

# The Aged in The Population in 1960 and Their Income Sources

by LENORE A. EPSTEIN\*

THE NUMBER of persons in the United States reported in the 1960 Census of Population as aged 65 years or over was larger by more than 900,000, or 6 percent, than had been estimated previously from 1950 Census data and from mortality and migration statistics.

Reports on the proportion of aged persons receiving payments under income-maintenance programs in recent years have in consequence conveyed an impression somewhat more favorable than warranted. For the United States as a whole, for example, the proportion of aged persons receiving old-age, survivors, and disability insurance, old-age assistance, or both had been calculated at about three-fourths of the total aged population for 1959 and slightly more for mid-1960. On the basis of the Census of Population count, however, the proportion was 72 percent at the end of March 1960 and 74 percent at the end of December 1960. The modification is, of course, not enough to affect any generalization concerning the gains since 1950.

Because State estimates require information on internal migration as well as net immigration and mortality, differences between the population count and recent estimates are, as might have been expected, much greater for some States than for the Nation as a whole. For those States, therefore, for which the aged population had been most seriously underestimated (Florida, Puerto Rico, Massachusetts, California, Maryland, New Jersey, and Arizona)<sup>1</sup> the beneficiary and recipient rates calculated for old-age, survivors, and disability insurance and for old-age assistance for 1959 were too high. For States where the population aged 65 and over had been overestimated (notably Alaska, Hawaii, Idaho, South Carolina, Montana, Arkansas, Vermont,

and the District of Columbia),<sup>1</sup> the beneficiary and recipient rates were correspondingly low.

## AGED POPULATION IN 1960

There were 16.6 million persons aged 65 and over in the 50 States and the District of Columbia on April 1, 1960, according to the advance reports from the 1960 Census of Population—7.5 million men and 9.1 million women (table 1). In addition, in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands there were about 125,000 aged persons.

During the 1950's, the number aged 65 and over increased by 4.3 million, or more than one-third, raising the proportion of the aged in the total population from 8.1 percent to 9.2 percent. The relative number of aged women continued its increase; by April 1960 there were more than 6 women to every 5 men aged 65 and over. This ratio is, of course, related to the longer life expectancy of women and the fact that proportionately more of the older group had passed their seventy-fifth birthday in 1960 than in 1950. Indeed, the increase during the decade in the number aged 85 and over exceeded 50 percent for men and 66 percent for women.

## Misreporting of Age

Comparison of the number in 1960 in each 5-year age group, beginning with age 50-54, with the number in the group that was 10 years younger in 1950 (table 2) implies significant misstatements of age at one or both dates. The evidence of such misstatements is particularly sharp when comparison is made with 10-year survival ratios computed from population life tables, which indicate an apparent overreporting at ages 65-69 and 70-74 for both men and women. Some persons in their fifties and early sixties a decade ago may have then reported themselves to the 1950 Census enumerator as younger than they

---

\* Division of Program Research, Office of the Commissioner.

<sup>1</sup> The States are listed according to the size of the error in percentage terms.

actually were. There is much incentive for such misreporting in our youth-oriented culture. In contrast, some persons reporting themselves as aged 65 or older in the 1960 Census may have reported themselves as older than they were in fact. Here the incentive is the use of age 65 as a criterion of eligibility for old-age assistance and as the normal retirement age under a number of social insurance programs and private pension plans.

According to a 1957 study by the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance on methods of proving age to establish eligibility for benefits, the date of birth given when applying for an account number was different from that finally established in 20 percent of the cases. In four-fifths of these cases (or 16 percent of all cases) the age given when applying for the account number was younger than the age finally established as correct.

The Bureau of the Census found from study of the 1950 Census returns that there was an apparent overcount of the age group 65-69, especially among the nonwhite population. A recent report<sup>1a</sup> explains that "the relatively large number reported for this age group interrupts a rather smooth decline in the size of successive age groups up the age scale. In order to assure a regular decline throughout the entire age span 55 to 69 years for nonwhites, the figures as enumerated for the 5-year age groups in this span were adjusted mathematically." The numbers for the 48 States and the District of Columbia, as reported in the 1950 Census, and the adjusted numbers for

<sup>1a</sup> Bureau of the Census, *Current Population Reports, Population Estimates, Series P-25, No. 212, January 26, 1960*. Adjusted 1950 Census age data were used as a basis for intercensal estimates of the population by age.

the nonwhite population are shown in the following tabulation. For women, it will be noted, the adjustment was slightly larger.

[In thousands]

Age	Men		Women	
	Reported	Adjusted	Reported	Adjusted
55-59.....	689	689	674	674
55-59.....	279	290	260	285
60-64.....	208	227	198	219
65-69.....	202	172	216	170

Age data by race are not yet available for 1960. The data by sex in table 2, however, do show more concentration at ages 65-69 for women than for men, perhaps because women are more likely than men to understate their age during their middle years. It seems possible that some adjustment of the 1960 figures will be found necessary after an evaluation of the 1960 age distribution. It is too soon to say.

### The Aged in Institutions

Decennial Census data by age are still to be released not only on race but also on marital status, household relationship, living arrangements, and economic characteristics. The number of aged persons in institutions is of particular concern. Information on the age distribution of persons in institutions is not scheduled for release until 1962. An interim estimate of the probable minimum number of persons aged 65 and over in institutions at the Census date may therefore be useful.

The rate of increase would surely be greater than the 22 percent reported for the institutional

TABLE 1.—Age and sex of persons aged 65 and over in the United States: <sup>1</sup> 1960 and 1950

Age	1960			1950			Percentage increase, 1960 from 1950		
	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female
Total.....	16,559,580	7,503,097	9,056,483	12,294,098	5,812,691	6,482,007	34.7	29.1	39.7
65-69.....	6,257,910	2,931,088	3,326,822	5,013,490	2,431,035	2,582,455	24.8	20.6	28.8
70-74.....	4,738,932	2,185,216	2,553,716	3,419,208	1,633,382	1,785,826	38.6	33.8	43.0
75-79.....	3,053,559	1,359,424	1,694,135	3,284,061	1,510,794	1,773,267	41.1	34.0	47.1
80-84.....	1,579,927	665,093	914,834						
85 and over.....	929,252	362,276	566,976	577,939	237,480	340,459	60.8	52.6	66.5

<sup>1</sup> Includes Alaska and Hawaii in 1950 as well as 1960.

Source: Bureau of the Census, *1960 Census of Population*, advance reports, PC (A2)-1 (Mar. 31, 1961).

TABLE 2.—Comparison of survival proportions computed by relating 1950 and 1960 Census reports with the proportions computed from life tables

Age in 1960	Persons of specified age in 1960 as percent of persons who were 10 years younger in 1950 <sup>1</sup>	Expected 10-year survival rates (percent) for persons who in 1950 were 10 years younger than specified <sup>2</sup>	Column 1 as percent of column 2
Total			
50-54.....	93.8	94.0	100
55-59.....	92.6	90.8	102
60-64.....	86.1	86.2	100
65-69.....	86.3	79.5	109
70-74.....	78.0	70.5	111
75-79.....	60.9	59.8	102
80-84.....	46.2	45.9	101
85 and over.....	24.1	21.8	111
Men			
50-54.....	93.0	92.3	101
55-59.....	90.8	88.0	103
60-64.....	82.3	82.1	100
65-69.....	80.5	74.0	109
70-74.....	71.7	63.9	112
75-79.....	55.9	53.0	105
80-84.....	40.7	40.0	102
85 and over.....	20.7	20.0	104
Women			
50-54.....	94.6	95.6	99
55-59.....	94.4	93.5	101
60-64.....	89.9	90.2	100
65-69.....	92.1	85.0	108
70-74.....	84.4	76.9	110
75-79.....	65.6	66.3	99
80-84.....	51.2	51.1	100
85 and over.....	27.3	23.2	118

<sup>1</sup> Calculated from table 1, Bureau of the Census, *1960 Census of Population, Advance Reports, PC (A2)-1* (Mar. 31, 1961).

<sup>2</sup> Based on National Office of Vital Statistics, *Abridged Life Tables for the United States, 1957* (Vital Statistics—Special Reports, Vol. 50, No. 9, July 23, 1959), with rate for those aged 85 and over in 1960 based on weighting of quinquennial rates by 1950 population in age groups 75-79, 80-84, and 85 and over.

Source: Social Security Administration, Division of the Actuary.

population of all ages combined, because the aged population increased almost twice as fast as the total population (34.7 percent in comparison with 18.5 percent). The question is how much greater. It seems reasonable to assume that at the minimum the percentage in institutions would be no less than in 1950 for age-sex specific groups. If so, there must have been at least 540,000 aged persons in institutions in the United States<sup>2</sup> in March 1960, or 3.2 percent of all aged persons.

### State Variations

In two-fifths of the States at least 10 percent of the population was aged 65 or over on April 1, 1960. Only in nine States—Alaska, Arizona,

Hawaii, Nevada, New Mexico, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Utah—and in Puerto Rico were fewer than 7 percent in this age group (table 3).

The aged population of both Florida and Arizona more than doubled from 1950 to 1960. Three other States had increases of more than 50 percent—California, Nevada, and New Mexico. At the other extreme, in three States—Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont—the increase was less than 20 percent.

The Far West ranked first in the rate of growth of the aged population during the decade, followed closely by the Southwest and the Southeast. The latter region, however, would have fallen below the national average had it not been for the heavy migration into Florida.

The Plains States and New England had the smallest increases. The proportion of the population that was aged 65 and over was nevertheless still highest in these two groups of States in 1960, as it had been in 1950.

### SOURCES OF MONEY INCOME

Public income-maintenance programs not only provide protection to the population but constitute an important source of information on the economic status of selected groups in the population. Operating statistics yield precise information, very promptly, on the number of aged persons receiving retirement or survivor benefits under a social insurance program, pensions or compensation because of military service, or public assistance. Regular surveys made by the Bureau of the Census on the employment status of the population yield information on the number with earned income—information that is less precise than the counts of checks issued but available almost as speedily. Household interview surveys conducted from time to time—often for selected groups—have been the main source of information on the number and characteristics of aged persons receiving contributions from relatives and the number receiving income from investments. These same studies are the only source of information on the numbers receiving income simultaneously from a variety of sources. Survey data are of course subject to sampling variability and to response errors.

<sup>2</sup> The 50 States and the District of Columbia.

The following discussion of the sources of money income is presented under three broad headings, public income-maintenance programs,

TABLE 3.—Population aged 65 and over: Number, percent of total population, and percentage increases, by region and State, April 1, 1960 and 1950

Region <sup>1</sup> and State	Number of persons (in thousands)		Percent of total population		Percentage increase, 1960 from 1950
	1960	1950	1960	1950	
Total (including Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands).....	16,684.0	12,382.3	9.2	8.1	34.7
United States <sup>2</sup> .....	16,559.6	12,294.7	9.2	8.1	34.7
New England.....	1,121.8	906.6	10.7	9.7	23.7
Maine.....	106.5	93.6	11.0	10.2	13.9
New Hampshire.....	67.7	57.8	11.2	10.8	17.2
Vermont.....	43.7	39.5	11.2	10.5	10.6
Massachusetts.....	571.6	468.4	11.1	10.0	22.0
Rhode Island.....	89.5	70.4	10.4	8.9	27.2
Connecticut.....	242.6	176.8	9.6	8.8	37.2
Mideast.....	3,708.0	2,785.8	9.6	8.3	33.1
New York.....	1,687.6	1,258.5	10.1	8.5	34.1
New Jersey.....	560.4	394.0	9.2	8.1	42.2
Pennsylvania.....	1,128.5	886.8	10.0	8.4	27.3
Delaware.....	35.7	26.3	8.0	8.3	35.8
Maryland.....	226.5	163.5	7.3	7.0	38.5
District of Columbia.....	69.1	56.7	9.0	7.1	22.0
Great Lakes.....	3,358.5	2,595.9	9.3	8.5	29.4
Michigan.....	638.2	461.6	8.2	7.2	38.2
Ohio.....	897.1	709.0	9.2	8.9	26.5
Indiana.....	445.5	361.0	9.6	9.2	23.4
Illinois.....	974.9	754.3	9.7	8.7	29.2
Wisconsin.....	402.7	309.9	10.2	9.0	29.9
Plains.....	1,720.0	1,377.6	11.2	9.8	24.9
Minnesota.....	354.4	269.1	10.4	9.0	31.7
Iowa.....	327.7	273.0	11.9	10.4	20.0
Missouri.....	503.4	407.4	11.7	10.3	23.6
North Dakota.....	58.6	48.2	9.3	7.8	21.6
South Dakota.....	71.5	55.3	10.5	8.5	29.3
Nebraska.....	164.2	130.4	11.6	9.8	25.9
Kansas.....	240.3	194.2	11.0	10.2	23.7
Southeast.....	3,256.4	2,298.1	8.4	6.8	41.7
Virginia.....	289.0	214.5	7.3	6.5	34.7
West Virginia.....	172.5	138.5	9.3	6.9	24.5
Kentucky.....	292.3	235.2	9.6	8.0	24.3
Tennessee.....	308.9	234.9	8.7	7.1	31.5
North Carolina.....	312.2	225.3	6.9	5.5	38.6
South Carolina.....	160.6	115.0	6.3	5.4	30.9
Georgia.....	290.7	219.7	7.4	6.4	32.3
Florida.....	553.1	237.5	11.2	8.6	132.9
Alabama.....	261.1	198.6	8.0	6.5	31.5
Mississippi.....	190.0	153.0	8.7	7.0	24.2
Louisiana.....	241.6	176.8	7.4	6.6	36.6
Arkansas.....	194.4	149.0	10.9	7.8	30.5
Southwest.....	1,135.7	784.6	8.0	6.9	44.7
Oklahoma.....	248.8	193.9	10.7	8.7	28.3
Texas.....	745.4	513.4	7.8	6.7	45.2
New Mexico.....	51.3	33.1	5.4	4.9	55.1
Arizona.....	90.2	44.2	6.9	5.9	103.9
Rocky Mountain.....	367.7	270.6	8.5	7.8	35.9
Montana.....	65.4	50.9	9.7	8.6	28.6
Idaho.....	58.3	43.5	8.7	7.4	33.8
Wyoming.....	25.9	18.2	7.8	6.3	42.6
Colorado.....	158.2	115.6	9.0	8.7	36.8
Utah.....	60.0	42.4	6.7	6.2	41.3
Far West.....	1,891.6	1,275.6	8.8	8.3	48.3
Washington.....	279.0	211.4	9.8	8.9	32.0
Oregon.....	183.7	133.0	10.4	8.7	38.1
Nevada.....	18.2	11.0	6.4	6.9	65.4
California.....	1,376.2	895.0	8.8	8.5	53.8
Alaska.....	5.4	4.7	2.4	3.7	13.6
Hawaii.....	29.2	20.4	4.6	4.1	46.0
Puerto Rico.....	122.2	85.6	5.2	3.9	42.8
Virgin Islands.....	2.2	2.0	6.9	7.5	9.7

<sup>1</sup> The regional classification follows that now used by the Department of Commerce for analysis of personal income by State.

<sup>2</sup> Includes Alaska and Hawaii for 1950 as well as for 1960.

Source: Bureau of the Census, release, Mar. 14, 1961.

employment, and other sources. It will be noted that data for private pension plans are in one sense operating statistics, but they are discussed with other sources of income both because of the interest in distinguishing public programs and because the statistics generally available do not provide adequate information on even so basic a characteristic as the age of beneficiaries.

### Public Income-Maintenance Programs

*OASDI and public assistance.*—By the end of 1960, when the aged population in the United States<sup>3</sup> had probably grown to about 17 million, 10.8 million aged persons—or 64 percent of that total—were receiving benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program as retired workers, wives, or widows (table 4). Beneficiaries under this program represented 68 percent of all aged men and 61 percent of the aged women. The increase from the end of 1950 was fourfold for all beneficiaries (nearly sevenfold for women).

The Federal-State program of old-age assistance provided support for about the same number of aged persons as the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program at the end of 1950. By 1960, the assistance program had, of course, declined greatly in relative importance. In December 1960, nevertheless, more than 2.3 million aged persons, or 14 percent of the total, were receiving old-age assistance, and probably almost 70,000 were recipients under the programs of aid to the blind and to the permanently and totally disabled (table 5). Nearly one-third of these recipients, however, were receiving assistance to supplement old-age, survivors, and disability insurance benefits that did not meet their needs according to the assistance standards in their State of residence. Payments for medical care were also made for a few others—15,000, mostly in Massachusetts—under the program of medical assistance for the aged authorized by the 1960 amendments to the Social Security Act, which was then just beginning to get under way.

Aged persons receiving payments under one or both of these broad income-maintenance programs under the Social Security Act represented

<sup>3</sup> The 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

74 percent of all the aged in the population. There was no significant difference by sex, because proportionately more men than women received old-age, survivors, and disability insurance benefits and proportionately more women than men received assistance. About two-thirds of the public assistance recipients were women, many over age 75. Most of them had never become entitled to benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program either by their own work or that of their husbands.

TABLE 4.—Estimated number of persons aged 65 and over in the United States<sup>1</sup> with money income from present or previous employment, by sex, December 1960

[In thousands]

Type of money income	Total		Men	Women
	Number	Per cent		
Total population aged 65 and over.....	16,960	100.0	7,690	9,270
Employment or social insurance or both.....	13,570	80.0	6,880	6,690
Employment.....	4,110	24.2	2,330	1,780
Earners.....	3,220	19.0	2,330	890
Nonworking wives of earners.....	890	5.2		890
Social insurance (retirement and survivor) benefits <sup>2</sup> .....	12,010	70.8	5,770	6,240
Old-age, survivors, and disability insurance.....	10,820	63.7	5,190	5,630
Railroad retirement.....	650	3.8	330	320
Government employee retirement.....	1,020	6.0	510	510

<sup>1</sup> The 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

<sup>2</sup> Persons with income from more than one of the programs listed are counted only once. Estimates of women with benefits under the government employee programs include estimated number of beneficiaries' wives not in direct receipt of benefits.

The number per 1,000 receiving old-age, survivors, and disability insurance tends to be inversely correlated with the number per 1,000 receiving old-age assistance. In consequence, State differences in the number per 1,000 receiving income under one or both of these programs tend to be relatively small. Estimates of the age distribution of the population are not yet available for December 1960. In consequence, the rates by State are presented for March 1960 and compared with those a decade earlier (table 6).

The range in the relative number receiving old-age, survivors, and disability insurance, old-age assistance, or both was from a high of more than 800 per 1,000 in Mississippi and Alabama to a low of 521 per 1,000 in the District of Columbia, where the Federal civil-service retirement system protects much of the working population. Maryland and Virginia, which were next lowest, also

have many aged persons receiving civil-service annuities.

Rhode Island, New Hampshire, and Michigan headed the list of States in the proportion of aged persons receiving old-age, survivors, and disability insurance benefits. Louisiana, Georgia, and New Mexico were at the opposite extreme. The three States with the highest old-age assistance recipient rates—Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama—also ranked highest in the proportion receiving payments under old-age, survivors, and disability insurance, old-age assistance, or both.

When the States are grouped by region it appears that regional differences in old-age assistance rates and old-age, survivors, and disability insurance rates were largely offsetting in March 1960; the number having either or both types of payment ranged closely around the national average of 716 per 1,000. New England had the

TABLE 5.—Estimated number of persons aged 65 and over in the United States<sup>1</sup> with money income from employment or public programs, by sex, December 1960

[In thousands]

Type of money income	Total		Men	Women
	Number	Per cent		
Total population aged 65 and over.....	16,960	100.0	7,690	9,270
Employment, total <sup>2</sup> .....	4,110	24.2	2,330	1,780
Employment and no income from public programs.....	1,160	6.9	850	310
Employment and social insurance benefits.....	2,550	15.0	1,220	1,330
Employment and payments under other public programs.....	400	2.3	260	140
Social insurance (retirement and survivor) benefits, total <sup>3,4</sup> .....	12,010	70.8	5,770	6,240
Benefits and no earnings or veterans' or public assistance payments.....	7,700	45.4	3,560	4,140
Benefits and veterans' payments.....	1,020	6.0	680	340
Benefits and public assistance.....	740	4.4	310	430
Veterans' pension or compensation, total <sup>4</sup> .....	1,670	9.8	990	680
Veterans' payments and no earnings or social insurance <sup>5</sup> .....	340	2.0	110	230
Public assistance, total <sup>6</sup> .....	2,410	14.2	830	1,580
Public assistance and no earnings or payments under other public programs.....	1,560	9.2	450	1,110
No income from employment or public programs.....	1,490	8.4	250	1,240

<sup>1</sup> The 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

<sup>2</sup> Includes 3,220,000 earners and an estimated 890,000 nonworking wives of earners.

<sup>3</sup> Includes persons with income from one or more of the following sources: old-age, survivors, and disability insurance, railroad retirement, and government employees retirement (see table 4). Excludes persons with benefits under unemployment or temporary disability insurance or workmen's compensation programs.

<sup>4</sup> Includes estimated number of beneficiaries' wives not in direct receipt of benefits.

<sup>5</sup> Includes a small number receiving supplementary public assistance.

<sup>6</sup> Old-age assistance recipients and persons aged 65 and over receiving aid to the blind or to the permanently and totally disabled, including a small number receiving vendor payments for medical care but no direct cash payment either under old-age assistance or medical assistance for the aged.

largest proportion (741 per 1,000) of persons aged 65 and over receiving either old-age, sur-

vivors, and disability insurance or old-age assistance, or both, and the Mideast had the smallest

TABLE 6.—Persons aged 65 and over receiving OASDI, OAA, or both, per 1,000 aged population, by region and State, March 1960 and 1950

Region and State	Number per 1,000 aged population receiving—							
	1960				1950			
	OASDI, OAA, or both	OASDI <sup>1</sup>	OAA	Both OASDI and OAA <sup>2</sup>	OASDI, OAA, or both	OASDI <sup>1</sup>	OAA	Both OASDI and OAA <sup>2</sup>
Total (including Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands)	716	615	142	40				
United States <sup>4</sup>	716	616	141	41	366	164	224	22
New England	741	681	110	50	377	238	175	36
Maine	761	693	110	42	341	208	158	25
New Hampshire	742	697	72	27	334	225	128	19
Vermont	741	657	130	46	316	167	170	21
Massachusetts	738	667	139	68	405	236	214	45
Rhode Island	765	722	75	32	403	286	146	29
Connecticut	727	693	60	26	338	258	108	28
Mideast	692	661	45	14	293	213	92	12
New York	697	665	49	17	295	211	96	12
New Jersey	711	688	34	11	290	237	62	9
Pennsylvania	700	668	44	12	314	221	106	13
Delaware	686	661	36	11	255	198	65	8
Maryland	616	584	42	10	234	168	73	7
District of Columbia	521	489	45	13	174	131	49	6
Great Lakes	721	660	86	25	336	179	177	20
Michigan	761	696	97	32	374	190	216	32
Ohio	715	644	100	29	350	190	179	19
Indiana	731	684	63	16	295	165	144	14
Illinois	690	634	76	20	330	179	169	18
Wisconsin	739	677	89	27	307	158	169	20
Plains	709	600	150	41	317	105	232	20
Minnesota	706	608	134	36	309	117	208	16
Iowa	691	613	106	28	262	97	181	16
Missouri	747	583	232	68	411	124	319	32
North Dakota	695	596	125	26	229	48	187	6
South Dakota	715	617	126	28	271	58	221	8
Nebraska	677	606	92	21	254	85	183	14
Kansas	688	598	119	29	286	100	201	15
Southeast	734	550	231	47	425	108	334	17
Virginia	631	585	51	5	207	121	90	4
West Virginia	745	642	114	11	362	173	194	5
Kentucky	746	589	193	36	360	105	266	11
Tennessee	697	538	179	20	354	91	271	8
North Carolina	726	594	156	24	358	105	264	11
South Carolina	733	531	217	15	435	91	355	11
Georgia	758	480	333	55	517	93	449	25
Florida	686	601	126	41	418	163	287	32
Alabama	807	511	378	82	491	107	399	15
Mississippi	813	497	421	105	459	54	410	5
Louisiana	797	429	517	149	738	104	695	61
Arkansas	773	533	284	44	486	78	424	16
Southwest	724	499	296	71	503	87	441	25
Oklahoma	761	486	362	87	575	78	521	24
Texas	725	498	297	70	493	86	433	26
New Mexico	652	480	209	37	371	76	305	10
Arizona	666	558	155	47	398	138	292	32
Rocky Mountain	717	591	198	72	408	127	311	30
Montana	700	627	107	34	330	116	232	18
Idaho	738	650	127	39	353	115	262	24
Wyoming	676	595	127	46	345	132	236	23
Colorado	727	545	209	117	492	132	402	42
Utah	714	615	132	33	356	134	241	19
Far West	709	615	174	80	434	196	288	50
Washington	760	654	178	72	487	200	343	56
Oregon	752	692	93	33	354	206	177	29
Nevada	632	566	143	77	354	164	236	46
California	695	598	186	89	437	194	295	52
Alaska	749	574	268	93	441	149	330	38
Hawaii	675	634	51	10	300	201	118	10
Puerto Rico <sup>5</sup>	743	420	323	( <sup>6</sup> )				
Virgin Islands <sup>6</sup>	725	453	272	( <sup>6</sup> )				

<sup>1</sup> State data estimated for 1950 from distributions for December 1949 and June 1950; for 1960, from distributions for December 1959 and June 1960.

<sup>2</sup> Data for February or March 1960.

<sup>3</sup> Estimated by applying to the OAA caseload for March 1950 the September 1950 proportion of the total OAA caseload that was receiving both OASDI

and OAA.

<sup>4</sup> Includes Alaska and Hawaii for 1950 as well as for 1960.

<sup>5</sup> First included under public assistance in October 1950; under old-age, survivors, and disability insurance in January 1951.

<sup>6</sup> Fewer than 50 recipients.

(692 per 1,000). The Southeast and Southwest followed New England. Differences were much smaller than in 1950, when the Southwest was highest with 503 per 1,000—well above the national average of 366 per 1,000—and the Mideast was lowest with 293 per 1,000.

*Programs for railroad and government employees.*—Retirement and survivorship programs for railroad and government employees complement old-age, survivors, and disability insurance by providing not assistance based on need but protection somewhat similar to that provided the great body of workers in the United States. Benefit levels tend to be higher, but under most plans for government employees (other than those coordinated with old-age, survivors, and disability insurance) survivor protection is less adequate. At the end of 1960 almost 1.7 million aged persons were receiving support through one of these programs, either as a direct beneficiary or the wife of a retired government employee. Under government employee programs, unlike the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance and railroad retirement programs, wives do not generally receive direct benefits. More than one-fourth of the beneficiaries under the programs for railroad and government employees were also on the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance rolls.

The total number of aged persons receiving benefits under one or more of the retirement and survivor programs, including old-age, survivors, and disability insurance, was 12.0 million—71 percent of all those aged 65 and over in the population.

*Programs for veterans.*—With the aging of the World War I veteran population, the number of aged persons receiving some support under veterans' compensation and pension programs has continued to grow rapidly. At the end of 1960, it is estimated, these programs afforded income support for nearly 1.7 million persons aged 65 or older, or about every tenth aged person in the population. (Included are aged wives of veterans receiving pensions or compensation.)

The majority of the aged persons on the Veterans Administration rolls received in addition some income from employment or a social insurance program. The proportion with such

income has been growing because World War I veterans coming on the rolls in recent years are much more likely to have employment and/or to be entitled to old-age and survivors insurance than the older Spanish-American war veterans, who make up a declining proportion of the total veteran population.

## EMPLOYMENT

As a source of income, employment was next in importance to old-age, survivors, and disability insurance. According to preliminary estimates developed by the Division of Program Research to take account of the Decennial Census count, there were at the end of 1960 about 4.1 million aged persons with some income from employment. The total includes 2.3 million men and 900,000 women with paid employment and about an equal number of women who were not in the labor force but whose husbands had jobs.

Age and marital status have a significant effect on the employment patterns of older as well as younger persons. A special analysis of data collected in connection with the March 1960 survey of the labor force shows that men aged 65–69 were twice as likely as those aged 70 or over to work and that women aged 65–69 were three times as likely as older women to have employment (table 7). Men with a wife to support were much more likely to work than other men, even at ages 65–69. Among women aged 65–69, the situation was unlike that of the men, reflecting to

TABLE 7.—Percent of persons aged 65 and over in the labor force, by age, sex, and marital status, in the United States, March 1960<sup>1</sup>

[Noninstitutional population]			
Sex and marital status	Total aged 65 and over	Aged 65-69	Aged 70 and over
Men, total.....	31.8	45.5	23.2
Married, spouse present.....	37.1	48.4	27.9
Single.....	24.3	34.1	19.5
Other marital status.....	18.2	32.2	14.3
Women, total.....	10.1	17.5	5.9
Married, spouse present.....	5.9	8.8	2.9
Single.....	21.6	42.0	12.1
Other marital status.....	11.0	22.9	6.3

<sup>1</sup> The 50 States and the District of Columbia.

Source: Jacob Schiffman, "Marital and Family Characteristics of Workers, March 1960," *Monthly Labor Review*, Preprint No. 2364 (Apr. 1961), table B.

TABLE 8.—Extent of work experience during the year for persons aged 65 and over in the United States,<sup>1</sup> by sex, 1959 and 1950

[Noninstitutional population]

Extent of work experience	1959		1950	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
Total percent.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Worked at full-time jobs <sup>2</sup> :				
50-52 weeks.....	42.5	25.2	52.3	29.7
27-49 weeks.....	11.7	10.8	15.1	11.1
1-26 weeks.....	11.2	9.6	9.1	12.0
Worked at part-time jobs <sup>2</sup> .....	34.5	54.4	23.5	47.4
Percent of population with work experience during year.....	42.4	13.9	49.3	11.8

<sup>1</sup> Excludes Alaska and Hawaii.

<sup>2</sup> A person is classified as having worked at part-time jobs during 1959 if he worked at jobs that provided less than 35 hours per week in a majority of the weeks in which he worked. He is classified as having worked at full-time jobs if he worked 35 hours or more per week during a majority of the weeks in which he worked in 1959.

Source: Sophia Cooper, "Work Experience of the Population in 1959," *Monthly Labor Review*, Dec. 1960, table 6.

some extent differences in their employment experience. Those who were single were almost as likely to work as married men. Those widowed and divorced worked about half as frequently, and the married women relatively seldom.

Much of the employment among persons aged 65 and over is, of course, part time or sporadic. During 1959, for example, more than one-third of the aged men with work experience worked at part-time jobs all year and nearly one-fourth had full-time jobs for less than 50 weeks. The others—42 percent of the total—worked year-round at full-time jobs (table 8). Not only did the proportion with any work experience during the year drop to 42 percent in 1959 (from 49 percent in 1950), but the proportion of those with work experience who worked year-round at full-time jobs was down from 52 percent to 42 percent. Women have characteristically worked part time, so the change from 1950 to 1960 was less striking for them.

In summary, the 1959 work-experience data show that, of the aged not in institutions, fewer than 1 in 5 of the men and fewer than 1 in 25 of the women worked full time that year. It is therefore not surprising that almost two-thirds of the persons with income from employment also received social insurance benefits and an additional 10 percent received payments under the programs for veterans or—a few—from public assistance.

Practically all those with earned income and

with no income from public programs would have been entitled to old-age, survivors, and disability insurance benefits if it were not for this employment. As of December 31, 1960, it is estimated that there were in all 1.2 million persons—three-fourths of them men—who were fully insured under old-age, survivors, and disability insurance but not receiving benefits. In addition, it is estimated that about 270,000 women were eligible for, but not receiving, wife's benefits.<sup>4</sup>

At the end of 1960 about four-fifths of all persons aged 65 and over in the United States were receiving income on the basis of previous if not current employment (table 4). The continuing reduction in the labor-force participation rate of older men has been more than offset by the expansion of the public retirement programs.

### Other Sources of Income

At the end of 1960, it is estimated, there were about 1.5 million persons aged 65 and over with no income from employment or public programs. Some lived on investment income, some were supported by relatives, and some were maintained in institutions supported by taxes or by philanthropic contributions. The great majority are women, usually in the older ages.

Private pensions are, of course, an important source of support for some retired workers. Information is not yet available for December 1960 on the number of persons aged 65 and over receiving benefit payments as a result of private group retirement plans. There is little doubt, however, that the number exceeded 1½ million or that the vast majority of pensioners were also old-age, survivors, and disability insurance beneficiaries. Relatively few of the aged without income from current employment or public programs were eligible for private pensions.

Annuities purchased individually or elected as settlements under life insurance policies that provided income to persons aged 65 and over probably approached 600,000 in number. Many went to persons with other forms of income, but some

(Continued on page 36)

<sup>4</sup> When this group is added to the number of beneficiaries, it appears that a total of 12.3 million aged persons were eligible for old-age, survivors, and disability insurance benefits at the end of 1960.



TABLE 18.—Average payment per recipient for all assistance, for money payments, and for vendor payments for medical care, by program and State, March 1961<sup>1</sup>

State	Old-age assistance			Medical assistance for the aged	Aid to dependent children (per recipient)			Aid to the blind			Aid to the permanently and totally disabled		
	All assistance	Money payments to recipients	Vendor payments for medical care		All assistance	Money payments to recipients	Vendor payments for medical care	All assistance	Money payments to recipients	Vendor payments for medical care	All assistance	Money payments to recipients	Vendor payments for medical care
All States.....	\$69.43	\$57.81	\$11.61	\$187.69	\$30.60	\$28.55	\$2.05	\$73.97	\$66.95	\$7.02	\$68.08	\$55.46	\$12.62
Alabama.....	52.72	50.92	1.81	-----	10.13	10.13	( <sup>2</sup> )	41.32	41.31	.01	37.32	37.31	.01
Alaska.....	66.00	66.00	-----	-----	33.41	33.41	-----	74.13	74.13	-----	( <sup>3</sup> )	( <sup>3</sup> )	( <sup>3</sup> )
Arizona.....	61.01	61.01	-----	-----	29.36	29.36	-----	72.19	72.19	-----	( <sup>3</sup> )	( <sup>3</sup> )	( <sup>3</sup> )
Arkansas.....	52.18	45.29	6.90	-----	15.85	15.08	.77	56.42	51.03	5.39	40.59	32.02	8.56
California.....	92.88	79.76	13.12	-----	49.25	43.68	5.57	108.75	97.68	11.07	90.12	80.60	9.52
Colorado.....	99.03	82.01	17.03	-----	34.55	33.58	.98	82.25	73.33	8.93	71.88	68.68	3.19
Connecticut.....	111.79	91.71	20.09	-----	49.56	43.48	6.08	107.17	83.08	24.09	120.73	89.39	31.39
Delaware.....	50.25	50.25	-----	-----	20.51	20.51	-----	72.30	66.63	5.67	60.08	60.08	-----
District of Columbia.....	65.61	56.47	9.14	-----	33.78	33.69	.08	68.66	68.23	.42	75.39	72.03	3.36
Florida.....	59.25	48.09	11.16	-----	16.78	16.35	.43	61.29	57.32	3.97	64.76	55.44	9.32
Georgia.....	47.09	47.09	-----	-----	23.48	23.48	-----	52.52	52.52	-----	51.53	51.53	-----
Guam.....	25.20	25.20	-----	-----	11.74	11.74	-----	( <sup>4</sup> )	( <sup>4</sup> )	-----	23.06	23.06	-----
Hawaii.....	73.68	62.76	10.91	-----	35.60	31.63	3.97	92.78	78.08	14.70	89.84	73.59	16.25
Idaho.....	81.60	56.91	24.68	-----	40.99	40.99	-----	71.67	68.29	3.38	75.03	68.73	6.30
Illinois.....	77.98	43.83	34.16	-----	40.12	36.30	3.83	86.01	61.90	24.11	87.42	60.27	27.15
Indiana.....	65.58	44.30	21.29	-----	28.38	24.81	3.57	73.74	58.66	15.09	( <sup>3</sup> )	( <sup>3</sup> )	( <sup>3</sup> )
Iowa.....	88.06	62.82	25.24	-----	40.10	36.70	3.40	98.40	89.93	8.47	94.29	86.33	7.96
Kansas.....	82.13	68.93	13.21	-----	36.94	33.22	3.72	82.71	73.88	8.82	86.91	72.55	14.37
Kentucky.....	50.12	50.04	.08	-----	23.80	23.77	.03	52.48	52.40	.08	54.19	54.11	.08
Louisiana.....	70.99	68.74	2.25	-----	23.49	23.26	.23	80.11	78.25	1.87	55.80	52.16	3.63
Maine.....	66.02	47.02	19.00	-----	27.37	25.96	1.41	64.08	55.08	9.00	64.27	54.27	10.00
Maryland.....	62.72	57.47	5.25	-----	30.00	28.41	1.59	65.00	63.66	1.34	65.00	64.54	.46
Massachusetts.....	86.54	69.95	16.59	189.46	47.48	43.20	4.27	116.73	110.31	6.42	131.65	68.89	62.75
Michigan.....	78.98	66.03	12.94	270.80	36.85	35.74	1.11	82.01	72.56	9.45	100.82	78.71	21.91
Minnesota.....	95.12	52.28	42.84	-----	46.44	39.94	6.49	113.57	69.75	43.83	61.69	56.90	4.79
Mississippi.....	34.54	34.54	-----	-----	9.35	9.35	-----	38.33	38.33	-----	34.81	34.81	-----
Missouri.....	61.27	59.74	1.53	-----	24.43	23.99	.44	65.00	65.00	-----	63.84	62.05	1.79
Montana.....	63.98	63.62	.36	-----	33.77	33.77	-----	73.69	71.23	2.46	72.59	72.47	.12
Nebraska.....	75.80	49.39	26.41	-----	30.72	29.44	1.29	95.14	69.80	25.32	74.48	50.75	23.73
Nevada.....	80.67	71.17	9.50	-----	27.33	27.33	-----	100.70	93.70	7.00	( <sup>3</sup> )	( <sup>3</sup> )	( <sup>3</sup> )
New Hampshire.....	85.42	67.70	17.73	-----	41.32	37.13	4.19	87.10	72.27	14.83	100.83	67.86	32.97
New Jersey.....	90.76	54.69	36.07	-----	47.21	47.21	-----	87.03	86.84	.19	93.42	74.05	19.37
New Mexico.....	69.73	59.06	10.67	-----	33.30	30.20	3.11	62.76	59.44	3.31	72.57	59.22	13.35
New York.....	111.71	77.52	34.19	-----	43.97	39.41	4.56	114.65	85.74	28.91	105.71	73.15	32.57
North Carolina.....	44.78	42.50	2.28	-----	20.01	19.50	.51	56.26	53.41	2.85	50.70	47.61	3.09
North Dakota.....	92.79	56.50	36.29	-----	41.18	36.15	5.03	70.69	58.73	11.87	92.97	58.37	34.60
Ohio.....	76.40	64.74	11.66	-----	30.80	30.80	( <sup>2</sup> )	75.62	66.37	9.26	74.94	61.36	13.58
Oklahoma.....	84.44	66.46	17.98	213.38	33.37	31.55	1.82	102.85	84.94	17.91	94.75	76.66	18.09
Oregon.....	85.50	52.98	32.53	-----	42.54	39.17	3.37	93.00	76.08	16.92	95.31	67.20	28.11
Pennsylvania.....	68.25	64.30	3.95	-----	31.74	30.44	1.30	74.00	70.99	3.01	60.42	54.84	5.58
Puerto Rico.....	8.27	8.27	-----	-----	3.82	3.82	-----	8.21	8.21	-----	8.70	8.70	-----
Rhode Island.....	81.15	66.15	15.00	-----	38.74	33.49	5.25	77.54	66.54	11.00	85.44	70.44	15.00
South Carolina.....	42.61	38.29	4.32	-----	14.93	14.00	.93	48.09	44.87	3.22	46.00	42.09	4.51
South Dakota.....	63.67	63.67	-----	-----	31.51	31.51	-----	60.04	60.04	-----	65.00	65.00	-----
Tennessee.....	43.37	40.57	2.80	-----	18.82	18.39	.43	46.91	46.11	.80	45.60	44.50	1.10
Texas.....	52.73	52.73	-----	-----	18.18	18.18	-----	58.41	58.41	-----	54.28	54.28	-----
Utah.....	71.80	51.88	19.92	-----	37.19	35.21	1.98	78.92	61.14	17.78	79.73	60.40	19.33
Vermont.....	71.44	49.76	21.68	-----	30.92	30.92	-----	63.28	57.33	5.95	64.67	55.42	9.25
Virgin Islands.....	26.44	26.44	-----	-----	14.42	14.42	-----	( <sup>4</sup> )	( <sup>4</sup> )	-----	36.28	28.88	7.40
Virginia.....	53.47	41.31	12.16	-----	24.12	23.46	.67	57.37	51.35	6.02	60.94	51.29	9.66
Washington.....	93.25	56.80	36.45	200.12	45.05	42.10	5.95	95.66	72.09	23.57	101.48	66.45	35.03
West Virginia.....	39.00	34.03	4.96	72.76	24.68	23.16	1.53	42.70	38.70	4.01	42.27	37.76	4.52
Wisconsin.....	88.60	38.14	50.46	-----	46.54	40.46	6.08	93.55	51.67	41.87	108.80	42.25	66.55
Wyoming.....	76.33	64.95	11.38	-----	39.37	36.36	3.02	71.02	64.82	6.20	74.87	67.84	7.03

<sup>1</sup> Averages based on cases receiving money payments, vendor payments for medical care, or both. Money payments may also include small amounts for assistance in kind and vendor payments for other than medical care. Figures in italics represent payments made without Federal participation. Averages for general assistance not computed because of difference among

States in policy or practice regarding use of general assistance funds to pay medical bills for recipients of the special types of public assistance.

<sup>2</sup> Less than 1 cent.

<sup>3</sup> No program for aid to the permanently and totally disabled.

<sup>4</sup> Average payment not computed on base of fewer than 50 recipients.

## THE AGED IN 1960

(Continued from page 17)

may well have been the primary support of aged widows.

Current information is lacking on other forms

of property income and on cash contributions from relatives. Earlier studies suggest clearly that most aged persons with significant amounts of income in the form of interest, dividends, or rents either are still employed or receive benefits under a formal retirement program.