# Classification of Place of Residence on Death Certificates and Matching Census Records

United States - May - August 1960

Comparison of the classification of residence stated on the death certificate with residence as stated on the matching census record for selected geographic areas by age, race, and sex. Based on a sample of death certificates for deaths occurring in the United States during May-August 1960, matched to 1960 census records.

DHEW Publication No. (HRA) 74-1287

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
Public Health Service

Health Resources Administration
National Center for Health Statistics
Rockville, Maryland



# NATIONAL CENTER FOR HEALTH STATISTICS

EDWARD B. PERRIN, Ph.D., Director

PHILIP S. LAWRENCE, Sc.D., Deputy Director

GAIL F. FISHER, Director for Health Statistics Development

JAMES E. KELLY, D.D.S., Dental Advisor

EDWARD E. MINTY, Executive Officer

ALICE HAYWOOD, Information Officer

Vital and Health Statistics-Series 2-No. 30

DHEW Publication No. (HRA) 74-1287 Library of Congress Catalog Card Number 68-62238

# **CONTENTS**

· ·	Page
Introduction	1
Major Findings	2
Urban Places	2
Population-Size Groups Underenumeration in 1960 Census of Population Followback Survey	4 5 5
Metropolitan and Nonmetropolitan Counties for Urban and Rural Areas	6
Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas	7
Age by Geographic Division	9
Race by Geographic Region	10
References	11
Selected Bibliography	12
Detailed Tables	13
Technical Appendix	56
Design of Study	56
Criteria for Matching	57
Variances	57
Age	57 = 7
Race and Color	58
Sex	58
Urban and Rural Areas	58
Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas	59
Metropolitan and Nonmetropolitan Counties	59
Geographic Divisions and RegionsFormula for Adjusting Annual Death Rate	59 59
Not and Cross Difference Dates	60 60

IN THIS REPORT a comparison of the classification of residence stated on the death certificate with residence as stated on the matching census record for selected geographic regions by demographic variables is presented.

The classification of residence information on the death certificates corresponds closely to the residence on the census records for the decedents whose records were matched. An inverse relationship exists between the size of the geographic area and the degree of difference between census assignments and those by the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS) with differences approaching zero as the size of the area increases. NCHS somewhat overstates the numbers of deaths for individual urban places and understates those for rural areas. Towns, townships, boroughs in Connecticut, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, territorial annexations between 1950 and 1960, and urban fringe areas presented problems to NCHS in properly allocating the residence of the decedents. The poorest age agreement between the census records and the death certificates was for the nonwhite group at ages 85-99 years in the geographic divisions comprising the South Region, The average proportion of records unmatched was 50 percent higher for the nonwhite group than for the white. Both the differences by race between census and NCHS records and the match status were most favorable for the white population and the Japanese when compared with other racial and ethnic groups. Differences by sex were negligible.

# SYMBOLS

# COMPARISON OF THE

# CLASSIFICATION OF PLACE OF RESIDENCE ON DEATH CERTIFICATES AND MATCHING CENSUS RECORDS

Mary A. McCarthy, Division of Vital Statistics

#### INTRODUCTION

The chief purpose of the 1960 Comparison Study is to measure differences for selected characteristics as reported on the death certificates and on the questionnaires for those decedents enumerated in the Eighteenth Decennial Census of the United States. A secondary objective is to assess the accuracy of the annual death rate on the basis of the results of this study.

This comparison study involves a sample of deaths occurring during the 4-month period May-August, 1960. The design of the sample, number of records, procedure for matching, and related information are noted in the Technical Appendix.

The present study is a byproduct of the University of Chicago Mortality Study, Social and Economic Differentials in Mortality: United States, 1960, which is now providing nationwide statistics on mortality differentials collected in the 1960 census by social and economic characteristics. 1, 2

This report evaluates the comparability of classification of residence as reported on the death certificate and on the 1960 census schedules. The report primarily evaluates coding differences between the Bureau of the Census and the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS). The standard certificate of death (1956 Revision)

contained the following item for eliciting residence information:

2. USUAL RESIDENCE (Where desected lived. 6. STATE D	If institution: Residence before admission) COUNTY
c. CITY, TOWN, OR LOCATION	
d. STREET ADDRESS	<del></del>
e. IS RESIDENCE INSIDE CITY LIMITS?	J. IS RESIDENCE ON A FARM?
YES 🗍 NO 🗍	YES NO .

In order to develop uniform national statistics, NCHS issues standard certificates which serve as models for the States. With respect to the death certificate, the usual residence is the place where the deceased resided at the time of death. However, in the case of persons residing in long-term institutions, assignment is made to the place where the deceased lived prior to admission, if it is given.

In the 1960 Census of Population each individual enumerated was counted as an inhabitant of his usual place of abode which, for the most part, was the place where the individual lived most of the time. Differences exist between census and vital statistics in determining the usual residence for certain numerically small groups such as inmates of long-term institutions and residents of foreign countries temporarily living in the United States.

The residence data shown in this report were grouped into six major categories:

- (1) Urban places of 25,000 population or more in 1960
- (2) Population-size groups of areas
- (3) Metropolitan and nonmetropolitan counties, urban and rural areas
- (4) Standard metropolitan statistical areas
- (5) Geographic divisions
- (6) Geographic regions

(For definitions of these geographic areas, see the Technical Appendix.)

#### MAJOR FINDINGS

The classification of residence information on the death certificates corresponds closely to the place of residence as stated on the census records for the decedents whose records were matched. The proportion of unmatched records was high—23 percent.

Considerable improvement in the quality of the residence data has taken place since 1950. This observation is based on a comparison of the results of this study with those for a matched record study involving births for 1950.

An inverse relationship exists between the size of the geographic area and the degree of difference found between census assignments and those by NCHS. Differences diminish as the population size of the area increases. Compared with census assignments, NCHS somewhat overstates the numbers of deaths for individual urban places and understates those for rural areas. A comparison of NCHS annual data with figures tabulated by selected State offices of vital statistics shows the same pattern.

Towns, townships, and boroughs in Connecticut, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania; urban fringe areas; and territorial annexations made between 1950 and 1960 presented the greatest problems to NCHS in properly allocating the residence of decedents.

The poorest age agreement between the census records and the death certificates was for the nonwhite group at ages 85-99 years in the geographic divisions comprising the South Region.

For three-fifths of the 729 urban places of 25,000 population or more in 1960, either no

matched deaths for nonwhite persons were reported or fewer than 10 deaths were reported, thereby obscuring the comparison of differences by color.

The average proportion of records unmatched was 50 percent higher for nonwhite than for white persons. Both the net difference rates by race and the match status were more favorable for the white and Japanese groups than for other racial and ethnic groups. Differences by sex were negligible.

A followback survey involving almost 10,000 decedents showed that the distribution of matched and unmatched records by nine population-size groups of geographic areas was not different. However, this general finding cannot be extended to the more detailed residence data used in this report.

The findings of this study on the annual death rate are limited by the fact that a sample of deaths is taken only for the summer months, and data are for a single year. Other limiting factors are covered in the Technical Appendix. The results of this study generally indicate that the annual death rate for an individual urban place is slightly overstated.

#### **URBAN PLACES**

A frequency distribution of net difference rates for 729 urban areas with a population of 25,000 or more in 1960 is shown in table 1. Net difference rates were computed by subtracting the number of deaths matched at the usual place of residence according to census assignments from those by NCHS assignments, dividing by the census figure, and multiplying by 100. A negative rate indicates more assignments by census than by NCHS. The group "matched at usual residence" represents those decedents who died at the place where they had usually resided and had been enumerated in the 1960 Census of Population. Net difference rates based on 100 frequencies or more (according to census designations) are shown separately from those based on fewer than 100 deaths. The reason for this separation is that the variance would be greater for rates based on small frequencies. This latter group has a wider range of rates-from 0 to 94.9-compared with the range of 0 to 49.9 for the group in which the rates are based on 100 deaths or more.

The median net difference rate for the 729 areas falls at 3.0 percent. Based on 100 deaths or more, the median is 2.9, and for small frequencies, 3.2. The size of the difference varies inversely with the size of the urban area. For areas of under 100,000 population, differences of understatement by NCHS exceed those of overstatement.

As indicated in table 1, most of the differences are positive. This finding is consistent with that of other independent sources used for comparison. In a previous matched-record study involving births for 1950, the results were the same as those of this study—an overstatement of events in the urban areas by NCHS compared with census records,<sup>3</sup>

Net difference rates for deaths in 1960 and births in 1950 for 221 selected urban areas were reviewed. The basis for the selection of the 221 areas was the number of births included in the 1950 study, namely, 100 events according to either the census record or the birth record. For 66.5 percent of the areas the difference was positive for births and deaths (more assignments by NCHS than by census). The direction of the differences for births and deaths for the balance of the areas was as follows:

Direction of difference	Percent of total	
Both negative	7.2	
One positive and one negative	16.3	
Zero net difference for either births		
or deaths	10.0	

The negative differences were not concentrated in any one State but were scattered among 32 of the 42 States and the District of Columbia, shown in table 2. This pattern was also typical of the other types of differences shown above.

The magnitude of the difference was substantially less for deaths than it was for births (table 2). Two factors contributed to this difference. First, the addition of the residence checkbox item on whether the place of residence was inside or outside the city limits on the standard certificates in 1956 aided in properly allocating the

residence of persons living near cities, but outside the corporate limits. Certificates of births and deaths for the majority of States contain this checkbox item. The second factor involves the mobility of persons using hospitals. There is more likelihood of movement for the utilization of hospitals for births than for deaths.

A comparison was made between the annual number of deaths by place of residence as tabulated by NCHS and those tabulated by the various State offices of vital statistics. For most registration areas, NCHS figures were larger than the State tabulated data.

Three-fifths of the States or registration areas had State assigned residence codes on the microfilm copies of the death certificates received by NCHS for 1960. It is not known if these codes were assigned on the basis of census tracts, street maps, or if the codes were assigned only on the basis of the information entered in the residence section of the certificate. NCHS used the State codes in determining its own geographic codes for only four States and for selected local areas and counties in 11 other States.

The findings of the 1960 Comparison Study show the same pattern of difference when comparing NCHS figures with either those of the State or the Bureau of the Census.

The primary reasons for the differences between census and NCHS figures are to be found in the enumeration process and vital registration-the former giving greater support to the accuracy of the census figures. In the 1960 Census of Population, geographic locations can be fixed with a high degree of precision by the use of street maps and similiar aids. The situation is very different with respect to the vital record, however. In assigning residence codes, NCHS is, for the most part, dependent on the information entered in the section of the vital record pertaining to usual residence. Due to the great number of vital records which NCHS must code, it is not feasible to verify all addresses by means of a census tract or street guide.

Few extreme differences between census and NCHS assignments were observed. Only 14 of the 729 areas had net difference rates of 50 percent or more. With the exception of Boise City, Idaho, the remaining 13 areas had fewer than 100 deaths matched at the usual place of residence as re-

ported by either census or NCHS designations. The average number of such records for the combined 14 areas was below 50.

Not all of the excess differences can be explained. Generally, the areas with these extreme differences in code assignments between census and NCHS fell into three groups. First, towns, townships, and boroughs were difficult to identify and code for vital statistics purposes. Almost three-fourths of the areas with large net difference rates were towns or townships in Connecticut, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. In each of these areas, the numbers of assignments were understated by NCHS when compared with census numbers. For example, the first area listed in Pennsylvania was Bristol Township-an area of 59,298 population which was classified as urban by special rule. In the same county-Bucks County-there was also the incorporated area of Bristol borough (population of 12,364) which NCHS also classified as utban. Duplication of place names within a county and double entries of place names on certificates resulted in problems in correctly classifying geographic areas.

The second factor relating to extreme differences may be the number of annexations between the two decennial census periods. For example, Hayward, California, had over a 400-percent increase in population, primarily due to annexations between 1950 and 1960. Frequently, the place names of the annexed areas are reported as the decedent's residence and thus may be improperly classified. Several of the areas with substantial net differences had large annexations between 1950 and 1960.

Finally, unincorporated areas which have mailing addresses and/or place names similar to that of an adjacent urban place present a coding problem. One such example is Boise City, Idaho, which is surrounded by unincorporated areas with place names similar to Boise City such as South Boise.

The numbers of deaths matched at the usual place of residence were tabulated by color for the 729 urban places having 25,000 population or more in 1960. Comparisons of net difference rates for the white and nonwhite decedents were limited by the small frequencies for the nonwhite group. Almost one-third of the 729 areas had no matched deaths assigned according to either the

census record or death record for the nonwhite group (table 3). Another 4 percent of the areas had no frequency according to either census assignments or those by NCHS and with only one or two deaths in the alternative cell. Consequently, no net difference rate could be computed. An additional one-third of the areas had frequencies of fewer than 10. Net difference rates for white individuals were lower than those for the nonwhite group for most areas. As the number of matched deaths increased, the net difference rates for the nonwhite group approached those for the white.

The urban places with at least 50 nonwhite deaths or more assigned by both census and NCHS were concentrated in the South Region (table 4). In this region the match status for both color groups was least favorable. About one-fourth of the records in the South were not matched and thus obscured the analysis of white-nonwhite differences.

The proportions of records which were unmatched for the nonwhite group were higher than those for the white in 324 of the 729 areas. However, for three-fourths of the 324 areas there were fewer than 20 unmatched deaths. The unmatched proportion was higher for white than nonwhite persons in only 92 of the 729 areas. The balance (43 percent) had no matched and/or unmatched deaths.

It can be concluded that no judgment can be made about the white-nonwhite differences for the unmatched group for urban areas of 25,000 population or more throughout the country because of the small frequencies for nonwhite deaths except in the South Region.

# POPULATION-SIZE GROUPS

Table 5 shows the numbers of deaths matched at the usual place of residence for urban places grouped by population size as of 1960. As indicated previously, for the less definitive population-size groups in table 1, the magnitude of the net difference rates varies inversely with the size of the area. This inverse relationship is more evident from data shown in table 1, than from data shown in table 5. For all urban areas of 100,000 population or over and for rural areas, the net difference rates are positive, indicating more assignments according to the death record

than by the census record. For all other urban places, the direction of the difference is negative.

The group, urban areas of 2,500-10,000 population, had the largest net difference rate (-9.0) compared with other population-size groups. There are slightly over 3,000 such areas and the problem of properly identifying the residence of decedents of such areas has increased so extensively since 1960 that starting with datayear 1964 NCHS no longer separately identifies such places. The reason for this change was primarily due to the fact that mailing addresses rather than the actual residence of the decedents were often entered on the death record.

The proportions of records which were not matched at the usual place of residence were similar for the various population-size groups with the exception of that for rural areas. The proportion for this latter group was 26 percent and the range for the other eight groups was from 20 to 22 percent. Lack of a well defined place of residence on the vital record undoubtedly contributed to the high proportion of unmatched records for rural areas.

Data for white and nonwhite individuals are also included in table 5. The net difference rates by population-size groups follow the same pattern for each color group as for the total population. For most of the population-size groups in table 5, the net difference rates for the white group were higher than those for the nonwhite. However, the proportion of the records which were not matched at the usual place of residence was about 50 percent greater for nonwhite than for white persons. For urban places of a combined population of 25,000 or more, the unmatched proportion was 19 percent for the white and 30 for the nonwhite group.

# Underenumeration in 1960 Census of Population

There appears to be an association between the net undercount in the 1960 Census of Population for geographic areas grouped by population size and the proportion of records unmatched in the 1960 Comparison Study. Various methods were used in estimating the coverage errors in the 1960 census. One method was an estimate of housing unit coverage errors noted in Waksberg's

paper.<sup>4</sup> The data relate only to field enumeration errors and not to errors resulting from FOSDIC Processing (Film Optical Sensing Device for Input to Computer). The highest net undercounts were reported for urban places of 500,000 population or more and for areas of under 10,000 population. Likewise the proportion of records unmatched in the 1960 Comparison Study showed somewhat the same distribution—low proportions of unmatched records for groups of urban places of 10,000 to 250,000 population and high proportions for areas above and below these population groups.

#### Followback Survey

One method of evaluating the character of the unmatched group was to followback by an independent survey on a sample of matched and unmatched decedents. This was done for 9,475 decedents of the 340,033 included in the comparison study. A survey questionnaire was mailed to the 9,475 informants whose names were entered on the death certificates. On the basis of the questionnaires returned and after personal interview followups, there was over 90-percent response.

The only residence data included in both the survey and the 1960 Comparison Study were those for population-size groups of areas. Table 6 shows the number and percent distribution of deaths by population-size groups of areas included in both the survey and the comparison study. The distributions were almost identical, thereby indicating that the survey was representative of the major study. The number of records matched in both the survey and the comparison study are shown in table 7. With the exception of the category 25,000 to 50,000, the distributions of matched events followed closely those of total events shown in table 6. The large difference for this category was the result of processing errors. It is probable that an additional 300 records in the survey in the group "25,000 or more, but not further defined" should be properly classified to the size of areas, 25,000-50,000.

Table 8 shows data for the unmatched group. The number of decedents for which there was a response in the followback survey is shown separately from that for which a response was

not received. Since this latter group included only 221 records, it is not feasible to make a judgment about the differences between this distribution and that representing a response in the survey.

The percentage distribution by populationsize group of the unmatched decedents for which there was a response in the survey differed only slightly from the matched groups (table 7). Therefore, it is probable that the matched and unmatched decedents were from the same "population." To be conclusive, it would be necessary to have a distribution of deaths matched in the survey only and coded according to the responses in the survey. This was not done, however.

# METROPOLITAN AND NONMETROPOLITAN COUNTIES FOR URBAN AND RURAL AREAS

Net difference rates and the proportion of records unmatched for the combined groups of metropolitan and nonmetropolitan counties are presented in table 9. The two groups of counties are further classified by urban and rural areas for color-sex groups.

Metropolitan counties had smaller net difference rates and lower proportions of unmatched records than nonmetropolitan counties. For the latter group of counties there were more assignments according to the census record, whereas for metropolitan counties there were more assignments according to the death record. Consistent with the findings noted in the previous section, NCHS classified more deaths to urban areas than to rural. The rural areas of both types of counties have higher proportions of unmatched records than urban areas. This may be related to the fact that rural areas generally have less definitive mailing addresses than urban areas. Consequently, matching the census and death records for individuals who had resided in these areas was not as successful as in urban areas.

The difference between census assignments and those by NCHS was greatest for rural areas in metropolitan counties (table 10). Likewise, the proportion of records not matched—27.4—was considerably higher for this geographic component than for the others shown in the table. The rural section of metropolitan counties is unique for several reasons. First, the rural component

of metropolitan counties as defined for vital statistics includes the "urban fringe," that is, places surrounding large metropolitan areas. This definition differs from that used by the Eighteenth Decennial Census insofar as the Bureau of the Census classifies these fringe areas as urban. This difference is necessitated by the fact that census can set up one-time boundaries for unincorporated areas for its decennial enumerations, whereas NCHS must depend upon established political delineations for a 10-year period. A rapid growth of new fringe areas took place between the two census periods-1950 and 1960. Such areas frequently had mailing addresses of the adjacent incorporated urban places, and these addresses were reported as the usual place of residence. Consequently, there were difficulties in matching.

The second factor to adversely affect the match status was migration. As used here, migration pertains to those persons 5 years of age and over who moved from one county to another between April 1, 1955, and April 1, 1960. The proportion of persons who moved to different counties in this quinquennial period was 21.1 percent for the urban fringe of metropolitan areas and only 14.0 percent for the central cities of metropolitan counties.

The social and economic characteristics of the rural parts of metropolitan areas are very different from those for rural areas in nonmetropolitan counties. From one point of view, the rural section of metropolitan areas is more urban in character than the rural section of nonmetropolitan areas.

In regard to the net difference rates and the proportions unmatched, the differential between the white and the nonwhite groups is pronounced—both measures are higher for nonwhite than for white persons. The contrast between the direction of the net difference rates is noteworthy. These rates for rural areas are negative for the white group and positive for the nonwhite. The individual geographic areas which comprise the rural total are not separately identified in coding geographic information on the death certificates. This detail would be necessary to attempt to explain the differences in the rates for the white and nonwhite groups. Rural data were reviewed for the four geographic regions and the differences observed

in the North Central Region contributed most to the high positive net difference rate for the nonwhite group.

Region	Nonwhite metropolitan-rural net difference rate
Total	10.3
Northeast	25.9
North Central	57.6
South	8.0
West	-13.6

(Death record is base of rate and minus sign indicates more assignments by the death record than by the census record.)

# STANDARD METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREAS

Table 11 shows a comparison of net difference rates for 25 standard metropolitan statistical areas (SMSA's) which were randomly selected, and the urban components of these same SMSA's. Here the urban components are limited to those places of 25,000 population or more in 1960 since deaths for urban places below 25,000 population were not separately tabulated. All subsequent references to these components will be limited to urban areas of 25,000 population or more.

Data presented in this table show that the net difference rates are, for the most part, lower for the SMSA than for selected urban areas which are a part of that SMSA. The SMSA is a county or group of contiguous counties and therefore includes urban and rural areas. As noted in table 9, NCHS data generally show an overstatement of events for urban places and an understatement for rural areas. As a result, the net difference rate is low—the result of compensating differences.

The SMSA's with the highest proportion of unmatched records were located in the South Region with the West having the next highest proportion. This is not only true for the 25 SMSA's in table 11 but for all 201 SMSA's (MSEA's in New England) and for other residence data in this

report. Both the South and the West Regions have a higher proportion of nonwhite persons than either the Northeast or North Central Regions. For this color group the unmatched proportion is less favorable than that for the white group. Another factor is that migration is higher in the West and South; therefore it is likely that the unmatched proportion would be higher in these two regions than in the Northeast or the North Central Regions.

The largest of the SMSA's in table 11—Chicago, Illinois—had 22 urban components of 25,000 population or more. The net difference rates for these areas ranged from 0 for several components to 91.4 for Oak Lawn, Illinois, but the average was only 5.9 percent and the net difference rate for the SMSA, 0.2 percent.

The number of matched deaths for SMSA's was tabulated separately for two groups: Matched at usual place of residence (UPOR) and matched but not at the usual place of residence. This latter group was numerically small and represents those matched at the place of death (POD). The number and percentage breakdown of the number of records by match status are as follows:

	Number	Percent
Total	532,948	100.0
Matched	420,292	78.9
UPOR	388,754	72.9
POD	31,538	5.9
Unmatched	112,656	21.1

The group matched at the place of death (POD) is different insofar as any comparison of residence coding by census and NCHS is not applicable. One factor which accounts for a match at the place of death rather than at the usual place of residence is the difference between the enumeration process and the vital registration system. Persons residing in long-term institutions were enumerated in the census at these institutions prior to their death, but the death record asks for the usual place of residence prior to admission to the institution. Therefore, the two geographic codes assigned are not the same.

The net difference rate for the total matched group was 0.3 and for the two subgroups, UPOR and POD, the rates were 0.0 and 4.1 (table 12).

The highest rates for the total group were observed for the three SMSA's of Columbia, South Carolina; Pueblo, Colorado; and Tuscaloosa, Alabama. The high difference rates for the total group were the result of matching at the place of death. The distribution of net difference rates by type of match is as follows:

	Total	UPOR	POD
Columbia, S.C	-22.3	-1.7	<b>-77.</b> 5
Pueblo, Colo	-30.3	-2.1	-85.7
Tuscaloosa, Ala	-37.4	-	-92.5

In comparing the net difference rates by color only 57 SMSA's were considered. The areas were those to which 100 or more nonwhite deaths were assigned (table 13). Although the net difference rates for the white group were higher for slightly over half of the 57 areas, the proportion unmatched was considerably higher for the nonwhite group (table 14). The frequency distribution of the proportion unmatched (using census as base) for the white and nonwhite groups is presented below:

Proportion unmatched	Number of SMSA's			
	White	Nonwhite		
Total	57	57		
10.0-19.9	20	1		
20.0-29.9	28	26		
30.0-39.9	9	28		
40.0-49.9	-	2		

Those areas for which the net difference rates for the nonwhite group did exceed those for the white were located for the most part in the South Region, where the match status was least favorable.

One purpose of the 1960 Comparison Study was to evaluate the effect of the findings of this study on the annual death rate. The annual death rates for SMSA's in 1960 are published in *Vital Statistics of the United States*, 1960, Vol. II, Part B. The method involves the following assumptions. First, the assignment of deaths to any SMSA

made by census is presumably the "correct" figure rather than the NCHS figure for the May-August study period. As indicated previously, the difference between the enumeration process and vital registration gives greater support to the accuracy of the coding of geographic locations by the Bureau of the Census. The second assumption is that the population enumerated as of April 1, 1960, for an SMSA is "correct." Measures of misstatement of residence or underenumeration for individual SMSA's as of April 1 have not been published by the Bureau of the Census.

The annual rate could be adjusted on the basis of the findings of this study. An upper and lower range of the annual rate could be computed as indicated below.

The upper range is derived as follows:

- (1) Increase or decrease the annual number of deaths by the percent difference between census and NCHS assignments for the study period for the SMSA. If the census figure is lower than the NCHS figure, the annual number of deaths would be reduced; if the NCHS figure is lower, the annual figure would be increased.
- (2) Compute the upper range of the annual adjusted rate using the frequency derived in step 1.

In computing the upper range of the annual adjusted rate, all unmatched deaths are assumed to be correctly assigned to the SMSA. In computing the lower range of the annual adjusted rate, all unmatched deaths are assumed to be incorrectly assigned to the SMSA. Therefore, the range of the annual adjusted rate is determined by the unmatched deaths.

The lower range of the annual adjusted rate is computed as follows:

- (1) Follow step 1 for the upper range.
- (2) Reduce the annual number of deaths by the proportion that unmatched deaths are of total deaths for the study period. The figure for total deaths is the sum of the matched and unmatched deaths.
- (3) Compute the lower range of the annual adjusted rate using the frequency derived in step 2.

It is probable that the true adjusted rate is closer to the upper range since it is most likely that the majority of unmatched deaths are correctly assigned.

The formulas for computing the adjusted rates and their application for one SMSA are shown in the Technical Appendix.

# AGE BY GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION

Net difference rates vary slightly among the nine geographic divisions for the total population. In five of the divisions, the highest net difference rates-all negative-were reported for the age group 25-34 years. (Negative indicates more assignments by census than by NCHS to an age group.) For the three divisions comprising the South Region, maximum positive net differences were observed for the interval 55-64 years. The highest net difference rate (-5.5) in the Middle Atlantic division was reported at ages 35-44 years (table 15). Division data discussed here and region data discussed in the following section are according to census designations. These sections differ from those appearing previously insofar as they are a comparison of age and race, respectively, rather than a comparison of residence. A detailed analysis of age for the United States has been covered in a report in Vital and Health Statistics, Series 2, No. 29.6

There was only a slight difference by sex, but a pronounced difference by color when data were compared by age for the divisions. Net difference rates for nonwhite males and females were considerably higher than those for white males and females. The highest rates were reported for nonwhite individuals below 25 years of age. However, the rates are based on extremely small frequencies—generally about 10 deaths—for all divisions except those in the South Region.

In addition to net difference rates, the percent agreement between census and NCHS assignments was also computed. This measure was derived by dividing the number of matched records classified by a given age group by both census and NCHS (the common cell) by the number of matched records classified to that same age group by census. As was noted for net difference rates, extensive variability was observed for the percent agreements for the nine divisions by 10-year age

groups. Generally, the poorest agreement occurred at 85-99 years—the age group for which the annual age-specific death rate is maximal. The New England Division was an exception to the pattern; the percent agreement was poorest at the younger ages rather than the older ages. The observations made for the net difference rates by color and sex are applicable to the percent agreements. Nonwhite differences between census and NCHS assignments were more extreme than those for white decedents and these differences were greatest in the divisions comprising the South Region.

With few exceptions, the proportions of records unmatched for males and females and for white and nonwhite persons were highest for the age groups 15-24 and 25-34 years in the nine geographic divisions. For the most part, the exceptions to this pattern were for the interval 1-4 years of age and the proportions were based on small frequencies.

With respect to the characteristics of age and race, there were two phases in the 1960 Comparison Study. The difference between the two phases of the study relates to the two-stage enumeration in the 1960 Census of Population, All matched records in stage I represent decedents who were in the 100-percent enumeration. Stage II includes those decedents who were matched in stage I and who also were included in the 25-percent sample of households. With respect to this study and the impact on vital rates, the important distinction is that in stage II, not stated and not valid codes for the majority of items were allocated. The method of allocation is described in the various publications relating to the 1960 Census of Population found in the bibliography. It is data from stage II which are used in computing selected vital rates.

All data by age previously discussed have been derived from stage I. Table 16 shows four series of net difference rates for white males for the South Atlantic Division—stage I with and without the "not stated and not valid" codes and stage II with and without the allocations of the "not stated and not valid" codes. Stage I illustrates better than stage II the "true" comparison between data derived from the census record and those from the death record. The fact that the effect of the allocations on most age groups was

to increase the disparity between age reporting on the census record and the death record has an impact on the analysis of mortality data.

# RACE BY GEOGRAPHIC REGION

Detailed data for race for the United States and four regions are presented in tables 17 and 18. The net difference rates for each of the regions were less than 1 percent for the white group. The direction of the difference was always positive, that is, more assignments were made to the white group by NCHS than by census (census record used as base). Two factors may contribute slightly to the direction of these differences. First, the number of "race not stated and not valid" assignments according to census tabulations was 3,214, compared with 22 "race not valid" assignments according to NCHS tabulations. Therefore, the figures for the white and for the nonwhite category by census designations are below those by NCHS designations for the United States and each region. Second, the death records for which the race was not stated were assigned to "white" in the initial coding operation in NCHS. The number of "not stated" entries is not known. but presumably the figure is small.

Not only are the net difference rates generally lowest for the white group but the proportions of unmatched deaths are lowest. The latter factor gives greater validity to the net difference rates for the white population.

The net difference rates for the Negro race were higher than those for the white and were generally positive; the rates were less than 2 percent for the United States and each region. However, the proportion of records unmatched was approximately 30 percent for the Negro race—almost 50 percent above that for the white.

The net difference rates for the Indian group were negative for each region and lowest in the West where the majority of the Indian reservations are located. Self-enumeration of race, which was introduced in the 1960 Census of Population, may contribute to the excess of census records over death records which were coded as Indian. The annual death rate for the Indian group was 8.6 per 1,000 population in the United States for 1960 compared with 13.0 in 1950. The self-enumeration procedure in the 1960 census and

changes in classification by census of persons of mixed stock of Indian and other races contributed to a sharp increase in the Indian population between the two census years. This artifact observed in the anual death rates is consistent with the findings of this study.

With the exception of those for the West, the regional net difference rates for Chinese, Japanese, and Filipino are based on such small frequencies as to render the rates statistically unreliable. The net difference rate for the Japanese in the West was -0.6 which was the lowest of any net difference rate for any racial category for the United States or any of the four regions. The match status for this racial group-18 percent-is superior to that of the other racial categories in the West Region or in the United States as a whole. The net difference rate for the Chinese is 0.9—the same as that for the white group in this region. The proportion unmatched is about the same for the two categories-22 for the white group and 23 for the Chinese. The net difference rates for the "other nonwhite" group showed the greatest divergence between census assignments and those by NCHS. Likewise the proportion unmatched is highest-approximately 50 percent (census record used as a base). If the death record is used as a base, the equivalent proportion is below 30 percent because the denominator of the proportion would be substantially larger. It is difficult to explain the large difference between census assignments and those by NCHS for this group because it is an "all other" category. Differences may exist in interpretation between census and NCHS as to what should be included in this "all other" group.

Regional differences for each sex group were examined only for the white and nonwhite categories since the frequencies for the racial groups were very small. Net difference rates for females were lower than those for males for each region except the West.

In stage II of the 1960 Comparison Study there were 87,905 matched records. Of this number 1,145 or 1.3 percent had no entry for race ("not valid" included). After the 1,145 records were assigned a code for race, the assignments were compared with the codes for race on the death records for those 1,145 decedents. There was only 20 percent agreement. The effect on the

comparison study was to bring into closer agreement the assignments of codes by census and NCHS to the white category. The reverse effect occurred with respect to most of the nonwhite racial groups. A comparison of the net difference rates for stages I and II by race for the United States is shown below. (Census record is used as base and minus sign indicates more assignments by census than by NCHS.)

Race	Net difference rates for stages:			
	I	II		
White	0.8	-0.4		
Nonwhite	1.1	-1.2		
Negro	1.1	0.2		
Indian	-9.4	-11.2		
Japanese	-0.9	7 <b>.</b> 5		
Chinese	-4.6	-25.0		
Filipino	-23.2	-33.3		
Other	-125.4	21.9		
Not stated and not valid	-99.3	•••		

If the annual death rates for the two groups, white and nonwhite, are evaluated in terms of the findings noted above, the effects are negligible. However, rates for specified nonwhite racial groups would be affected. For example, the net difference rate for the Japanese according to stage I is -0.9 and according to stage II, +7.5. The latter net difference rate (+7.5) represents fewer allocations of "not stated" to the Japanese than the findings of this study would warrant. The effect would be to overstate the published annual death rate for the Japanese from 5.1 per 1,000 population to 5.5.

## REFERENCES

<sup>1</sup>Kitagawa, E. M., and Hauser, P. M.: Methods used in a current study of social and economic differentials in mortality. *Emerging Techniques of Population Research*, Proceeding of the 1962 Annual Conference of the Milbank Memmorial Fund. New York. Milbank Memorial Fund, Mar. 1967.

<sup>2</sup>Kitagawa, E. M., and Hauser, P. M.: Education and Income Differentials in Mortality, United States, 1960. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Fopulation Association of America, New York, Apr. 29-30, 1966. Revised Mar. 1967.

<sup>3</sup>National Vital Statistics Division: Matched record comparison of birth certificate and census information, United States, 1950. Vital Statistics—Special Reports, Vol. 47, No. 12. Public Health Service. Washington, D.C. Mar. 1962.

<sup>4</sup>Waksberg, J.: Housing unit coverage errors by type of geographic areas, 1960 census. Memorandum No. 2. Bureau of the Census. Unpublished data.

<sup>5</sup>U.S. Bureau of the Census: U.S. Census of Population, 1960. General Social and Economic Characteristics. United States Summary. Final Report PC (1)-1C. Washington. U.S. Government Printing Office, 1962.

<sup>6</sup>National Center for Health Statistics: Comparability of age on the death certificate and matching census record; United States, May-August 1960. Vital and Health Statistics. PHS Pub. No. 1000-Series 2-No. 29. Public Health Service. Washington. U.S. Government Printing Office, June 1968.

<sup>7</sup>National Office of Vital Statistics: The comparability of reports on occupation from vital records and the 1950 census, by D. L. Kaplan, E. Parkhurst, and P. K. Whelpton. Vital Statistics—Special Reports. Vol. 53, No. 1. Public Health Service. Washington, D.C. June 1961.

<sup>8</sup>U.S. Bureau of the Census: U.S. Census of Population, 1960, Number of Inhabitants, United States Summary. Final Report PC (1)-1A. Washington. U.S. Government Printing Office, 1961.

<sup>9</sup>U.S. Bureau of the Budget: Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas. Washington. U.S. Government Printing Office, 1961.

10U.S. Bureau of the Census: U.S. Census of Population, 1960, Selected Area Reports, State Economic Areas. Final Report PC (3)-1A. Washington. U.S. Government Printing Office, 1963.

# SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arriaga, E.: Index for the Detection of the Underregistration of Rural Deaths Due to the Inaccessibility of the Registration Office. A paper presented at the April, 1966, annual meeting of the Population Association of America.

Fellegi, I. P.: Response variance and its estimation. J.Am. Statis. Assoc. 59(308):1016-1041, Dec. 1964.

Kitagawa, E. M., and Hauser, P. M.: Educational differentials in mortality by cause of death, United States, 1960. Demography, Vol. 5, No. 1, 1968.

Marks, E., and Waksberg, J.: Evaluation of coverage in the 1960 Census of Population through case-by-case checking. *Proceedings of the Social Statistics Section*. American Statistical Association, Los Angeles, Calif., Aug. 15-18, 1966.

National Office of Vital Statistics: Coding and punching geographic and personal particulars; births, deaths, and fetal deaths occurring in 1960. Vital Statistics-Instruction Manual, Part II, Section B and Supplements. Public Health Service. Washington. U.S. Government Printing Office, Oct. 1960.

National Office of Vital Statistics: Interviewer's Manual; National Mortality Study, 1960. Washington. U.S. Government Printing Office, Oct. 1960.

National Vital Statistics Division: Vital Statistics of the United States, 1960, Vol. I. Public Health Service. Washington. U.S. Government Printing Office, 1962.

National Vital Statistics Division: Vital Statistics of the United States, 1960, Vol. II, Parts A and B. Public Health Service. Washington. U.S. Government Printing Office, 1963.

National Center for Health Statistics: Vital Statistics of the United States, 1964, Vol. II, Part A, Section 6. Public Health Service. Washington. U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

Neter, J., Maynes, E. S., and Ramanathan, R.: The effect of mismatching on the measurement of response errors. *J.Am. Statis. Assoc.* 60(312):1005-1027, Dec. 1965.

Siegel, J. S., and Zelnik, M.: An evaluation of coverage in the 1960 Census of Population by techniques of demographic analysis and by composite methods. *Proceedings of the Social* Statistics Section, American Statistical Association, 1966.

Taeuber, C., and Hansen, M. H.: Self-enumeration as a census method. *Demography* 3(1):289-295, 1966.

Zelnik, M.: Errors in the 1960 census enumeration of native whites. J.Am. Statis. Assoc. 59(306):437-459, June, 1964.

- U.S. Bureau of the Census: County and City Data Book, 1962, A Statistical Abstract Supplement. Washington. U.S. Government Printing Office, 1962.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census: Evaluation and Research Program of the U.S. Censuses of Population and Housing, 1960; Record Check Studies of Population Coverage. Series ER 60, No. 2. Washington, D.C., 1964.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census: Evaluation and Research Program of the U.S. Censuses of Population and Housing, 1960; the Employer Record Check. Series ER 60, No. 6. Washington. U.S. Government Printing Office, 1965.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census: U.S. Censuses of Population and Housing, 1960; Principal Data-Collection Forms and Procedures. Washington, D.C., 1961.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census: The Post-Enumeration Survey, 1950. Bureau of the Census Technical Paper No. 4. Washington, D.C., 1960.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census: U.S. Census of Population, 1960, Detailed Characteristics, United States Summary. Final Report PC(1)-1D. Washington. U.S. Government Printing Office, 1963.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census: U.S. Census of Population, 1960, General Population Characteristics, United States Summary. Final Report PC(1)-1B. Washington. U.S. Government Printing Office, 1961.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census: U.S. Census of Population, 1960, Selected Area Reports, Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas. Final Report PC(3)-1D. Washington. U.S. Government Printing Office, 1963.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census: U.S. Census of Population, 1960, Subject Reports, Inmates of Institutions. Final Report PC(2)-8A. Washington. U.S. Government Printing Office, 1963.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census: U.S. Census of Population, 1960, Subject Reports, Mobility for States and State Economic Areas. Final Report PC(2)-2B. Washington. U.S. Government Printing Office, 1963.

U.S. Bureau of the Census: U.S. Census of Population, 1960, Subject Reports, Mobility for Metropolitan Areas. Final Report PC(2)-2C. Washington. U.S. Government Printing Office, 1963.

# **DETAILED TABLES**

Page			
15	Frequency distribution of size of net difference rates based on deaths matched at usual place of residence, for urban areas of 25,000 population or more: United States, May-August 1960	ble 1.	T
16	Net difference rates based on events matched at usual place of residence for 221 selected urban areas of 25,000 population or more: United States, selected months, 1950 and 1960	2.	
19	Distribution of nonwhite deaths matched at usual place of residence for 729 urban areas of 25,000 population or more, by frequency groupings and type of difference: United States, May-August 1960	3.	
20	Number of deaths matched at usual place of residence and net difference rates, deaths unmatched, and proportion unmatched for 89 selected urban areas of 25,000 population or more, by color: United States, May-August 1960	4.	
23	Number of deaths matched at usual place of residence and net difference rates, by population-size group of area: United States, May-August 1960	5.	
24	Number and percent distribution of deaths in the 1960 Comparison Study and the followback survey, by population-size group of area according to death record designations: United States, May-August 1960	6.	
24	Number and percent distribution of deaths matched in the 1960 Comparison Study and the followback survey, by population-size group of area according to census record designations: United States, May-August 1960	7.	
25	Number and percent distribution of unmatched deaths, for which there were response and no response in the followback survey, and unmatched deaths in the 1960 Comparison Study, by population-size group of area according to death record designations: United States, May-August 1960	8.	
25	Net difference rates and proportion of death records unmatched for urban and rural areas in metropolitan and nonmetropolitan counties, by color and sex: United States, May-August 1960	9.	
26	Number of deaths matched at usual place of residence and not at usual place of residence, according to census record and death record for urban and rural areas in metropolitan and nonmetropolitan counties, by color and sex: United States, May-August 1960	10.	
29	Comparison of net difference rates and proportion unmatched, based on deaths matched at usual place of residence for 25 selected standard metropolitan statistical areas (SMSA's) and urban area components of those SMSA's: United States, May-August 1960	11.	
	Number of matched deaths reporting same standard metropolitan statistical area (SMSA) on both census and death records, on census record only, and on death record only; and net difference rates for total matched, matched at usual place of residence, and not at usual place of residence: United States, May-August	12.	

# DETAILED TABLES-Con.

Page		
44	Number of matched deaths reporting same standard metropolitan statistical area (SMSA) on both census and death records, census record only, and death record only; and net difference rates, by color: United States, May-August 1960	Table 13.
48	Number of unmatched deaths for standard metropolitan statistical areas (SMSA's), by color: United States, May-August 1960	14.
52	Net difference rates, by color, sex, and age: United States and each geographic division, May-August 1960	15.
53	Net difference rates for white males for stage I and stage II, by age: South Atlantic Division, May-August 1960	16.
54	Number of matched deaths reporting same race on both census and death records, census record only, and death record only; and net and gross difference rates: United States and each region, May-August 1960	17.
55	Number of matched and unmatched deaths and proportion unmatched, by race: United States and each region. May-August 1960	18.

Table 1. Frequency distribution of size of net difference rates based on deaths matched at usual place of residence, for urban areas of 25,000 population or more: United States, May-August 1960

Census record used as a base. Negative indicates more assignments by census than by NCHS]

	Positive difference				Negative d	ifference	fference		
Net difference rate	Areas of:				Aı	eas of:			
	Tota1	100,000 or more	50,000 100,000	25,000 50,000	Total	100,000 or more	50,000 100,000	25,000 to 50,000	
	Based on 100 deaths or more								
Total	289	110	110	69	83	21	45	17	
0-0.04	47 172 50 14 3	5 91 12 2	22 55 23 6 1 2	20 26 15 6 2	68 10 1	18 2 1	38 5 1	12 3 -	
25.0-29.9 30.0-34,9	1	1 1 1	1	1111	1 1 1	- - -	1 - - -	1 1	
Total	-    -   -   -   -   -   -   -   -   -					98			
0-0.04	84 89 32 12 3 12 - - 1 1 1		7 8 3 1	77 81 29 11 3 11 4 2 - 1	.61 21 12 3 3 3 1 	:	10 1 3	20 9 3 3 3 1 	

Table 2. Net difference rates based on events matched at usual place of residence for 221 selected urban areas of 25,000 population or more: United States, selected months, 1950 and 1960

[2ensus record used as base. Minus (-) sign indicates more assignments by census than by NCHS. Includes only those areas for which at least 100 births or more were assigned according to either the census record or the birth record in 1950]

	Net difference rate			Net difference rate		
Area	Deaths, 1960	Births, 1950	Area	Deaths, 1960	Births, 1950	
Alabama:	_		Georgia:			
BirminghamGadsden	2.1	5.0	Atlanta	2.7	4.0	
Mobile	-2.7 -0.6	-11.7 -4.9	Augusta	8.2	34.7 34.5	
Montgomery	4.2	-7.4	Macon	17.5	53.3	
Arizona:			Savannah	0.9	9.1	
Phoenix	-5.5	22.9	Illinois:			
Tucson	4.6	271.0	Chicago Decatur	0.5	0.8	
Arkansas:		1	East St. Louis	9.3 5.6	4.3 8.1	
Little Rock	8.1	10.3	Joliet	4.4	71.1	
			Peoria	0.7	1.8	
California:			Rockford	2.5	2.3	
Alameda	0.7	1.2	Springfield	8.0	-	
Bakersfield	14.4	41.1				
Berkeley Burbank	1.4	3.2	Indiana:	1		
Compton	12.9	0.8 15.1	East Chicago Evansville	-0.3	10.6	
Fresno	4.1	18.9	Fort Wayne	1.5	9.6	
Glendale		-1.7	Gary	4.3	20.2	
Long Beach	0.5	1.6	Hammond	-1.1	-15.0	
Los Angeles	-0.1	3.1	Indianapolis	2.7	9.0	
Oakland	0.9	3.7	Muncie	13.3	15.9	
Pasadena Richmond	1.1	-1.4	South Bend	4.9	12.1	
Riverside	11.0	9.1 13.3	Terre Haute	1.6	25.7	
Sacramento	8.4	3.9	Iowa:			
San Bernardino	1.6	38.8	Cedar Rapids	1.1	4.1	
San Diego	-1.2	2.5	Davenport	-3.2	-4.9	
San Francisco	-	1.8	Des Moines	2.2	17.4	
San Jose	6.8	35.7	Dubuque	[ _ :	4.4	
Santa Monica	2.6	0.9	Sioux City	-0.5	-5.9	
Stockton	5.3	11.4	Waterloo	3.4	6.6	
Colorado: . Colorado Springs	7.6	28.2	Kansas: Kansas City	11.5	10.3	
Denver	-0.2	0.7	Topeka	2.8	17.1	
Pueb10	2.0	7.9	Wichita	6.8	23.3	
Connecticut:			Kentucky:			
Bridgeport	-1.0	1.6	Covington	-1.0	6.1	
Hartford New Britain	-5.9	1.4	Louisville	12.1	12.7	
New Haven	1.4	0.9 -0.5	Louisiana:		1	
Stamford	-1.0	-6.8	Baton Rouge	4.0	0.4	
Waterbury	0.3	4.1	New Orleans	0.7	1.9	
•			Shreveport	0.7	11.2	
Delaware:				Į.		
Wilmington	3.3	7.4	Maine: Portland	-0.4	-3.9	
District of Columbia:		1		1		
Washington	-0.7	7.4	Maryland: Baltimore	0.6	1.1	
Florida:			Parcrimore		1	
Jacksonville	7.4	25.7	Massachusetts:		]	
Miami Pensacola	6.0	15.2	Boston	0.1	1.1	
	-3.5	41.1	Brockton	-1.7	-5.7	

Table 2. Net difference rates based on events matched at usual place of residence for 221 selected urban areas of 25,000 population or more: United States, selected months, 1950 and 1960—Con.

[Census record used as base. Minus (-) sign indicates more assignments by census than by NCHS. Includes only those areas for which at least 100 births or more were assigned according to either the census record or the birth record in 1950]

	Net diffe	rence rate		Net difference rate		
Area	Deaths, 1960	Births, 1950	Area	Deaths, 1960	Births, 1950	
Massachusetts-Con.			New Mexico:			
Fall River	-	3.6	Albuquerque	6.0	19.0	
Lawrence	-0.5	2.3			_,,,	
Lowell	=	3.0	New York:			
Lynn Malden	-0.7	-0.5	Albany	1.9	6.9	
New Bedford	0.6	2.0	Binghamton	1.2	-3.6	
Newton	1.3	2.5	Buffalo	0.5	-0.2	
Quincy	-6.5 -0.9	4.9 2.1	Mount Vernon	-1.1	-2.0	
Somerville	-0.5	-2.2	New York City	0.2	0.5	
Springfield	-0.5	4.4	Niagara Falls Rochester	1.2	3.0	
Worcester	0.2	2.2	Schenectady	5.8	2.4 10.8	
	· · · ·		Syracuse	1.1	0.3	
Michigan:			Troy	1.0	14.8	
Bay City	3.6	44.2	Utica	-2.4	14.0	
Dearborn	9.4	24.0	Yonkers	-2.6	-5.2	
Detroit	0.4	1.5		_,-		
Flint	0.9	6.1	North Carolina:			
Grand Rapids	3.0	11.4	Charlotte	-0.6	6.5	
Jackson	7.5	35.4	Durham	0.6	21.7	
Kalamazoo	3.5	13.7	Fayetteville	20.9	9.6	
Lansing	2.0	8.0	Greensboro	1.1	32.7	
Muskegon Pontiac	3.3	26.9	Raleigh		21.2	
Royal Oak	0.6	6.9	Winston-Salem	3.4	15.5	
Saginaw	1.9	22.2	Ohio			
Daginaw	1.9	1.0	Ohio: Akron	1.7	2 5	
Minnesota:			Canton	3.5	3.5 25.7	
Duluth	2.1	_	Cincinnati	0.4	0.4	
Minneapolis	1.ī l	2.2	Cleveland	1.7	1.1	
St. Paul	0.2	3.6	Columbus	-0.1	-2.5	
			Dayton	2.1	46.1	
Mississippi:			Lakewood	-0.6	-3.9	
Jackson	2.5	-	Lima	3.3	32.0	
\(\frac{1}{2}\)			Lorain	-0.8	3.0	
Missouri:			Springfield	5.1	14.1	
Kansas City	0.2	-1.7	Toledo	0.3	16.2	
SpringfieldSt. Joseph	1.3	2.9	Warren	5.1	13.8	
St. Louis	-0.5	3.1	Youngstown	0.2	15.0	
Du. Hours	0.6	1.5	Oklahoma:	1		
Nebraska:			Oklahoma City	5.2	3.8	
Lincoln	3.0	5.6	Tulsa	8.7	7.3	
Omaha	4.1	5. ĭ		0.,	7.5	
			Oregon:			
New Hampshire:	1		Eugene	-8.6	62.7	
Manchester	-	3.0	Portland	5.0	30.5	
	1					
New Jersey:	į		Pennsylvania:			
Bayonne		0.8	Allentown	1.5	1.9	
CamdenClifton	1.6	, -	Altoona	2.4	5.5	
	0.6	-4.8	Bethlehem Chester	4.0	6.7	
East OrangeElizabeth	-1.3	-0.9 2.4	Erie	5.1	17.2	
Jersey City	-0.8	2.4	Harrisburg	1.0 12.0	8.7	
Newark	0.9	-0.2	Johnstown	36.9	13.0 42.6	
Paterson	0.8	-0.5	Lancaster	21.0	13.2	
Trenton	3.3	4.3	Philadelphia	0.3	13.2	

Table 2. Net difference rates based on events matched at usual place of residence for 221 selected urban areas of 25,000 population or more:United States, selected months, 1950 and 1960—Con.

Eensus record used as base. Minus (-) sign indicates more assignments by census than by NCHs. Includes only those areas for which at least 100 births or more were assigned according to either the census record or the birth record in 1950

<del></del>	<del></del>		r			
	Net differ	rence rate		Net difference rate		
Area	Deaths, 1960	Births, 1950	Area	Deaths, 1960	Births, 1950	
Pennsylvania—Con. Pittsburgh Reading Scranton Upper Darby Wilkes-Barre York	5.0 1.0 1.9 -3.4 4.0	30.5 10.3 1.6 -16.9 23.7 26.7	Texas—Con.  Houston Laredo Lubbock Port Arthur San Antonio San Angelo Waco Wichita Falls	-12.3 -4.7 0.7 1.2 2.0 -1.7 2.7	14.2 3.9 0.6 9.7 8.7 1.8 2.5	
Rhode Island: Pawtucket Providence	-0.8 -0.7	7.3 1.1	Wichita Falls Utah: Ogden Salt Lake City	5.5 3.7	10.5 5.5 6.6	
South Carolina: Charleston Columbia Greenville South Dakota: Sioux Falls	2.0 -1.0 4.2 6.7	11.9 45.2 7.7 6.9	Virginia: Alexandria Arlington County Norfolk Portsmouth Richmond Roanoke	1.5 - 1.6 0.5 0.3	13.2 0.3 5.1 2.0 6.6	
Tennessee: ChattanoogaKnoxville Memphis Nashville	3.2 0.4 1.8 3.0	27.7 5.0 -7.9 58.1	Washington: Seattle Spokane Tacoma Yakima	3.7 1.6 1.2 17.6	43.9 9.7 10.3 33.0	
Texas: Amarillo Austin Beaumont Corpus Christi Dallas	-0.5 -1.4 1.6 0.4	7.4 7.8 1.9 1.4 5.2	West Virginia: Charleston Huntington Wheeling Wisconsin: Green Bay	2.6 3.5 3.6	38.0 9.7 4.9	
E1 Paso	1.7 3.4 0.5	6.0 14.6 23.2	Madison Milwaukee Racine	3.1 0.5 0.5	-0.5 1.1 11.5	

NOTE: May-August 1960 used for deaths and January-March 1950 used for births.

Source for births: National Vital Statistics Division: Matched record comparison of birth certificate and census information: United States, 1950. <u>Vital Statistics—Special Reports</u>, Vol. 47, No. 12. Public Health Service. Washington, D.C., Mar. 1962.

Table 3. Distribution of nonwhite deaths matched at usual place of residence for 729 urban areas of 25,000 population or more, by frequency groupings and type of difference: United States, May-August 1960

Direction of difference	Number of urban areas
All areas	729
No deaths assigned according to census record or death record	201
Frequency of 1 or 2 according to either census record or death record and zero frequency in other	26
Frequency of less than 10 deaths according to census record	239 150 5 84
Frequency of 10 deaths or more according to census records  Net difference rate is zero  Net difference rate for white is higher than for nonwhite  Net difference rate for white is lower than for nonwhite	<sup>1</sup> 263 58 79 125

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Includes one area for which the net difference rate was the same for white and nonwhite.

Table 4. Number of deaths matched at usual place of residence and net difference rates, deaths unmatched, and proportion unmatched for 89 selected urban areas of 25,000 population or more, by color: United States, May-August 1960

[Census record used as a base for net difference rate and proportion white teled. Minus (-) sign indicates more assignments by census than by NCHS. Includes only those areas for which at least 50 nonwhite deaths were assigned according to either the census record or death record]

	Deaths	matched a	t usual ing to:	residence		Net	Unm	atched		ortion
Area	Censu	s record	D∈at	h record	differ	ence rate	de	aths	unmatched	
770	White	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite
Alabama: BessemerBirmingham Mobile Montgomery	23 450 222 110	42 370 120 127	29 466 227 123	51 380 117 127	26.1 3.6 2.3 11.8	21.4 2.7 -2.5	12 169 72 63	26 136 45 55	34.3 27.3 24.5 36.4	38.2 26.9 27.3 30.2
Arkansas: Little Rock	171	74	189	77	10.5	4.1	51	37	23.0	33.3
California: Los Angeles Oakland San Diego San Francisco	4,975 858 884 2,012	627 150 56 172	5,021 877 886 2,035	618 146 54 169	0.9 2.2 0.2 1.1	-1.4 -2.7 -3.6 -1.7	1,362 257 323 514	305 65 24 69	21.5 23.0 26.8 20.3	32.7 30.2 30.0 28.6
Colorado: Denver	1,183	56	1,193	53	0.2	-0.8	230	24	16.3	30.0
Delaware: Wilmington	254	51	262	54	3.1	5.9	51	33	16.7	39.3
District of Columbia: Washington	1,070	854	1,064	863	-0.6	1.1	260	358	19.5	29.5
Florida: Jacksonville Miami St. Petersburg Tampa	251 639 720 584	205 103 66 138	278 687 751 614	214 108 65 140	10.8 7.5 4.3 5.1	4.4 4.9 -1.5 1.4	100 293 135 152	83 64 25 56	28.5 31.4 15.8 20.7	28.8 38.3 27.5 28.9
Georgia: Albany Atlanta Augusta Columbus Macon Savannah	56 691 67 147 111 169	50 428 84 59 88 152	58 724 81 146 132 163	54 438 90 60 103 163	3.6 4.8 20.9 -0.7 18.9 -3.6	8.0 2.3 7.1 1.7 17.0 7.2	16 227 41 73 26 47	22 174 34 26 33 41	22.2 24.7 38.0 33.2 19.0 21.8	30.6 28.9 28.8 30.6 27.3 21.2
Hawaii: Hilo Honolulu	17 103	43 231	19 106	56 294	11.8 2.9	30.2 27.3	3 44	29 72	15.0 29.9	40.3 23.8
Illinois: Chicago East St. Louis	8,081 133	1,643 92	8,199 149	1,682 95	1.5 12.0	2.4 3.3	2,061 41	.849 36	20.3 23.6	34.1 28.1
Indiana: Gary Indianapolis	262 970	132 239	276 1,017	137 235	5.3 4.8	3.8 -1.7	46 259	56 98	14.9 21.1	29.8 29.1
Kansas: Kansas City	237	78	272	86	14.8	10.3	67	22	22.0	22.0
Kentucky: Lexington Louisville	142 806	54 225	182 933	61 237	28.2 15.8	13.0 5.3	36 281	24 111	20.2 25.9	30.8 33.0
Louisiana: Alexandria Baton Rouge Monroe New Orleans Shreveport	46 169 46 1,111 234	52 108 69 609 171	51 177 48 1,128 231	51 111 75 618 179	10.9 4.7 4.3 1.5 -1.3	-1.9 2.8 8.7 1.5 4.7	31 45 16 231 83	25 38 28 213 72	40.3 21.0 25.8 17.2 26.2	32.5 26.0 28.9 25.9 29.6
Maryland: Baltimore	1,744	679	1,773	687	1.7	1.2	469	329	21.2	32.6

Table 4. Number of deaths matched at usual place of residence and net difference rates, deaths unmatched, and proportion unmatched for 89 selected urban areas of 25,000 population or more by color: United States, May-August 1960—Con.

[Lensus record used as a base for net difference rate and proportion unmatched. Minus (-) sign indicates more assignments by census than r / NCHS. Includes only those areas for which at least 50 nonwhite deaths were assigned according to either the census record or death record]

	Deaths		at usual iing to:	residence				natched			
Area	Censu	s record	Deat	h record	differ	ence rate	de	eaths	unmatched		
	White	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite	
Massachusetts: Boston	1,927	134	1,946	129	1.0	-3.7	457	71	19.2	34.6	
Michigan: Detroit Flint	3,344 380	885 73	3,383 387	898 71	1.2 1.8	1.5 -2.7	663 68	341 16	16.5 15.2	27.8 18.0	
Mississippi: Greenville Jackson Vicksburg	32 134 31	62 105 67	34 139 31	60 106 69	6.3 3.7	-3.2 1.0 3.0	12 54 12	13 32 14	27.3 28.7 27.9	17.3 23.4 17.3	
Missouri: Kansas City St. Louis	1,139 1,742	213 514	1,146 1,771	216 513	0.6 1.7	1.4	242 471	85 242	17.5 21.3	28.5 32.0	
Nebraska: Omaha	584	65	613	66	5.0	1.5	151	33	20.5	33.7	
New Jersey: Atlantic City Jersey City Newark	165 767 740	53 69 266	160 761 761	58 74 264	-3.0 -0.8 2.8	9.4 7.2 -0.8	51 153 239	24 44 160	23.6 16.6 24.4	31.2 38.9 37.6	
New York: New York City Buffalo	18,703 1,520	2,074 129	18,813 1,559	2,132 116	0.6 2.6	2.8 -10.1	4,350 225	1,252 36	18.9 12.9	37.6 21.8	
North Carolina: Charlotte Durham Greensboro Raleigh Wilmington Winston-Salem	208 120 114 93 71 122	139 55 63 60 60	206 123 117 94 73 128	139 54 62 59 65 115	-1.0 2.5 2.6 1.1 2.8 4.9	-1.8 -1.6 -1.7 8.3 2.7	73 28 45 29 12 25	40 31 24 11 13 46	26.0 18.9 28.3 23.8 14.5	22.3 36.0 27.6 15.5 17.8 29.1	
Ohio: Akron	602 1,082 1,934 836 529 783 416	58 247 492 167 127 81 53	616 1,091 1,995 835 549 791 418	56 254 489 173 126 83 52	2.3 0.8 3.2 -0.1 3.8 1.0 0.5	-3.4 2.8 -0.6 3.6 -0.8 2.5	127 232 339 179 133 186 55	29 101 184 46 44 22 18	17.4 17.7 14.9 17.6 20.1 19.2 11.7	33.3 29.0 27.2 21.6 25.7 21.4 25.4	
Oklahoma: Oklahoma City Tulsa	546 447	81 65	581 493	83 70	6.4 10.3	2.5 7.7	201 131	44 31	26.9 22.7	35.2 32.3	
Pennsylvania: Philadelphia Pittsburgh	4,464 1,551	1,174 264	4,529 1,639	1,162 281	1.5 5.7	-1.0 6.4	,235 410	518 88	21.7 20.9	30.6 25.0	
South Carolina: Charleston Columbia Greenville	79 132 65	71 59 52	84 132 74	70 62 50	6.3	-1.4 5.1 -3.8	26 20 36	20 40 26	24.8 13.2 35.6	22.0 40.4 33.3	
Tennessee: Chattanooga Knoxville Memphis Nashville	200 215 594 279	114 57 437 190	212 221 617 294	113 53 443 191	6.0 2.8 3.9 5.4	-0.9 -7.0 1.4 0.5	85 95 135 78	65 22 173 65	29.8 30.6 18.5 21.8	36.3 27.8 28.4 25.5	
Texas:  Beaumont Dallas Fort Worth Galveston Houston San Antonio Waco	163 928 569 144 1,152 925 170	75 251 130 55 374 98 59	172 945 598 147 1,017 940 177	76 247 131 56 334 99 54	5.5 1.8 5.1 2.1 -11.7 1.6 4.1	1.3 -1.6 0.8 1.8 -10.7 1.0 -8.5	45 321 211 34 348 286 62	21 137 58 20 161 42	21.6 25.7 27.1 19.1 23.2 23.6 26.7	21.9 35.3 30.9 26.7 30.1 30.0 23.4	

Table 4. Number of deaths matched at usual place of residence and net difference rates, deaths unmatched, and proportion unmatched for 89 selected urban areas of 25,000 population or more by color: United States, May-August 1960—Con.

[Densus record used as a base for net difference rate and proportion unmatched. Minus (-) sign indicates more assignments by census than by NCHS. Includes only those areas for which at least 50 nonwhite deaths were assigned according to either the census record or death record]

	Deaths matched at usual residence according to:					Net	Unmatched		Proportion		
Area	Censu	s record	Deat	h record	direr	difference rate		difference rate deaths		unmatched	
	White Nonwhite White Nonwhite V		White	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite			
Virginia: Newport News Norfolk Petersburg Portsmouth Richmond	108 377 56 140 432	71 190 49 78 185	109 383 56 143 440	72 195 51 79 185	0.9 1.6 2.1 1.9	1.4 2.6 4.1 1.3	31 107 13 40 85	31 81 14 36 92	22.3 22.1 18.8 22.2 16.4	30.4 29.9 22.2 31.6 33.2	
Washington: Seattle	1,205	59	1,260	60	4.6	1.7	468	25	28.0	29.8	
Wisconsin: Milwaukee	1,750	92	1,766	91	0.9	1.1	326	34	15.7	27.0	

Table 5. Number of deaths matched at usual place of residence and net difference rates, by population-size group of area: United States, May-August 1960

[Census record used as base. Minus (-) sign indicates more assignments by census than by NCHS]

Population-size group of area		ched at usual according to:	Net differ-
Topulation-Size group of drea	Census record	Death record	ence rate
m 1			
<u>Total</u>			
All areas	388,754	388,754	•••
Total areas of 25,000 or more	189,363	189,307	-0.0
Total areas of 25,000 or more	46,317	46,452	ŏ.ă
	27 760	27,924	0.6
250,000 to 500,000	25,671	26,259	2.3
100,000 to 250,000	27,203	27,530	1.2
50,000 to 100,000	30,768	30,543	-0.7
25,000 to 50,000	31,644 36,159	30,599	-3.3 -4.7
2 500 to 10 000	41,510	34,464 37,786	-9.0
250,000 to 500,000	121,722		4.5
<u>White</u>			
All areas	344,495	347,247	0.8
Total areas of 25 000 or more	163,749	164,963	0.7
Total areas of 25,000 or more	39,567	39,957	1.6
500,000 to 1,000,000	39,567 22,529	22,899	1.6
		22,025	3.6
250,000 to 300,000	23,423	23,899	2.0
50,000 to 100,000	28,003	27,982	-0.1
25,000 to 50,000	28,972	28,201	-2.7
2 500 to 10 000	33,294 38,142	31,854 34,879	-4.3 -8.6
Rural	109,310	115,551	5.7
Nonwhite			
All areas	41,111	41,486	0.9
Total areas of 25,000 or more	24,084	24,335	1.0
1,000,000 or more	6,401	6,492	1.4
500,000 to 1,000,000	5,026	5,024	-0.0
250,000 to 500,000	4,140	4,233	2.2
100,000 to 200,000	3,593 2,509	3,628	1.0 2.1
10,000 to 100,000	2,309	2,561 2,397	-0.7
10.000 to 25.000	2,645	2,397 2,607	-1.4
2,500 to 10,000	2,995	2,903	-3.1
Rural	11,387		2.2

NOTE: For explanation of why white and nonwhite do not add to the total, see Technical Appendix.

Table 6. Number and percent distribution of deaths in the 1960 Comparison Study and the follow-back survey, by population-size group of area according to death record designations: United States, May-August 1960

	1960 Com Stu		Followback survey		
Population-size group of area	Number	Percent distri- bution	Number	Percent distri- bution	
Total	501,410	100.0	9,475	100.0	
1,000,000 or more	59,390	11.8	1,134	12.0	
500,000 to 1,000,000	35,800	7.1	717	7.6	
250,000 to 500,000	33,830	6.7	651	6 <b>.</b> 9	
100,000 to 250,000	34,600	6.9	653	6.9	
50,000 to 100,000	37,991	7.6	708	7.5	
25,000 to 50,000	38,000	7.6	718	7.6	
10,000 to 25,000	43,425	8.7	825	8.7	
2,500 to 10,000	47,434	9.5	843	8.9	
All other	170,940	34.1	3,226	34.0	

Table 7. Number and percent distribution of deaths matched in the 1960 Comparison Study and the followback survey, by population-size group of area according to census record designations: United States, May-August 1960

	1960 Com Stu		Followback survey		
Population-size group of area	Number	Percent distri- bution	Number	Percent distri- bution	
Total	388,754	100.0	7,393	100.0	
1,000,000 or more	46,317	11.9	889	12.0	
500,000 to 1,000,000	27,760	7.1	539	7.3	
250,000 to 500,000	25,671	6.6	495	6.7	
100,000 to 250,000	27,203	7.0	474	6.4	
50,000 to 100,000	30,768	7.9	564	7.6	
25,000 to 50,000	31,644	8.1	292	3.9	
10,000 to 25,000	36,159	9.3	700	9.5	
2,500 to 10,000	41,510	10.7	761	10.3	
25,000 or more <sup>1</sup>	•••	•••	302	4.1	
All other	121,722	31.3	2,377	32.2	

 $<sup>^1</sup>$ Processing errors by census category represents areas of 25,000 population or more, but size of area could not be further defined.

Table 8. Number and percent distribution of unmatched deaths, for which there were response and no response in the followback survey, and unmatched deaths in the 1960 Comparison Study, by population-size group of area according to death record designations: United States, May-August 1960

Population-size group of area		Followbac	Unmatched deaths in 1960 Comparison Study			
	Number	Percent distri- bution	Number	Percent distri- bution	Number	Percent distri- bution
Total	1,861	100.0	221	100.0	112,656	100.0
1,000,000 or more	189 127 121 140 126 127 155 164 712	10.2 6.8 6.5 7.5 6.8 6.8 8.3 8.3	30 34 16 11 24 17 18 5 66	13.6 15.4 7.2 5.0 10.9 7.7 8.1 2.3 29.9	12,938 7,876 7,571 7,070 7,448 7,401 8,961 9,648 43,743	11.5 7.0 6.7 6.3 6.6 6.6 8.0 8.6 38.8

Table 9. Net difference rates and proportion of death records unmatched for urban and rural areas in metropolitan and nonmetropolitan counties, by color and sex: United States, May-August 1960

[Death record used as a base. Minus (-) sign indicates more assignments by census than by NCHS. For definition of areas, see Technical Appendix]

Area, color, and sex	Net differ- ence rate	Propor- tion of deaths un- matched	Area, color, and sex	Net differ- ence rate	Propor- tion of deaths un- matched
Total	•••	21.1	White female-Con.		
Metropolitan counties	-0.3	20.8	Nonmetropolitan counties	0.5	21.5
UrbanRural	0.3 -3.6	19.4 27.4	Urban Rural	2.4 -0.9	19.7 22.9
Nonmetropolitan counties	0.5	21.6	Nonwhite male	•••	34.6
UrbanRural	2.0 -0.5	20.0 22.7	Metropolitan counties	-0.7	35.4
White male		21.0	UrbanRural	-2.2 15.0	33.8 48.1
Metropolitan counties	-0.3	20.8	Nonmetropolitan counties	1.1	33.2
UrbanRural	0.3 -3.4	19.2 27.4	Urban Rural	0.3 2.0	31.8 34.1
Nonmetropolitan counties	0.5	21.2	Nonwhite female	•••	31.5
UrbanRural	2.5 -0.7	19.8 22.0	Metropolitan counties	-0.3	31.0
White female		20.4	Urban Rural	-1.2 10.0	29.4 45.1
Metropolitan counties	-0.3	19.8	Nonmetropolitan counties	0.4	32.4
UrbanRural	0.6 -5.0	18.0 27.8	Urban Rural	-0.2 1.0	28.8 34.9

NOTE: Figures with color and/or sex not stated are included in the total, but are not shown separately.

Table 10. Number of deaths matched at usual place of residence and not at usual place of residence, according to census record and death record for urban and rural areas in metropolitan and nonmetropolitan counties, by color and sex: United States, May-August 1960

[For definition of areas, see Technical Appendix]

[For definition of aleas, see Technical Appendix]										
			Area acc	ording to	o death re	cord				
Area according to census record	Total	Metrop	olitan co	unty	Nonmetropolitan county					
		Total	Urban	Rural	Total	Urban	Rura1			
USUAL PLACE OF RESIDENCE										
<u>Total</u>										
All counties	388,754	241,075	201,366	39,709	147,679	60,191	87,488			
All metropolitan counties	241,030	240,717	201,154	39,563	313	118	195			
Urban Rural	205,660 35,370	205,469 35,248	197,373 3,781	8,096 31,467	191 122	100 18	91 104			
All nonmetropolitan counties-	147,724	358	212	146	147,366	60,073	87,293			
Urban Rural	61,372 86,352	120 238	86 126	34 112	61,252 86,114	57,565 2,508	3,687 83,606			
White					:					
Male	190,119	115,442	94,749	20,693	74,677	29,139	45,538			
All metropolitan counties	115,438	115,263	94,624	20,639	175	60	115			
Urban Rural	96,833 18,605	96,733 18,530	92,632 1,992	4,101 16,538	100 75	56 4	44 71			
All nonmetropolitan counties-	74,681	179	125	54	74,502	29,079	45,423			
Urban Rural	29,867 44,814	57 122	47 78	10 44	29,810 44,692	27,870 1,209	1,940 43,483			
Female	138,013	87,880	73,672	14,208	50,133	21,899	28,234			
All metropolitan counties	87,854	87,761	73,614	14,147	93	41	52			
Urban Rural	75,443 12,411	75,381 12,380	72,430 1,184	2,951 11,196	62 31	30 11	32 20			
All nonmetropolitan counties-	50,159	119	58	61	50,040	21,858	28,182			
Urban Rural	22,380 27,779	44 75	28 30	16 45	22,336 27,704	21,071 787	1,265 26,917			
Nonwhite										
Male	19,886	12,113	11,076	1,037	7,773	2,998	4,775			
All metropolitan counties	12,108	12,089	11,061	1,028	19	6	13			
UrbanRural	11,141 967	11,129 960	10,924 137	205 823	12 7	5 1	7 6			
All nonmetropolitan counties-	7,778	24	15	9	7,754	2,992	4,762			
Urban Rural	2,996 4,782	9 15	7 8	2 7	2,987 4,767	2,851 141	136 4,626			

Table 10. Number of deaths matched at usual place of residence and not at usual place of residence, according to census record and death record for urban and rural areas in metropolitan and nonmetropolitan counties, by color and sex: United States, May-August 1960—Con.

[For definition of areas, see Technical Appendix]

	1	T					
	,	Area according to death record					
Area according to census record	Total	Metrop	olitan co	ounty	Nonmetropolitan county		
		Total	Urban	Rural	Total	Urban	Rural
USUAL PLACE OF RESIDENCE Con.							
Nonwhite-Con.							
Female	16,814	10,520	9,666	854	6,294	2,703	3,591
All metropolitan counties	10,523	10,507	9,660	847	16	6	10
Urban Rural	9,732 791	9,722 785	9,566 94	156 691	10 6	4 2	6 4
All nonmetropolitan counties-	6,291	13	6	7	6,278	2,697	3,581
UrbanRural	2,703 3,588	4 9	1 5	3 4	2,699 3,579	2,591 106	108 3,473
NOT AT USUAL PLACE OF RESIDENCE							
<u>Total</u>							
All counties	31,538	19,992	16,936	3,056	11,546	5,038	6,508
All metropolitan counties	19,210	17,041	14,445	2,596	2,169	932	1,237
UrbanRural	13,368 5,842	11,886 5,155	10,581 3,864	1,305 1,291	1,482 687	632 300	850 387
All nonmetropolitan counties-	12,328	2,951	2,491	460	9,377	4,106	5,271
UrbanRural	5,165 7,163	1,075 1,876	890 1,601	185 275	4,090 5,287	2,170 1,936	1,920 3,351
White							
Male	13,450	8,325	7,030	1,295	5,125	2,183	2,942
All metropolitan counties	7,920	6,891	5,807	1,084	1,029	424	605
UrbanRural	5,274 2,646	4,550 2,341	4,049 1,758	501 583	724 305	309 115	415 190
All nonmetropolitan counties-	5,530	1,434	1,223	211	4,096	1,759	2,337
UrbanRural	2,223 3,307	543 891	437 786	106 105	1,680 2,416	849 910	831 1,506
Female	15,493	9,902	8,322	1,580	5,591	2,552	3,039
All metropolitan counties	9,634	8,689	7,323	1,366	945	430	515
Urban Rural	7,049 2,585	6,372 2,317	5,632 1,691	740 626	677 268	291 139	386 129
All nonmetropolitan counties-	5,859	1,213	999	214	4,646	2,122	2,524
UrbanRura1	2,662 3,197	439 774	373 626	66 148	2,223 2,423	1,221 901	1,002 1,522

Table 10. Number of deaths matched at usual place of residence and not at usual place of residence, according to census record and death record for urban and rural areas in metropolitan and nonmetropolitan counties, by color and sex: United States, May-August 1960—Con.

[For definition of areas, see Technical Appendix]

E or definition of Blood, one forming.									
		Area according to death record							
Area according to census record	Total	Metrop	Metropolitan county			Nonmetropolitan county			
		Tota1	Urban	Rural	Total	Urban	Rural		
NOT AT USUAL PLACE OF RESIDENCE—Con.									
Nonwhite									
Male	1,273	886	793	93	387	148	239		
All metropolitan counties	800	696	625	71	104	39	65		
UrbanRural	467 333	428 268	405 220	23 48	39 65	15 24	24 41		
All nonmetropolitan counties-	473	190	168	22	283	109	174		
UrbanRural	139 334	61 129	52 116	9 13	78 205	42 67	36 138		
Female	903	617	565	52	286	115	171		
All metropolitan counties	585	518	476	42	67	26	41		
UrbanRural	379 206	350 168	330 146	20 22	29 38	12 14	17 24		
All nonmetropolitan counties-	318	99	89	10	219	89	130		
UrbanRural	108 210	27 72	25 64	2 8	81 138	48 41	33 97		

NOTE: Figures with  $\,$  color and/or sex not  $\,$  stated are included in the total  $\,$  but are not shown separately.

Table 11. Comparison of net difference rates and proportion unmatched, based on deaths matched at usual place of residence for 25 selected standard metropolitan statistical areas (SMSA's) and urban area components of those SMSA's: United States, May-August 1960

[Urban area components are only those of 25,000 population or more. For further definition of areas, see Technical Appendix]

		···	
Area		Proportion unmatched	
		Census record base	Death record base
Albuquerque, N. MexAlbuquerque, N. Mex	-0.3 6.0	31.4 30.6	31.4 29.3
Augusta, GaS.C	0.3 8.2	36.1 32.2	36.1 30.5
Billings, MontBillings, Mont	8.5	31.1 29.3	31.1 27.7
Chicago, Ill	0.2 4.2 8.3 1.1 4.5 0.52 -0.9 15.8 -3.1 -0.5 -4.4 -8.5 91.4 0.6 -1.1 5.6	21.3 32.4 20.0 2.6 21.4 22.8 16.0 6.6 33.3 17.7 10.9 25.6 15.1 13.2 13.7 18.6 20.4 8.0 9.4 19.1	21.3 31.5 18.8 2.7 20.7 22.8 15.8 6.6 30.2 18.2 14.1 11.0 25.6 15.1 12.7 14.8 10.7 20.3 8.0 9.3 10.8 18.3
Davenport-Rock Island-Moline, Iowa-Ill	-1.4 -3.2 6.5 -1.5	19.1 20.3 23.9 9.6	19.4 20.8 22.8 9.7
El Paso, TexEl Paso, Tex	3.3 1.7	28.9 28.7	28.2 28.3
Fort Wayne, IndFort Wayne, Ind	0.2 1.5	12.5 12.5	12.5 12.3
Jersey City, N.J	0.2 -0.8 -0.8 -0.9 -0.6 -1.1	17.9 20.0 25.6 18.9 11.9 12.3 9.9 20.7	17.9 20.0 25.7 19.1 12.0 12.3 9.8 20.9
Laredo, TexLaredo, Tex	0.8	25.3 25.7	25.2 25.7
Lorain-Elyria, Ohio	-0.3 -3.0 -0.8	25.0 17.3 19.6	25.1 17.7 19.7

Table 11. Comparison of net difference rates and proportion unmatched, based on deaths matched at usual place of residence for 25 selected standard metropolitan statistical areas (SMSA's) and urban area components of those SMSA's: United States, May-August 1960—Con.

[Urban area components are only those of 25,000 population or more. For further definition of areas, see Technical Appendix]

Area		Proportion unmatched	
		Census record base	Death record base
Milwaukee, Wis	0.1 0.5 -7.0 6.3 5.7	16.6 16.3 26.0 13.0 7.6	16.6 16.2 24.7 13.8 7.3
Muncie, Ind	13.3	25.2 19.5	25.2 17.6
Nashville, TennNashville, Tenn	-0.3 3.0	25.5 23.3	25.5 22.8
Odessa, TexOdessa, Tex	1.2	29.9 33.1	29.9 32.8
Omaha, NebrIowa	2.1 4.1	20.1 3.6 22.0	19.8 3.6 21.3
Racine, Wis	0.5	15.4 12.0	15.4 12.0
Rockford, Ill	-0.2 2.5	18.3 14.2	18.3 13.9
Salt Lake City, UtahSalt Lake City, Utah	3.7	23.7 20.9	23.7 20.3
Shreveport, La	-0.4 - 0.7	31.1 28.9 27.6	31.2 28.9 27.4
Steubenville-Weirton, Ohio-W.VaSteubenville, Ohio	0.8	24.8 19.9 32.0	24.7 19.9 31.4
Tacoma, WashTacoma, Wash	-0.3 1.2	28.4 17.9	28.5 17.7
Tuscaloosa, Ala Tuscaloosa, Ala	13.3	48.1 46.5	48.1 43.4
Wichita Falls, Tex	1.9 2.7	24.0 20.0	23.6 19.6
Wilkes-BarreHazleton, Pa Hazelton, Pa Wilkes-Barre, Pa	-	15.1 13.7 21.3	15.1 13.7 21.3
Youngstown-Warren, Ohio	-0.1 5.1 0.2	19.9 18.0 13.5	19.9 17.2 13.4

<sup>1</sup> Census record used as base. Minus (-) sign indicates more assignments by census than by NCHS.

Table 12. Number of matched deaths reporting same standard metropolitan statistical area (SMSA) on both census and death records, on census record only, and on death record only; and net difference rates for total matched, matched at usual place of residence, and not at usual place of residence: United States, May-August 1960

[Census record used as a base. Minus (-) sign indicates more assignments by census than by NuHS. For definition of areas, see Technical Appendix]

	Number reporting			
Area	Same on both	Census record only	Death record only	Net differ- ence rate
<u>Total</u>				
All areas	412,197	8,095	8,095	•••
Total SMSA's	255,454	4,786	5,613	0.3
Abilene, Tex	179 1,042 126 1,833 364	24 - 19 3	9 46 1 76 3	2.7 2.1 0.8 3.1
Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton, PaN.J	1,398 404 210 288 264	14 21 15 70 22	16 4 7 9 6	0.1 -4.0 -3.6 -17.0 -5.6
Atlanta, Ga	1,869 517 350 329 467	24 6 14 55	62 17 12 6 16	2.0 2.1 0.5 -12.8 3.4
Baltimore, Md	3,855 356 224 546 134	64 7 1 8	55 12 8 18 1	-0.2 1.4 3.1 1.8 0.7
Binghamton, N.Y Birmingham, Ala Boston-Lowell-Lawrence, Mass <sup>1</sup> Bridgeport-Stamford-Norwalk, Conn <sup>1</sup> Brockton, Mass <sup>1</sup>	522 1,200 8,713 1,532 692	33 8 71 28 20	14 37 129 34 28	-3.4 2.4 0.7 0.4 1.1
Brownsville-Harlingen-San Benito, Tex	223 3,468 764 241 192	5 57 42 - 2	53 9 3 13	0.9 -0.1 -4.1 1.2 5.7
Charleston, S.C	295 436 405 512 15,504	6 3 4 6 91	12 9 2 10 377	2.0 1.4 -0.5 0.8 1.8
Cincinnati, Ohio-Ky	2,694 4,406 245 432 309	32 12 13 124 6	29 94 19 - 19	-0.1 1.9 2.3 -22.3 4.1
Columbus, Ohio	1,490 312 1,880 633 1,458	35 7 43 32 37	24 11 54 10 10	-0.7 1.3 0.6 -3.3 -1.8

Table 12. Number of matched deaths reporting same standard metropolitan statistical area (SMSA) on both census and death records, on census record only, and on death record only; and net difference rates for total matched, matched at usual place of residence, and not at usual place of residence: United States, May-August 1960—Con.

	Number reporting			N
Area	Same on both	Census record only	Death record only	Net differ- ence rate
Decatur, Ill	237 1,942 622 7,848 186	5 22 3 26 23	5 66 19 141 4	2.2 2.6 1.5 -9.1
Duluth-Superior, MinnWis	741 222 439 649 238	16 1 7 3	37 11 22 21 9	2.8 4.5 3.4 2.8 3.8
Evansville, IndKy	440	19	2	-3.7
	998	13	16	0.3
	170	7	14	4.0
	720	9	14	0.7
	702	26	5	-2.9
Fort Smith, Ark	127	5	3	-1.5
	521	25	27	0.4
	1,025	14	28	1.3
	715	6	13	1.0
	150	10	3	-4.4
Galveston-Texas City, Tex	278	3	14	3.9
	1,166	1	35	2.9
	808	34	20	-1.7
	180	6	3	-1.6
	253	8	12	1.5
Greensboro-High Point, N.C	392	11	9	-0.5
	269	-	12	4.5
	400	-	7	1.8
	885	39	29	-1.1
	1,551	16	41	1.6
Honolulu, Hawaii	602	6	2	-0.7
	1,934	18	31	0.7
	529	23	15	-1.4
	144	6	4	-1.3
	1,673	19	49	1.8
Jackson, Mich	345	5	15	2.9
	346	22	17	-1.4
	839	13	22	1.1
	1,865	9	60	2.7
	813	21	20	-0.1
Kalamazoo, Mich	322 2,330 192 622 185	29 26 5 36	2 94 10 8 7	-7.7 2.9 2.5 -4.3 3.8
Lancaster, Pa	656 568 118 199	64 12 - 1	24 16 8 9 6	-5.6 0.7 6.8 4.5 5.0

Table 12. Number of matched deaths reporting same standard metropolitan statistical area (SMSA) on both census and death records, on census record only, and on death record only; and net difference rates for total matched, matched at usual place of residence, and not at usual place of residence: United States, May-August 1960—Con.

	Numb	Net		
Area	Same on both	Census record only	Death record only	differ- ence rate
Lexington, Ky	292 228 355 410 394	40 14 21 32 17	6 21 3 4 7	-10.2 2.9 -4.8 -6.3 -2.4
Los Angeles-Long Beach, Calif	14,583 1,643 179 215 336	90 37 22 16	203 16 24 12 11	0.8 -1.3 13.4 -4.2 -1.4
Madison, Wis	426 450 1,297 1,984 61	23 2 22 3 -	14 10 18 16 6	-2.0 1.8 -0.3 0.7 9.8
Milwaukee, Wis	2,762 3,207 520 195 280	23 65 35 3 16	33 90 21 9 10	0.4 0.8 -2.5 3.0 -2.0
Muncie, Ind	242 328 819 4,163 1,672	5 49 116 18	6 10 4 115 60	2.5 1.5 -5.2 -0.0 2.5
New Orleans, La	2,169 366 28,001 974 101	24 34 93 3	56 8 333 34 2	1.5 -6.5 0.9 3.2 2.0
Ogden, Utah	179 915 968 555 2,619	1 55 29 5 42	4 15 48 8 100	1.7 -4.1 1.9 0.5 2.2
Pensacola, Fla	306 644 10,931 994 6,061	52 94 42 57	10 8 134 22 54	1.9 -6.3 0.4 -1.9 -0.0
Pittsfield, Mass <sup>1</sup>	418 465 2,130 2,012 180	6 11 29 21 31	10 23 67 28	0.9 2.5 1.8 0.3 -14.7
Pueblo, Colo	245 320 267 852 158	108 12 40 29 21	1 7 13 5	-30.3 -1.5 -8.8 -2.7 -11.2

Table 12. Number of matched deaths reporting same standard metropolitan statistical area (SMSA) on both census and death records, on census record only, and on death record only; and net difference rates for total matched, matched at usual place of residence, and not at usual place of residence: United States, May-August, 1960—Con.

	Number reporting			Net
Area	Same	Census	Death	differ-
	on	record	record	ence
	both	only	only	rate
Richmond, Va	830 316 1,631 467 918	24 41 33 4 7	34 17 33 12 56	1.2 -6.7 1.7 5.3
Saginaw, Mich	436	3	11	1.8
	263	39	2	-12.3
	4,881	42	47	0.1
	652	15	20	0.7
	114	10	13	2.4
San Antonio, Tex	1,153	64	12	-4.3
	1,570	58	37	-1.3
	1,694	26	33	0.4
	6,234	65	276	3.3
	1,080	83	7	-6.5
Santa Barbara, Calif	331 399 835 2,384 562	1 11 19 8	10 13 22 88 3	2.7 3.0 1.3 2.9 -0.9
Sioux City, Iowa	299	5	13	2.6
	174	-	3	1.7
	537	3	11	1.5
	701	42	15	-3.6
	440	9	24	3.3
Springfield, Mo	290	7	6	-0.3
	322	18	7	-3.2
	1,357	33	22	-0.8
	391	7	19	3.0
	528	33	13	-3.6
Syracuse, N.Y Tacoma, Wash Tampa-St. Petersburg, Fla Terre Haute, Ind Texarkana, TexArk	1,450	20	63	2.9
	658	80	7	-9.9
	2,440	40	37	-0.1
	329	2	8	1.8
	161	3	14	6.7
Toledo, Ohio	1,141	23	24	0.1
	300	29	7	-6.7
	664	27	15	-1.7
	445	12	4	-1.8
	840	10	37	3.2
Tuscaloosa, Ala Tyler, Tex Utica-Rome, N.Y Waco, Tex Washington, D.CMdVa	143	87	1	-37.4
	143	23	1	-13.3
	872	122	8	-11.5
	322	22	10	-3.5
	3,612	65	86	0.6
Waterloo, Iowa	264	8	5	-1.1
	563	8	11	0.5
	500	4	57	10.5
	602	7	16	1.5
	215	55	7	-17.8

Table 12. Number of matched deaths reporting same standard metropolitan statistical area (SMSA) on both census and death records, on census record only, and on death record only; and net difference rates for total matched, matched at usual place of residence, and not at usual place of residence: United States, May-August 1960—Con.

	<u> </u>			<u> </u>
	Number reporting			Net
Area	Same on both	Census record only	Death record only	differ- ence rate
Wilkes-Barre—Hazleton, Pa	1,168 756 325 1,652 545	18 25 5 92 8	19 32 5 24 33	0.1 0.9 -3.9 4.5
Youngstown-Warren, OhioAll other areas	1,116 156,743	3,309	31 2,482	2.1 -0.5
All areas	387,763	991	991	
Total SMSA's	240,397	633	678	0.0
Abilene, Tex	167 1,010 124 1,731 360	3	1 12	-0.3 0.8 0.7 -0.3
Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton, PaN.J	1,330 378 208 273 257	6 2 1 8	2 2 2 3 1	-0.4 - 0.5 -1.8
Atlanta, Ga	1,802 462 327 301 460	6 1 - 4	3 1 2	-0.2 -0.2 0.3 -1.3 0.4
Baltimore, Md	3,581 350 209 538 133	2 - 1 6 -	1 12	-0.1 0.3 -0.5 1.1
Binghamton, N.Y	494 1,175 7,844 1,456 619	3 6 26 2 7	1 29 2 8	-0.6 -0.4 0.0 -
Brownsville-Harlingen-San Benito, Tex	215 3,230 714 227 180	14 2 -	6 5 1 1	-0.2 0.4 0.4
Charleston, S.C	289 422 394 501 14,683	6 1 2 1 18	1 1 - 2 46	-1.7 -0.5 0.2 0.2

Table 12. Number of matched deaths reporting same standard metropolitan statistical area (SMSA) on both census and death records, on census record only, and on 3 th record only; and net difference rates for total matched, matched at usual place of residence, and not at usual place of residence: United States, May-August 1960—Con.

	Number reporting			Net
Area	Same on both	Census record only	Death record only	differ- ence rate
Cincinnati, Ohio-Ky	2,438 4,241 245 398 305	9 3 - 7 1	3 12 - - 3	-0.2 0.2 -1.7 0.7
Columbus, Ohio	1,377 312 1,822 612 1,351	5 2 19 9 1	3 - 1	-0.3 -0.6 -0.9 -1.4
Decatur, II1	229 1,863 577 7,451 171	2 2 3	1 1 11 2	0.4 -0.1 -0.2 0.1 1.2
Duluth-Superior, MinnWis	718 222 427 624 231	8 2 -	16 - 2	-0.7 3.3 0.9
Evansville, IndKy  Fall River-New Bedford, Mass <sup>1</sup>	429 896 165 711 668	1 1 2 4	6 1 - 1	0.6 -0.3 -0.4
Fort Smith, Ark	127 508 1,000 697 148	2 - 5 3	1 3 2 3	. 0.8 0.2 0.2 -0.3 -2.0
Galveston-Texas City, Tex	277 1,133 749 159 253	1 1 1 3	10 3 -	0.7 0.8 0.4 -0.6 -0.8
Greensboro-High Point, N.C	371 250 366 848 1,487	- - 1 5	1 5 - 11 2	0.3 2.0 - 1.2 -0.2
Honolulu, Hawaii	577 1,896 515 144 1,539	1 5 2 1 1	2 2 5 - 22	0.2 -0.2 0.6 -0.7 1.4
Jackson, Mich	331 335 784 1,769 773	- 1 4 1	2 1 2 7 2	0.6 0.3 0.1 0.2 0.1

Table 12. Number of matched deaths reporting same standard metropolitan statistical area (SMSA) on both census and death records, on census record only, and on death record only; and net difference rates for total matched, matched at usual place of residence, and not at usual place of residence: United States, May-August 1960—Con.

	Number reporting			
Area	Same on both	Census record only	Death record only	Net differ- ence rate
Kalamazoo, Mich	310 2,238 192 573 185	1 4 5 1 -	1 7 5 1	0.1
Lancaster, Pa	606 523 118 198 99	11 - - - 1	3 - 1 - 5	-1.3 0.8 - 4.0
Lexington, Ky	279 215 340 391 378	13 3 2	1 2 2 1	-1.4 0.5 -3.1 -0.3 -0.3
Los Angeles-Long Beach, Calif	13,321 1,554 179 202 332	10 - - 3 1	16 4 7 - 3	0.0 0.3 3.9 -1.5 0.6
Madison, Wis	391 443 1,232 1,916 61	1 - 2 -	5 1 3 1	1.0 0.2 0.2 -0.1
Milwaukee, Wis	2,635 2,998 509 194 274	4 5 1 3 1	6 3 2 2 3	0.1 -0.1 0.2 -0.5 0.7
Muncie, Ind	238 320 736 3,920 1,610	- 4 9 3	2 13 11	-0.3 0.1 0.5
New Orleans, La	2,104 335 26,017 949 101	20	2 1 17 -	-0.1 0.3 -0.0
Ogden, Utah	169 871 922 523 2,529	7 2 2 13	7 21 3 5	2.1 0.2 -0.3
Pensacola, Fla	306 599 10,302 955 5,645	3 1 25 7 13	2 - 23 7 9	-0.3 -0.2 -0.0 -

Table 12. Number of matched deaths reporting same standard metropolitan statistical area (SMSA) on both census and death records, on census record only, and on death record only; and net difference rates for total matched, matched at usual place of residence, and not at usual place of residence: United States, May-August 1960—Con.

	Number reporting			Net
Area	Same on both	Census record only	Death record only	differ- ence rate
Pittsfield, Mass <sup>1</sup>	403 459 1,968 1,809 168	2 6 1	- - 1	-0.4 -0.3 -0.6
Pueblo, Colo	228 283 266 804 150	6 2 - 1	1 2 - -	-2.1 -0.1
Richmond, Va	814 309 1,447 442 879	5 - 8 1	3 2 1 - 11	-0.2 0.6 -0.5 -0.2 1.1
Saginaw, Mich	422 233 4,579 613 109	11 2 -	1 3 2 1	0.2 -0.2 0.9
San Antonio, Tex	1,097 1,495 1,571 5,892 1,015	1 10 10 10 7	4 1 14 3	-0.1 -0.4 -0.6 0.1 -0.4
Santa Barbara, Calif	323 390 756 2,160 544	1 1 2 10 3	- 2 - 5 - 3	0.3 -0.3 0.4 -0.3 -0.4
Sioux City, Iowa	269 167 508 612 434	- 3 4 -	2 - 3 5 9	0.7 - 0.2 2.1
Springfield, Mo	270 298 1,300 383 496	3 2 1	1 2 5 5 2	0.4 0.7 0.2 0.8 0.2
Syracuse, N.Y Tacoma, Wash Tampa-St. Petersburg, Fla Terre Haute, Ind Texarkana, TexArk	1,333 594 2,303 328 154	3 3 7 - 3	3 1 12 -	-0.3 0.2 -1.9
Toledo, Ohio Topeka, Kans Trenton, N.J Tucson, Ariz Tulsa, Okla	1,074 274 627 433 823	- - 1 3	5 1 3 4	0.5 0.2 0.5 0.1

Table 12. Number of matched deaths reporting same standard metropolitan statistical area (SMSA) on both census and death records, on census record only, and on death record only; and net difference rates for total matched, matched at usual place of residence, and not at usual place of residence: United States, May-August 1960—Con.

				<del></del>
	Numb		ing	Net
Area	Same on both	Census record only	Death record only	differ- ence rate
Tuscaloosa, Ala	137 131 778 303	- 5 5	3	-0.3 -1.6 -0.4
Waterloo, Iowa	3,397 259 542 470 601 204	16 2 2 2 5 2	3 5 - 14 2 6	1.1 -0.4 2.5 -0.5 1.9
Wilkes-Barre—Hazleton, Pa	1,137 718 324 1,485 520	7 - 9 4	7 1 - 5 -	0.1 -0.3 -0.8
Youngstown-Warren, OhioAll other areas	1,083 147,366	2 358	1 313	-0.1 -0.0
Not at usual place of residence	24,434	7,104	7,104	
Total SMSA's	15,057	4,153	4,935	4.1
Abilene, Tex	12 32 2 102 4	21 - 19 2	9 46 - 64 3	31.3 47.2 - 37.2 16.7
Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton, PaN.J	68 26 2 15	8 19 14 62 21	16 2 5 6 5	10.5 -37.8 -56.3 -72.7 -57.1
Atlanta, Ga	67 55 23 28 7	18 5 14 51	59 17 11 6 14	48.2 20.0 -8.1 -57.0 200.0
Baltimore, MdBaton Rouge, LaBay City, MichBeaumont-Port Arthur, TexBillings, Mont	274 6 15 8 1	62 7 - 2	55 11 8 6 1	-2.1 30.8 53.3 40.0 100.0
Binghamton, N.Y Birmingham, Ala	28 25 869 76 73	30 2 45 26 13	14 36 100 32 20	-27.6 125.9 6.0 5.9 8.1

Table 12. Number of matched deaths reporting same standard metropolitan statistical area (SMSA) on both census and death records, on census record only, and on death record only; and net difference rates for total matched, matched at usual place of residence, and not at usual place of residence: United States, May-August 1960—Con.

	Numb	Number reporting		
Area	Same on both	Census record only	Death record only	differ- ence rate
Brownsville-Harlingen-San Benito, Tex	8 238 50 14 12	5 43 40 - 1	7 47 4 2 12	15.4 1.4 -40.0 14.3 84.6
Charleston, S.C	6 14 11 11 821	2 2 2 5 73	11 8 2 8 331	183.3 37.5 - 18.8 28.9
Cincinnati, Ohio-Ky	256 165 34 4	23 - 9 13 117. 5	26 82 19 16	1.1 42.0 46.2 -77.5 122.2
Columbus, Ohio	113 58 21 107	30 5 24 23 36	23 11 51 10 9	-4.9 120.0 32.9 -29.5 -18.9
Decatur, Ill	8 79 45 397 15	5 20 1 23 23	66 18 130 2	-7.7 46.5 37.0 25.5 -55.3
Duluth-Superior, MinnWis	23 - 12 25 7	8 1 5 3	1 34 - 11 - 6 21 7	83.9 1,000.0 5.9 64.3 100.0
Evansville, IndKy  Fall River-New Bedford, Mass <sup>1</sup>	11 102 5 9 34	19 12 - 6 - 7- 22	10 13 14 4	-56.7 -1.8 63.6 43.8 -32.1
Fort Smith, Ark	13 25 18 2	7 5 23 14 1 7	2 24 26 10 3	-60.0 2.8 30.8 47.4 -44.4
Galveston-Texas City, Tex	1 33 59 21 -	3 34 5 5	12 25 17 3 11	225.0 75.8 -18.3 -7.7 120.0
Greensboro-High Point, N.C	21 19 34 37 64	11 - - 38 11	8 7 7 18 39	-9.4 36.8 20.6 -26.7 37.3

Table 12. Number of matched deaths reporting same standard metropolitan statistical area (SMSA) on both census and death records, on census record only, and on death record only; and net difference rates for total matched, matched at usual place of residence, and not at usual place of residence: United States, May-August 1960—Con.

	Number reporting			Net
Area	Same on both	Census record only	Death record only	differ- ence rate
Honolulu, Hawaii	25 38 14 - 134	5 13 21 5 18	29 10 4 27	-16.7 31.4 -31.4 -20.0 5.9
Jackson, Mich	14 11 55 96 40	5 22 12 5 20	13 16 20 53 18	42.1 -18.2 11.9 47.5 -3.3
Kalamazoo, Mich	12 92 - 49 -	28 22 - 35 -	1 87 5 7 7	-67.5 57.0 -33.3
Lancaster, Pa	50 45 - 1 -	53 12 - -	21 16 7 9 1	-31.1 7.0 900.0
Lexington, Ky	13 13 15 19 16	36 14 8 29 15	6 20 1 2 6	-61.2 22.2 -30.4 -56.3 -29.0
Los Angeles-Long Beach, Calif	1,262 89 13 4	80 37 19 15	187 12 17 12 8	8.0 -19.8 - -21.9 -36.8
Madison, Wis	35 7 65 68 ~	22 2 22 1	9 9 15 15 6	-22.8 77.8 -8.0 20.3
Milwaukee, Wis	127 209 11 1 6	19 60 34 - 15	27 87 19 7	5.5 10.0 -33.3 700.0 -38.1
Muncie, Ind	4 8 83 243 62	5 45 107 15	6 10 2 102 49	150.0 38.5 -33.6 -1.4 44.2
New Orleans, La Newport News-Hampton, Va New York, N.Y Norfolk-Portsmouth, Va Odessa, Tex	65 31 1,984 25	20 34 73 3	54 7 316 34 2	40.0 -41.5 11.8 110.7

Table 12. Number of matched deaths reporting same standard metropolitan statistical area (SMSA) on both census and death records, on census record only, and on death record only; and net difference rates for total matched, matched at usual place of residence, and not at usual place of residence: United States, May-August, 1960—Con.

	Numb	Number reporting		
Area	Same on both	Census record only	Death record only	Net differ- ence rate
Ogden, Utah	10 44 46 32 90	1 48 27 3 29	4 8 27 5 95	27.3 -43.5 - 5.7 55.5
Pensacola, Fla	45 629 39 416	1 51 69 35 44	8 8 111 15 45	700.0 -44.8 6.0 -27.0 0.2
Pittsfield, Mass <sup>1</sup>	15 6 162 203 12	6 9 29 15 30	10 23 67 27	19.0 93.3 19.9 5.5 -71.4
Pueblo, Colo	17 37 1 48 8	102 10 40 28 21	5 13 5 1	-85.7 -10.6 -65.9 -30.3 -69.0
Richmond, Va	16 7 184 25 39	19, 41, 25, 3 6	31 15 32 12 45	34.3 -54.2 3.3 32.1 86.7
Saginaw, MichSt. Joseph, Mo	14 30 302 39 5	3 39 31 13 - 10	10 2 44 18 12	41.2 -53.6 3.9 9.6 13.3
San Antonio, Tex	56 75 123 342 65	63 48 16 55 76	12 33 32 262 4	-42.9 -12.2 11.5 52.1 -51.1
Santa Barbara, Calif	8 9 79 224 18	- 9 9 5	8 13 17 85 2	100.0 144.4 9.1 32.6 -13.0
Sioux City, Iowa	30 7 29 89 6	5 - - 38 9	11 3 8 10 15	17.1 42.9 27.6 -22.0 40.0
Springfield, Mo	20 24 57 8 32	7 18 30 5 32	5 5 17 14 11	-7.4 -31.0 -14.9 69.2 -32.8

Table 12. Number of matched deaths reporting same standard metropolitan statistical area (SMSA) on both census and death records, on census record only, and on death record only; and net difference rates for total matched, matched at usual place of residence, and not at usual place of residence: United States, May-August 1960—Con.

	Numb	er report	Net	
Area	Same on both	Census record only	Death record only	differ- ence rate
Syracuse, N.Y Tacoma, Wash Tampa-St. Petersburg, Fla Terre Haute, Ind Texarkana, TexArk	117 64 137 1 7	17 77 33 2	60 6 25 8 14	32.1 -50.4 -4.7 200.0 200.0
Toledo, Ohio	67 26 37 12 17	23 29 27 11 7	19 7 14 1 33	-4.4 -40.0 -20.3 -43.5 108.3
Tuscaloosa, Ala	6 12 94 19 215	87 23 117 17 49	1 1 5 10 83	-92.5 -62.9 -53.1 -19.4 12.9
Waterloo, Iowa	5 21 30 1 11	6 6 2 2 53	11 43 14 1	-54.5 18.5 128.1 400.0 -81.3
Wilkes-Barre—Hazleton, Pa	31 38 1 167 25	11 25 5 83 4	12 31 5 19 33	2.4 9.5 -25.6 100.0
Youngstown-Warren, OhioAll other areas-	33 9,377	5 2,951	30 2,169	65.8 -6.3

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Metropolitan State economic areas.

Table 13. Number of matched deaths reporting same standard metropolitan statistical area (SMSA) on both census and death records, census record only, and death record only; and net difference rates, by color: United States, May-August 1960

		te		Nonwhite				
Area	Numbe	r report	ing	Net	Number reporting			Net
	Same on both	Census record only	Death record only	differ- ence rate	Same on both	Census record only	Death record only	differ- ence rate
All areas	366,216	7,308	7,308	•••	42,579	723	723	
Total SMSA's	226,877	4,341	5,056	0.3	26,521	395	516	0.4
Abilene, Tex	168 981 63 1,791 342 1,375	19 3 13	9 45 1 75 2 16	2.9 2.1 1.6 3.1 -0.3 0.2	10 60 62 37 20 7	- - - - 1	1 1 1 1	1.7 2.7 5.0 -12.5
Altoona, Pa	400 195 275 227 1,331	21 14 63 16 21	4 7 8 5 52	-4.0 -3.3 -16.3 -4.5 2.3	4 14 13 37 514	1 5 6 3	1 1 10	-6.7 -22.2 -11.6 1.4
Atlantic City, N.J	443 218 280 417 3,002	5 12 40 - 38	15 7 5 14 51	2.2 -2.2 -10.9 3.4 0.4	71 124 49 46 823	1 2 15 26	2 4 1 2 4	1.4 1.6 -21.9 4.3 -2.6
Baton Rouge, La	204 222 403 132 508	2 1 8 - 33	6 8 12 1 14	1.9 3.1 1.0 0.8 -3.5	152 1 136 2 13	5 - - -	6 -	0.6 4.4 -
Birmingham, AlaBoston-Lowell-Lawrence, Mass <sup>1</sup> Bridgeport-Stamford-Norwalk, Conn <sup>1</sup> Brockton, Mass <sup>1</sup> Brownsville-Harlingen-San Benito, Tex	678 8,438 1,462 674 219	4 70 25 18 5	25 123 33 27 7	3.1 0.6 0.5 1.3 0.9	510 186 51 13 3	4 1 2 2	12 6 1 1	1.6 2.7 -1.9 -6.7
Buffalo, N.Y	3,272 718 240 185 176	56 34 - 2 1	51 8 3 13 7	-0.2 -3.5 1.3 5.9 3.4	172 36 1 6 117	1 3 - 4	2 1 - - 5	0.6 -5.1 - 0.8
Charleston, W. Va	391 254 376 13,489 2,338	3 4 6 82 32	8 - 10 338 25	1.3 -1.6 1.0 1.9 -0.3	40 151 132 1,853 332	- - 4 -	1 2 39 4	2.5 1.3 1.9 1.2
Cleveland, Ohio	3,854 235 304 195 1,287	11 12 73 5 30	83 19 - 13 23	1.9 2.8 -19.4 4.0 -0.5	527 7 123 114 191	1 51 1 5	11 - - 6 1	1.9 -29.3 4.3 -2.0
Corpus Christi, Tex	288 1,559 617 1,285 224	7 38 32 34 5	11 42 9 9 3	1.4 0.3 -3.5 -1.9 -0.9	22 307 14 165 13	- 4 - 3 -	12 1 1 2	2.6 7.1 -1.2 15.4
Denver, Colo	1,866 593 6,734 185 735	21 3 24 23 16	56 18 118 4 37	1.9 2.5 1.4 -9.1 2.8	60 23 1,049 -	1 2 -	6 1 21 -	8.2 4.3 1.8

Table 13. Number of matched deaths reporting same standard metropolitan statistical area (SMSA) on both census and death records, census record only, and death record only; and net difference rates, by color: United States, May-August 1960—Con.

	,	Whi	.te		Nonwhite			
Area	Numbe	r report	ing	Net	Numb	er repor	ting	Net
AL CR	Same on both	Census record only	Death record only	differ- ence rate	Same on both	Census record only	Death record only	differ- ence rate
Durham, N.CE1 Paso, TexEric, PaEugene, OregEvansville, IndKy	159 425 630 235 398	7 3 - 19	10 22 20 9 2	6.3 3.5 2.7 3.8 -4.1	62 11 18 2 36	1 - - -	1 1 -	5.6
Fall River-New Bedford, Mass <sup>1</sup> Fargo-Moorhead, N. DakMinn	968 169 641 614 113	13 7 8 23 5	16 14 12 2 2	0.3 4.0 0.6 -3.3 -2.5	22 75 84 13	- 1 3 -	- 2 3 1	1.3 7.7
Fort Wayne, Ind	501 875 665 126 207	25 13 5 9 3	27 23 11 -	0.4 1.1 0.9 -6.7 3.8	14 141 47 22 68	1 1 1	- 5 - 3 3	2.8 -2.1 8.7 4.4
Gary-Hammond-East Chicago, IndGrand Rapids, MichGreat Falls, Mont	983 769 176 251 291	33 6 7 11	32 20 3 10 6	3.2 -1.6 -1.6 1.2 -1.7	175 31 3 2 100	1 - 1	2 - - 3	-33.3 -33.3 3.0
Greenville, S.C	194 376 825 1,483 159	39 15 2	7 7 28 39	3.6 1.9 -1.3 1.6 -1.2	73 19 55 53 342	- - 1 2	5 1 2 2	6.8 1.8 1.9
Houston, Tex Huntington-Ashland, W. VaKyOhio Huntsville, Ala Indianapolis, Ind Jackson, Mich	1,495 486 116 1,400 333	13 22 6 19 3	28 15 2 48 15	1.0 -1.4 -3.3 2.0 3.6	424 34 27 263 11	5 1 - - 2	3 - 2 1 -	-0.5 -2.9 7.4 0.4 -15.4
Jackson, Miss	184 584 1,771 801 309	18 12 8 19 28	15 16 58 19 2	-1.5 0.7 2.8 - -7.7	157 252 78 9 7	4 1 - 2 1	2 6 2 1 -	-1.2 2.0 2.6 -9.1 -12.5
Kansas City, MoKans Kenosha, Wis Knoxville, Tenn	1,991 185 539 130 646	18 5 36 - 64	89 10 5 5 24	3.5 2.6 -5.4 3.8 -5.6	314 6 80 55 7	3 - - -	3 2 2 2	2.5 3.6
Lansing, Mich Laredo, Tex Las Vegas, Nev Lawton, Okla Lexington, Ky	555 113 181 90 225	12 - 1 35	16 8 8 6 6	0.7 7.1 4.4 5.5 -11.2	13 - 18 9 67	- - - 5	- 1 -	5.6 -6.9
Lima, Ohio Lincoln, Nebr Little Rock-North Little Rock, Ark Lorain-Elyria, Ohio Los Angeles-Long Beach, Galif	217 343 282 369 13,584	13 19 26 15 84	21 3 1 6 187	3.5 -4.4 -8.1 -2.3 0.8	10 12 125 22 872	1 2 6 2 6	- 3 1 8	-9.1 -14.3 -2.3 -4.2 0.2
Louisville, KyInd	1,366 164 165 201 414	37 21 15 21	13 22 10 5	-1.7 13.4 -5.9 -4.6 -1.6	263 15 50 134 5	- 1 1 2	3 2 2 6	1.1 13.3 2.0 3.7 -28.6

Table 13. Number of matched deaths reporting same standard metropolitan statistical area (SMSA) on both census and death records, census record only, and death record only; and net difference rates, by color: 1960—Con.

		Whi	.te		Nonwhite			
Area	Numbe	r report	ing	Net	Number rep		ting	Net
	Same on both	Census record only	Death record only	differ- ence rate	Same on both	Census record only	Death record only	differ- ence rate
Manchester, N.H  Memphis, Tenn  Miami, Fla  Midland, Tex  Milwaukee, Wis	450 762 1,751 57 2,659	1 19 2 - 22	10 15 10 6 33	2.0 -0.5 0.5 10.5 0.4	523 207 4 96	1 3 1 -	1 6 -	-100.0 -0.4 2.4 -1.0
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn Mobile, Ala Monroe, La Montgomery, Ala Muncie, Ind	3,113 327 96 127 223	65 1 3 11 -	90 18 4 4 6	0.8 5.2 1.0 -5.1 2.7	78 187 93 150 17	34 - 5 -	- 3 5 6 -	-14.0 5.4 0.6
Muskegon-Muskegon Heights, Mich Nashville, Tenm Newark, N.J New Haven-Waterbury, Conn <sup>1</sup> New Orleans, La	293 589 3,674 1,604 1,468	5 39 109 18 13	9 2 107 58 34	1.3 -5.9 -0.1 2.5 1.4	32 216 462 53 685	10 7 11	1 2 8 1 22	3.1 -3.5 0.2 1.9 1.6
Newport News-Hampton, VaNew York, N.YNorfolk-Portsmouth, VaOdessa, Tex	25,332 658 93 170	25 90 3 -	3 307 19 2 4	-8.2 0.9 2.4 2.2 1.8	2,461 310 8 7	9 2 - -	5 26 15 - -	-3.1 1.0 4.8
Oklahoma City, Okla Omaha, NebrIowa Orlando, Fla Paterson-Clifton-Passaic, N.J Pensacola, Fla	809 893 463 2,516 229	54 24 5 42 3	12 45 6 95 8	-4.9 2.3 0.2 2.1 2.2	101 72 89 78 76	1	3 3 2 4 2	3.0 4.2 2.2 5.1 1.3
Peoria, Ill	612 9,336 924 5,571 409	51 88 40 53 6	8 117 19 53 10	-6.5 0.3 -2.2 -	14 1,512 67 453 6	1 6 2 4	15 2 1	-6.7 0.6 -0.7
Portland, Maine <sup>1</sup>	457 2,063 1,969 179 239	11 28 20 30 100	23 67 28 - 1	2.6 1.9 0.4 -14.4 -29.2	47 21 - 6	1 - 1 5	-	-2.1 -100.0 -45.5
Racine, Wis	312 165 835 148 624	11 39 29 21 19	7 9 5 1 20	-1.2 -14.7 -2.8 -11.8 0.2	8 97 14 8 199	1 1 - - 5	- 4 - 14	-11.1 3.1 - 4.4
Roanoke, Va	265 1,588 451 848 406	36 33 3 4 3	15 32 10 53 11	-7.0 -0.1 1.5 5.8 2.0	50 36 15 52 30	5 1 1	2 1 - 2 -	-5.5 2.8 -6.3 1.9
St. Joseph, Mo	249 4,125 640 104 1,050	38 39 15 10 62	2 41 20 12 7	-12.5 0.0 0.8 1.8 -4.9	13 724 11 10 99	1 3 - - 2	- 6 - 1 5	-7.1 0.4 10.0 3.0
San Bernardino-Riverside-Ontario, Calif San Diego, Calif	1,509 1,601 5,703 1,052 326	50 26 64 81 1	37 32 266 7 10	-0.8 0.4 3.5 -6.5	56 79 477 24 5	3 1 1	10 10	-5.1 1.3 1.9 -4.0

Table 13. Number of matched deaths reporting same standard metropolitan statistical area (SMSA) on both census and death records, census record only, and death record only; and net difference rates, by color: United States, May-August 1960—Con.

				Nonw	hite			
Area	Numbe	r report	ing	Net	Numb	er repor	ting	Net
ti V	Same on both	Census record only	Death record only	differ- ence rate	Same on both	Census record only	Death record only	differ- ence rate
Savannah, Ga	216 827 2,296 320 292	- 11 19 6 5	7 22 85 -	3.2 1.3 2.9 -1.8 2.7	182 5 77 237 3	- - - 2 -	6 - 3 3 -	3.3 3.9 0.4
Sioux Falls, S. Dak	174 507 683 426 278	- 3 39 9 5	3 10 15 24 6	1.7 1.4 -3.3 3.4 0.4	24 14 12 12	- - 3 - 2	1 - -	4.2 -17.6 -14.3
Springfield, Ohio	272 1,316 368 484 1,421	16 33 7 27 20	4 17 18 10 60	-4.2 -1.2 2.9 -3.3 2.8	43 33 20 40 21	- - - 4	3 - 1 3 1	7.0 - 5.0 -2.3 4.8
Tacoma, Wash	637 2,190 312 117 1,049	78 39 2 2 23	7 32 8 9 24	-9.9 -0.3 1.9 5.9 0.1	19 233 17 44 84	2 1 - 1	5 5 5	-9.5 1.7 8.9
Topeka, Kans Trenton, N.J Tucson, Ariz Tulsa, Okla Tuscaloosa, Ala	270 594 417 733 84	28 21 11 9 82	6 13 3 34	-7.4 -1.3 -1.9 3.4 -49.4	29 68 27 93 59	1 6 1 1 3	- 2 1 3 1	-3.3 -5.4 - 2.1 -3.2
Tyler, Tex	107 855 247 2,531 255	18 122 18 63 8	- 8 6 67 5	-14.4 -11.7 -4.5 0.2 -1.1	36 11 69 1,039	5 - 4 2 -	1 - 4 19	-9.8 - 1.6
West Palm Beach, Fla	467 488 562 195 1,160	4 4 7 54 18	10 55 14 7 19	1.3 10.4 1.2 -18.9 0.1	91 10 32 19 2	4 - 1 -	1 2 2 -	-3.2 20.0 6.3 -5.0
Wilmington, DelN.J	649 205 1,636 533 1,024 139,339	19 5 88 8 7 2,967	26 5 24 33 27 2,252	1.0 -3.7 4.6 1.9 -0.5	104 119 6 10 87 16,058	6 - 4 - 328	6 - - - 4 207	-40.0 -4.6 -0.7

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Metropolitan State economic areas.

Table 14. Number of unmatched deaths for standard metropolitam statistical areas (SMSA's), by color: United States, May-August 1960

[For definition of areas, see Technical Appendix]

[For definition of areas, see a ecuation Appendix]			
Area	Total	White	Nonwhite
All areas	<sup>1</sup> 112,656	93,319	19,336
Total SMSA's	68,731	56,613	12,117
Abilene, Tex	60	57	3
	268	236	32
	48	23	25
	381	367	14
	165	158	7
Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton, PaN.J	214	207	7
	93	92	1
	70	64	6
	66	57	9
	183	158	25
Atlanta, Ga	677	458	219
	132	94	38
	185	106	79
	137	115	22
	174	154	20
Baltimore, Md	1,274	876	398
	131	69	62
	57	57	-
	177	133	44
	60	60	-
Binghampton, N.YBirmingham, Ala	114	113	1
	622	351	271
	1,724	1,642	82
	344	308	36
	158	151	7
Brownsville-Harlingen-San Benito, Tex	116	114	2
	620	567	53
	217	193	24
	92	92	-
	55	53	2
	205	89	116
	146	130	16
	201	133	68
	281	204	77
	3,979	3,077	902
Cincinnati, Ohio-Ky	635	516	119
	869	681	188
	75	74	1
	146	71	75
	169	113	56
Columbus, Ohio	321	273	48
	113	105	8
	663	488	175
	147	145	2
	349	298	51
Decatur, Ill	75 425 125 1,545 16	73 400 115 1,163 16	2 25 10 382

See footnotes at end of table.

Table 14. Number of unmatched deaths for standard metropolitan statistical areas (SMSA's), by color: United States, May-August 1960—Con.

For definition of areas, see Technical Appendix

[For definition of aleas, see Fedinical Appendix]	<del></del> 1		
Area	Total	White	Nonwhite
Duluth-Superior, MinnWis	167	165	2
	96	55	41
	174	171	3
	159	156	3
	117	116	1
Evansville, IndKy	115	97	18
	120	117	3
	64	64	-
	152	135	17
	226	156	70
Fort Smith, Ark	67	61	6
	73	68	5
	400	337	63
	228	205	23
	109	95	14
Galveston-Texas City, Tex	133	96	37
	262	197	65
	155	149	6
	49	45	4
	69	67	2
Greensboro-High Point, N.C	143	102	41
	185	140	45
	78	74	4
	178	157	21
	369	345	24
Honolulu, Hawaii	211	78	133
	810	594	216
	173	167	6
	106	71	35
	433	334	99
Jackson, Mich	43	39	4
	125	70	55
	307	194	113
	386	336	50
	122	115	7
Kalamazoo, Mich	76 656 71 319 94	76 544 71 284 74	112 - 35 20
Lancaster, Pa	135 159 40 116 41	134 153 40 100 34	1 6 16 7
Lexington, Ky Lima, Ohio	78	52	26
	30	26	4
	89	89	-
	226	130	96
	127	119	8
Los Angeles-Long Beach, Calif	3,559	3,189	370
	517	401	116
	70	65	. 5
	88	62	26
	128	74	54

See footnotes at end of table.

Table 14. Number of unmatched deaths for standard metropolitan statistical areas (SMSA's), by color: United States, May-August 1960—Con.

[For definition of areas, see Technical Appendix]

Area	Tota1	White	Nonwhite
Madison, Wis Manchester, N.H <sup>2</sup> Memphis, Tenn Miami, Fla Midland, Tex	71 132 387 724 38	71 132 170 601 32	217 123 6
Milwaukee, Wis Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn Mobile, Ala Monroe, La Montgomery, Ala	526	490	36
	796	777	19
	223	134	89
	109	61	48
	155	79	76
Muncie, Ind Muskegon-Muskegon Heights, Mich Nashville, Tenn Newark, N.J New Haven-Waterbury, Conn <sup>2</sup>	80	78	2
	35	29	6
	253	173	80
	987	773	214
	336	311	25
New Orleans, La Newport News-Hampton, Va New York, N.Y Norfolk-Portsmouth, Va Odessa, Tex	557	315	242
	123	62	61
	<sup>1</sup> 7,119	5,746	1,372
	389	220	169
	43	40	3
Ogden, Utah	44	43	1
	339	280	59
	233	199	34
	209	161	48
	513	483	30
Pensacola, Fla Peoria, Iil Philadelphia, PaN.J Phoenix, Ariz Pittsburgh, Pa	140	94	46
	175	169	6
	2,946	2,301	645
	545	493	52
	1,554	1,414	140
Pittsfield, Mass <sup>2</sup>	68 143 582 391 30	68 141 565 380 30	2 17 11
Pueblo, Colo	82	78	4
	52	51	1
	107	66	41
	110	105	5
	96	93	3
Richmond, Va	325	210	115
	101	84	17
	224	208	16
	99	95	4
	350	320	30
Saginaw, Mich	81	68	13
	59	56	3
	1,432	1,109	323
	191	185	6
	60	56	4
San Antonio, Tex	389	346	43
	557	522	35
	620	589	31
	1,561	1,379	182
	314	308	6

See footnotes at end of table.

Table 14. Number of unmatched deaths for standard metropolitan statistical areas (SMSA's), by color: United States, May-August 1960—Con.

For definition of areas, see Technical Appendix

	ii	<u> </u>	
Area	Total	White	Nonwhite
Santa Barbara, Calif	117	114	3
	121	70	51
	119	115	4
	803	764	39
	247	126	121
Sioux City, Iowa	82 38 118 177 113	82 37 102 166 107	1 16 11 6
Springfield, Mo	116	114	2
	82	73	9
	187	177	10
	127	116	11
	225	196	29
Syracuse, N.Y Tacoma, Wash Tampa-St. Petersburg, Fla Terre Haute, Ind Texarkana, TexArk	233	221	12
	237	225	12
	598	501	97
	98	93	5
	81	59	22
Toledo, Ohio Topeka, Kans Trenton, N.J Tucson, Ariz Tulsa, Okla	303	277	26
	91	85	6
	173	141	32
	202	187	15
	251	207	44
Tuscaloosa, Ala	127	69	58
	94	57	37
	223	219	4
	118	95	23
	1,180	728	452
Waterloo, Iowa	62	60	2
	198	121	77
	164	158	6
	164	151	13
	65	56	9
Wilkes-Barre—Hazleton, Pa	203	201	2
	232	179	53
	146	94	52
	280	280	-
	139	133	6
Youngstown-Warren, OhioAll other areas	270	240	30
	43,925	36,706	7,219

 $<sup>^{1}</sup>$ Includes one machine error.

 $<sup>^2\,\</sup>mathrm{Metropolitan}$  State economic areas.

NOTE: For explanation of why white and nonwhite do not add to the total, see Technical Appendix.

Table 15. Net difference rates, by color, sex, and age: United States and each geographic division, May-August 1960

[Census record used as a base. Minus (-) sign indicates more assignments by census than by NCH5]

Color, sex, and age	Total	New England	Middle Atlantic	East North Central	West North Central	South Atlantic	East South Central	West South Central	Mountain	Pacific
<u>Total</u>										
1-4 years 5-14 years 15-24 years 35-44 years 45-54 years 55-64 years 65-74 years 75-84 years 85-99 years	-2.1 -0.3 -0.8 -3.9 -3.6 0.3 1.8 -1.3 0.7	0.6 -2.6 0.7 -12.4 -5.5 -0.8 -0.5 -1.0 2.4 1.6	-0.4 -0.6 -1.0 -4.3 -5.5 -0.9 0.7 -0.7 1.9	-2.3 0.6 -1.1 -3.5 -3.4 -0.3 1.0 -1.4 0.9 2.4	-3.4 1.8 -4.5 -4.3 -0.6 -2.6 1.8 3.5	-2.9 -0.1 -2.1 -1.1 -2.0 3.5 6.6 -1.6 -3.3 -1.6	-2.5 -1.3 -0.6 -5.6 -2.1 1.0 5.8 -1.4 -0.3 -2.5	-3.4 -0.2 0.8 -2.6 -2.2 1.6 4.4 -0.6 -1.3 -2.2	-1.5 1.3 -0.3 -4.4 -3.5 0.1 -0.2 -0.8 1.1 3.1	-2.0 -0.9 -2.9 -3.9 -3.3 -1.2 -0.3 -1.4 2.3 2.6
White male										
1-4 years 5-14 years 15-24 years 25-34 years 35-44 years 55-64 years 65-74 years 75-84 years 85-99 years	-0.6 0.2 0.2 -4.0 -4.1 -1.2 0.1 -0.3 1.2	4.3 2.9 1.1 -16.0 -5.3 -1.8 -0.0 1.8 0.9 -2.1	0.3 1.7 -0.9 -5.0 -5.2 -1.2 0.1 1.6 1.0	-1.3 0.9 -3.1 -4.5 -1.5 -0.7 -0.9 0.9	-3.1 0.4 -0.3 -3.6 -0.9 -0.5 -1.0 0.8 4.1	0.6 -0.6 -0.2 -2.2 -2.6 -0.1 -0.1 0.6 2.2	-2.9 2.4 -2.9 -3.1 0.3 1.0 -1.1 1.2 -0.2	-2.9 -1.6 2.2 -3.3 -4.6 -1.6 -0.1 -0.4 1.7 2.4	-0.4 -2.9 -3.0 -0.4 -0.3 -1.0 2.1	-0.9 -1.0 -3.1 -1.5 -0.3 0.0 1.7
White female										
1-4 years 5-14 years 25-24 years 35-44 years 45-54 years 55-64 years 65-74 years 75-84 years 85-99 years	-1.2 -1.5 -1.8 -4.9 -4.0 -1.3 -0.6 -2.8 2.4 2.8	3.6 -12.8 2.4 -9.4 -5.7 0.1 -1.4 -4.4 3.7 3.2	0.5 -6.0 -1.5 -2.1 -6.9 -2.4 0.2 -1.3 2.6	-2.7 1.7 -3.6 -4.6 -0.5 -1.2 -1.9 1.6	-3.1 -5.8 -7.6 -6.0 -2.3 -5.2 3.4	-0.8 -0.6 -1.3 -4.2 -2.2 -1.9 0.3 -3.3 -1.2 -5.9	4.0 -2.0 -2.1 -9.0 -1.9 -4.3 0.1 -4.8 4.2 3.1	-1.5 0.8 -1.6 -4.0 -2.5 -0.1 -3.9 2.8 1.4	2.6 -3.4 -8.4 -2.3 -1.0 -0.3 -0.5 -0.5	-4.0 -0.6 -5.6 -3.8 -4.0 -1.2 -0.7 -3.6 2.8 4.1
Nonwhite male										
1-4 years 5-14 years 15-24 years 25-34 years 45-54 years 55-64 years 65-74 years 75-84 years 85-99 years	-1.5 0.4 -2.9 -3.2 -1.9 6.2 13.6 2.1 -15.2 -22.6	-20.0 33.3 -12.5 12.5 -7.7 3.3 3.6 -4.8	7.6 2.9 -3.2 -7.8 -2.9 4.3 4.3 0.8 -6.6 -20.5	2.9 -5.2 3.2 -6.1 -3.5 5.2 10.0 -1.8 -10.3 -15.0	6.3 6.3 3.2 -8.3 5.6 9.6 -6.3 -22.2	-4.1 0.6 -3.5 -0.4 2.9 9.0 23.8 -0.1 -28.1 -35.2	-8.2 -2.9 -3.9 -4.3 5.3 12.0 5.6 -11.7 -15.7	-4.8 1.3 1.9 -3.2 7.2 17.9 6.5 -19.6 -29.1	6.7 -4.5 -12.5 -5.6 16.7 -2.8 2.1 7.3 -20.8	-2.8 -18.0 -7.4 -4.3 -1.0 4.0 2.3 0.4 2.4
Nonwhite female										
1-4 years 5-14 years 15-24 years 25-34 years 45-54 years 55-64 years 65-74 years 75-84 years 85-99 years	-2.2 -2.3 -4.8 -2.4 -1.1 13.3 23.6 -4.5 -17.2 -20.8	-33.3 7.1 -7.7 -10.0 13.9 6.7	-5.0 -2.4 2.3 -5.3 -2.1 9.6 11.1 -7.1 -5.4 -13.8	-3.3 -4.9 2.5 -1.5 -5.0 9.4 19.1 -7.1 -13.2 -13.9	12.5 -28.6 40.0 -20.0 7.7 2.4 12.1 -6.0 -2.6 -7.2	-3.4 -11.2 4.3 -4.0 22.2 32.5 -5.9 -27.8 -32.0	-2.3 1.9 -8.1 -9.0 2.2 6.8 32.5 -3.5 -15.6 -18.0	-1.9 -2.7 -3.6 -5.6 10.4 18.0 27.7 2.6 -25.7 -25.7	-16.7 -22.2 -17.4 21.4 10.3 -5.1 4.5 -13.3	-2.9 3.7 -4.2 -15.0 1.9 6.8 -6.6 3.8 -4.6

NOTE: Figures with color and/or sex not stated are included in the total, but are not shown separately.

Table 16. Net difference rates for white males for stage I and stage II, by age: South Atlantic Division, May-August 1960

[Census record used as base. Minus (-) sign indicates more assignments by census than NCHS. For explanation of stage I and stage II, see Technical Appendix]

		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Stag	ge I	Stage II		
Age not stated and not valid included	Age not stated and not valid excluded	Age not stated and not valid allocated	Age not stated and not valid unallocated	
1.1	0.6	-6.3	-6.3	
-	-0.6	1.3	-	
0.5	-0.2	-3.8	-2.9	
-1.0	-2.2	0.8	2.3	
-1.7	-2.6	-5.7	-4.5	
0.2	-0.6	-3.8	-2.7	
0.9	-0.1	-0.5	-0.8	
0.6	-0.1	0.9	0.7	
1.4	-0.6	1:.8	1.1	
3.1	2.2	•••		
	•••	5.2	5.5	
-100.0		•••	•••	
-42.9		•••	•••	
	Age not stated and not valid included  1.1 - 0.5 -1.0 -1.7 0.2 0.9 0.6 1.4 3.1100.0	Stated and not valid included	Age not stated and not valid included excluded excluded allocated  1.1 0.6 -6.3 -0.6 1.3 0.5 -0.2 -3.8 -1.0 -2.2 0.8 -1.7 -2.6 -5.7 0.2 -0.6 -3.8 0.9 -0.1 -0.5 0.6 -0.1 0.9 1.4 -0.6 1.8 3.1 2.2 5.2 -100.0 5.2	

NOTE: Stage I, but not stage II, excludes decedents whose age was stated to be  $100\ \mathrm{years}$  or over on the census record.

Table 17. Number of matched deaths reporting same race on both census and death records, census record only, and death record only; and net and gross difference rates: United States and each region, May-August 1960

	Number reporting			Ce	nsus rec	ord as ba	ıse	I	Death record as base				
Region and race	Same on	Census	Death	Net diff	erence1	Gross di	fference	Net di	fference <sup>2</sup>	Gross o	lifference		
	both	record only	record only	Number	Rate	Number	Rate	Number	Rate	Number	Rate		
All regions									3				
White Nonwhite Negro Indian Japanese Chinese Filipino Other non-	353,612 37,110 35,309 602 562 315 138	847 881 685 154 19 33 56	3,621 1,299 1,092 83 14 17	2,774 418 407 -71 -5 -16 -45	0.8 1.1 1.1 -9.4 -0.9 -4.6 23.2	4,468 2,180 1,777 237 33 50 67	1.3 5.7 4.9 31.3 5.7 14.4 34.5	-2,774 -418 -407 71 5 16 45	-0.8 -1.1 -1.1 10.4 0.9 4.8 30.2	4,468 2,180 1,777 237 33 50 67	1.3 5.7 4.9 34.6 5.7 15.1 45.0		
white Not stated and	69	49	197	148	125.4	246	208.5	-148	-55.6	246	92.5		
not valid	•••	3,214	22	-3,192	-99.3	3,236	100.7	3,192	14,509.1	3,236	14,709.1		
Northeast			4										
White Nonwhite Negro Indian Japanese Chinese Filipino Other non-	107,551 5,467 5,313 24 8 74 3	275 245 229 21 - 13	1,007 332 335 10 1 3	732 87 106 -11 1 -10 -14	0.7 1.5 1.9 -24.4 12.5 -11.5 -77.8	1,282 577 564 31 1 16 16	1.2 10.1 10.2 68.9 12.5 18.4 88.9	-732 -87 -106 11 -1 10	-0.7 -1.5 -1.9 32.4 -11.1 13.0 350.0	1,282 577 564 31 1 16	1.2 9.9 10.0 91.2 11.1 20.8 400.0		
white Not stated and	1	11	26	15	125.0	37	308.3	-15	-55.6	37	137.0		
not valid	•••	824	5	-819	-99.4	829	100.6	819	16,380.0	829	16,580.0		
North Central													
White Nonwhite Negro Indian Japanese Chinese Filipino Other non-	113,116 6,587 6,401 110 28 21 5	196 204 153 51 3 8	1,117 263 257 14 1 2	921 59 104 -37 -2 -6 -1	0.8 0.9 1.6 -23.0 -6.5 -20.7 -12.5	1,313 467 410 65 4 10 5	1.2 6.9 6.3 40.4 12.9 34.5 62.5	-921 -59 -104 37 2 6	-0.8 -0.9 -1.6 29.8 6.9 26.1 14.3	1,313 467 410 65 4 10	1.1 6.8 6.2 52.4 13.8 43.5 71.4		
white Not stated and	-	8	9	1	12.5	17	212,5	-1	-11.7	17	188.9		
not valid	•••	989	9	-980	-99.1	998	100.9	980	10,8889	998	11,088.9		
South									-				
White Nonwhite Negro Indian Japanese Chinese Filipino Other non-	81,809 22,369 22,188 146 5 15	274 262 220 38 3 3	926 448 433 20 2 1 2	652 186 213 -18 -1 -2 -5	0.8 0.8 1.0 -9.8 -12.5 -11.1 -71.4	1,200 710 653 58 5 4	1.5 3.1 2.9 31.5 62.5 22.2 128.6	-652 -186 -213 18 1 2 5	-0.8 -0.8 -0.9 10.8 14.3 12.5 250.0	1,200 710 653 58 5 4	1.5 3.1 2.9 34.9 71.4 25.0 450.0		
white Not stated and	-	6	5	-1	-16.7	11	183.3	1	20.0	11	220.0		
not valid	•••	842	4	-838	-99.5	846	100.5	838	20,950.0	846	21,150.0		
<u>West</u>													
White Nonwhite Negro Indian Japanese Chinese Filipino Other non-	51,136 2,687 1,407 322 521 205 130	102 170 83 44 13 9 31	571 256 67 39 10 11 6	469 86 -16 -5 -3 2 -25	0.9 3.0 -1.1 -1.4 -0.6 0.9 -15.5	673 426 150 83 23 20 37	1.3 14.9 10.1 22.7 4.3 9.3 23.0	-469 -86 16 5 3 -2 25	-0.9 -2.9 1.1 1.4 0.6 -0.9 18.4	673 426 150 83 23 20 37	1.3 14.5 10.2 23.0 4.3 9.3 27.2		
white Not stated and	68	24	157	133	144.6	181	196.7	-133	-59.1	181	80.4		
not valid	•••	559	4	-555	-99.3	563	100.7	555	13,875.0	563	14,075.0		

 $<sup>^{1}\</sup>mbox{Minus}$  sign indicates more assignments by census than by NCHS.

 $<sup>^2\</sup>mbox{Minus}$  sign indicates more assignments by NCHS than by census.

NOTE: For explanation of why white and nonwhite do not add to the total, see Technical Appendix.

Table 18. Number of matched and unmatched deaths and proportion unmatched, by race: United States and each region, May-August 1960

		<del></del>	,			
	Matched deaths	according to:		Proportion unmatched		
Region and race			Unmatched deaths	Census record	Death record	
All regions						
All races	395,664	395,664	100,412	20.2	20.2	
White Nonwhite Negro Indian Japanese Chinese Filipino Other nonwhite Not stated and not valid Northeast	354,459 37,991 35,994 756 581 348 194 118 3,214	357,233 38,409 36,401 685 576 332 149 266 22	84,560 15,851 14,913 432 131 153 112 110	19.3 29.4 29.3 36.4 18.4 30.5 36.6 48.2 0.0	19.1 29.2 29.1 38.7 18.5 31.5 42.9 29.3 4.3	
All races	114,362	114,362	24,321	17.5	17.5	
White Nonwhite Negro Indian Japanese Chinese Filipino Other nonwhite Not stated and not valid	107,826 5,712 5,542 45 8 87 18 12 824	108,558 5,799 5,648 34 9 77 4 27	21,821 2,499 2,410 16 4 58 2	16.8 30.4 30.3 26.2 33.3 40.0 10.0 42.9 0.1	16.7 30.1 29.9 32.0 30.8 43.0 33.3 25.0 16.7	
North Central All races	101 000	101 000	26 21 2	17.0	17.0	
White Nonwhite Negro Indian Japanese Chinese Filipino Other nonwhite Not stated and not valid South	121,092 113,312 6,791 6,554 161 31 29 8 8 989	121,092 114,233 6,850 6,658 124 29 23 7 9	26,318 23,792 2,526 2,386 105 7 15 3 10	17.9 17.4 27.1 26.7 39.5 18.4 34.1 27.3 55.6	17.9 17.2 26.9 26.4 45.9 19.4 39.5 30.0 52.6	
All races	105,556	105,556	34,279	24.5	24.5	
White Nonwhite Negro Indian Japanese Chinese Filipino Other nonwhite Not stated and not valid	82,083 22,631 22,408 184 8 18 7 6 842	82,735 22,817 22,621 166 7 16 2 5	24,681 9,598 9,487 83 3 15 4	23.1 29.8 29.7 31.1 27.3 45.5 36.4 50.0	23.0 29.6 29.5 33.3 30.0 48.4 66.7 54.5	
West	E/, 6E/,	E/, 6E/,	15 404	22.1	22 1	
White Nonwhite Negro Indian Japanese Chinese Filipino Other nonwhite Not stated and not valid	54,654 51,238 2,857 1,490 366 534 214 161 92 559	54,654 51,707 2,943 1,474 361 531 216 136 225 4	15,494 14,266 1,228 630 228 117 65 103 85	22.1 21.8 30.1 29.7 38.4 18.0 23.3 39.0 48.0	22.1 21.6 29.4 29.9 38.7 18.1 23.1 43.1 27.4	

## TECHNICAL APPENDIX

# Design of Study

The study includes a sample of registered deaths which occurred during the 4-month period, May-August, 1960. The following age-color groups were included:

- 1. All nonwhite decedents
- 2. All white decedents under 65 years of age
- 3. One-half of white decedents 65-74 years of age
- One-fifth of white decedents 75 years and over

The records for white decedents were systematically selected from the regular mortality punchedcard file using the randomly assigned terminal digits of the certificate numbers. Sample groups three and four of both the matched and unmatched records were inflated by two and five, respectively, during the processing operation.

ď

As indicated in table I, the actual count of death certificates included in the match operation was 340,033. Of this number, 495 records were excluded because of "impossible" codes—483 matched and 12 records unmatched.

Also included in table I are the inflated counts of records by match status.

A seasonal bias may be introduced since the deaths were limited to May-August. But an examination of "nonmatch" rates by month, particularly April and September, for a previous study involving the occupation item on the census and death records, 7 resulted in a decision to limit this study to the 4-month period.

٤.

Table I. Number and percent distribution of records included in the 1960 Comparison Study: United States, May-August 1960

Result of match operation	Actual count of records		Inflated count of	
	Number	Percent distribu- tion	อรักษุก Number	Percent distribu- tion
Total	340,033	100.0	533,747	100.0
Matched	262,483 77,055 2495	77.2 22.7 0.1	420,292 112,656 3799	78.7 21.1 0.1

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Includes impossible codes not included in the study.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Includes 483 matched records and 12 unmatched.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>Includes 782 matched records and 17 unmatched.

## Criteria for Matching

Copies of the 340,033 death certificates included in this study were coded for the stage I Census Enumeration District (ED). A record was considered matched if the exact street address of residence and the name of the decedent were located in the ED book. Other information such as date of birth and marital status were used if the above criteria did not result in a match.

If infants under 1 year of age were not located in the ED book, an attempt was made to match via the mother. The infants represented a high nonmatch risk group since many of them were born after the 1960 Census of Population and therefore were not enumerated.

Almost 6 percent of the records were matched at the place of death, rather than the usual place of residence. Those persons matched at the place of death were for the most part those who died in institutions.

Decedents matched in stage I and included in the 25-percent sample of the 1960 Census of Population, referred to as stage II, were then searched in the stage II books. There were 64,675 such decedents and all but 2,188 were located in the stage II census records. The names of these 2,188 decedents could not be located on the appropriate pages of the stage II schedules.

A host of reasons exists for failure to match the death certificate to the census record:

- (1) The decedent may have moved after the date of enumeration on April 1.
- (2) The decedent may not have been enumerated.
- (3) Clerical and machine errors occurred at all stages of the study.
- (4) Misstatements of information were entered on the census record and/or the death certificate.

## **Variances**

The sample design has been discussed in a previous section, "Design of Study." To obtain the sampling error of an estimate of the net

difference rate for a given geographic area, it would be necessary to know the number of death records for white decedents 65-74 years of age and 75 years and over during May-August 1960 for geographic areas both before and after sampling. The death records were sampled but the color designations for most geographic areas were based on the color on the census record. Although all nonwhite decedents were included in the study period, a decedent stated to be white on the death record may be nonwhite on the census record and vice versa. Therefore, it is not possible to state that the sampling error is zero for the nonwhite group shown in the tables.

## Age

The age reported on the death record is generally the age of the decedent at his last birthday. If the reported age did not agree with the computed age (the difference between the date of death and the date of birth on the certificate). the stated age was accepted unless the difference was 5 years or more. If the difference was 5 years or more, entries for other items on the vital record such as cause of death, occupation, marital status, and social security number were considered in determining the age. Most of the differences involved infants. Therefore, the aforementioned characteristics would give some indication of the "correct" age. If a discrepancy occurred such as 25 years for the computed age and 35 for the stated age, the stated age was accepted.

The age classification used in the 1960 Census of Population is based on the quarter of the year of birth as of April 1, 1960. For this study, the age was updated to adjust for a birth-day that might have occurred between the date of the census and the time of death.

As indicated in the tables showing data by age, the number of matched records for decedents under 1 year of age and 100 years and over, according to the census record, are excluded. The number of records with negative ages are also excluded. Infants were excluded because many were born after the date of enumeration on April 1, 1960. There were 23,176 records

for infants. Decedents 100 years and over and those with negative ages were omitted because there was an excessive number of errors in the century-of-birth codes on the census record. For example, if the year of birth was actually 1861 and the century code for 1900 was assigned, the result was a negative age. There were 1,452 such records, that is, for persons 100 years and over and for negative ages. Such exclusions were made to maintain comparability in order to better assess differences in age reported on the two records.

Additional technical problems relating to age reported on the vital record are covered in another report.  $^6$ 

#### Race and Color

Deaths in the United States in 1960 are classified for vital statistics purposes into white, Negro, American and Alaskan Indian, Chinese, Japanese, Aleut, Eskimo, Filipino, Hawaiian, part-Hawaiian, and other nonwhite. The U.S. Bureau of the Census uses the same classification.

Tabulations in this study by race were grouped as follows:

White

Nonwhite:

Negro

Indian (American and Alaskan)

Japanese

Chinese

Filipino

Other nonwhite (Aleut, Eskimo, Hawaiian, part-Hawaiian, and racial mixtures except as noted below)

Not stated and not valid

The category "white" includes, in addition to persons reported as "white," those reported as Mexican or Puerto Rican. If race is given as a mixture of Negro with any other race except Hawaiian, the race is classified as Negro. Mixtures of Hawaiian and any other race are classified as "other non-white."

In stage I the number of census records for which the race item was not stated is combined with "not valid" codes (processing errors) and shown as a single group in the race tables. The

relative number of such records is small—less than 1 percent of the matched records. If the race was not entered on the death record, the code for "white" was assigned in the initial code-punch operation in NCHS. Consequently, the category "not stated and not valid" according to death certificate designations includes only invalid codes. The number of such records is small. This factor is noted, not because it seriously invalidates the net difference rates, but because the category "not stated and not valid" was excluded from most of the residence tables. Therefore, figures by white and nonwhite do not add to the total.

With the exception of table 18 which shows a comparison of detailed groupings of race, the tables show the color item according to census designations. The purpose was to compare a single characteristic such as data for an SMSA according to census and to death record assignments. Therefore, all other characteristics such as age, sex, and color in that table were by census designations so as not to distort the comparison of the variable being compared.

#### Sex

In a table showing a characteristic such as age or race classified by sex, the sex of the matched decedent is that stated on the census records in order not to invalidate the characteristic being compared.

The small number of deaths for which the sex was not stated—0.5 percent of the total matched records—is included in the total in those tables containing sex, but the category is not shown separately.

# Urban and Rural Areas

The urban-rural definitions used by NCHS differ from those used for data published by the U.S. Bureau of the Census. For this study, the Bureau of the Census assigned the residence codes on the census records of the decedents included in this study according to the rules used for vital statistics. Therefore, the figures for urban and rural are comparable with respect to the application of rules, and the differences

between the NCHS figures and those tabulated by census result from the entries on the two records or processing errors. As noted earlier, differences in the enumeration process and the registration system give greater weight to the accuracy of the census figures. For the decennial census, geographic locations can be fixed with a high degree of accuracy by the Bureau of the Census through the use of street maps, census tracts, and the like. NCHS is dependent almost entirely on the information entered in the residence item on the vital record.

For the definitions of urban and rural as used for vital statistics purposes, see *Vital Statistics of the United States*, 1960, Volume II. Part A.

# Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas

The standard metropolitan statistical areas (SMSA's) used in this report are the same as those established by the U.S. Bureau of the Budget as of 1960 (except in the New England States) and used by the U.S. Bureau of the Census.

Except in the New England States, an SMSA is a county or a group of contiguous counties which contains at least one city of 50,000 inhabitants or more or "twin cities" with a combined population of at least 50,000 in the 1960 census. Contiguous counties are included in an SMSA if, according to specified criteria, they are (1) essentially metropolitan in character and (2) socially and economically intergrated with the central city or cities.

In New England the Bureau of the Budget uses towns and cities rather than counties as geographic components of SMSA's. NCHS cannot use the SMSA classification in New England because its data are not coded to identify all towns. Instead the metropolitan State economic area (MSEA) established by the Bureau of the Census, which is made up of county units, is used. (For a more complete discussion of SMSA's and MSEA's, see references 8-10.)

# Metropolitan and Nonmetropolitan Counties

Counties which are included in SMSA's, or in New England MSEA's, are called metropolitan counties; all other counties are classified as nonmetropolitan.

## Geographic Divisions and Regions

The nine divisions and four regions referred to in this report correspond to those used by the U.S. Bureau of the Census. For States included in each division and region, see reference 8.

# Formula for Adjusting Annual Death Rate

$$\frac{D-D}{\frac{dm_{d}-dm_{c}}{dm_{c}}} = R_{1} = \text{Upper range of rate}$$

$$\frac{D-D \quad \left(\frac{dm_{\rm d}-dm_{\rm c}}{dm_{\rm c}}\right) - D\left(\frac{du}{dm_{\rm c}+d_{\rm u}}\right)}{P}$$

 $= R_2 =$  Lower range of rate

Symbols

D = annual number of deaths, 1960

P = population enumerated as of April 1, 1960

 $dm_c$  =matched deaths in study period according to census record

dm<sub>d</sub> =matched deaths in study period according to death record

du = unmatched deaths in study period

R = annual death rate per 1,000 population

R<sub>1</sub> =upper range of adjusted annual death rate per 1,000 population

R<sub>2</sub> =lower range of adjusted annual death rate per 1,000 population

Deaths, 1960, by residence—SMSA of Abilene, Texas—White

Formula A-upper range

$$\frac{794 - 794 \quad \left(\frac{177 - 172}{172}\right)}{114.508} = R_1$$

 $\frac{771}{114,508}$  x 1,000 = 6.7 =  $R_1$  = upper range

Formula B-lower range

$$\frac{794 - \left[794 \left(\frac{177 - 172}{172}\right)\right] - 794 \left(\frac{57}{172 + 57}\right) = R_2}{114,508}$$

$$\frac{573}{114,508}$$
 x 1,000 =  $R_2$  = 5.0 = lower range

Rates

$$R = 6.9$$
 published annual rate  $R_1 = 6.7$  adjusted rates  $R_2 = 5.0$ 

### Net and Gross Difference Rates

Net difference rates for matched deaths were computed as follows:

- Subtract the number of records according to census assignments only from those according to NCHS assignments only
- (2) Divide the number obtained in step 1 by the number of records for which there is agreement between census and NCHS plus census assignments only
- (3) Multiply by 100

Most tables contain net difference rates with the census record as base; thus a negative rate indicates more assignments by census than by NCHS. If the death record is the base, a negative rate signifies more assignments by NCHS. In most instances the base is inconsequential. If the differences are relatively large, the rate may vary greatly depending on the base.

Gross difference rates were computed by summing the differences rather than subtracting the differences as for net difference rates. Otherwise the computation was the same.

Due to a programming error the first digit of the gross difference rates was not printed out on the tabulations in many instances. Rather than manually correct all of these errors, only a few were recomputed for inclusion in this report.

## Symbols

- s; = Number of assignments are the same according to both the census record and the death record
- c<sub>i</sub> = Number of assignments according to the census record only
- d<sub>i</sub> = Number of assignments according to the
   death record only

ndr, = Net difference rate

 $gdr_i = Gross difference rate$ 

#### Formulas

Net difference rate:

Census record is base.

$$\frac{d_i - c_i}{s_i + c_i} \times 100 = n dr_i$$

Death record is base.

$$\frac{c_i - d_i}{s_i + d_i} \times 100 = n dr_i$$

Gross difference rate:

Census record is base.

$$\frac{d_i + c_i}{s_i + c_i} \times 100 = gdr_i$$

Death record is base.

$$\frac{c_i + d_i}{s_i + d_i} \times 100 = gdr_i$$

#### OUTLINE OF REPORT SERIES FOR VITAL AND HEALTH STATISTICS

Originally Public Health Service Publication No. 1000

- Series 1. Programs and collection procedures.—Reports which desc ii the general programs of the National Center for Health Statistics and its offices and divisions, data collection methods used, definitions, and other material necessary for understanding the data.
- Series 2. Data evaluation and methods research.—Studies of new statistical methodology including: experimental tests of new survey methods, studies of vital statistics collection methods, new analytical techniques, objective evaluations of reliability of collected data, contributions to statistical theory.
- Series 3. Analytical studies.—Reports presenting analytical or interpretive studies based on vital and health statistics, carrying the analysis further than the expository types of reports in the other series.
- Series 4. Documents and committee reports.—Final reports of major committees concerned with vital and health statistics, and documents such as recommended model vital registration laws and revised birth and death certificates
- Series 10. Data from the Health Interview Survey.—Statistics on illness, accidental injuries, disability, use of hospital, medical, dental, and other services, and other health-related topics, based on data collected in a continuing national household interview survey.
- Series 11. Data from the Health Examination Survey.—Data from direct examination, testing, and measurement of national samples of the population provide the basis for two types of reports: (1) estimates of the medically defined prevalence of specific diseases in the United States and the distributions of the population with respect to physical, physiological, and psychological characteristics; and (2) analysis of relationships among the various measurements without reference to an explicit finite universe of persons.
- Series 12. Data from the Institutional Population Surveys.—Statistics relating to the health characteristics of persons in institutions, and on medical, nursing, and personal care received, based on national samples of establishments providing these services and samples of the residents or patients.
- Series 13. Data from the Hospital Discharge Survey.—Statistics relating to discharged patients in short-stay hospitals, based on a sample of patient records in a national sample of hospitals.
- Series 14. Data on health resources: manpower and facilities.—Statistics on the numbers, geographic distribution, and characteristics of health resources including physicians, dentists, nurses, other health manpower occupations, hospitals, nursing homes, and outpatient and other inpatient facilities.
- Series 20. Data on mortality.—Various statistics on mortality other than as included in annual or monthly reports—special analyses by cause of death, age, and other demographic variables, also geographic and time series analyses.
- Series 21. Data on natality, marriage, and divorce.—Various statistics on natality, marriage, and divorce other than as included in annual or monthly reports—special analyses by demographic variables, also geographic and time series analyses, studies of fertility.
- Series 22. Data from the National Natality and Mortality Surveys.—Statistics on characteristics of births and deaths not available from the vital records, based on sample surveys stemming from these records, including such topics as mortality by socioeconomic class, medical experience in the last year of life, characteristics of pregnancy, etc.

For a list of titles of reports published in these series, write to: Office of Information

Office of Information
National Center for Health Statistics
Public Health Service, HRA
Rockville, Md. 20852

# DHEW Publication No. (HRA) 74 - 1287 Series 2 - No. 30

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE Health Resources Administration 5600 Fishers Lane Rockville, Maryland 20852

OFFICIAL BUSINESS
Penalty for Private Use \$300

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEW



THIRD CLASS BLK. RT.