, the variation was pronounced ranging from 0.3 per


Figure 3. Divorce rates for metropolitan and nonmetropolitan areas: United States, 1965.

1,000 population in the New York SMSA in both 1960 and 1965 to 43.3 in 1.960 and 35.2 in 1965 in the Reno SMSA. The magnitude of the rate depended in part on two factors: the geographic location and the size of the SMSA. Rates for SMSA's located in States with low divorce rates tendea to be low and those in States with high divorce rates tended to be high. On the other hand, as rates for central cities were usually much higher than for the suburban counties within the same SMSA, everything else being equal, large metropolitan areas, which included many suburban counties, tended to have lower rates than small metropolitan areas. Rates increased in most SMSA's between 1960 and 1965. Information is available for 200 such areas, with 154 of them experiencing an increase, 34 a decline, and no change in 12.

In the United States and in the majority of geographic divisions and States, the divorce rate for all metropolitan counties combined was higher than for nonmetropolitan counties combined (table 6 and fig. 3), but this difference seems to be
declining. In 1960, metropolitan counties had higher rates in 41 States, but in 1965 only in 35 States. The rates for nonmetropolitan counties were higher than or equal to those for metropolitan counties in many Northeastern States as well as in States that seem to have "divorce mills" in some of their nonmetropolitan counties.

All States except three (Alaska, Vermont, and Wyoming) had metropolitan counties that contain central cities, but only 31 had suburban metropolitan counties. In 26 of these 31 States rates for counties containing central cities were higher than for suburban counties, in three States (Minnesota, Alabama, and Washington) the contrary was true, while in Florida and Tennessee both. rates were equal. In 15 of the 31 States, the rate for suburban metropolitan counties was also lower than that for nonmetropolitan counties, and in two other States the nonmetropolitan and the suburban rates were equal.

## AGE OF HUSBAND AND WIFE

## Age at Decree in Selected States

All States included in the divorce-registration area (DRA) have questions about age, or date of birth, of the parties on their divorce record forms, but in many registration States these questions are often left blank, and in a few States this information is reported in less than 10 percent of the cases. Originally, the number of States that reported age satisfactorily was very small (only four in 1960), but it has increased considerably in recent years, and in 1965 data from 10 States were usable. These States are Hawaii, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Virginia, and Wisconsin. These States reported 71,879 decrees, or 43.6 percent of the DRA total.

In all 10 States the modal age groups at time of decree were either 20-24 or 25-29 years for men and 20-24 for women. These age groups included one-fifth of the divorced husbands and about one-fourth of the divorced wives (table 7). The number of divorces declined with age, including a small number who were divorced when they were over 65 years (fig. 4). All reporting States showed the same general pattern in age at decree.


Figure 4. Percent of divorces and annulments, by age of husband and wife at decree: total of 10 selected registration States, 1965.

## Likelihood of Divorce by Age at Decree

National divorce figures by age at decree were estimated for 1965, by applying to the national divorce total the percentages computed for the 10 States combined, and estimated age-specific divorce rates were prepared from these data (table 8). As expected, the rates declined with age, and this decline was very pronounced for both wives and husbands (fig. 5). The rate for teenaged wives was 30.6 per 1,000 , the highest of all age-specific rates; it declined consistently afterwards to 13 per 1,000 in the group 65 years and older. For husbands, the highest rate was found in the 20-24 years group, slightly higher than that for teenaged husbands, and the decline for older age groups was smaller compared with that for the wives. Age-specific rates for husbands were higher than the comparable rates for wives in all age groups, except the teenage. The estimated rates for 1965 show the same pattern as the age-specific rates for four selected States published in the report, "Divorce Statistics Analysis, United States, 1962."

The propensity to divorce for various age groups can also be demonstrated by comparing


Figure 5. Estimated age-specific divorce rates: United States, 1965.
the age distribution of persons divorced in the 10 States in 1965 with that of all married persons (table 9).

The percentages for the divorced were more than twice as high as the percentages for the married population in the young age groups, and the ratio between the two sets of percentages declined consistently with increasing age, to 0.1 for the oldest group.

The likelihood of divorce was high for young husbands and wives for all years for which data are available. The highest median age at decree for reporting States was always considerably lower than the corresponding age of the total married population (table $1:$.

## Age at Marriage of Divorcing Couples

In the 10 States that reported age with satisfactory completeness, almost 20 percent of the husbands and 50 percent of the wives divorced in 1965 were married while still in their teens,
and 62 and 75 percent, respectively, were married while under 25 years of age (table 11). Percentages declined rapidly with increasing age at the time of marriage, and only 6 percent of the husbands and 4 percent of the wives had been married when 45 years or older. Twenty-five percent of all men divorced in 1965 in the selected States were under 20.7 years of age at the time of their marriage, 50 percent were under 23.6 years of age, and 75 percent, under 29.1 years of age. For wives, comparable figures were 17.1, 20.4, and 24.9, respectively (table 12). There was comparatively little variation among the selected States. The interquartile range of the age at marriage was narrow, 8.4 years for men and 7.8 years for women. Thus, irrespective of their age at decree, the middle 50 percent of divorced women were married in their late teens and early twenties. As duration of marriage varies considerably, the distribution of age at decree is much wider than that of the age at marrie.e.

## Likelihood of Divorce by Ag : at Marriage

Rates by age at marriage cannot be computed because population bases are not available by the age of the married population at the time of their current marriage. Another method had to be used; therefore age at marriage of the divorced population was compared with that of brides and grooms married in earlier years. Because of the general interest in teenage marriages, persons who had married while still under 20 were used for comparison (table 13). It was found that the proportions of divorced persons who had married in their teens were considerably higher than the proportions of teenage brides and grooms for all years included in the table, and therefore the likelihood of divorce was higher for persons who married at an early age than for the total married population. This finding is based on data from a group of 15 States, some of which have very high percentages of divorces for which age was not stated.

The inference from the data in table 13 is supported by an analysis of Bureau of the Census statistics on the age of women at first marriage by their marital status at the time of the 1960 census. ${ }^{3}$ It is demonstrated from these data that women who had been divorced and had either remarried or not remarried, at the time of the
enumeration, were, in general, younger at "e time of their first marriage than women still living with their first husbands.

## Trend in Age of Husband and Wife at Decree and af Marriage

Data showing trends on age at decree and age at marriage are incomplete and unsatisfactory. Only eight States reported age at decreefor 1958 and nine States for 1959. Age at marriage was not computed before 1960 . Although since 1960 all registration States have reported both age at decree and age at marriage, the reporting has been incomplete in most States. Median ages at decree and at marriage for each individual registration State are shown in tables 14 and 15, respectively. Many of the 10 States that had satisfactory data for 1965 had had a less complete reporting in prior years.

For the 10 States combined, median and quartile ages at decree and at marriage were highest in 1962 and have declined since that year (table 16). The divorce rate began to rise and the median duration of marriage started to decline (as discussed later in this report) at about the same time, and it is likely that there is an association between age, rate, and duration.

## RACE AND MARRIAGE ORDER

## Race

Information about xace is reported with 85 percent or more completeness in the 10 DRA States shown in table 17; nine of theseStates also have satisfactory reporting of age. The reporting of race is less complete in 11 DRA States, and this information is not collected in Ohio.

Almost 90 percent of persons divorced in the 10 States combined were white, alinost 10 percent Negro, and about 1 percent members of other races, which include Indian, Chinese, Japanese, Filipino, Hawaîian, and so forth. Nonwhite husbands and wives other than Negroes represent 0.5 percent or less in most reporting continental States, but about 50 percent in Hawaii. The proportion of racial groups among persons who divorce depends on two factors: (1) Their
proportion in the total married population, and (2) the differential likelihood of divorce in various racial groups. Divorce rates by race, or by color, could not be computed for 1964 and 1965, because population figures were not available for individual States.

Divorce data do not represent all family disruptions. The great majority of marriages are ended by the death of one of the spouses. Some couples are separated, i.e., married but living apart because of marital discord, with little hope of reconciliation. The difference between the white and nonwhite population is pronounced in the prevalence of separation-1965 estimates for the United States ${ }^{1}$ indicate that 1.7 percent of white married men were separated compared with 9.5 percent of nonwhite married men-percentages of the separated among married women were 2.4 for white and 15.3 for nonwhite, Similar proportions are found for earlier years.

In more than 99 percent of all divorces both husband and wife belonged to the same color group, either white or nonwhite, but in a small number of cases one spouse was white and the other nonwhite (table 18). These couples represent a sizable proportion among divorces granted in Hawaii (over 20 percent) but a negligible fraction of those granted on the continent. Information is not available for interracial divorces within the nonwhite population, i.e., cases in which the husband and the wife belong to two different nonwhite races.

## Number of This Marriage

The reporting of the item, "number of this marriage," has improyed considerably over recent years. In 1963 only six States (Hawaii, Iowa, Missouri, Rhode Island, Tennessee, and Wiscon$\sin$ ) reported this item with 85 percent or more completeness. Three additional States-Kansas, Montana, and Virginia-achieved this level of reporting by 1965. The case of Virginia is particularly interesting. Until 1964 the State did not require the reporting of the number of this marriage of husband and wife. A new divorce record form which included this item was introduced in 1964, and in 1965-the first full
calendar year when the new form was usedthe reporting was 98 percent complete.

Almost 75 percent of husbands and wives divorced in 1965 in the nine States combined had been married once, 20 percent twice, and 6 percent three or more times (table 19). These proportions varied considerably among the reporting States for both husbands and wives, and because of these variations, data for the reporting States combined may change considerably after more States achieve a satisfactory level of reporting the number of marriages of parties who divorce.

## Likelihood of Divorce by Marriage Order

The term, marriage order, is used to denote the classification of marriages as firstmarriages or remarriages, without a further subclassification of remarriages by the number of this marriage. Data for past years indicate that remarriages have a higher likelihood of ending in divorce than first marriages.

Percent distributions of marriages and of divorces by marriage order were prepared for the total of a group of nine States (table 20). Information about marriages has been available since 1956; hence, annual figures for a 10-year period are shown in the table, and over 60 percent of all couples divorced in 1965 had married during this 10 -year period. Percentages of first marriages are higher among persons who were married during all years shown in table 20 than among those who divorced, though the difference between the two sets of percentages tended to decline in recent years. Hence, husbands and wives married once were and still are underrepresented among those who divorce, and, conversely, persons married more than once are overrepresented, but in recent years the difference has become less pronounced. The great majority of remarried persons had been previously divorced, rather than widowed; e.g., in $1964,16.8$ percent of brides and 17.3 percent of grooms in the marriage-registration area had been previously divorced and only 5.8 and 5.1 percent, respectively, were widowed. This seems to indicate that persons who have already been divorced at least once are more likely to divorce again than persons who have never been divorced.

## Color, Marriage Order, and Age

Tabulations of 1963 divorces were prepared for a special study, including tables showing the interaction of color, marriage order, and age of husband and of wife in five States with good reporting of all three variables: Hawaii, Lowa, Missouri, Tennessee, and Wisconsin. Figures for the five States combined indicate that the proportion of persons married more than once was slightly higher among white husbands and wives who divorced than among nonwhite-about 28 percent for white husbands and wives and about 23 percent for nonwhite. White persons divorced at a younger age than nonwhite (table 21 and fig. 6). Within each group of husbands and wives classified by marriage order, percentages for white persons were higher in the youngest age group and percentages for nonwhite persons were higher in the oldest age group. The same applies to the age at marriage of divorcing persons married once, but the age at marriage of nonwhite persons married more than once was concentrated in the age group, 25-34 years, with percentages for the white group higher for both the group under 25 years and that over 34 .

## GEOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

## Residence of Defendant

Divorce statistics are tabulated by State of occurrence, which may or may not have been the State of residence of the couple. The plaintiff, in order to file a divorce complaint, must, at least nominally, be a resident of the State where the complaint was filed. Hence, only the information about the residence of the defendant is of interest for divorce statistics. Information as to who is the defendant was reported with a high degree of completeness: 97.1 percent in 1964 and 98.4 in 1965 for the DRA as a whole, with the reporting for only one State less than 85 percent complete. Residence of the defendant was available in 80 percent of all cases granted in the DRA in 1965 , and the reporting was 85 percent or more complete in the 12 States listed in table 22. Usually, the wife is the plaintiff and the husband the defendant. In 1965 this was the case in 71.4


Figure 6. Percent distribution of divorces and annulments, by color and age: total of five selected registration States, 1963.
percent of divorces granted in the DRA, and this proportion was similar in earlier years. Thus, the wife was the defendant in less than 30 percent of all divorces.

There are differences between the place of residence of divorcing husbands and that of divorcing wives. Defendant husbands resided in the State where the decree was granted more often than defendant wives: for the DRA, the percentages were 86.1 for husbands and 75.4 for wives (table 22). A similar pattern was found for the individual States, with percentages for husbands
ranging from 71.8 to 90.0 and for wives from 57.9 to 79.3 .

These data indicate that when the wife applies for divorce, and, therefore, the husband is the defendant, both spouses are more likely to live in the same State than in cases where the husband applies. Since in over 70 percent of divorces the husband is the defendant, it can be said that when the couple conforms to the usual manner of seeking divorce, both spouses are more likely to live in the State where the suit is filed. Furthermore, when the couple does not conform to the preva-
lent pattern, the distance between places of xesidence of the spouses tends to be more pronounced. In $1965,15.2$ percent of defendant wives but only 7.4 percent of defendant husbands lived outside the region where the decree was granted.

Differences in the State of residence of the spouses are due to migration that occurred after separation. From the available data it is impossible to say whether the plaintiff, the defendant, or both, changed their State of residence. As most of the States included in the DRA contain no "divorce mills," it is unlikely that the migration was due to the plaintiff establishing a temporary residence outside his or her own State for the sole purpose of obtaining an easy divorce.

## Place of Marriage of Divorced Couple

In the DRA, 60.9 percent of couples were married in the same State where they were divorced. This proportion can be compared with 83.0 percent of defendants who were residents of the State where the decree was granted. Thus, among couples divorced in 1965, out-of-State marriages were more prevalent than out-ofState residence of either of the spouses. This difference is due to marriages performed outside the intended State of residence of the couple and to migration of the couple before separation. Marriages performed outside the State of residence are exemplified by the high percentage of couples divorced in Tennessee, but married in Georgia and Mississippi (15.5 and 16.1 percent, respectively, of all couples divorced in Tennessee in 1963) and by couples divorced in Oregon, but married in Nevada (13.2 percent in 1963).

The majority of all divorced couples-60.9 percent in 1965-were married in the State where the decree was granted (table 23), though in most Western States, couples married within the State represented less than half of all divorces granted during the year. On the other extreme, in Rhode Island and Maryland, this proportion was 70 percent or more. In general, it seems that the proportion of divorced couples married in the State where the decree was granted declined from east to west. The variations are due in part to the general stream of migration from east to west, as well as to "marriage mills" and "divorce
mills" functioning in the western part of the country.

The available information for 1963 indicates that, among couples married in a State other than where they were divorced, the majority were married in a contiguous State. For the DRA, 23.1 percent of divorced couples were in this category compared with 16.6 percent who had married ina noncontiguous State or outside the United States.

## DURATION OF MARRIAGE

## Modal and Median Duration

Duration of marriage is computed by subtracting "the year and month the marriage was performed from the year and month the decree was granted. 'Since the time of marriage is reported with a high degree of completeness, information about duration of marriage was available for the DRA in 96.1 percent of cases in 1964 and in 97.4 percent of cases in 1965. Thirteen States in 1964 and 16 States in 1965 reached a level of completeness of 99.0 percent or higher.

The distribution of divorces by duration of marriage in 1964 and 1965 was similar to that for earlier years: the highest percentage was found after 1 full year of marriage, and percentages declined with each additional year (fig. 7). This pattern was observed for the DRA and for 14 of the 22 registration States, both in 1964 and in


Figure 7. Percent of divorces and annuiments, by duration of marriage: divorce-registration area, 1965.

1965 (percentages for the latter year are shown in table 24). Most of the States where the modal duration of marriage was 2 years or more in 1964 and 1965 had divorce rates below the national average. It seems probable that there is a connection between low rates and comparatively few divorces soon after marriage.

The median duration of marriage for the DRA as a whole was 7.4 years in 1964 and 7.2 in 1965. In 1964, State medians varied from 5.0 to 9.8 years, and in 1965 from 5.1 to 9.2. Similar variations were found for the first and third quartiles (table 25).

There was a strong regional variation among the State medians. All reporting States in the northeastern part of the country, including the Northeast Region, the EastNorth Central Division, and the northern part of the South Atlantic Division, had medians higher than that for the DRA, while all other reporting States had lower medians. This was true for both 1964 and 1965.

## Trend

The trend in duration changed its direction on several occasions. During the first period for which data are available, 1867-86, the median duration was slightly higher than it is now, 7.6 years, and during the subsequent 20 -year period it increased further to 8.2 years. The trend then reversed itself and in the early and middle 1920's this median was much lower, about 6.6 years. In 1927, a period of increase in duration began, and the median reached 7.1 years in the early $1930^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$, a figure very similar to the median of 7.2 years found in 1960-the last year for which national data are available. The increase of the median in the late 1920's and early 1930's camnot be said to be exclusively caused by the depression, since this increase began in 1927, before the onset of the depression.

Information about duration of marriage for limited muribers of States is available for each year since 1954 (table 26). In order to ascertain the direction of the trend, increases and declines of State medians for consecutive years were compared. There were more increases than declines in the annual State medians prior to 1963, but more declines from 1963 to 1964 and from 1964 to 1965. Moving averages of the medians
eliminated minor fluctuations, but presented the same pattern.

The question arises whether declines in the median duration of marriage are connected with recent increases in the divorce rates. Data are not sufficient to warrant a definite answer, butit should be noted that changes in the rates, in age at decree, and in duration of marriage, occurred simultaneously. Statistics for later years may provide materials for a more definitive answer.

## Variation in Duration of Marriage

The duration of marriage at decree is associated with other variables analyzed in this report. The 1963 divorce data for a group of five States (Hawaii, Iowa, Tennessee, Missouri, and Wisconsin) were tabulated by marriage duration, marriage order, and color.

Medians and quartiles of duration by marriage order of the spouses indicate that divorced persons married once are, on the average, married for more years than persons married more than once (table 27). Duration for white couples is shorter than for nonwhite, in the case of both first marriages and remarriages. Duration for nonwhite couples in the four continental States; where the great majority of nonwhite persons are Negroes, was longer than that for Hawaii, where other nonwhite and interracial couples constitute the overwhelming majority of the nonwhite population.

Another variable associated with duration of marriage is place of marriage, because couples married in the State where they divorce have a shorter duration than couples married elsewhere (table 28). The difference could be partially explained by a higher likelihood of inter-State migration during a comparatively long period of marriage. However this does not explain the tact that State residents married out of State have a longer duration of marriage than residents married in their State of residence. The median duration for couples married and divorced in Pennsylvania was 8.6 years, but 9.3 years for Pennsylvania couples married in Maryland. Couples married and divorced in Tennessee had a median duration of 4.4 years and those married and divorced in Georgia 6.1 years, while couples from Tennessee married in Georgia had a median
of 7.8 years. Much more information is necessary to elucidate the relationship between residence, State of marriage, and duration of marriage at time of decree.

## NUMBER OF CHILDREN

## Children Reported

The level of reporting the number of children of divorced couples is satisfactory. For the DRA as a whole, the percent completeness was 94.3 in 1965, and in only four States was this percentage below 90.0. The increase of the overall level of completeness was due to a change in coding rules. Values could be assigned to many cases from Pennsylvania and Rhode Island that would have been coded "not stated" according to


Figure 3. Percent of divorces and annulments, by number of children reported: total of 20 selected rejistration States, 1965.


Figure 9. Number of divorces and number of children reported in divorce cases: United States, 1953-65.
the previous rules. Due to this change, the level of completeness improved considerably for both States. The coding procedures are described in the appendix.

Numbers and percentages of divorces for 1964 and 1965, classified by the number of children reported, are shown in table 29. In order to make the data comparable, figures for Pennsylvania and Rhode Island were omitted. In the remaining 20 States, for each 10 divorced couples four had no children, four had one or two children, one had three children, and one, four children or more (fig. 8). The increase in the total number of divorces from 1964 to 1965 was caused almost exclusively by divorcing couples reporting no children. Couples reporting one or two children increased slightly, while those reporting three children or more showed a slight decline.

The changes in the numbers of children reported in divorce cases probably reflect the decline in the number of children born annually from a peak of $4,268,326$ in 1961 to $3,760,358$ in 1965. This decline led to a virtual cessation of the growth of the number of children under 18 and to an actual decline of those under 5. The
figures, in thousands, estimated by the Bureau of the Census, ${ }^{5}$ were as follows:

|  | 1965 | 1964 | 1963 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |
| Under 18 years-- | 70,428 | 70,229 | 68,855 |
| Under 5 years--- | 20,433 | 20,693 | 20,750 |
| $5-17$ years $-\cdots-$ | 49,995 | 49,536 | 48,105 |

## All Children Involved

The estimating procedures for the total number of children involved, which were used for the years 1961 through 1964, became obsolete in 1965 because of the changes in the coding procedures. A new method had to be devised, and national totals for the years 1961-64 were reestimated (table 30). The methods are described in the appendix.

The national total number of children involved continued to increase (fig. 9) but the mean number per decree declined from 1.36 in 1964 to 1.32 in 1965 due, no doubt, to the decline in the total number of children. The decline was small,
but it was the first such decline since 1953, the first year for which the number of children was estimated. The decline in the mean number of children is not due to the new method of estimating this figure, as each of the methods tried yielded a decline.

Declines in the total numbers of children were observed in the DRA and in many registration States (table 31). The total number of children involved in the DRA was 219,200 in 1964 and 212,700 in 1965. Totals declined in 10 of the 22 States, increased in 11, and showed no change in one. The average numbers of children per decree declined in 16 States and increased in six.

## LEGAL GROUNDS FOR DECREE

The legal grounds for a divorce or annulment decree are known in all cases or are easily ascertainable by the court clerk responsible for the completion of the statistical report. Still, this information is left blank on a small proportion of records ( 4.2 percent in 1964 and 3.0 percent in 1965).


Figure 10. Percent of divorces and annulments, by legal grounds for which decrees were granted: divorce-registration area, 1965.

Legal grounds are listed in the State divorce statutes and a decree can be granted only if the reason for divorce is described in terms of these grounds. Hence, the true cause for the decision of the spouses to seek divorce remains unknown; it may coincide with the legal ground mentioned in the divorce petition, or it may not, and, no doubt, the legal ground and the cause do not always coincide, especially in cases that are not contested. The least defined and the least unpleasant ground is usually favored by the plaintiff. The same ground may differ considerably between two States-it may be an easy ground for divorce in one State and a much more difficult one in another. Furthermore, the terminology used by the courts may differ from that used in the statutes.

In the majority of the reporting States, one particular ground was alleged in 80 percent or more of divorce decrees. This ground was cruelty in 10 States (Geor,ia, Idaho, Iowa, Michigan, Montana, Nebraska, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, and Wisconsin), indig ities in three States (Missouri, Pennsylvania, and Wyoming), nonsupport in one State (Ohio), and incompatibility in one State (Alaska).

Though there are a large number of grounds listed in the State statutes, few of them are
numerically important for the DRA as a whole. Only six legal grounds were alleged in 1 percent or more of all divorces granted in the DRA; they are cruelty, neglect or nonsupport, indignities, desertion or abandonment, voluntary separation or absence, and adultery (table 32 and fig. 10). A seventh ground, incompatibility, should be added here, because over 95 percent of decrees granted in Alaska were granted on this ground. Only 4.4 percent of divorces in 1964 and 6.4 percent in 1965 were granted on all other grounds combined.

The total number of legal grounds for which divorces were granted is larger than the total number of divorces, because 14 percent of decrees were granted on two or more grounds. The proportion of cases with multiple grounds varied from 0.3 percent in Alaska to 55 percent in Kansas. The multiple grounds most widely used in DRA States were cruelty and gross neglect or nonsupport, used in 1965 for 14,696 decrees; cruelty and desertion or abandonment (1,531 decrees); cruelty and indignities ( 1,262 ); desertion or $\varepsilon$ :andonment and neglect or nonsupport (905); and desertion and indignities (658). All other combinations of legal grounds were found in the remaining 2,661 divorce decrees.
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Table 1. Number of divorces and annulments and rate per 1,000 population with percent changes from preceding year: United States, 1920-65

| Year | ```Number of decrees``` | Percent change in number | Rate per 1,000 total population | Percent change in rate | Rate per 1,000 married women 15 years of age and over | Percent change in rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 479,000 | $+6.4$ | 2.5 | +4.2 | 10.6 | +6.0 |
| 1965 | 450,000 | +5.1 | 2.4 | $+4.3$ | 10.0 | +4.2 |
| 1963 | 428,000 | +3.6 | 2.3 | +4.5 | 9.6 | +2.1 |
| 1962 | 413,000 | -0.2 | 2.2 | -4.3 | 9.4 | -2.1 |
| 1961 | 414,000 | +5.3 | 2.3 | +4.5 | 9.6 | $+4.3$ |
| 1960 | 393,000 | -0.5 | 2.2 | - | 9.2 | -1.1 |
| 1959 | 395,000 | $+7.3$ | 2.2 | $+4.8$ | 9.3 | +4.5 |
| 1958 | 368,000 | -3.4 | 2.1 | -4.5 | 8.9 | -3.3 |
| 1957 | 381,000 | -0.3 | 2.2 | -4.3 | 9.2 | -2.1 |
| 1956 | 382,000 | +1.3 | 2.3 | - | 9.4 | +1.1 |
| 1955- | 377,000 | -0.5 | 2.3 | -4.2 | 9.3 | $-2.1$ |
| 1954 | 379,000 | -2.8 | 2.4 | -4.0 | 9.5 | -4.0 |
| 1953 | 390,000 | -0.5 | 2.5 | - | 9.9 | $-2.0$ |
| 1952- | 392,000 | +2.9 | 2.5 | - | 10.1 | +2.0 |
| 1951- | 381,000 | -1.1 | 2.5 | -3.8 | 9.9 | -3.9 |
| 1950 | 385, 144 | -3.0 | 2.6 | -3.7 | 10.3 | -2.8 |
| 1949 | 397,000 | -2.7 | 2.7 | -3.6 | 10.6 | -5.4 |
| 1948 | 408,000 | -15.5 | 2.8 | -17.6 | 11.2 | -17.6 |
| 1947- | 483,000 | -20.8 | 3.4 | -20.9 | 13.6 | -24.0 |
| 1946 | 610,000 | +25.8 | 4.3 | +22.9 | 17.9 | $+24.3$ |
| 1945- | 485,000 | $+21.3$ | 3.5 | +20.7 | 1.4 | +20.0 |
| 1944 | 400,000 | +11.4 | 2.9 | +11.5 | 12.0 | +9.1 |
| 1943- | 359,000 | +11.8 | 2.6 | +8.3 | 11.0 | $+8.9$ |
| 1942 | 321,000 | $+9.6$ | 2.4 | $+9.1$ | 10.1 | +7.4 |
| 1941 | 293,000 | +11.0 | 2.2 | $+10.0$ | 9.4 | $+6.8$ |
| 1940 | 264,000 | +5.2 | 2.0 | +5.3 | 8.8 | +3.5 |
|  | 251,000 | +2.9 | 1.9 | - | 8.5 | $+1.2$ |
| 1938 | 244, 000 | -2.0 | 1.9 | - | 8.4 | -3.4 |
| 1937 | 249,000 | +5.5 | 1.9 | +5.6 | 8.7 | +4.8 |
| 1936 | 236,000 | +8.3 | 1.8 | $+5.9$ | 8.3 | +6.4 |
|  | 218,000 | $+6.9$ | 1.7 | $+6.3$ | 7.8 | $+4.0$ |
| 1934- | 204,000 | $+23.6$ | 1.6 | $+23.1$ | 7.5 | +23.0 |
| 1933 | 165,000 | +0.6 | 1.3 |  | 6.1 |  |
| 1932- | 164,241 | -12.6 | 1.3 | -13.3 | 6.1 | -14.1 |
|  | 188,003 | -4.1 | 1.5 | -6.2 | 7.1 | -5.3 |
| 1930 | 195,961 | -4.8 | 1.6 | -5.9 | 7.5 | -6. 2 |
| 1929 | 205,876 | $+2.8$ | 1.7 |  | 8.0 | +2.6 |
| 1928 | 200,176 | +2.0 | 1.7 | $+6.3$ | 7.8 |  |
|  | 196,292 | +6.3 | 1.6 | - | 7.8 | +4.0 |
| 1926 | 184,678 | +5.3 | 1.6 | +6.7 | 7.5 | $+4.2$ |
| 1925 | 175,449 | $+2.6$ | 1.5 | - | 7.2 | +1.4 |
| 1924--- | 170,952 | +3.5 | 1.5 | - | 7.2 | +1.4 |
| 1923---- | 165,096 | +10.9 | 1.5 | $+7.1$ | 7.1 | +7.6 |
| 1922- | 148,815 | -6.7 | 1.4 | $-6.7$ | 6.6 | -8.3 |
| 1921 | 159,580 | -6.4 +20.4 | 1.5 1.6 | -6.2 +23.1 | 7.2 8.0 | -10.0 |
| 1920- | 170,505 | +20.5 | 1.6 | +23.1 | 8.0 |  |

Table 2. Number of persons inyolved in divorce (husbands, wives, and children) and rate per 1,000 total population with percent changes from preceding year: United States, 1953-65

|  | Yeax | Number of persons | Percent <br> change in number | $\begin{gathered} \text { Rate per } \\ 1,000 \\ \text { poputation } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 1965 |  | 1,588,000 | +5.0 | 8.2 |
| 1964 - |  | 1, 513,000 | $+6.7$ | 7.9 |
| 1963 |  | $1,418,000$ | $+4.4$ | 7.5 |
| $1961^{1}$ |  | 1, $1,358,000$ | $+1.0$ | 7.3 |
| 1960- |  | 1, 249,000 | $+7.6$ | 7.3 |
| 1959-- |  | 1,258,000 | -10.9 | 7.0 |
| 1958- |  | 1, 134,000 | +10.9 -0.6 | $7 \cdot \frac{1}{5}$ |
| 1957- |  | 1, 141,000 | -0.6 | 6.5 |
| 1956- |  | 1, 125,000 | +1.4 +2.2 | 6.7 |
| 1955 |  | 1,101,000 | $+0.2$ | 6.7 |
| 1954 - |  | 1, 1 , 019,000 | +0.0 | 6.7 |
| 1953 |  | 1,110,000 |  | 7.0 |

${ }^{1}$ Revised,

Table 3. Divorce rates per 1,000 population: United States And selected countries, $1958-65$

| Country | 1965 | 1964 | 1963 | 1962 | 1961 | 1960 | 1959 | 1958 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Rate per 1,000 population |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2.47 | $2_{2.35}$ | 2.27 | 2,22 | 2.26 | 2.18 | 2.24 | 2.12 |
|  | 22,16 | 2.14 | 2.11 | 2,03 | 2.32 | 2.50 | 2.40 | 2,43 |
| Hungary | 2.01 | 1.95 | 1.82 | 1.73 | 1.74 | 1.66 | 2.20 | 1:51 |
| Romania-" | 1.94 | 1.86 | 1.92 | 2.04 | 1.80 | 2,01 | $\underline{1.69}$ | 1.96 |
| U.S.S.R, ${ }^{\text {East }}$ Germany | 1.56 | 1.47 | 1.30 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.1 | 1.1 |
| East German | 1.44 | 1.51 | 1.33 | 1.36 | 1.44 | 1,34 | 1.32 | 1.26 |
| Czechoslovakia | 21,32 | 1,20 | 1.32 | 1. 3.20 | $\underline{1.43}$ | 1.46 | 1.42 | 1.46 |
| Swedep-m. | 1.24 | 1, 20 | 1. 1.12 | 1.17 | 1.19 | 1.12 | 1.15 | 1.18 |
| Austriamm | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1,14 | 1.12 | 1. 1.14 | 1.13 | 1. 1.20 | 1.17 |
| West Gexmany | 0.93 | 0.99 | 0.92 | 0. 82 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.8 |
| Switzerland- | 0.84 | 0.83 | 0.82 | 0.83 | 0.86 | 0.87 | 0.89 | 0.85 |
| Sapanermerer-rer | 0,79 | 0.75 | 0,73 | 0,75 | 0.74 | 0.74 | 0.78 | 0.81 |
| Australiand Wale | 0.78 | 0.72 | 0.67 | 0.61 | 0,54 | 0.51 | 0.52 | 0.49 |
| Francemm- | 0.75 0.71 | 0.71 0.69 | 0.68 | 0.67 | 0.64 | 0.65 | 0.73 | 0.70 |
| Belgiumm | 20.59 | 0.58 | 0.56 | 0.51 | 0.50 | 0.66 0.50 | 0.66 | 0.71 |
| Mexico-m | 0.58 | 0.51 | 0.50 | 0.47 | $0 . .46$ | 0.43 | 0.46 | 0.47 |
| Scotlands | 0.51 | 0.46 | 0.43 | 0.39 | 0.35 | 0.35 | 0.32 | 0.34 |
| Netherlands- | 0,50 | 0.51 | 0.49 | 0.48 | 0.49 | 0.49 | 0.49 | 0.47 |
| Canada-m | 0.46 | 0.45 | 0.41 | 0.36 | 0.36 | O. 39 | 0.37 | 0.37 |
| Venezuel | 0.26 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.22 | 0.23 | 0.25 | 0.23 | 0.20 |

[^2]Table 4. Number of divorces and annulments and rate per 1,000 population: United States, each region, division, and State, 1963-65

| Region, division, and State | 1965 | 1964 | 1963 | 1965 | 1964 | 1963 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| United States ${ }^{1}$ | Number of decrees |  |  | Rate per 1,000 population |  |  |
|  | 479,000 | 450,000 | 428,000 | 2.5 | 2.4 | 2.3 |
| Region: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| North Central | 128,000 | 120,000 | 114,000 | 2.4 | 2.2 | 2.2 |
| South ${ }^{\text {West }}$ | 176,000 128,000 | 166,000 119,000 | 161,000 112,000 | 2.9 4.0 | 2.8 3.8 | 2.8 3.6 |
| Northeast: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| New England | 17,469 | 16,384 | 14,421 | 1.6 | 1.5 | 1.3 |
| Middle Atlantic | 30,397 | 28,517 | 26,215 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.7 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| West North Central- | 33,407 | 33,074 | 31,801 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 2.0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| East South Central- | 36,185 64,432 | 65,769 63,913 | 35,502 60,907 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 2.8 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pacific- | 89,892 | 79,100 | 174,851 | 3.7 | 3.3 | ${ }^{1} 3.2$ |
| New England: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maine--- | 2,521 | 2,421 | 2,207 | 2.6 | 2.4 | 2.2 |
| New Hampshire | 1,573 | 1,425 | 1,373 | 2.3 | 2.2 | 2.1 |
| Vermont- | 601 | 608 | 501 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.3 |
| Massachusetts | 7,848 | 7,093 | 6,066 | 1.5 | 1.3 | 1.1 |
| Rhode Island | 1,193 | 1,100 | 1,055 | 1.3 | 1.2 | 1.2 |
| Connecticut- | 3,733 | 3,737 | 3,219 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.2 |
| Middle Atlantic: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| New York-- | 8,187 | 7,093 | 6,312 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.4 |
| New Jersey- | 5,632 | 5,285 | 5,114 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.8 |
| Pennsylvania | 16,578 | 16,139 | 14,789 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.3 |
| East North Central: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ohio--- | 25,780 | 25,053 | 23,731 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.4 |
| Indiana | 18,520 | 15,949 | 15,145 | 3.8 | 3.3 | 3.2 |
| Illinois- | 24,654 | 21, 290 | 20,765 | 2.3 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| Michigan- | 20,305 | 19,400 | 17,479 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.2 |
| Wisconsin- | 5,232 | 5,214 | 4,918 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.2 |
| West North Central: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minnesota-------- | 4,893 | 5,157 | 4,636 | 1.4 | 1.5 | 1.3 |
| Iowa------ | 5,258 | 5,091 | 5,003 | 1.9 | 1.8 | 1.8 |

See footnotes at end of table.

Table 4. Number of divorces and annulments and rate per 1,000 population: United States, each region, division, and State, 1963-65-Con.

| Region, division, and State | 1965 | 1964 | 1963 | 1965 | 1964 | 1963 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number of decrees |  |  | Rate per 1,000 population |  |  |
| West North Central-Con. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Missouri- | 13,185 | 12,785 | 12,652 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 2.9 |
| North Dakota | 720 | 758 | 689 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.1 |
| South Dakota | 1,015 | 951 | 953 | 1.5 | 1.4 | 1.3 |
| Nebraska- | 2,520 | 2,519 | 2,436 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 |
| Kansas | 5,816 | 5,813 | 5,432 | 2.6 | 2.6 | 2.4 |
| South Atlantic: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delaware- | 740 | 662 | 621 | 1.5 | 1.3 | 1.3 |
| Maryland- | 6,978 | 6,697 | 6,402 | 2.0 | 1.9 | 1.9 |
| District of Columbi | 1,328 | 1,190 | 1,214 | 1.7 | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| Virginia- | 8,889 | 8,580 | 8,101 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 1.9 |
| West Virginia | 3,852 | 3,826 | 3,769 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 2.1 |
| North Carolina | 11,150 | 7,225 | 7,308 | 2.3 | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| South Carolina | 2, 3,018 | 2,520 | 2,535 | 1.2 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Georgia- | ${ }^{2} 12,043$ | 11, 312 | 10,569 | 2.7 | 2.6 | 2.5 |
| Florida- | 25,334 | 23,757 | 22,910 | 4.4 | 4.2 | 4.1 |
| East South Central: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kentucky- | 8,276 | 7,942 | 7,139 | 2.6 | 2.5 | 2.3 |
| Tennessee | 11,143 | 10,725 | 10,345 | 2.9 | 2.8 | 2.8 |
| Alabama- | 11,036 | 11,088 | 12,566 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 3.7 |
| Mississippi | 5,730 | 5,631 | 5,452 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.4 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Arkansas-- | 6,622 | 26,059 | 26,483 | 3.4 | ${ }^{2} 3.1$ | ${ }^{2} 3.4$ |
| Louisiana ${ }^{2}$ | 4,623 | 4,704 | 3,415 | * | * | * |
| Oklahoma | 11,864 | 12,308 | 11,790 | 4.8 | 5.0 | 4.8 |
| Texas | 41,323 | 40,842 | 39,219 | 3.9 | 3.9 | 3.8 |
| Mountain: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Montana | 2,002 | 1,981 | 1,909 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 2.7 |
| Idaho- | 2,874 | 2,876 | 2,798 | 4.1 | 4.2 | 4.1 |
| Wyoming-1 | 1,414 | 1,411 | 1,359 | 4.3 | 4.2 | 4.1 |
| Colorado ${ }^{1}$ | 6,700 | 6,100 | 6,700 | 3.4 | 3.2 | 3.5 |
| New Mexico ${ }^{2}$ | 3,662 | 3,280 | 3,470 | 3.6 | $\pm$ | 3.5 |
| Arizona | 8,575 | 8,790 | 8,482 | 5.4 | 5.7 | 5.6 |
| Utah-- | 2,872 | 2,895 |  | 2.9 | 3.0 | 2.7 |
| Nevada | 9,996 | 11,849 | 9,682 | 23.0 | 28.3 | 24.8 |
| Pacific: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Washington- | 11, 518 | 10,864 | ${ }^{1} 9,953$ | 3.9 | 3.7 | 13.4 |
| Oregon--- | 6,219 | 6,486 | 6,180 | 3.2 | 3.4 | 3.3 |
| California | 69,926 | 59,094 | 56,274 | 3.8 | 3.3 | 3.2 |
| Alaska- | 1,118 | -966 | - 929 | 4.2 | 3.9 | 3.8 |
| Hawaii- | I, 111 | 1,690 | 1,515 | 1.6 | 2.4 | 2:2 |

[^3]Table 5. Divorce rates per 1,000 population: standard metropolitan statistical areas, 1960 and 1965
[ MSA 's as defined in 1960. State economic areas used in New England]

| Standard metropolitan statistical area | $\begin{gathered} \text { Rate per } \\ 1,000 \\ \text { population } \end{gathered}$ |  | Standard metropolitan statistical area | $\begin{gathered} \text { Rate per } \\ 1,000 \\ \text { population } \end{gathered}$ |  | Standard metropolitan statistical area | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Rate per } \\ & 1,000 \\ & \text { population } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1965 | 1960 |  | 1965 | 1960 |  | 1965 | 1960 |
| Abilene, Te | 3.7 | 3.8 | Columbus, Ohio | 3.4 | 3.6 | Jackson, Mic | 3.4 | 2.8 |
| Akron, Ohio | 2.0 | 2.8 | Corpus Christi, Tex-- | 4.0 | 3.6 | Jackson, Miss---.---- | 3.0 | 2. |
| Albany, Ga- | 4.3 | 2.0 | Dallas, Tex------ | 5.4 | 4.9 | Jacksonville, Fla---- | 4.2 | 3.7 |
| Albany-Schenectady- |  |  | Davenport-Rock Island |  |  | Jersey City, N.J----- | 1.0 | 0.8 |
| Albuquerque, N, Mex---------- | 1.1 5.2 | 0.7 4.6 | Moline, Iowa-I11---Dayton, Ohio------.-- | 3.6 | 3.0 | Johnstown, Pa-------- | 0.8 | 0.8 |
| Allentown-Bethlehem- |  |  | Decatur, I11 | 2.6 | 2.2 | Kalamazoo, Mich------- | 3.2 | 2.7 |
| Easton, Pa.-N.J------- | 2.4 | 1.4 | Denver, Colo | 3.9 | 3.1 | Kansas City, Mo.-Kans- | 3.6 | 3.4 |
| Altoona, Pa | 1.3 | 1.2 | Des Moines, Io | 3.5 | 3.3 | Kenosha, Wis--------- | 1.6 | 1.1 |
| Amarillo, Tex | 4.6 | 4.3 | Detroit, Mich | 2.5 | 2.3 | Knoxville, Tenn----- | 3.3 | 2.9 |
| Ann Arbor, Mich | 3.0 | 2.1 | Dubuque, Iowa | 1.1 | 0.9 | Lake Charles, La---- | 2.2 | 1.9 |
| Asheville, N.C--------- | 3.4 | 2.4 | Duluth-Superior, <br> Minn.-Wis | 1.5 | 1.1 |  | 1.6 | 1.3 |
| Atlanta, Ga | 3.0 | 2.6 | Durham, N.C | 3.3 | 2.0 | Lansing, Mich-...--.-- | 3.0 | 2.5 |
| Atlantic City, N.J----- | 1.1 | 1.3 | El Paso, Te | 3.1 | 4.1 | Laredo, Tex | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| Augusta, Ga. | 4.4 | 3.7 | Erie, Pa-- | 1.8 | 1.6 | Las Vegas, Nev---~--- | 20.6 | 30.2 |
| Austin, T | 4.9 | 3.8 | Eugene, Oreg | 3.4 | 3.3 | Lawton, Okl | 4.6 | 4.7 |
| Bakersfield, | 3.6 | 3.2 | Evansville, Ind. $-\mathrm{Ky}--$ <br> Fall River-New | 3.2 | 2.6 | Lexington, Ky---------- | 3.9 2.8 | 3.2 2.4 |
| Baltimore, Md----------- | 2.2 | 1.9 | Bedford, Mass-...---- | 1.6 | 1.2 | Lima, Ohio------------- | 2.8 2.7 | 2.4 2.5 |
| Baton Rouge, La-------- | 2.1 2.0 | 2.2 1.8 | Fargo-Moorhead, |  |  | Little Rock-North |  |  |
| Bay City, Mich--7---- | 2.0 | 1.8 | Flint, Mich- | $\frac{1}{3.5}$ | $\frac{1}{2.7}$ | Little Rock, Ark-m- | 5.0 | 5.3 |
| Tex------------ | 4.4 | 3.8 | Fort Lauderdale- |  |  | Lorain-Elyria, Ohio-- | 1.9 | 1.9 |
| Billings, Mont- | 3.4 | 4.0 | Hollywood, Fla------ | 4.0 | 3.1 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Fort Smith, Ark | 3.9 | 3.0 | Los Angeles-Long Beach, Calif-- |  |  |
| Binghamton, N.Y <br> Birmingham, Ala $\qquad$ | 0.7 3.8 | 0.8 3.5 | Fort Wayne, Ind | 2.9 5.6 | 2.6 |  | 4.2 | 3.4 2.8 |
| Birmingham, Ala-------- <br> Boston-Lowel1- | 3.8 | 3.5 | Fort Worth, Tex | 5.6 2.9 | 4.9 2.5 | Loulsbock, Tex---Ind-- | 3.9 | 3.8 4.6 |
| Lawrence, Mass ${ }^{1}$.------- | 1.3 | 1.0 | Gadsden, Ala | 4.4 | 3.9 | Lynchburg, Va--------- | 1.9 | $\frac{1}{3} .4$ |
| Bridgeport-Stamford Norwalk, Conn ${ }^{2}$ _...... |  |  |  |  |  | Macon, Ga------------ | 3.1 | 3.5 |
| Brockton, Mass ${ }^{\text {8 }}$ | 1.6 | 1.2 | Tex---------- | 4.4 | 5.0 | Madison, Wis- | 1.9 | 1.3 |
|  |  |  | Gary-Hammond-East |  |  | Manchester, N. | 2.1 | 1.8 |
| Brownsville-Harlingen- |  |  | Chicago, Ind---..-.-- | 5.9 | 2.8 | Memphis, Ten | 2.5 | 2.4 |
| San Benito, Tex---..- | 1.9 | 1.8 | Grand Rapids, Mich--- | 2.5 | 1.5 | Miami, Fla | 4,9 4.9 | 4.6 3.8 |
| Buffalo, N . Y | 0.8 | 0.7 |  | 3.0 1.0 | 2.9 | Midland, Te | 4.9 | 3.8 |
| Cantor, Ohio--- | 2.4 | 2.5 | Green Bay, Wis------- |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cedar Rapids, Iowa----- | 2.7 | 2.4 | Greensboro-High Point, |  |  | Milwaukee, Wis------- | 1.5 | 1.3 |
| Champaign-Uxbana, Ill-- | 2.2 | 1.8 | N.C----------------- <br> Greenville, S.C- | 3.3 | 2.1 | Minneapolis-St. Paul, | 2 |  |
| Charleston, S.C | 2.1 | 1.7 | Hamilton-Middietown, |  |  | Mobile, Al | 2.3 | 2.4 |
| Charleston, W. | 2.4 | 2.1 | Ohio-------------- | 3.2 | 3.1 | Monroe, T, | 2.2 | 2.2 |
| Charlotte, N.C- | 2.8 | 1.3 | Harrisburg, Pa------- | 1.9 | 1.7 | Montgomery, Ala------ | 4.0 | 3.7 |
| Chattanooga, Tenn.-Ga-- | 4.3 | 3.3 | Hartford-New Britain- |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chicago, I11----------- | 2.3 | 2.1 | Bristol, Conn ${ }^{\text {- }}$---- | 0.4 | 0.9 | Muncie, Ind-n-------- | 9.0 | 4.1 |
|  |  |  | Honolulu, Hawaii----- | 1.7 | 2.3 | Muskegon-Musl yon |  |  |
| Cincinnati, Ohio-Ky | $\frac{1}{2.9}$ | 2.5 2.2 | Houston, Tex------ | 4.7 | 4.1 | Heights, Mic Nashville, | 2.7 2.6 | 2.5 3.0 |
| Colorado Springs, Colo- | 4.1 | 3.5 | W. Va.-Ky-Ohio---- | 3.2 | ${ }^{5} 2.8$ | Newark, N.J-..---...-- | 0.8 | 0.8 |
| Columbia, S.C---------- | 1.6 | 1.8 | Huntsville, Ala------ | 2.9 | 3.2 | New Haven-Waterbury, |  |  |
| Columbus, Ga.-Ala------ | 5.1 | 5.0 | Indianapolis, Ind | 3.7 | 3.2 | Conn ${ }^{7}$ | 1.4 | 0.9 |

${ }^{1}$ Rates for Massachusetts State Economic Area C; the 1965 rate excludes Essex County.
${ }^{2}$ Rates for Connecticut State Economic Area A.
${ }^{3}$ Rates for Massachusetts State Economic Area D.
${ }^{4}$ Rates for Connecticut State Economic Area C.
${ }^{5}$ Rate for 1960 includes Boyd County, Ky .
${ }^{6}$ Rates for New Hampshire State Economic Area A.
${ }^{7}$ Rates for Connecticut State Economic Area B.

Table 5. Divorce rates per 1,000 population: standard metropolitan statistical areas, 1960 and $1965-C o n$.
[SMSA's as defined in 1960. State economic areas used in New England]

| Standard metropolitan statistical area | $\begin{gathered} \text { Rate per } \\ 1,000 \\ \text { population } \end{gathered}$ |  | Standard metropolitan statistical area | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Rate per } \\ & \text { I,000 } \\ & \text { population } \end{aligned}$ |  | Standard metropolitan statistical area | $\begin{gathered} \text { Rate per } \\ 1,000 \\ \text { population } \end{gathered}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1965 | 1960 |  | 1965 | 1960 |  | 1965 | 1960 |
| New Orleans, La ${ }^{8}$ | 2.3 | 1.4 | Sacriamento, Calif | 4.0 | 3.4 | Syracuse, N.Y- | 0.7 | 0.8 |
| Newport News-Hampton, |  |  | Saginaw, Mích--------. | 2.3 | 1.8 | Tacoma, Wash- | 3.7 | 3.8 |
| Va------------------- | 2.4 | 2.1 | St. Joseph, Mo-------- | 4.0 | 3.6 | Tampa-St. Petersburg, | 3.7 |  |
| New York, N.Y---------- | 0.3 | 0.3 | St. Louis, Mo.-Ill---- | 2.9 | 2.7 |  | 4.1 | 3.8 |
| Norfolk-Portsmouth, <br>  |  |  | Salt Lake City, Utah-- | 3.5 | 3.0 | Terre Haute, Ind------.. | 3.4 | 3.7 |
| Va-s------- | 2.7 | 2.6 | San Angelo, Tex------- | 4.3 | 3.4 | Texarkana, Tex.-Ark---- | 3.6 | 4.8 |
| Ogden, Utah------------- | 3.7 | 3.2 | San Antonio, Tex----- | 3.8 | 3.7 | Toledo, Ohio----------- | 3.3 | 2.7 |
| Oklahoma City, Okla-..- | 4.9 | 5.0 | San Bernardino-River- |  |  | Topeka, Kans------------ | 4.2 | 4.0 |
| Omaha, Nebr.-Iowa------ | 2.5 | 2.4 | side-Ontario, Calif-- | 3.4 | 2.5 | Trenton, N.J------------ | 1.2 | 0.9 |
| Orlando, F'la----------- | 2.1 | 1.7 | San Diego, Calif------ | 4.2 | 3.4 | Tueson, Ari | 4.1 | 3.7 |
| Paterson-Clifton- |  |  | San Francisco-Oakland, Calif. $\qquad$ |  |  | Tulsa, Okla | 6.9 | 6.8 |
| Passaic, N.J---------- | 0.8 | 0.5 | San Jose, Cali£------ | 3.7 | 3.1 |  |  |  |
| Pensacola, Fla--------- | 5.0 | 4.4 |  |  |  | Tuscaloosa, Ala------- | 2.5 | 2.8 |
| Peoria, III------------ | 3.0 | 2.6 |  |  |  | Tyler, Tex-------------- | 3.6 | 3.6 |
| Philadelphia, Pa. -N.J-- | 1.3 | 1.2 | Santa Barbara, Calif-- | 3.3 | 2.4 | Utica-Rome, N. | 0.4 | 0.6 |
| Phoenix, Ariz---.---- | 6.7 | 4.1 | Savannah, Ga---------- | 4.2 | 3.8 | Waco, Tex-------------- | 3.8 | 3.1 |
| Pittsburgh, Pa--------- | 1.5 | 1.3 | Scranton, Pa Seattle, Wash | 1.1 3.7 | 1.0 3.5 | Washington, D.C.-Md.- | 1.8 | 1.4 |
| Pittsfield, Mass ${ }^{9}$------ | 2.4 | 1.2 | Shreveport, La--------- | --- | --- |  |  |  |
| Portland, Maine ${ }^{10}$ | 2.9 | 2.6 |  |  |  | Waterloo, Iowa | 2.3 | 2.2 |
| Portland, Oreg.-Wash--- | 3.3 | 3.6 |  |  |  | West PaIm Beach, Fla--- | 3.6 | 3.3 |
| Providence, R.III----------- | 1.3 | 1.1 | Sioux City, Iowa------ Sioux Falls, S. Dak--- | 2.7 2.3 | 2.3 | Wheeling, W. Va.-0hio-- | 3.6 1.9 | 1. 5 |
| Provo-Orem, Utah------- | 2.4 | 1.9 | South Bend, Ind | 2.3 | 2.0 |  | 3.8 | 3.0 |
| Pueblo, Colo----------- | 2.8 | 2.6 | Spokane, Wash-o------- | 3.9 | 3.5 | Wichita Falls, Tex----- | 4.4 | 4.8 |
| Racine, Wis | 0.9 | 1.3 | Sprimgfield, Ill------ | 3.3 | 2.5 |  |  |  |
| Raleigh, N.C | 2.6 | 1.4 |  |  |  | Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton, |  |  |
| Reading, Pa------------ | 2.0 | 1.8 | Springfield, Mo------- | 4.0 | 3.7 |  | 0.9 | 0.7 |
| Reno, Nev--------------- | 35.2 | 43.3 | Springfield, Ohio----- | 3.6 | 3.3 | Wilmington, Del. -N.J--- | 1.4 | 1.6 |
| Richmond, Va |  |  | Springfield-Holyoke, Mass ${ }^{12}$ |  |  | Winston-Salem, N.C---- | 2.5 | 1.5 |
| Roanoke, Va | 3.0 2.5 | 3.1 | Mass ${ }^{\text {Steubenville-Weirton, }}$ | 1.7 | 1.3 | Worcester, Mass York, Pa- | 1.7 | 1.1 |
| Rochester, N. | 0.8 | 0.7 | Ohio-W. Va------ | 2.8 | 1.9 | Youngstown-Warren, | 2.2 | 1.9 |
| Rockford, Ill | 3.3 | 2.7 | Stockton, Calif------- | 3.4 | 2.5 | Ohio---------- | 2.3 | 2.1 |

${ }^{8}$ Rate for 1960 excludes St. Bernard Parish; rate for 1965 excludes Jefferson Parish.
${ }^{3}$ Rates for Massachusetts State Economic Area F.
${ }^{10}$ Rates for Maine State Economic Area A.
${ }^{11}$ Rates for Rhode Island State Economic Area A.
${ }^{12}$ Rates for Massachusetts State Economic Area A.
Source: Population bases from Current Population Reports, Series, P-25, No. 271.

Table 6. Divorce rates per 1,000 population for metropolitan and nonmetropolitan areas: United States, each division, and State, 1960 and 1965
[SMSA's as defined in 1960. State economic areas used in Now England.]
Geographic division and State $\quad$ [SMSA's as defined in 1960. State economic areas used in New England.]

Rate per 1,000 population in each area

|  | 2.5 | 2.6 | 2.9 | 1.6 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.3 | 2.5 | 1.4 | 2.1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Geographic division: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| New England-n----- | 1.6 | 1.4 | 1.6 | 1.2 | 2.0 | 1.2 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 0.9 | 1.6 |
| Middle Atlantic--- | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 0.8 |
| East North Central | 2.5 | 2.6 | 2.7 | 2.1 | 2.2 | 2.1 | 2.3 | 2.4 | 2.1 | 1.8 |
| West North Central ${ }^{1}$ | 2.1 | 2.8 | 3.0 | 2.5 | 1.5 | 1.9 | 2.5 | 2.7 | 1.9 | 1.3 |
| South Atlantic ${ }^{\text {c-a }}$ | 2.6 | 3.0 | 3.3 | 2.0 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 2.5 | 2.9 | 1.4 | 1.8 |
| East South Central ${ }^{1}$ | 2.8 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 2.8 | 2.6 | 3.4 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.5 |
| West South Central ${ }^{1}$ | 3.7 | 4.3 | 4.4 | 3.6 | 2.9 | 3.4 | 4.0 | 4.1 | 2.7 | 2.7 |
| Mountain' ${ }^{\text {- }}$---- | 5.0 | 6.2 | 6.8 | 2.9 | 3.6 | 4.2 | 5.4 | 5.9 | 2.3 | 3.1 |
| Pacific- | 3.7 | 3.8 | 4.0 | 2.5 | 3.3 | 3.1 | 3.2 | 3.3 | 2.8 | 2.8 |
| New England: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maine---- | 2.6 | 2.9 | 2.9 | - | 2.5 | 2.2 | 2.6 | 2.6 | - | 2.1 |
| New Hampshire | 2.3 | 2.1 | 2.1 | - | 2.4 | 1.8 | 1.8 | 1.8 | - | 1.9 |
| Vermont-- | 1.5 | - |  | - | 1.5 | 2.2 |  |  | - | 1.2 |
| Massachusetts | 1.5 | 1.4 | 1.7 | 1.2 | 2.3 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.3 | 0.9 | 1.3 |
| Rhode Island-- | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 0.9 | 1.4 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.3 | 1.0 |
| Connecticut-- | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.3 |  | 1.6 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 0.9 | - | 1.3 |
| Middle Atlantic: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| New York---- | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.6 |
| New Jersey- | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.7 |
| Pennsylvania | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.5 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.1 | 1.1 |
| East North Central: | 2.5 | 2.6 | 2.6 | 2.5 | 2.3 | 2.4 | 25 | 2.6 | 2 | 19 |
| Indiana- | 3.8 | 4.2 | 4.3 | 2.8 | 3.4 | 2.7 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 2.5 | 2.6 |
| Illinois | 2.3 | 2.4 | 2.7 | 1.8 | 1.9 | 2.2 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.2 | 1.9 |
| Michigan ${ }^{1}$ | 2.4 | 2.6 | 2.7 | 2.4 | 2.0 | 2.1 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.0 | 1.7 |
| Wisconsin- | 1.3 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.4 | 1.1 | 0.9 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 0.8 | 0.7 |
| West North Central: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minnesota- | 1.4 | 2.1 | 2.0 | 2.7 | 0.5 . | 1.2 | 1.6 | 1.7 | $\frac{1}{2} \cdot 0$ | 0.8 |
| Missouri! | 2.9 | 3.3 | 3.8 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.7 | 3.1 | 3.6 | 1.4 1.9 | $\frac{1}{2.1}$ |
| North Dakota | 1.1 | 1.5 | 1.5 | - | 1.1 | 0.9 | 1.9 | 1.9 | - | 0.8 |
| South Dakota | 1.5 | 2.3 | 2.3 | - | 1.3 | 1.2 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 5 | 1.0 |
| Nebraska- | 1.7 | 2.5 | 2.6 | 1.4 | 1.2 | 1.5 | 2.4 | 2.5 | 1.5 | 1.0 |
| Kansas- | 2.6 | 3.4 | 3.9 | 2.6 | 2.1 | 2.2 | 2.9 | 3.2 | 2.5 | 1.8 |
| South Atlantic: | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | - |  |  | 1.7 | 1.7 |  | 1.3 |
| Delaware-- | 2.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 1.5 | 1.9 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 2.6 | 1.2 | 1.4 |
| District of Columbi | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 |  |  | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 |  |  |
| Virginia- | 2.0 | 2.8 | 3.0 | 2.6 | 1.1 | 1.9 | 2.2 | 3.0 | 1.5 | 1.4 |
| West Virginia | 2.1 | 2.6 | 2.7 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 2.2 | 2.3 | 1.5 | 1.8 |
| North Caxolina | 2.3 | 2.9 | 2.9 | - | 2.0 | 1.3 | 1.7 | 1.7 |  | 1.2 |
| South Carolina | 1.2 | 1.9 | 2.1 | 1.1 | 0.8 | 1.3 | 1.8 | 1.9 | 1.3 | 1.1 |
| Georgia | 2.7 | 3.6 | 3.9 | 2.1 | 1.9 | 2.3 | 3.1 | 3.4 | 1.8 | 1.5 |
| Florida- | 4.4 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.8 | 3.9 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 3.4 | 4.3 |
| East South Central: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kentucky | 12.6 | 3.0 | 3.4 | 2.1 | 2.4 2.8 | 2.8 | 3.0 2.8 | 2.9 | 3.2 | 2.8 |
| Alabama-- | 3.2 | 3.5 | 3.4 | 6.6 | 2.9 | 5.3 | 3.4 | 3.2 | 8.5 | 6.9 |
| Mississippi- | 2.5 | 3.0 | 3.0 | - | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.5 | 2.5 | - | 2.4 |
| West South Central: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Arkansas ${ }^{\text {L }}$ - | 13.4 | 4.7 2.2 | 4.7 2.3 | 1.1 | 3.1 | 3.4 1.5 | 4.8 1.7 | 4.8 1.8 | 1.0 | 3.0 1.4 |
| Oklahoma- | 4.8 | 5.6 | 5.9 | 4.1 | 4.2 | 4.6 | 5.7 | 6.0 | 3.7 | 3.8 |
| Texas | 3.9 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 3.7 | 2.8 | 3.6 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 3.4 | 2.6 |
| Mountain: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Montana- | 2.8 | 3.2 | 3.2 | - | 2.7 | 3.0 | 3.4 | 3.4 | - | 2.8 |
| Idaho-- | 4.1 | 3.3 | 3.3 | - | 4.3 | 3.9 | 3.8 | 3.9 | - | 3.9 |
| Wyouing- | 4.3 | $\stackrel{-}{8}$ |  | - | 4.3 | 4.0 | , | - | 3 | 4.0 |
| Colorado- | 3.4 | 3.8 | 4.6 | 2.9 | 2.5 | 2.7 | 3.1 | 3.5 | 2.3 | 1.9 |
| New Mexico ${ }^{1}$ | 3.6 | 5.2 | 5.2 | - | 3.2 | 3.3 | 4.6 | 4.6 | - | 2.7 |
| Arizona | 5.4 | 6.0 | 6.0 | - | 4.2 | 3.7 | 4.0 | 4.0 | - | 2.9 |
| Utah | 2.9 | 3.4 | 3.4 | - | 1.9 | 2.4 | 2.8 | 2.8 | - | 1.6 |
| Nevada- | 23.0 | 25.4 | 25.4 | - | 13.9 | 29.6 | 35.5 | 35.5 | - | 12.8 |
| Pacific: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Washington- | 3.9 | 3.8 | 3.7 | 4.0 | 4.1 | 3.3 | 3.4 | 3.4 | 3.4 | 3.0 |
| Oregon--- | 3.2 | 3.2 | 3.6 | 2.3 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 3.6 | 3.9 | 2.4 | 2.9 |
| California- | 3.8 | 3.9 | 4.2 | 2.5 | 3.0 | 3.1 | 3.2 | 3.3 | 2.8 | 2.7 |
|  | 4.2 1.6 | 1.7 | $1 . \overline{7}$ | - | 4.2 0.8 | 3.5 2.0 |  | $2 . \overline{3}$ | - | 3.5 1.1 |
| Hawaii--------------------------------- | 1.6 | 1.7 | 1.7 | - | 0.6 | 2.0 | 2.3 |  |  |  |

${ }^{1}$ Reporting countles only; population of counties failing to report the number of divorces is excluded.
Source: Population bases from Current Population Reports, Series P-25, No. 371.

Table 7. Number and percent distribution of divorces and annulments, by age at decree of husband and wife: 10 selected registration States, 1965
[Based on sample data. These States reported age at decree with a completeness of 85 percent or higher]


Table 8. Estimated number and rate of divorces and anmulments, by age of husband and wife at decree: United States, 1965
[For method of estimating, see appendix]

| Age at decree | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Number } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { divorces } \end{aligned}$ | ```Rate per 1,000 population in each age-sex group``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Husband |  |  |
| Total- | 479,000 | 10.8 |
| Under 20 years | 6,700 | 27.1 |
| 20-24 years - | 81,000 | 28.8 |
| 25-29 years- | 93,900 | 21.7 |
| 30-34 years | 72,300 | 15.7 |
| 35-44 years | 120,200 | 11.7 |
| 45-54 years - | 70,900 | 7.5 |
| 55-64 years--- | 24,900 | 3.7 |
| 65 years and over | 9,100 | 1.6 |
| Wife |  |  |
| Total- | 479,000 | 10.6 |
| Under 20 years | 31,600 | 30.6 |
| 20-24 years | 114,500 | 26.0 |
| 25-29 years | 87,700 | 17.7 |
| 30-34 years- | 63,700 | 12.6 |
| 35-44 years | 106,800 | 9.7 |
| 45-54 years | 55,600 | 6.0 |
| 55-64 years | 15,300 | 2.6 |
| 65 years and over | 3,800 | 1.0 |

Source: Population data from Gurrent Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 144.

Table 9. Percent distribution of the total married population of the United States by age and of husbands and wives divorced in 10 selected registration States, by age at decree: 1965
[For method of estimating, see appendix]

| Age | Married population of U.S. | Persons divorced in 10 States | Ratio between the percents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Husband | Percent distribution |  |  |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 1.0 |
| Under 20 years- | 0.6 | 1.4 | 2.3 |
| 20-24 years | 6.4 | 16.9 | 2.6 |
| 25-29 years- | 9.8 | 19.6 | 2.0 |
| 30-34 years- | 10.4 | 15.1 | 1.5 |
| 35-44 years- | 23.3 | 25.1 | 1.1 |
| 45-54 years- | 21.5 | 14.8 | 0.7 |
| 55-64 years- | 15.3 | 5.2 | 0.3 |
| 65 years and over- | 12.7 | 1.9 | 0.1 |
| Wife |  |  |  |
| Total- | 100.0 | 100.0 | 1.0 |
| Under 20 years | 2.3 | 6.6 | 2.9 |
| 20-24 years | 9.7 | 23.9 | 2.5 |
| 25-29 years- | 11.0 | 18.3 | 1.7 |
| 30-34 years | 11.2 | 13.3 | 1.2 |
| 35-44 years | 24.3 | 22.3 | 0.9 |
| 45-54 years- | 20.4 | 11.6 | 0.6 |
| 55-64 years- | 13.0 | 3.2 | 0.2 |
| 65 years and over | 8.1 | 0.8 | 0.1 |

[^4]Table 10. Median age of all married persons in the United States and the highest and lowest State median age at decree in the divorce-registration area: 1959-65
[State medians for 1960-65 based on sample data]


Source: Median age of all married persons from Current Population Reports, Series P-20.

Table 11. Percent distribution of divorces and annulments, by age of divorced husbands and wives at marriage: 10 selected registration States, 1965
[Based on sample data. These States reported age at marriage with a completeness of 85 percent or higher]


Table 12. Medians and quartiles of age of divorced husbands and wives at marriage: 10 selected registration States, 1965
[Based on sample data. These States reported age at marriage with a completeness of 85 percent or higher]

| State | $\begin{gathered} \text { First } \\ \text { quartile } \end{gathered}$ | Median | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Third } \\ & \text { quartile } \end{aligned}$ | Interquartile range |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Husband | Age at marriage |  |  |  |
| Total | 20.7 | 23.6 | 29.1 | 8.4 |
| Hawaii------ | 22.2 | 25.6 | 32.8 | 10.6 |
| Iowa- | 20.6 | 23.6 | 29.5 | 8.9 |
| Kansas | 21.0 | 24.0 | 30.0 | 9.0 |
| Missouri- | 20.7 | 24.0 | 31.3 | 10.6 |
| Montana - | 21.6 | 24.6 | 32.0 | 10.4 |
| Nebraska----- | 20.9 | 23.6 | 28.7 | 7.8 |
| Pennsylvania - | 20.8 | 23.5 | 28.0 | 7.2 |
| Tennessee--- | 19.8 | 23.2 | 28.7 | 8.9 |
| Virginia | 20.4 | 23.2 | 27.9 | 7.5 |
| Wisconsin--- | 21.1 | 23.7 | 28.7 | 7.6 |
| Wife |  |  |  |  |
| Total- | 17.1 | 20.4 | 24.9 | 7.8 |
| Hawaii- | 19.9 | 23.5 | 29.7 | 9.8 |
| Iowa--- | 17.1 | 20.2 | 24.8 | 7.7 |
| Kansas- | 17.3 | 20.8 | 26.2 | 8.9 |
| Missouri- | 17.2 | 20.7 | 27.2 | 10.0 |
| Montana- | 17.7 | 21.6 | 27.4 | 9.7 |
| Nebraska- | 17.3 | 20.8 | 24.6 | 7.3 |
| Pennsylvania---- | 17.2 | 20.5 | 24.4 | 7.2 |
| Tennessee | 16.8 | 19.6 | 24.7 | 7.9 |
| Virginia | 16.8 | 19.7 | 24.4 | 7.6 |
| Wisconsin- | 17.5 | 21.0 | 24.8 | 7.3 |

Table 13. Percent of brides and grooms and of divorced husbands and wives married under age 20: 15 selected registration States, ${ }^{1}$ 1957-65
[Based on sample data for 1960 and later years]

| Year | Husband |  | Wife |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Married | $\begin{gathered} \text { Di- } \\ \text { vorced } \end{gathered}$ | Married | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Di- } \\ & \text { vorced } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Percent |  |  |  |
| 1965- | 15.3 | 20.0 | 40.0 | 48.9 |
| 1964- | 14.0 | 20.2 | 38.2 | 49.3 |
| 1963-- | 14.1 | 19.7 | 38.6 | 47.4 |
| 1962- | 15.3 | 18.9 | 40.5 | 47.4 |
| 1961-- | 14.3 | 20.0 | 40.4 | 47.8 |
| 1960-- | 14.0 | 16.4 | 40.3 | 46.0 |
| 1959-- | 13.2 | --- | 39.1 | --- |
| 1958-- | 12.9 | --- | 39.0 |  |
| 1957-- | 12.0 | --- | 37.8 |  |

[^5]Table 14. Median age of husband and wife at decree; divorce-registration area and each registration State, 1959-65
[Based on sample data for 1960 and later years]

${ }^{1}$ Data for Hawaii not included in the DRA total for 1959.

Table 15. Median age of divorced husbands and wives at marriage: divorce-registration area and each registration State, 1960-65
[Based on sample data]


Table 16. Medians and quartiles of age of husbands and wives: 10 selected registration States ${ }^{1}$, 1960-65
[Based on sample data]


## Husband








## Wife






$1960^{2}$

Age at marriage

| 20.7 | 23.6 | 29.1 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 20.7 | 23.7 | 29.1 |
| 20.7 | 23.8 | 29.4 |
| 21.0 | 24.0 | 30.0 |
| 20.7 | 23.8 | 29.7 |
| --- | .-- | .-- |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| 17.1 | 20.4 | 24.9 |
| 17.1 | 20.3 | 24.9 |
| 17.2 | 20.5 | 25.0 |
| 17.2 | 20.6 | 25.6 |
| 17.2 | 20.5 | 25.4 |
| --- | --- | --- |

[^6]Table 17. Percent distribution of divorces and annulments, by race of husband and wife: 10 selected registration States, 1965
[Based on sample data. These States reported race with a completeness of 85 percent or higher]

| State | $\underset{\text { races }}{\text { All }}$ | White | Noriwhite |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Total | Negro | Other |
| Husband | Percent distribution |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 100.0 | 89.1 | 10.9 | 9.7 | 1.2 |
| Hawaii- | 100.0 | 51.0 | 49.0 | 1.5 | 47.5 |
| Iowa- | 100.0 | 97.5 | 2.5 | 2.4 | 0.1 |
| Kansas | 100.0 | 93.2 | 6.8 | 6.5 | 0.4 |
| Missouri-- | 100.0 | 87.9 | 12.1 | 12.1 | - |
| Montana- | 100.0 | 95.7 | 4.3 | 0.8 | 3.5 |
| Nebraska- | 100.0 | 94.9 | 5.1 | 4.7 | 0.4 |
| Rhode Island-- | 100.0 | 96.0 | 4.0 | 3.7 | 0.3 |
| Tennessee- | 100.0 | 88.6 | 11.4 | 11.4 | 0.0 |
| Virginia- | 100.0 | 81.8 | 18.2 | 17.9 | 0.2 |
| Wisconsin- | 100.0 | 94.0 | 6.0 | 5.4 | 0.6 |
| Wife |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 100.0 | 88.9 | 11.1 | 9.6 | 1.5 |
| Hawaii-- | 100.0 | 45.3 | 54.7 | 0.6 | 54.1 |
| Iowa- | 100.0 | 97.5 | 2.5 | 2.3 | 0.2 |
| Kansas- | 100.0 | 93.1 | 6.9 | 6.4 | 0.5 |
| Missouri- | 100.0 | 87.8 | 12.2 | 12.1 | 0.1 |
| Montana- | 100.0 | 95.3 | 4.8 | 0.6 | 4.2 |
| Nebraska- | 100.0 | 95.1 | 4.9 | 4.5 | 0.4 |
| Rhode Island- | 100.0 | 96.2 | 3.8 | 3.5 | 0.3 |
| Tennessee-- | 100.0 | 88.4 | 11.6 | 11.4 | 0.2 |
| Virginia- | 100.0 | 81.4 | 18.6 | 18.0 | 0.5 |
| Wisconsin- | 100.0 | 94.3 | 5.7 | 5.2 | 0.5 |

Table 18. Number and percent distribution of divorces and annulments, by color of husband and wife: divorce-registration area, 1960 and 1963-65
[Based on sample data]

| Year and color | Total | Hawaii | Other <br> States | Total | Hawaii | Other States |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1965 | Number of divorces |  |  | Percent distribution ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |
| All decree | 164,942 | 1,110 | 163,832 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Both spouses white---------------------------- | 86,107 | 420 | 85,687 | 89.4 | 37.9 | 90.0 |
| Both spouses nonwhite | 9,503 | 461 | 9,042 | 9.9 | 41.6 | 9.5 |
| Husband white, wife nonwhite | 461 | 146 | 315 | 0.5 | 13.2 | 0.3 |
| Husband nonwhite, wife white | 288 | 82 | $\begin{array}{r} 206 \\ 68,582 \end{array}$ | 0.3 | 7.4 | 0.2 |
| Not stated for either or both spouse | 68,583 |  |  | ... | . $\cdot$ | ... |
| All decrees | 160,987 | 1,688 | 159,299 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
|  | 83,103 | 613 | 82,490 | 89.3 | 36.3 | 90.2 |
| Both spouses nonwhit | 9,156 | 695 | 8,461 | 9.8 | 41.2 | 9.3 |
| Husband white, wife nonwhit | 516 | 249 | 267 | 0.6 | 14.8 | $\begin{aligned} & 0.3 \\ & 0.2 \end{aligned}$ |
| Husband nonwhite, wife whit | $\begin{array}{r} 323 \\ 67,889 \end{array}$ | $1$ | 67, 888. |  |  |  |
| Not stated for either or both spouses |  |  |  |  | ... | . . |
| A11 decrees-------------------------------- | 152,594 | 1,514 | 151,080 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Both spouses white--------------------- | 75,873 | 493 | 75,380 | 89.1 | 33.4 | 90.1 |
| Both spouses nonwhite | 8,694 | 643 | 8,051 | 10.2 | 43.6 | 9.6 |
| Husband white, wife nonwhite | 355 | 209 | 146 | 0.40.3 | 14.28.8 | 0.20.1 |
| Husband nonwhite, wife whi | $67,442$ |  | 101 |  |  |  |
| Not stated for either or both spouses- |  | $40$ | 67,402 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | ... |
| 1960 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 94,074 | 1,270 | 92,804 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Both spouses white----------------------------- | 57,124 | 410 | 56,714 | 88.7 | 32.3 | 89.8 |
| Both spouses nonwhite | 6,797 | 588 | 6,209 | 10.6 | 46.4 | 9.8 |
| Husband white, wife nonwhit | 275 | 166 | 109 | 0.40.3 | 13.1 | 0.2 |
| Husband nonwhite, wife whit | 217 | 1042 | 11329,659 |  | 8.2 | 0.2 |
| Not stated for either or both spouses-------- | 29,661 |  |  | . . . |  |  |

${ }^{1}$ DRA included 18 States in 1960 and 22 States in 1963-65.
${ }^{2}$ Percentages exclude couples with color not stated for either or both spouses.

Table 19. Percent distribution of divorces and annulments, by number of this marriage: nine selected registration States, 1965
[Based on sample data. These States reported the number of this marriage with a completeness of 85 percent or higher]

| State | $\begin{gathered} \text { AlI } \\ \text { marriages } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { First } \\ & \text { marriage } \end{aligned}$ | Remarriages |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Total | 2d | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \mathrm{~d} \\ & \text { or more } \end{aligned}$ |
| Husband | Percent distribution |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 100.0 | 74.1 | 25.9 | 19.7 | 6.1 |
| Hawaii | 100.0 | 70.1 | 29.9 | 22.3 | 7.6 |
| Iowa- | 100.0 | 70.9 | 29.1 | 21.3 | 7.8 |
| Kansas- | 100.0 | 68.2 | 31.8 | 23.1 | 8.7 |
| Missouri- | 100.0 | 72.2 | 27.8 | 19.6 | 8.1 |
| Montana- | 100.0 | 69.3 | 30.7 | 22.9 | 7.8 |
| Rhode Island- | 100.0 | 87.0 | 13.0 | 12.0 | 1.0 |
| Tennessee- | 100.0 | 71.5 | 28.5 | 22.0 | 6.6 |
| Virginia- | 100.0 | 82.7 | 17.3 | 15.3 | 1.9 |
| Wisconsin- | 100.0 | 79.2 | 20.8 | 17.6 | 3.1 |
| Total- | 100.0 | 73.2 | 26.8 | 20.2 | 6.6 |
| Hawaii- | 100.0 | 65.5 | $3 \dot{4} .5$ | 25.3 | 9.2 |
| Iowa- | 100.0 | 70.1 | 29.9 | 21.2 | 8.7 |
| Kansas- | 100.0 | 67.3 | 32.7 | 24.0 | 8.6 |
| Missouri- | 100.0 | 71.4 | 28.6 | 20.4 | 8.2 |
| Montana-- | 100.0 | 65.5 | 34.5 | 25.1 | 9.4 |
| Rhode Island-- | 100.0 | 86.3 | 13.7 | 11.7 | 2.0 |
| Tennessee- | 100.0 | 71.8 | 28.2 | 22.0 | 6.1 |
| Virginia- | 100.0 | . 81.3 | 18.7 | 15.4 | 3.3 |
| Wisconsin- | 100.0 | 78.0 | 22.0 | 17.8 | 4.2 |

Table 20. Percent distribution of divorces and marriages, by marriage order of husband and wife: nine selected registration States, 1 selected years
[For 1980-65, based on sample data; for 1956-59, based on total counts]

| Event and year | Total | Husband |  | Wife |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Married once | Married more than once | Married once | Married more than once |
| Divorces | Pexcent distribution |  |  |  |  |
| 1965- | 100.0 | 75.7 | 24.4 | 74.0 | 26.0 |
| 1964- | 100.0 | 74.3 | 25.7 | 73.9 | 26.1 |
| 1963- | 100.0 | 74.1 | 25.9 | 73,2 | 26.8 |
| 1962- | 100.0100.0 | $\begin{aligned} & 72.5 \\ & 73.2 \end{aligned}$ | 27.5 | 71.4 | 28.6 |
| 1961- |  |  | 26.8 | 72.4 | 27.6 |
| Marriages |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1965- | 100.0 | 78.1 | 21.9 | 78.2 | 21.8 |
| 1964- | 100.0 | 78.0 | 22.0 | 78.4 | 21.6 |
| 1963- | 100.0 | 78.6 | 21.4 | 78.3 | 21.7 |
| 1962- | 100.0 | 78.7 | 21.3 | 79,1 | 20.9 |
| 1961- | 100.0 | 78.4 | 21.6 | 79.1 | 20.9 |
| 1960- | 100.0 | 79.3 | 20.7 | 78.7 | 21,3 |
| 1959- | 100.0 | 79.3 | 20.7 | 78.6 | 21.4 |
| 1958- | 100.0 | 79.8 | 20,2 | 79,2 | 20.8 |
| 1957-- | 100.0 | 80.4 | 19.6 | 79,7 | 20.3 |
| 1956- | 100.0 | 80.2 | 19.8 | 79,4 | 20,6 |

${ }^{1}$ Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Maryland, Michigan, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, and Utah.

Table 21. Percent distribution of divorces and annulments, by color, age of husband and wife, and marriage order: five selected registration States, 11963
[Based on sample data]


[^7]Table 22. Percent distribution of divorces and annulments,by resident status of defendant husband and wife: divorce-registration area and 12 selected registration States, 1965
[Based on sample data. These States reported residence with a completeness of 85 percent or higher]

| Area and State | Total | Resident of State where decree granted | Resident of other State, same region | Not resident of region |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Defendant husband | Percent distribution |  |  |  |
| Divorce-registration area----------------------------- | 100.0 | 86.1 | 6.5 | 7.4 |
|  | 100.0 | 88.9 | 6.6 | 4.5 |
|  | 100.0 | 81.7 | 8.6 | 9.7 |
|  | 100.0 | 88.3 | 6.4 | 5.3 |
|  | 100.0 | 77.4 | 12.9 | 9.7 |
|  | 100.0 | 88.7 | 4.6 | 6.7 |
|  | 100.0 | 84.8 | 9.7 | 5.5 |
|  | 100.0 | 90.0 | 1.7 | 8.3 |
|  | 100.0 | 85.8 | 5.5 | 8.7 |
| Rhode Island-------------------------------------------------1- | 100.0 | 84.9 | 8.6 | 6.6 |
|  | 100.0 | 88.0 | 5.5 | 6.5 |
|  | 100.0 | 71.8 | 15.5 | 12.6 |
|  | 100.0 | 89.3 | 5.7 | 5.0 |
| Defendant wife |  |  |  |  |
| Divorce-registration area---------------------------- | 100.0 | 75.4 | 9.4 | 15.2 |
|  | 100.0 | 76.7 | 10.2 | 13.1 |
| Hawaii------------------------------------------------------- | 100.0 | 57.9 | 16.0 | 26.1 |
|  | 100.0 | 77.7 | 7.8 | 14.5 |
|  | 100.0 | 74.3 | 11.4 | 14.3 |
|  | 100.0 | 76.6 | 7.5 | 15.9 |
| Montana----------------------------------------------------- | 100.0 | 70.9 | 17.9 | 11.2 |
|  | 100.0 | 79.3 | 3.1 | 17.5 |
| Pennsylvania--------------------------------------------------- | 100.0 | 77.7 | 6.8 | 15.5 |
|  | 100.0 | 71.0 | 15.7 | 13.3 |
| Tennessee--------------------------------------------------------- | 100.0 | 74.5 | 10.1 | 15.4 |
|  | 100.0 | 68.7 | 15.6 | 15.7 |
| Wisconsin---------------------------------------------------- | 100.0 | 77.5 | 10.2 | 12.4 |

Table 23. Percent distribution of divorces and annulments, by place of marriage: divorce-registration area and each registration State, 1965
[Based on sample data]

| State | Place of marriage |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Same State | Other State, same region | Not in region |
| , | Percent distribution |  |  |  |
| Divorce-registration a | 100.0 | 60.9 | 20.9 | 18.2 |
| Alabama | 100.0 | 64.0 | 29.0 | 7.0 |
| Alaska | 100.0 | 47.9 | 26.7 | 25.4 |
| Georgia | 100.0 | 69.4 | 22.8 | 7.8 |
| Hawaii | 100.0 | 63.2 | 14.1 | 22.7 |
| Idaho- | 100.0 | 49.4 | 37.3 | 13.3 |
| Iowa- | 100.0 | 59.8 | 29.6 | 10.6 |
| Kansas-- | 100.0 | 57.7 | 11.9 | 30.4 |
| Maryland | 100.0 | 70.6 | 19.8 | 9.6 |
| Michigan- | 100.0 | 69.5 | 14.2 | 16.3 |
| Missouri- | 100.0 | 63.2 | 13.6 | 23.2 |
| Montana | 100.0 | 58.9 | 27.5 | 13.6 |
| Nebraska- | 100.0 | 63.0 | 21.2 | 15.8 |
| Ohio----- | 100.0 | 59.4 | 12.0 | 28.6 |
| Oregon-- | 100.0 | 39.8 | 46.9 | 13.2 |
| Pennsylvania | 100.0 | 65.4 | 5.8 | 28.7 |
| Rhode Island- | 100.0 | 73.8 | 16.0 | 10.3 |
| South Dakota | 100.0 | 57.4 | 23.8 | 18.8 |
| Tennessee- | 100.0 | 50.6 | 42.5 | 6.9 |
| Utah | 100.0 | 46.7 | 44.2 | 9.2 |
| Virginia. | 100.0 | 55.5 | 33.3 | 11.2 |
| Wisconsin- | 100.0 | 62.1 | 26.1 | 11.9 |
| Wyoming- | 100.0 | 48.8 | 25.2 | 26.0 |

Table 24. Percent distribution of divorces and annulments, by duration of marriage: divorceregistration area and each registration State, 1965
[Based on sample data]

| State | Duration of marriage |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Under } \\ & \text { I } \\ & \text { year } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ \text { year } \end{gathered}$ | $\stackrel{2}{\text { years }}$ |
| Divorce-registration | Percent distribution |  |  |  |
|  | 100.0 | 5.3 | 9.3 | 8.6 |
| Alabama | 100.0 | 8.6 | 11.7 | 8.8 |
| Alaska | 100.0 | 6.6 | 10.2 | 9.9 |
| Georgia | 100.0 | 7.7 | 11.4 | 8.4 |
| Hawaii | 100.0 | 8.5 | 10.8 | 8.7 |
| Idaho- | 100.0 | 10.5 | 13.0 | 11.0 |
| Iowa-- | 100.0 | 6.8 | 11.6 | 9.7 |
| Kansas-- | 100.0 | 8.2 | 11.5 | 10.3 |
| Maryland | 100.0 | 1.2 | 2.5 | 6.9 |
| Michigan | 100.0 | 4.1 | 8.6 | 8.2 |
| Missouri | 100.0 | 7.7 | 11.4 | 9.5 |
| Montana- | 100.0 | 8.2 | 11.2 | 10.4 |
| Nebraska- | 100.0 | 5.9 | 9.5 | 10.9 |
| Ohio-- | 100.0 | 4.3 | 9.1 | 8.3 |
| Oregon----- | 100.0 | 7.6 | 11.0 | 9.9 |
| Pennsylvania | 100.0 | 1.7 | 6.8 | 7.8 |
| Rhode Island | 100.0 | 0.7 | 4.7 | 5.9 |
| South Dakota | 100.0 | 7.1 | 9.1 |  |
| Tennessee--- | 100.0 | 8.7 | 11.0 | 8.7 |
| Utah---- | 100.0 | 7.1 | 13.2 | 9.8 |
| Virginia | 100.0 | 0.6 | 5.9 | 8,1 |
| Wisconsin- | 100.0 | 2.8 | 7.1 | 7.5 |
| Wyoming - | 100.0 | 10.2 | 11.2 | 10.4 |

Table 24. Percent distribution of divorces and annulments, by duration of marriage: divorceregistration area and each registration State, 1965-Con.
[Based on sample data]

| Duration of marriage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\stackrel{3}{\text { years }}$ | $\stackrel{4}{4} \text { years }$ | $\stackrel{5}{\text { years }}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ \text { years } \end{gathered}$ | $\stackrel{7}{\text { years }}$ | $\stackrel{8}{8}$ | years | 10-14 | $\underset{\text { years }}{\text { 15-19 }}$ | $20-24$ years | $\begin{aligned} & 25-29 \\ & \text { years } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 30+ \\ \text { years } \end{gathered}$ |
| Percent distribution |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8.0 | 6.9 | 5.9 | 5.1 | 4.5 | 4.2 | 3.9 | 13.7 | 11.2 | 6.5 | 3.6 | 3.1 |
| 7.0 | 5.6 | 5.2 | 5.2 | 3.1 | 3.4 | 3.3 | 13.4 | 8.3 | 6.6 | 4.3 | 5.4 |
| 10.9 | 7.1 | 5.7 | 6.4 | 5.4 | 5.2 | 3.3 | 14.1 | 8.2 | 4.4 | 2.1 | 0.6 |
| 8.1 | 7.1 | 6.6 | 5.8 | 4.2 | 3.3 | 4.0 | 12.5 | 9.3 | 5.7 | 3.2 | 3.1 |
| 9.5 | 7.4 | 6.6 | 4.3 | 5.5 | 3.5 | 3.1 | 11.2 | 9.0 | 5.1 | 2.7 | 4.1 |
| 7.4 | 7.3 | 6.1 | 4.0 | 4.9 | 3.5 | 2.9 | 9.8 | 9.4 | 5.4 | 2.6 | 2.0 |
| 8.8 | 7.5 | 6.4 | 4.8 | 4.1 | 3.9 | 3.8 | 11.0 | 10.5 | 5.5 | 3.2 | 2.5 |
| 7.4 | 6.9 | 6.3 | 4.8 | 4.2 | 3.8 | 3.2 | 11.5 | 10.2 | 6.2 | 3.0 | 2.4 |
| 7.1 | 7.5 | 6.9 | 6.1 | 5.1 | 5.6 | 5.6 | 16.6 | 13.0 | 7.8 | 4.4 | 3.8 |
| 8.1 | 7.7 | 4.9 | 4.6 | 4.4 | 4.7 | 3.7 | 13.6 | 12.6 | 7.2 | 3.8 | 3.7 |
| 9.2 | 7.0 6.5 | 6.18 | 4.7 | 4.3 4.8 | 4.2 | 3.8 | 11.8 | 9.3 8.7 | 5.6 | 2.6 | 2.8 |
| 9.2 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 5.5 | 4.8 | 3.4 | 4.1 | 12.8 | 8.7 | 5.4 | 2.4 | 1.5 |
| 8.6 | 7.1 | 6.6 | 5.0 | 4.4 | 4.2 | 2.9 | 13.1 | 11.8 | 5.6 | 2.1 | 2.4 |
| 7.3 | 6.8 | 5.1 | 5.3 | 4.9 | 4.9 | 4.2 | 14.7 | 12.9 | 6.4 | 3.6 | 2.2 |
| 8.7 | 7.6 | 5.8 | 5.6 | 5.1 | 3.1 | 3.8 | 12.6 | 8.5 | 5.7 | 2.4 | 2.8 |
| 7.9 | 6.1 | 6.5 | 4.9 | 4.8 | 4.1 | 4.5 | 15.3 | 13.5 | 7.5 | 4.9 | 3.7 |
| 6.4 | 7.9 | 6.6 | 6.5 | 5.3 | 5.3 | 3.7 | 16.8 | 14.0 | 8.8 | 4.3 | 2.9 |
| 8.0 | 7.8 | 7.0 | 4.6 | 3.9 | 4.3 | 3.6 | 13.1 | 10.3 | 5.2 | 3.2 | 3.4 |
| 8.9 | 6.1 | 6.4 | 5.3 | 3.9 | 3.1 | 3.6 | 12.6 | 9.2 | 5.4 | 3.8 | 3.4 |
| 10.8 | 7.8 | 7.8 | 4.4 | 4.3 | 2.3 | 4.0 | 12.2 | 9.7 | 3.1 | 2.4 | 1.0 |
| 7.0 | 7.7 | 5.9 | 4.9 | 4.8 | 5.1 | 4.3 | 16.8 | 13.5 | 8.0 | 4.3 | 3.4 |
| 7.8 | 7.2 | 6.5 | 5.4 | 4.8 | 5.0 | 3.8 | 15.8 | 12.0 | 8.0 | 3.6 | 2.7 |
| 8.1 | 7.0 | 6.4 | 5.1 | 4.2 | 3.9 | 3.3 | 11.2 | 9.1 | 5.2 | 2.7 | 2.0 |

Table 25. Medians and quartiles of duration of marriage at decree: divorce-registration area and each registration State, 1965
[Based on sample data]

| State | Duration of marriage |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | First quartile | Median | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Third } \\ & \text { quartile } \end{aligned}$ |
| Divorce-registration area | 3.2 | 7.2 | 14.8 |
| Alabama | 2.5 | 6.6 | 14.9 |
| Alaska | 2.8 | 6.0 | 11.6 |
| Georgia | 2.7 | 6.1 | 13.5 |
| Hawaii- | 2.7 | 5.8 | 13.2 |
| Idaho- | 2.1 | 5.1 | 12.2 |
| Iowa-- | 2.7 | 5.9 | 13.5 |
| Kansas- | 2.5 | 5.9 | 13.6 |
| Maryland | 5.0 | 9.2 | 16.5 |
| Michigan | 3.5 | 7.9 | 15.9 |
| Missouri | 2.6 | 5.8 | 13.0 |
| Montana | 2.5 | 5.8 | 12.3 |
| Nebraska - | 2.9 | 6.3 | 13.8 |
| Ohio- | 3.5 | 7.8 | 15.0 |
| Oregon---.-.- | 2.6 | 5.9 | 12.7 |
| Pennsylvania- Rhode Island- | 4.1 4.9 | 8.9 9.1 | 16.7 16.8 |
| South Dakota- | 2.9 | 6.3 | 13.9 |
| Tennessee--- | 2.6 | 6.1 | 13.7 |
| Utah----- | 2.5 | 5.2 | 11.4 |
| Virginia- | 4.5 | 9.0 | 16.5 |
| Wisconsin- | 4.0 | 8.2 | 15.5 |
| Wyoming--- | 2.3 | 5.5 | 12.3 |

Table 26. Median duration of marriage at decree: each registration State, 1954-65
[For 1960-65, based on sample data; for 1954-59, based on total counts]

| State | 1965 | 1964 | 1963 | 1962 | 1961 | 1960 | 1959 | 1958 | 1957 | 1956 | 1955 | 1954 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Median duration in years |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alabama | 6.6 | 6.9 | 7.5 | 7.1 | 7.3 | 7.3 | 7.6 | 7.4 | ${ }^{1} 7.1$ | 6.7 | 6.5 | 6.3 |
| Alaska- | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.8 | 6.2 | 6.3 | 6.2 | 6.0 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Georgia | 6.1 | 6.4 | 6.3 | 5.9 | 6.6 | 6.3 | 6.1 | 5.9 | ${ }^{1} 6.1$ | ${ }^{1} 6.0$ | $1_{5.6}$ | ${ }^{1} 6.7$ |
| Hawaii | 5.8 | 6.7 | 7.2 | 7.0 | 6.3 | 6.3 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Idaho- | 5.1 | 5.1 | 5.0 | 5.6 | 4.7 | 4.8 | 4.2 | 4.6 | 4.7 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.7 |
| Iowa | 5.9 | 5.0 | 6.1 | 6.2 | 5.5 | 5.7 | 5.4 | 5.6 | 5.3 | 5.1 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Kansas- | 5.9 | 6.3 | 6.5 | 5.9 | 6.5 | 5.8 | 6.3 | --- | 6.2 | 6.1 | 5.7 | 5.7 |
| Maryland- | 9.2 | 9.8 | 10.3 | 9.4 | 9.4 | 9.0 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Michigan | 7.9 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 7.6 | --- | --- | -- | 7.5 | 7.4 | ${ }^{1} 7.2$ | 17.1 |
| Missouri | 5.8 | 6.1 | 6.9 | 6.1 | 6.6 | --- | --- | --- | ${ }^{1} 6.1$ | ${ }^{1} 5.9$ | ${ }^{1} 5.9$ | ${ }^{1} 5.9$ |
| Montana- | 5.8 | 5.6 | 5.9 | 5.9 | 5.2 | 5.1 | 5.1 | 5.4 | 5.2 | 5.1 | 4.8 | 5.1 |
| Nebraska- | 6.3 | 6.5 | 6.7 | 6.1 | 6.5 | 6.3 | 6.0 | 5.9 | 6.1 | ${ }^{2} 6.0$ | 5.6 | 5.5 |
| Ohio- | 7.8 | 7.7 | 7.7 | 7.7 | --- | --- | --- | --- | 6.7 | 6.5 | 6.4 | 6.4 |
| Oregon- | 5.9 | 6.6 | 5.8 | 6.5 | 6.4 | 5.9 | 6.0 | 5.9 | 5.7 | 5.6 | 5.1 | 5.1 |
| Pennsylvania | 8.9 | 8.6 | 8.7 | 9.6 | 8.6 | 9.2 | 9.1 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Rhode Island | 9.1 | 9.0 | 9.0 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| South Dakota | 6.3 | 6.9 | 6.3 | 6.6 | 6.3 | 6.3 | 6.2 | 5.9 | 5.9 | 5.1 | 5.7 | 5.7 |
| Tennessee- | 6.1 | 6.6 | 6.6 | 6.4 | 6.1 | 6.3 | 6.1 | ${ }^{1} 5.7$ | 5.5 | 5.6 | 5.6 | 5.5 |
| Utah- | 5.2 | 5.1 | 5.1 | 5.5 | 5.2 | 4.7 | 5.4 | 5.4 | 5.0 | --- | - | --- |
| Virginia- | 9.0 | 8.9 | 9.2 | 8.6 | 8.6 | 8.3 | 8.7 | 8.5 | 8.5 | 8.1 | 7.9 | 7.7 |
| Wisconsin- | 8.2 | 8.3 | 8.1 | 7.2 | 8.4 | 8.2 | 7.4 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Wyoming- | 5.5 | 5.1 | 5.3 | 5.3 | 4.8 | 5.4 | 5.1 | 5.4 | 5.0 | ${ }^{1} 5.4$ | 4.7 | ${ }^{1} 5.1$ |

[^8]Table 27. Median and quartile duration of marriage at decree, by marriage order and color: five selected States, 1963
[Based on sample data]


[^9]Table 28. Median duration of marriage of all divorced couples and of couples married in the State where divorced: each registration State, 1963
[Based on sample data]

| State | Divorced in State | Married and divorced in State | State | Divorced <br> in State | Married and divorced in State |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Median } \\ \text { in } \end{gathered}$ | duration years |  | Median in | duration years |
| Alabama--- | 7.5 | 6.3 | Nebraska- | 6.7 | 5.9 |
| Alaska | 6.8 | 3.6 | Ohio-- | 7.7 | 6.7 |
| Georgia | 6.3 | 6.1 | Oregon- | 5.8 | 5.3 |
| Hawail- | 7.2 | 7.2 | Pennsylvania | 8.7 | 8.6 |
| Idaho-- | 5.0 | 3.9 | Rhode Island | 9.0 | 9.3 |
| Iowa--- | 6.1 | 6.0 | South Dakota | 6.3 | 5.7 |
| Kansas-- | 6.5 | 6.2 | Tennessee-1 | 6.6 | 4.4 |
| Maryland | 10.3 | 9.3 | Utah----- | 5.1 | 5.0 |
| Michigan | 8.0 | 6.6 | Virginia | 9.2 | 8.9 |
| Missouri | 6.9 | 6.3 | Wisconsin | 8.1 | 7.9 |
| Montana-- | 5.9 | 5.7 | Wyoming-- | 5.3 | 3.7 |

Table 29. Number and percent distribution of divorces and annulments, by number of children reported: divorce-registration area, excluding Pennsylvania and Rhode Island, 1964-65
[Based on sample data]

| Number of children | 1964 | 1965 | 1964 | 1965 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total | Number of divorces |  | Percent distribution |  |
|  | 143,740 | 147,174 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| None- | 50,807 | 55,994 | 38.5 | 40.4 |
| One- | 30,872 | 31,781 | 23.4 | 22.9 |
| Two- | 24,025 | 24,852 | 18.2 | 17.9 |
| Three - | 14,392 | 14,135 | 10.9 | 10.2 |
| Four- | 6,979 | 7,000 | 5.3 | 5.1 |
| Five-- | 2,919 | 2,753 | 2.2 | 2.0 |
| Six- | 1,104 | 1,124 | 0.8 | 0.8 |
| Severn- | 542 | 595 | 0.4 | 0.4 |
| Eight- | 193 | 216 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| Nine-- | 113 | 77 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| 10 or more | 67 | 57 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Not stated--- | 11,727 | 8,590 | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ |

Table 30. Number of children involved in divorces and annulments and rate per 1,000 children under 18 years of age: United States, 1953-65
[For 1960-65, based on sample data; for 1953-59, based on total counts. For method of estimating, see appendix]

| Year | ```A11 divorces and annulments``` | Estimated number of children involved | Mean number of children per decree | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Rate per } \\ & 1,000 \\ & \text { children } \\ & \text { under } 18 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1965- | 479,000 | 630,000 | 1.32 | 8.9 |
| $1964{ }^{1}$ | 450,000 | 613,000 | 1.36 | 8.7 |
| $1963{ }^{1}$ | 428,000 | 562,000 | 1.31 | 8.2 |
| $1962^{1}-$ | 413,000 | 532,000 | 1.29 | 7.9 |
| $1961{ }^{1}$ | 414,000 | 516,000 | 1.25 | 7.8 |
| 1960- | 393,000 | 463,000 | 1.18 | 7.2 |
| 1959- | 395,000 | 468,000 | 1.18 | 7.5 |
| 1958- | 368,000 | 398,000 | 1.08 | 6.5 |
| 1957- | 381,000 | 379,000 | 0.99 | 6.4 |
| 1956- | 382,000 | 361,000 | 0.95 | 6.3 |
| 1955- | 377,000 | 347,000 | 0.92 | 6.3 |
| 1954- | 379,000 | 341,000 | 0.90 | 6.4 |
| 1953- | 390,000 | 330,000 | 0.85 | 6.4 |

${ }^{1}$ Revised.

Table 31. Number of children involved in divorces and annulments and rate per 1,000 children under 18 years of age: divorce-registration area and each registration State, 1964-65
[Based on sample data. For methods of estimating, see appendix]


[^10]Table 32. Percent distribution of divorces and annulments, by legal grounds for decree: divorceregistration area, 1964-65
[Since two or more grounds are occasionally mentioned in the same diyorce, the percentage of all grounds is over 100.0]


## APPENDIX

## SOURCES AND QUALITY OF DATA

## Definitions

The term "divorce," as used in this report, denotes absolute divorces and annulments of marriage. The numbers of annulments are small-they represent only 3 percent of the national total. Divorces are reported by the place where the decrees were granted. The plaintiff must be a resident of the State, and in some States he or she must also be a resident of the county where application is made for divorce, hence, data can be considered to be tabulated by residence of the plaintiff. However, in some cases, divorce seekers become residents of a State with permissive divorce laws for the sole purpose of obtaining the decree, and leave that State after the decree is granted.

Data for the United States include Alaska beginning with 1959 and Hawaii beginning in 1960. Data for Puerto Rico, as well as for the VirginIslands and other American possessions, are not included in the national totals and are not discussed in this report.

Rates shown in this report are computed per 1,000 persons in the total population of an area or in a specified category of that population. The population was enumerated as of January 1 for 1920 and as of April 1 for 1930, 1940, 1950, and 1960. Populations for all intercensal years were estimated by the Bureau of the Census as of July 1. All population figures exclude Armed Forces abroad, except for the years 1941-46. Populations of standard metropolitan statistical areas, used for computing 1960 rates shown in tables 5 and 6 , were rounded to the nearest 1,000 . Rates for countries listed in table 3 were taken from the Demographic Yearbook of the United Nations.

## Sources of Data

This report is based on frequencies published in Vital Statistics of the United States, 1964 and 1965, Volume III, Section 2. Data for earlier years are taken from the appropriate annual issues of the same publication and from unpublished tabulations for 1963. A comparable analysis of divorce statistics was published for 1962 and 1963 in the Vital and Health Statistics, Series 21, Numbers 7 and 13, and inthe Vital Statistics of the United States for 1961 and earlier years.

Two methods for the collection of final divorce statistics have been used since 1960 . The total counts of divorces and annulments granted during a year are received from officials of the 50 States, the District of Columbia. Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Data for some counties of Kentucky and New Mexico and some parishes of Louisiana were received from local officials. In States that do not maintain statewide central files of divorce records, State officials conduct special surveys to obtain county totals. Altogether, anmual divorce and annulment totals are obtained for more than 3,000 counties or equivalent areas. No totals were reported for 23 counties in 1964 and 29 counties in 1965.

The national annual divorce totals are obtained from the reported State figures and estimates for nonreporting areas, which included in 1964 and 1965 several parishes of Louisiana. These estimates are prepared on the assumption that the divorce rate for nonreporting areas of a State is the same as that for reporting areas. Totals and rates for regions, divisions, States, and standard metropolitan statistical areas (tables 4, 5, and 6) are also based on State reports. Totals for some States may differ slightly from those shown in table 7 and subsequent tables, because the latter totals were estimated from probability samples.

The detailed statistics are estimated by the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS) from samples of transcripts of divorce or annulment records received from 22 States and the Virgin Islands which belong to the divorce-registration area (fig. I). Information for the Virgin Islands is notincludedin the present report, but is presented in Vital Statistics of the United States, Volume III.

The divorce-registration area (DRA) was established in 1958 to promote the collection of uniform, regular, and complete statistics, following the pattern of mortality, natality, and marriage-registration areas. States and independent registration areas were admitted to the DRA when they met the following four criteria:

1. Central statewide files of divorce and anmulment records are maintained.
2. A statistical report form which includes the required items of information is used.


Figure 1. Divorce-registration area and other States maintaining central files of divorce and annulment records: 1965.
3. The reporting from local areas to the State office is regular, timely, and complete:
4. The State office agrees to test the completeness and accuracy of registration, in cooperation with NCHS.

The items of information that must be included on the divorce form of a State that participates in the DRA are listed in the Standard Record of Divorce or Annulment (fig. II). Items on place of birth, occupation,
and business or industry, though included in the Standard Record, are not obligatory, and several other exceptions have been made in individual States, as discussed in the following section.

## Completeness of Data

Completeness of reporting is one of the most important factors which produce nonsampling errors in divorce statistics. Table I shows for the DRA and

, En

Figure 11. Standard Record of Divorce or Annulment.

Table I. Completeness of reporting of statistical variables expressed in percents: divorce-registration area and registration States, 1964-65

| State and year | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A11 } \\ & \text { di- } \\ & \text { vorces } \\ & \text { and } \\ & \text { annu1- } \\ & \text { ments } \end{aligned}$ | Age at decree |  | Age at marriage |  | Race |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Husband | Wife | Husband | Wife | Husband | Wife |
| Divorce-registration area----1964---- | $\begin{aligned} & 100.0 \\ & 100.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 58.3 \\ & 62.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 58.5 \\ & 62.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 58.1 \\ & 61.7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 58.0 \\ & 61.7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 58.1 \\ & 58.7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 58.1 \\ & 58.7 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 100.0 \\ & 100.0 \end{aligned}$ | 3.0 2.8 | 2.8 2.8 | 3.0 2.8 | $\begin{aligned} & 2.8 \\ & 2.7 \end{aligned}$ | 37.4 34.9 | 37.0 34.9 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 100.0 \\ & 100.0 \end{aligned}$ | 34.0 37.8 | $\begin{aligned} & 34.1 \\ & 37.1 \end{aligned}$ | 33.9 | 33.0 37.5 | 53.7 54.8 54.8 | 53.8 54.7 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 100.0 \\ & 100.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 43.0 \\ & 57.9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 41.9 \\ 57.8 \end{array}$ | 42.2 56.9 | 40.7 56.4 | 54.8 66.8 | 54,6 66.8 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 100.0 \\ & 100.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 97.1 \\ & 96.7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 97.2 \\ & 95.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 97.0 \\ & 96.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 97.0 \\ & 95.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 99.9 \\ 100.0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 99.9 \\ & 99.9 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 100.0 100.0 | 74.2 | 74.2 74.3 | 73.4 73.4 | 73.1 | 81.0 | 84.5 85.5 |
|  | 100.0 100.0 | 99.6 99.8 | 99.7 99.8 | 99.4 | 99.4 | 99.6 99.7 | 99.3 <br> 99.8 <br> 9.8 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 100.0 \\ & 100.0 \end{aligned}$ | 92.7 | 92.4 91.2 | 92.5 | 92.1 | 94,0 92,3 | 93.9 92.2 |
|  | 100.0 100.0 | 45.7 | 46.5 47.7 | 45.2 | 45.8 47.4 | 49.4 50.8 | 49.1 50.6 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 100.0 \\ & 100.0 \end{aligned}$ | 3.9 17.0 | $\begin{array}{r} 4.3 \\ 18.1 \end{array}$ | 3.9 16.8 | 4.3 17.9 | 9.5 10.7 | 9.8 10.8 |
|  | 100.0 100.0 | 96.5 96.5 | $\begin{aligned} & 97.4 \\ & 96.6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 96.3 \\ & 96.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 96.4 \\ & 95.7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 99.0 \\ & 98,6 \end{aligned}$ | 99.1 98.6 |
|  | 100.0 100.0 | 97.3 | 97.4 97.6 | 97.1 | $\begin{aligned} & 97.0 \\ & 97.3 \end{aligned}$ | 99.8 100.0 | 99.7 99.9 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 100.0 \\ & 100.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 89.6 \\ & 90.7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 89.9 \\ & 91.0 \end{aligned}$ | 89.6 90.5 | $\begin{aligned} & 89.7 \\ & 90.6 \end{aligned}$ | 90.4 92.4 | 90.4 92.4 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 100.0 \\ & 100.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 37.0 \\ & 38.8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 37.0 \\ & 38.6 \end{aligned}$ | 36.8 38.6 | $\begin{aligned} & 36.7 \\ & 38.3 \end{aligned}$ | --m | ---7 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 100.0 \\ & 100.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 75.9 \\ 83.4 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 76.2 \\ & 83,2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 75.4 \\ & 82.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 75.8 \\ & 81.6 \end{aligned}$ | 76.0 | 76.2 |
|  | 100.0 100.0 | 85.2 84.7 | $\begin{aligned} & 85.8 \\ & 85.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 85,1 \\ & 84,4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 85.5 \\ & 84.6 \end{aligned}$ | 80.5 81.5 | 80.4 81.3 |
|  | 100.0 100.0 | 89.3 82.7 | 88.2 | $\begin{aligned} & 87.9 \\ & 82.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 87.5 \\ & 82.7 \end{aligned}$ | 97.4 | 96.5 97.4 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 100.0 \\ & 100.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.0 \\ & 9.1 \end{aligned}$ | 8.4 8.8 | $\begin{aligned} & 8.0 \\ & 9.1 \end{aligned}$ | 8.4 8.8 | 29.3 34.9 | 28.9 34.9 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 100.0 \\ & 100.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 98.0 \\ & 97.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 97.7 \\ & 97.2 \end{aligned}$ | 97.6 96.6 | $\begin{aligned} & 96.2 \\ & 95.5 \end{aligned}$ | 99.7 99.6 | 99.6 99.5 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 100.0 \\ & 100.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 62.6 \\ & 62.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 63.0 \\ & 63.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 61.4 \\ & 60.9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 62.0 \\ & 61.6 \end{aligned}$ | 65.2 65.4 | 64.7 64.9 |
|  | 100:0 | $\begin{aligned} & 82.6 \\ & 97.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 83.6 \\ & 97.8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 82.2 \\ & 97.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 82.4 \\ & 96.7 \end{aligned}$ | 99.9 99.8 | 99.1 99.8 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 100.0 \\ & 100.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 99.5 \\ & 99.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 99.3 \\ & 99.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 99.4 \\ & 98.9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 99.0 \\ & 90.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 99.0 \\ & 99.4 \end{aligned}$ | 99.1 99.0 |
|  | 100.0 100.0 | 7.4 | 7.4 7.6 | 7.4 7.2 | 7.3 7.5 | 26,6 25,8 | 26.6 25.3 |

[^11]Table I. Completeness of reporting of statistical variables, expressed in percents: divorce-registration area and registration States, 1964-65-Con.

| Number of this marriage |  | Residence of defendant |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Place } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { marriage } \end{gathered}$ | Duration of marriage | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Number } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { children } \end{aligned}$ | Legal grounds | Plaintiff | To whom decree was granted |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Husband | Wife | Husband | Wife |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54.7 | 54.8 | 81.5 | 80.3 | 90.7 | 96.1 | 90.3 | 95.8 | 97.1 | 94.2 |
| 61.5 | 61.7 | 81.5 | 81.2 | 92.0 | 97.4 | 94.3 | 97.0 | 98.4 | 95.1 |
| 4.5 4.2 | 4.5 4.1 | 82.2 | 72.8 81.9 | 59.4 66.2 | 98.6 99.3 | 78.5 84.7 | 99.4 99.5 | $\begin{aligned} & 99.5 \\ & 99.7 \end{aligned}$ | 99.5 99.6 |
| 42.8 | 43.1 | 60.4 | 57.4 | 53, 5 | 80.3 | 78.1 | 80.3 |  |  |
| 58.2 | 58.5 | 68.4 | 68.4 | 60.5 | 82.9 | 82,6 | 83,9 | 95.3 | 93.4 86.9 |
| 99.7 | 99.7 | 98.3 | 97.8 | 100, 0 | 99.9 | 99.3 | 100.0 | 99.6 | 99.9 |
| 99.5 | 99.5 | 96.8 | 98.0 | 100.0 | 99.7 | 97.8 | 100,0 | 99.8 | 99.5 |
| 73.6 | 73.8 | 80.9 | 83.1 | 95.9 | 95.8 | 98.1 | 95.9 | 98.5 | 98.3 |
| 74.1 | 74.5 | 82.1 | 85.2 | 95.6 | 95.9 | 98.5 | 95.6 | 98.8 | 98.7 |
| 99.6 | 99.6 | 96.2 | 94.6 | 98.5 | 99.6 | 96.0 | 99.8 | 99.6 | 99.8 |
| 99.7 | 99.6 | 92.1 | 90.7 | 96,3 | 99.5 | 99.5 | 99.8 | 99.6 | 99.7 |
| 91.7 | 91.1 | --- | --- | 99.9 | 99.7 | 99.2 | 100.0 | 99.8 | 99.8 |
| 90.7 | 90.4 |  |  | 99.7 | 99.5 | 99.7 | 100.0 | 99.6 | 99.9 |
| 47.0 | 46.8 | 95.9 | 96.9 | 99.6 | 99.1 | 71.9 | 99.1 | 99.4 | 98.0 |
| 48.2 | 48.0 | 92,5 | 93.7 | 98.0 | 99.2 | 72.4 | 98.2 | 99.5 | 98.2 |
| 16.6 | 17.1 | 50.5 | 49.1 | 89.6 | 89.9 | 87.9 | 88.9 | 87.0 | 89.7 |
| 21.6 | 22.3 | 54.8 | 51.0 | 98,3 | 99.7 | 96.3 | 98.6 | 99.0 | 99.3 |
| 98.4 | 98.4 | 95,4 | 93.5 | 98.7 | 99.3 | 98.8 | 99.1 | 98.9 | 99.1 |
| 98.1 | 98.1 | 94.4 | 94.4 | 95.7 | 99.2 | 99.0 | 99.2 | 98.6 | 99.2 |
| 98.8 | 98.4 | 97.2 | 96.7 | 99,9 | 99.5 | 99.6 | 99.1 | 99.6 | 99.1 |
| 98.9 | 98.9 | 95.9 | 96.0 | 99.3 | 99,8 | 99.2 | 100.0 | 99.7 | 99.1 |
| --- | --- | 93.8 | 92.6 | 99.7 | 99.8 | 99.8 | 100.0 | 100.0 | --- |
| --- |  | 81.3 | 83.6 | 94.0 | 99.5 | 99.7 | 99.8 | 100.0 | --- |
| 43.6 | 43.9 | 93.8 | 93.0 | 94.8 | 99.5 | 99.6 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 99.4 |
| 44.1 | 44.6 | 92.7 | 94.0 | 94.9 | 99.5 | 99.7 | 99.5 | 99.8 | 99.8 |
| 71.5 | 71.7 | 81.5 | 85.1 | 99.0 | 99.0 | 93.8 | 96,8 | 99.0 | 83.6 |
| 71,9 | 71.6 | 83.2 | 81.1 | 98.6 | 98.0 | 92.2 | 94.8 | 97.7 | 80.2 |
| 78.9 | 79.2 | 98.1 | 97.6 | 99.3 | 99.4 | 77.6 | 97.8 | 98.7 | 96.9 |
| 78.0 | 78.2 | 97.5 | 97.7 | 99.0 | 99.0 | 95.5 | 97.4 | 98.9 | 97.4 |
| 90.6 | 90,5 | 94.2 | 91.2 | 91.7 | 97.9 | 82.1 | -99.9 | 98.4 | 97.6 |
| 92.3 | 91.4 | 94.8 | 92.5 | 96.0 | 99.2 | 97.6 | 100.0 | 98.2 | 97.6 |
| 12.2 | 12.7 | 96.0 | 98.2 | 96.4 | 98.2 | 99.8 | 99.1 | 98.5 | 99.6 |
| 14.8 | 15.4 | 72.4 | 76.2 | 95.5 | 98.3 | 99.4 | 99.3 | 99.2 | 9.7 .5 |
| 98.0 | 97.5 | 94.0 | 89.7 | 99.0 | 98.5 | 98.7 | 99.4 | 99.3 | 99.6 |
| 97.6 | 97.4 | 92.9 | 89.2 | 98.4 | 98.2 | 99.0 | 99.5 | 99.3 | 99.6 |
| 63.0 | 63.5 | 93.2 | 94.8 | 65.2 | 65.2 | 60.4 | 57.9 | 63.2 | 43.6 |
| 63.0 | 63.2 | 88.9 | 88.3 | 63.7 | 65.9 | 63.3 | 60.0 | 65.3 | 47.0 |
| (2) | (2) | 86,3 | 87.2 | 99.9 | 98.8 | 98.0 | 99.8 | 99.8 | 97.8 |
| 98.2 | 98.6 | 90.5 | 93.1 | 98.9 | 99.0 | 99.7 | 99.2 | 99.9 | 99.3 |
| 97.2 | 97.9 | 93.8. | 95.0 | 99.9 | 99.8 | 97.4 | 97.8 | 99.7 | 100.0 |
| 97.1 | 97.6 | 92.5 | 93.1 | 98.5 | 99.6 | 99.3 | 98.4 | 99.8 | 99.6 |
| 8.2 | 8.3 | 47.1 | 49.9 | 98.6 | 99.9 | 98.7 | 99.9 | 99.8 | 99.7 |
| 8.6 | 8.8 | 44.0 | 48.2 | 97.5 | 99.7 | 98.7 | 99.8 | 99.8 | 99.2 |

for the divorce-registration States the percentages of cases with various characteristics given. The lack of 100 -percent completeness is due to sample records which were incompletely filled out, to items not appearing on State record forms, or to failure of the States to send to NCHS all of their divorce records. For the DRA, the sample records not received represent 1.8 percent of all divorces in 1964 and 0.6 percent in 1965. In all detailed divorce tables the number of not stated cases was increased in order to bring the totals up to figures representing complete samples.

The required items of information appear on the divorce forms of all DRA states with the following exceptions: Kansas does not collect the information on the residence of husband and wife; Ohio on their race; Nebraska on the number of this marriage and on the party to whom the decree was granted; while Virginia did not collect the information on the number of marriages until July 1, 1964, but has collected it since.

The principal source of incompleteness in the 1964 and 1965 divorce statisties arises from failure to secure items of personal and demographic data in the States where these items are on the record forms. The proportion of records on which statistical variables are not stated varies among the reporting States. For age at decree it ranges from less than 1 to 97 per-
cent; for race or color from zero to 89 percent; for marriage order from 0.3 to 96 percent; for duration of marriage from 0.2 to 34 percent; and for number of children from 0.3 to 37 percent.

The completeness of reporting detailed divorce statistics has increased slightly every year. Mean percentages of completeness were computed for the DRA and each State (table II) from data on 10 variables: age at decree, race, and number of this marriage of the husband, residence of the defendant husband, place and duration of marriage, number of children, legal grounds, plaintiff, and the party to whom the decree was granted. In 1963, mean percentages of six States were below 70 and five States were over 95; in 1964 these figures were five and six and in 1965 four and eight States; respectively.

## Sample Design

The probability sample from which detailed divorce statistics were estimated was limited to the 22 States included in the DRA. The sample was drawn from the records of decrees of absolute divorce and of annulments granted during the year in 21 registration States, and decrees that became final during the year in Utah. In States where interlocutory divorce

Table II. Average completeness of reporting divorce data: divorce-registration area and registration States, 1963-65
[Figures were obtained by averaging percentages of compleleness for the following 10 items: age at decree, race, and number of this marriage of the husband; resident status of the defendant; place and duration of marriage; number of children, legal grounds, plaintiff, and party to whom decree was granted]

| State | 1965 | 1964 | 1963 | State | 1965 | 1964 | 1963 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DRA-------- | Percent complete$\begin{array}{l\|l\|l} 83.8 & 81.7 & 82.0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  | Percent complete |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | 75.7 | 77.3 | 69.1 |
| Alabama | 67.7 | 66.2 | 63.4 | Ohio'3 | 76.9 | 76.8 | 75.8 |
| Alaska- | 80.1 | 79.6 | 77.3 | Oregon- | 87.5 | 87.6 | 87:9 |
| Georgia | 74.3 | 68.3 | 66.3 | Pennsylvania | 92.9 | 91.2 | 89.8 |
| Hawaii- | 99.0 | 99.4 | 99.2 | Rhode Island | 95.8 | 93.9 | 94.4 |
| Idaho- | 89.4 | 89.2 | 89.5 | South Dakota | 72.0 | 73.7 | 72.8 |
| Iowa-- | 98.6 | 98.8 | 98.6 | Temnessee | 98.2 | 98.4 | 97.9 |
| Kansas ${ }^{1}$ | 87.3 | 87.7 | 82.1 | Utah----- | 64.5 | 64.0 | 68.6 |
| Maryland | 80.5 | 80.5 | 82.4 | Virginia. | 98.2 | 86.3 | 84.9 |
| Michigan- | 69.5 97 | 61.4 98.3 | 65.9 97.9 | Wisconsin- | 98.3 68.0 | 98.4 68.6 | 98.0 67.5 |
| Missouri- | 97.9 | 98.3 | 97.9 | Wyoming | 68.0 | 68.6 | 67.5 |

${ }^{1}$ Kansas does not report residence; the average completeness of the reported items was 91.2 percent in 1963, 97.4 percent in 1964, and 97.0 percent in 1965.
${ }^{2}$ Nebraska does not report the number of this marriage and the party to whom the decree was granted; the average completeness of the reported items was 86.4 percent in $1963,96.6$ percent in 1964 and 94.7 percent in 1965.
${ }^{3}$ Ohio does not report race; the average completeness of the reported items was 84.2 percent in 1963, 85.3 percent in 1964 , and 85.4 percent in 1965.
${ }^{4}$ Virginia did not report the number of this marriage for 1963 and 1964 ; the average completeness of the reported items was 93.6 percent in 1963 and 95.9 percent in 1964 . All items were reported in 1965.
decrees are granted, decrees granted during the latter part of 1963 became final in 1964, and decrees which had been granted late in 1964 became final in 1965. It is possible that some interlocutory decrees never became final because of death or reconciliation, but it is believed that the number of such cases is very small. In most cases such decrees automatically become final after the lapse of a certain period of time.

Information about the structure of the samples is shown in table III. The divorce sample was designed to
yield estimates of divorces classified by various characteristics for the DRA and for each State in the registration area. Four different sampling rates were designated for the States in the divorce-registration area-all records, one out of two, one out of five, and one out of 10 . While each State's records were sampled indeperdently, that is, with a randomly selected number designating the first record to be selected in each State, in computing the sampling errors, each

Table III. Divorce sampling rate and sample size: divorce-registration areand registration States, 1964-65

| Area, stratum, and State | ```Number of primary sampling units``` | Samplingrate | 1964 |  | 1965 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Number of <br> sample <br> records | Estimated number of decrees | Number of sample records | Estimated number of decrees |
| Divorce-registration area-- | 22 | ... | 38,797 | 160,987 | 39,273 | 164,942 |
| Total- | 6 | All records | 8,112 | 8,112 | 7,849 ${ }^{\prime}$ | 7,849 |
|  | 1 | All records | 966 | 966 | 1,118 | 1,118 |
|  | 1 | All records | 1,688 | 1,688 | 1,110 | 1,110 |
| Montana | 1 | All records | 1,982 | 1,982 | 2,003 | 2,003 |
| Rhode Island | 1 | A11 records | 1,097 | 1,097 | 1,188 | 1,188 |
| South Dakota | 1 | All records | , 965 | , 965 | 1,021 | 1,021 |
| Wyoming----- | 1 | All records | 1,414 | 1,414 | 1,409 | 1,409 |
| Tota1--------------------------- | 6 | 1/2 | 12,130 | 24,260 | 12,309 | 24,618 |
| Idaho- | 1 | 1/2 | 1,441 | 2,882 | 1,425 | 2,850 |
| Iowa- | 1 | 1/2 | 2,563 | 5,126 | 2,641 | 5,282 |
| Kansas- | 1 | 1/2 | 2,908 | 5,816 | 2,913 | 5,826 |
| Nebraska | 1 | 1/2 | 1,265 | 2,530 | 1,268 | 2,536 |
| Utah- | 1 | 1/2 | 1,447 | 2,894 | 1,436 | 2,872 |
| Wisconsin | 1 | 1/2 | 2,506 | 5,012 | 2,626 | 5,252 |
| Stratum 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total- | 6 | 1/5 | 11, 387 | 56, 935 | 11, 735 | 58,675 |
| Georgia | 1 | 1/5 | 2,269 | 11,345 | 2,410 | 12,050 |
| Maryland--------------------------- | 1 | 1/5 | 1,369 | 6,845 | 1,424 | 7,120 |
| Missouri----------------------------1- | 1 | 1/5 | 2,557 | 12,785 | 2,647 | 13,235 |
| Oregon--- | 1 | 1/5 | 1,299 | 6,495 | 1,243 | 6,215 |
| Temnessee | 1 | 1/5 | 2,178 | 10,890 | 2,235 | 11,175 |
| Virginia--------------------------- | 1 | 1/5 | 1,715 | 8,575 | 1,776 | 8,880 |
| Stratum 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total- | 4 | 1/10 | 7,168 | 71,680 | 7,380 | 73,800 |
|  | 1 | 1/10 | 1,107 | 11,070 | 1,094 | 10,940 |
| Michigan | 1 | 1/10 | 1, 940 | 19,400 | 2,023 | 20,230 |
| Ohio---- | 1 | 1/10 | 2,506 | 25,060 | 2,605 | 26,050 |
| Pennsylvania | 1 | 1/10 | 1,615 | 16,150 | 1,658 | 16,580 |

group of States with a uniform sampling rate was treated as a stratum.

The sampling rates are computed in order to se'nure samples of at least 1,000 records from each registration State. All divorce records were included in the sample in those States with an annual divorce total of less than 2,000 decrees.

## Estimates From Probability Sample

Before data were tabulated and statistics estimated, efforts were made to reconcile the totals estimated from samples received with the pretabulated counts for each reporting area if the difference was 1.5 percent or more of the annual area total.

Each sample case was assigned a weight that was the reciprocal of the probability with which the case was selected. Thus if a divorce record was selected from a State with a probability of one in 10 , each item on that record carried a weight of 10 , whereas if 100 percent of the records were processed from a State, each item on each record carried a weight of one. The sampling rates, indicating the probability with which
divorce records of every State were selected, are shown in table III. Frequencies were estimated by summing the inflated number of cases. Thus each frequency distribution is a sum of the weighted sample cases included.

It should be noted that weights for divorce sample records for the DRA vary from one to 10 . Variation between two or more equal figures in the relative proportions of cases with various weights results in each such figure having its distinctive sampling error, as discussed below.

Percentages were computed using data which excluded estimated numbers of not stated cases. Among the median ages of divorced wives at marriage, some fell into the lower interval of under 20 years of age; it was assumed that the lower limit of this age group was 14 .

## Sampling Errors of Estimates

Estimates computed from the samples (except statistics of States where the sample includes all records) are subject to sampling error. Since all cases in

Table IV. Sampling error of estimated percentages: divorce-registration area and each registration State, 1964-65
[Sampling errors for the entire divorce-registration area vary with proportions of cases from each stratum included in an estimate; for the sampling errors in this table it is assumed that these contributions are proportionate to stratum totals. Alaska, Hawaii, Montana, Rhode Island, South Dakota, and Wyoming have no sampling variability because all reports are tabulated]

| State | Total |  | Sampling error of percentages |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 1 or 99 |  | 10 or 90 |  | 25 or 75 |  | 50 |  |
|  | 1964 | 1965 | 1964 | 1965 | 1964 | 1965 | 1964 | 1965 | 1964 | 1965 |
| DRA---0-0--- | 160,987 | 164,942 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 |
|  | 11,070 | 10,940 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.4 | 1.4 |
| Alaska | 11,966 | 1,118 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Georgia | 11,345 | 12,050 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 0.9 |
| Hawaii | 1,688 | 1, 2,810 | $\ddot{0.2}$ | 0.2 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.9 | $\dot{0} 9$ |
| Iowa- | 5,126 | 5,282 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.7 |
| Kansas | 5,816 | 5,826 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.7 |
| Maryland | 6,845 | 7,120 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 1.2 | 1.0 | 1.2 | 1.2 |
| Michigan | 19,400 | 20,230 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 1.1 | 1.1 |
| Missouri | 12,785 | 13,235 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 0.9 |
| Montana | 1,982 | 2,003 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nebraska | 2,530 | 2,536 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Ohio-- | 25,060 | 26,050 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 0.9 |
| Oregon----- | 6,495 16,150 | 6,215 16,580 | 0.2 0.2 | 0.3 0.2 | 0.7 0.7 | 0.8 0.7 | 1.1 1.0 | 1.1 1.0 | 1.2 | 1.3 1.2 |
| Pennsylvania | 16,150 1,097 | 16,580 1,188 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.2 | 1.2 |
| South Dakota | 1,965 | 1,021 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tennessee- | 10,890 | 11, 175 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 1.0 | 0.9 |
| Utah--. | 2,894 | 2,872 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 0.9 |
| Virginia- | 8,575 | 8,880 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 1.1 | 1.1 |
| Wisconsin | 5,012 | 5,252 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.7 |
| Wyoming-- | 1,414 | 1,409 | . $\cdot$ | ... | . . $\cdot$ | ... | -•• | $\cdots$ | . . | :. |

these samples were selected with known probabilities, the sampling error can be computed for each estimate. The sampling errors for estimated percentages shown in table IV were computed by dividing the sampling error for the estimated frequency by the estimate of all divorces granted in the area. These sampling errors are the amounts which, when added to and subtracted from the estimated percents, give the intervals which contain the actual quantities being estimated in apFroximately 68 out of 100 similarly selected samples. As an example of the procedures described above, suppose that couples reporting three children in Kansas represented 12 percent of the State's total. The error shown in table IV for this percentage is about 0.4. By adding and subtracting 0.4 from 12 , one obtains the interval 11.6 to 12.4 ; the chances are about 68 out of 100 that the actual percent of couples with three children is in this interval.

To determine whether a difference between two proportions is due to sampling variability or is a true difference, divide that difference by the square root of the sum of the squares of their standard exrors. If the quotient of this division is greater than 2, then the probability that the difference is due to sampling error is less than one in 20 . For example, the proportions of divorces granted less than 1 year after marriage were 10.5 percent in Idaho and 4.1 percent in Michigan, and the standard errors of these proportions were 0.6 and 0.4 percent respectively. Division of the difference by the square root of the sum of the squares of the standard errors results in the following equation:


This value is more than 2, and therefore it is very unlikely that such a difference could be attributed to sampling error alone. Hence the observed difference has a high probability of being a true difference.

## Divorces by Age

National divorce data by age of husband and wife at the time of decree could not be estimated before 1965, because of the incomplete reporting of age by most States. By 1965, the reporting had improved, and information about age was available for 94 percent of the husbands and wives divorced in a group of 10 States combined: Hawaii, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Pennsylvania. Tennessee, Virginia, and Wisconsin. The national estimate was prepared on the assumption that the distribution by age of all husbands and wives divorced in the United States was the same as in these 10 States. Therefore, estimates were obtained by multiplying the national divorce total $(479,000)$ by the percentage distribution of the 10 States. From these estimates, age-specific divorce rates were pre-
pared. The estimated figures and rates are shown in table 8.

## Children Involved in Divorce

The recommended definition of the number of children to be reported on divorce records is "children under 18 years of age," including children born to or adopted by the couple and children of previous marriages living with the couple before separation. Fifteen States follow this definition, but in seven States slightly different definitions are used: "number of children under 21 affected" in Alaska; "number of children under age $20^{\prime \prime}$ in Hawaii; "number of children affected by decree" in Idaho and Nebraska; "number of children" in Kansas; "number of children under 18 of this marriage" in Tennessee; "number of children under 18 affected by decree ${ }^{1 \prime}$ in Virginia, since July 1, 1964, and "number of minor children affected" prior to that date.

The rules for coding the number of children were revised in 1965 . For 1964 and earlier years the item "number of children under 18 " or similar items described in the preceding paragraph were coded. If a State divorce record had two or more items relating to children, the coders were directed to ignore other items. On the forms of Iowa, Nebraska, Pennsylvania, and Rhode Island the coded item is preceded by the question "total number of children of this marriage." The reporting of children; as coded, has been unsatisfactory in Pennsylvania and Rhode Island (77.6 and 82.1 percent complete in 1964). The analysis of the data ${ }^{6}$ pointed to the likelihood that in these two States, when the first question was answered "none," the codable question was often left blank. Hence, the coders of the 1965 divorce data were instructed: "If on a State divorce form there is more than one question relating to children, and the preferred item which is usually coded contains no information, code the number of children given in the other item, e.g., 'number of children of this marriage'." Due to this new coding sule, the completeness of reporting of the number of children increased to 95.5 percent in Pennsylvania and to 97.6 percent in Rhode Island. It turned out that, as anticipated, a high proportion of this increase was comprised of couples with no children-the proportion of these increased in Pennsylvania from 26.6 percent in 1964 to 39.0 percent in 1965 and in Rhode Island from 24.5 to 33.0 percent.

## Estimating Procedures for Number of Children

The total numbers of children involved in divorce cases are estimated from data on divorces by number of children reported. For individual reporting States the estimating method is straightforward. The number of divorces with children not stated is distributed pro-

Fortionally, and then the number of decrees with no children reported is multiplied by zero, the number reporting one child by 1 , the number reporting two children by 2 , and so on. The sum of the products is the total number of children involved in divorce cases. There is not much estimation involved in this procedure, except for the assumption that divorces with number of children not stated are drawn randomly from the population of divorces and, therefore, can be distributed proportionally. As shown in the preceding discussion, such an assumption was incorrect in the case of Pennsylvania and Rhode Island.

The number of children involved for groups of States, including the DRA, are sums of the totals for the respective States, but the estimation of the national figures is much more involved, and several methods have been used. For the years before 1960, the national annual divorce total was multiplied by the average number of children per decree for the total of all States reporting for a given year. For 1960 the number of children was estimated from a nationwide probability sample of divorce transcripts. For the years 196164, the national estimates were originally obtained by multiplying by 5.40039 the combined estimates for 14 States-Georgia, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Maryland, Montana, Nebraska, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming. The factor 5.40039 is the ratio of the 1960 national estimate of children prepared from the nationwide sample to the comparable figure for the 14 States combined.

This method had to be abandoned for 1965 because Pennsylvania was one of the States included in the estimating procedures and the estimate of the number of children declined by 3,054 in that State due to the new coding rules. As the factor was 5.40039 , the national estimate declined by 16,493 simply because coding rules were changed in one of the 14 States used for estimation. The following method was selected to estimate the number of children for 1965. The average number of children per decree for the total of 16 registration States that had a satisfactory reporting of children was computed and the national divorce total was multiplied by that average. Six DRA States (Alabama, Georgia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Utah) were excluded from the computation because they had unsatisfactory statistics on the number of children for all or most of the years in the recent past. Total numbers of children for 1961-64 were reestimated according to the new method, hence, figures for all years after 1960 are comparable, being estimated by the same method.

National totals published in this report for the years 1961-64 differ from those published in earlier publications; the 1961 total was increased from 501,000 to 516,000 ; the 1962 total was reduced from 537,000 to 532,000 ; the 1963 total, from 583,000 to 562,000 ; and the 1964 total, from 634,000 to 613,000 . Mean numbers and rates were revised accordingly. The estimated number of children for the total period, 1961-64, changed very little, from $2,255,000$ to $2,223,000$, or 1.4 percent.
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[^2]:    ${ }^{1}$ Beginning in 1955, data include revocable divorces among the Moslem population, which approximate legal sepaxations.
    ${ }^{2}$ provisional.
    Source: United Nations: Demographic Yearbook, 1963, 1964, and 1967.

[^3]:    ${ }^{1}$ Data are estimated.
    ${ }^{2}$ Data are incomplete.

[^4]:    ${ }^{1}$ Hawaii, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Virginia, and Wisconsin. Data for the 10 States based on sample.

    Source: Data for the married population of the United States from Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 144.

[^5]:    ${ }^{1}$ Alabama, Georgia, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Maryland, Montana, Nebraska, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Virginia, and Wyoming.

[^6]:    ${ }^{1}$ Hawaii, Lowa, Kansas, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Virginia, and Wisconsin.
    ${ }^{2}$ Missouri was not in the DRA in 1960; age at decree for that State was taken from Missouri Division of Health, Vital Statistics, Missouri, 1960,table RR,but age at marriage is not available.

[^7]:    ${ }^{1}$ Hawaii, Iowa, Missouri, Tennessee, and Wisconsin.

[^8]:    ${ }^{1}$ Data are incomplete.
    ${ }^{2}$ Data include 16 decrees of separate maintenance.

[^9]:    ${ }^{1}$ Hawaii, Iowa, Missouri, Tennessee, and Wisconsin.
    ${ }^{2} 6,116$ nonwhite persons of both sexes were divorced in 1963 in the four States; 6,039 of them, or 98.7 percent, were Negroes, while 77 , or 1.3 percent, had white spouses.
    ${ }^{3} 1,647$ nonwhite persons of both sexes were divorced in Hawaii in 1963; 22 of them, or 1.3 percent, were Negroes, while 338 , or 20.5 percent, had white spouses.

[^10]:    ${ }^{1}$ Number of children under 21 affected.
    ${ }^{2}$ Number of children under 20.
    ${ }^{3}$ Number of children affected by decree.
    ${ }^{4}$ Number of children.
    ${ }^{5}$ Number of children under 18 of this marriage.
    6'Item on form was changed on July I, 1964, from "Number of minor children affected" to "Number of children under 18, affected by decree."

[^11]:    ${ }^{1}$ Percentages computed on the basis of cases where either the husband or wife was defendent; cases where defendant was not stated are omitted.
    ${ }^{2}$ Number of this marriage was included on the record form as of July 1, 1964, but not tabulated for that year.

