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The data relating to claims under the old-age and survivors insurance program in 1940 include information on the family composition of the workers with respect to whose wages these claims for benefits or payments were awarded. These workers constitute a select group and are not altogether representative of the entire body of workers insured under the program, since, as will be seen, some differentials have been introduced by the factors of retirement, of mortality, and of nonfiling for potential benefits or payments. These differentials are of particular importance in the first year of operations of the program. Morcover, the family composition data with respect to these claims are not so satisfactory as would be desired, both because they are limited in volume and because it was necessary to draw them from sources not primarily designed for general statistical purposes.

Novertheless, the data should be of considerable interest, since, together with corresponding data for 1941 and subsequent years, they will form $a$ basis for studying the extent to which the insurance program meets the needs arising from dependency of family members in at least a segment of the insured population. Moreover, while in many respects the data are less representative of the insured population as a whole than are other available data on urban population, in a few respects they improve upon or supplement these other data. The latter, which include the 1930 census and the family composition data recorded in the National Health Survey of $1935-36,{ }^{1}$ are less recent and less accurately enumerated and are not designed to meet as many of the needed statistical requirements, and they include portions of the urban population who would not come within the protection of the insurance program.

[^0]During 1940, claims for monthly benefits were awarded to 132,335 retired workers (workers who became entitled to primary benefits) and to 122,640 family members, of whom 42,804 were wives and children of the retired workers and 79,845 were childron, widows, or parents of 33,073 deceased insured workers. In addition, claims for lumpsum death payments were awarded with respect to 61,080 insured workers who died in 1940 leaving no survivors immedintely eligible for monthly benefits. Summary information on these claims, showing the family classification of the workers and other beneficiaries represented, was carried in the April Bulletin (pp. 86-89). It is now possible to present additional detail on the age and other characteristics of the workers and certain of the family members, including not only somo to whom monthly benefits were awarded but also some to whom no monthly benefit awards were made. The data presented here relate only to initial entitlements. ${ }^{2}$ They refer to the nge, marital status, and other characteristics of tho worker and his dependents as of the month when the worker became entitled to primary benefits or died, and make no adjustment for subsequent developments, such as the entitlement of additional family members or changes in marital status or in family composition.

## Retired Married Male Workers

Of the 117,433 male workers to whom primary benefits were awarded in 1940, 75 percent were married at the time of entitlement (tables 1 and 3 ). Of these, 36 percent had wives who became entitled to wife's benefits in the same month, and 6 percent had children who became entitled to child's benefits. The following comparison with 1930 census data shows that the proportion of male retired workers who are married is higher at each age than the corresponding proportion

[^1]among the urban population as $a$ whole in 1930, the difference increasing with age:

| Ago of worker at last blrthday | Marrled as percont of total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male rotired workers | Urban malos 1030 consus ${ }^{1}$ |
| 65. | 76 | 73 |
| 66. | 70 77 | 72 71 |
| 68. | 77 | 70 |
| $69 .$. | 77 | 08 |
| 70. | 70 | 07 |
| 71. | 74 | 05 |
| 72. | 73 | 64 |
| 73. | 72 | ${ }_{00}^{02}$ |
|  | 71 |  |

I Interpolation of published flares.
The data of the family composition study show that at these ages the proportions of men in urban areas who wore married were only one or two percentage points higher than the proportions in tho 1930 census data. ${ }^{3}$ It is possible that there was an increase, between 1930 and 1940, in the proportions married at these ages, but such increase could hardly account for the differences between the two columns of percentages shown in the tabulation. Of possibly more importance is the probability that married men are more likely to be employed and insured under the old-age and survivors insurance program than are nonmarried ${ }^{4}$ men. As may be scen from the tabulation

[^2]on page 23, the proportions of married mon among the male deceased insured workors aged 65-74 represented in the claims data were fully as high as the proportions among male retired workors.

Moreover, the relative adequacy of the different benefits available to the workor and his family has probably affected the marital-status distribution of primary bencficiarics. This factor may account for the increasing differential between the two sets of percentages at the higher ages. Most of the wives of married male workers 65 years of age are themselves under 65. On the other hand, the wife of the married male worker over 70 has probably attained ago 65 . Only a primary benefit is available in the former case, whereas the combination of primary and wife's benefits is available in the latter. In consequence, as compared with that of nonmarried men, the relative incentive to married men to apply for primary benefits increases with increasing ago.

A detailed distribution of male married retired workers according to age of wife appears in table 2. That the age of the wife was a significant factor in affecting the probability of retirement of the husband may be seen by comparing data in this table with those derived from the family composition study, assuming the lattor study to be fairly representative of insured workers generally in regard to relative ages of husband and wifo. No comparable data are available from the 1930 census. About 44 percent of the retired workers

Table 1.-Workers to whom primary benefits were auarded, by age and sex of worker and family classification of beneficiaries ${ }^{1}$ initially entitled, 1940

| Ago ${ }^{2}$ at ontlement | $\underset{\text { workors }}{\text { All }}$ | Male workers |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Femalo workers |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Total | Marriod |  |  |  |  | Other ${ }^{\text {' }}$ |  |  | Total | Worker only entitiod | Worker and 1 or moro ohlidren ontitled |
|  |  |  | Total | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Workor } \\ & \text { only } \\ & \text { ontitlod } \end{aligned}$ | Worker and wifo ontitlod | Worker and 1 or moro child ontition | Workor wito and ontitlod | Total | Worker only ontiliod | Worker and 1 or more chiluron ontitlod |  |  |  |
| Total. | 132,335 | 117, 133 | 87,073 | 80, 009 | 31,763 | b, 259 | 52 | 20,400 | 28, 881 | 670 | 14,002 | 14,808 | 4 |
| 65. | 40,316 | 40, 102 | 30,739 | 22,323 | 8, 827 | 2, 677 | 12 | 9,003 | 0, 383 | 280 | B, 014 | B, 012 | 2 |
| 66. | 28, 427 | 24, 882 | 18, 816 | 12, 557 | 4, 042 | 1,303 | 14 | 0,000 | 8, 016 | 160 | 3, 846 | 3, 643 | 2 |
| 67. | 15, 690 | 13, 010 | 10,695 | 6,423 | 3, 021 | 643 | 8 | 3, 251 | 3, 187 | 07 | 1,760 | 1,780 | 0 |
| 88. | 7,271 | 6. 602 | 4,970 | 2, 602 | 2,127 | ${ }^{248}$ | 8 | 1,520 | 1, 803 | ${ }^{23}$ | 709 | 709 | 0 |
| 69. | 5, 034 | 6,038 | 3, 891 | 1,080 | 2,078 | 132 | 4 | 1,144 | 1,127 | 17 | 600 | 600 | 0 |
| 70. | 6,012 | 6, 382 | 4,000 | 1,624 | 2, 362 | 122 | 1 | 1,283 | 1,273 | 10 | 630 | ${ }_{5} 30$ | 0 |
| 71. | 4,482 | 4, 052 | 2,006 | 1,001 | 1,010 | 74 | 2 | 1,060 | 1,040 | 10 | 430 | 430 | 0 |
| 72 | 3, 1003 | 3, 577 | 2.008 | 801 | 1,765 | 61 | 1 | 000 | 056 | 13 | 320 | 320 | 0 |
| 73. | 3, 2.46 | 2, 010 | 2,139 1,804 | 642 401 | 1,607 1,374 | 29 28 | 1 | 852 736 | 851 735 | 1 | 255 204 | 204 | 0 |
| 74. | 2,744 | 2, 610 | 1,804 | 401 | 1,374 | 28 | 1 | 736 | 735 | 1 | 204 | 204 | 0 |
| 88 and over | 6,804 | 6, 100 1,718 | 4,220 $\mathbf{0 7 8}$ | 800 160 | 3,380 811 | 43 8 | 0 | 2,171 | 2, 104 | 7 | 494 89 | 494 80 | 0 |

1 Including persons to whom wife's or child's beneftes were awarded with
: Ago of worker at last blrthday. respect to worker's wages.
(excluding those whose wives' ages were unknown) had wives who were 65 or over, while in the family composition study married men of these ages had wives of 65 or over in only 35 percent of the cases. (Wherever necessary in this article to ensure the validity of comparisons between the two sets of data, age distributions in the family composition data have been standardized to conform to those of the claims data.) As expected, the proportion of husbands whose wives had attained age 65 increases rapidly with increasing age of the husband, as shown below:

| Ago of husband at last blrthday | Workers with wives 85 or over as percent of total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Malo marriod retired workers | Married mon, family composi- lion study |
| 05 and over.. | 44 | 35 |
| 65. | 28 |  |
| ${ }_{67}^{66}$ | 36 42 | ${ }_{32}^{20}$ |
|  | 51 | 41 |
| 70-74 | ${ }_{72}^{61}$ | ${ }_{83}^{46}$ |
| 75 and over.. | 86 | 81 |

Relatively, the difference between the two sets of percentages is greatest at the youngest ages. At ages 75 and over, so large a proportion of husbands have wives over 65 that the age of wife is seldom a factor affecting probability of retirement. The percentages of retired workers with wives aged 65 or over may be slightly overstated, since the wives of unknown age, who were excluded in obtaining the percentages, were presumably under 65 in the great majority of cases.

Also, the percentages for retired workers might possibly have been affected by some overstatement of the wife's age, while the percentages for the family composition study probably were affected by understatement of the wife's age.

The greater prevalence of men whose wives are over 65 among the rotired workers than among those represented in the family composition study is also revenled by the following comparison of average ages of wives corresponding to given ages of the husband. As before, the data exclude wives of unknown age.

| Age of husband nt last birthday | A verage age of wives at last birthday |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Retired worker data | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Family } \\ & \text { composition } \\ & \text { study } \end{aligned}$ |
| 65. | 60.5 | 69.0 |
| ${ }_{67}^{66}$ | ${ }_{82}^{81.3}$ | ${ }^{60.0}$ |
| 68. | 63.1 | 61.8 |
|  | 81.2 | 62.7 |
| $70-74$ (averago ago 71.6) - 75 and over (avorago ngo 77.4 | 66.2 70.3 | ${ }_{69.2}^{65.2}$ |

It is of interest, incidentally, to note the gradual increase, with advancing age of husband, of the avorage seniority of the husband over his wife. Taking the family composition study data as a basis, as probably the more representative of insured workers as a whole, it may be seen that the average seniority of the husband increases from 6.0 yoars for husbands aged 65 and 66 to 7.8 years for husbands aged 75 and over. As will be seen later, this increase in average seniority with increasing age of husband is a characteristic in all

Table 2. - Married male workers to whom primary benefits were auarded, by age of uorker, age of wife, and entitlement of wife to vife's benefits, $1940^{1}$

| Ago ${ }^{\circ}$ of worker at entitlement | All <br> mar- <br> riod <br> male <br> work- <br> ors ${ }^{\prime}$ | Ago ${ }^{2}$ of wifo at worker's ontitloment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\mathrm{Uncl}_{50}$ | 60-54 | 65-50 | 60 | 81 | 62 | 03 | 64 | 65 minl over |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Not | Lintitled to wife's benoflts |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | cifors $\begin{gathered}\text { widents } \\ \text { benent }\end{gathered}$ | Total | 05 | 60 | 07 | 08 | 69 | 70-74 | 78 and over |
| Total...- | 87,073 | 4,183 | 5, 880 | 10, 873 | 4,320 | 4,601 | 5, 212 | 5,798 | 6, 106 | 8, 585 | 31,805 | 0,288 | 8, 213 | 4,341 | 3,405 | 2, 757 | 7,631 | 2,267 |
| 65............... | $\begin{aligned} & 30,739 \\ & 18,816 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,040 \\ & 1,027 \end{aligned}$ | 2,819 | 5, 113 | 2,050 | 2,118 | 2, 271 | 2, 456 | 2,358 | $2,250$ | 3,839 | $\begin{aligned} & 1,008 \\ & 1,423 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,277 \\ & 1,208 \end{aligned}$ | 834800 | 602 | 300 | 730 | 132 |
| 60. |  |  | $\begin{array}{r}1,438 \\ 700 \\ 243 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 2,, 121$1,28.4$ | 1,040825 | 1, 140 | 1,281 | 1,448760 | 1,445 |  | 4, 0 K3 |  |  |  | 602 300 730 132 <br> 601 209 023 96 |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{array}{r} 10,010 \\ 10,005 \\ 4,076 \end{array}$ | 827109 |  |  |  |  |  |  | - 882 | 080 | 3,629 | 005 | - 795 | 676 | 601 452 | $\begin{aligned} & 209 \\ & 242 \end{aligned}$ | 472 | 878180 |
| 68 |  |  |  | 300200 | 127 | 235131 | 180 | 235 | 380 | 271 | 2,1352,082 | 459 | 432 | 386 | 202 | 2410 | 309 |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 4,17 \\ & 3,804 \end{aligned}$ | 114 | 167 |  |  |  |  |  | 257 | 211 |  | 368 | 319 | 350 | 207 | 212 | 117 | 80 |
| 70-74........... | $\begin{array}{r} 13,016 \\ 4,220 \\ 978 \end{array}$ | 3224010 | 4238710 | $\begin{array}{r} 604 \\ 114 \\ 25 \end{array}$ | 313888 | 3604412 | 4310910 | 5108411 | 68110717 | 60.416043 | $\begin{array}{r} 8,073 \\ 3,380 \\ 811 \end{array}$ | 05616813 | 97818420 | 1,00318829 | 1,11021734 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,074 \\ 200 \\ 38 \end{array}$ | 3,2471,481240 | 545878128 |
| 75-79........... |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 80 and over.... |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{1}$ Data rolate to initial entitloments only. <br> s Ago at last blrthday. <br> - Includes 3,887 workers with wives of unknown ago, none of whom became ontitlod to wifo's bonents. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 3.-Workers to whom primary benefits were auarded, by marital status, sex, and age, 1940


I Age last birthuny at entilloment.
age groups and results from a number of factors. Perhaps the most important of these is the fact that the older the husband at time of marriage, the greater, on the average, is his seniority. ${ }^{5}$ Another reason may be the fact that, for any given age of the husband at time of marriage, the probability that the marringe will be terminated by the death of the wife-if not terminated by divorce or by death of the husband-increases with the wife's nge at time of marriage.
The average age of wives who became initially entitled to wife's benefits was 08.5 years at last birthday. The average age of all wives known to be 65 or over, including the 5,585 wives who did not become entitled to wife's benefits, was 08.1 years. The average age of those wives of known ages who were under 65 was 58.3 at last birthday, or almost 59 at nearest birthday, indicating that on the average these wives had about 0 years to wait from the time their husbands became entitled before they themselves could become entitled to wife's benefits. In the case of husbands 05 or over in the family composition study, the wives 65 or over averaged 08.1 years of age at last birthday, and those under 05 averaged 57.0 years. From the close agreement of these averages and those for the retired workers, it may be demonstrated that such differences as are found in the average ages of wives as a whole result from the different percentages of wives under and over 65 in the two sets of data.
Complete information is not available to explain the nonentitlement to wife's benefits of the 5,585 wives who had already attained age 65 when their

[^3]husbands became ontitled to primary benofits. Examination of a number of the cases, however, reveals a varicty of reasons. In some of these cases the wife did not qualify for wife's benefits because she had not been married to the retired worker before 1939. In some cases the wife was not living with the worker at the time his application for primary benefits was filed. In others, sho herself was entitled to a primary benefit equal to, or larger than, one-half her husband's primary benefit; as may be seen from table 3 , nearly 3,000 married women became entitled to primary benefits in 1940, and it is believed that a considerable proportion of them were wives of men who were also primary beneficiarics. Other wives who could have become entitled to wife's benefits chose not to file application, because they were earning $\$ 15$ or more a month in covered employment or for other reasons. Finally, there were possibly some wives who failed to apply because thoy were unaware of their rights to benefits; the possibility of such cases has, however, been greatly reduced by efforts of the Board's field offices to apprise potential claimants of their rights under the oldage and survivors insurance provisions.
The proportion of male married retired workers with children entitled to child's benefits decreased steadily from more than 8 percent for workers aged 65 to less than 1 percent for workers aged 75 and over (table 1). These percentages are in approximate accord with trends shown in the family composition study, which are discussed by Myers and Rasor. ${ }^{\circ}$ As their article indicated, a large proportion of the children of men of these older ages are stopchildren or adopted children. That cannot have been the case, however, for the fow

[^4]children of workers aged 78 or over, because those children must have been born after the worker became 60 years of age, and because, under the act, no stepchild or adopted child could qualify as a child of the worker if his relationship to the worker had commenced after the latter had attained age 60.

Although a small number of births to mothers aged 47 or over are reported overy yoar in the United States, it is probable that, in most of the 52 cases in which worker, wife, and cnild were initially entitled to benefits, the child was not the son or daughter of the wife but was either her stepchild or an adopted child.

A discussion of the number and ages of the children in frmilies with childron entitled to child's benefits appears in a later section.

## Other Retired Workers

In most other respects, tho marital-status distributions of male workers shown in table 3 compare reasonably well with available data on marital status for the urban population. The distributions shown for female workers, however, differ considerably from those of the urban female population. They probably reflect rather closely the marital status of women of these ages engaged in covered employment, among whom it would be expected that a larger proportion are single and a smaller proportion married than in the urban population as a whole.

A primary benefit awarded to oither a nonmarried male retired worker or a female retired worker can be supplemented only by child's benofits. In each case the probability of such supplementation is considerably less than in the case of the male married retired worker. More than one-fifth of the nommarricd male retired workers were singlo, and many of those who were widowed or divoreed had been so for so long a time before their entitlement to primary benefits that their children must havo attained ago 18 prior to their fathers' entitlement. In consequence, only 2 percent of the nonmarried malo retired workers had children entitled to child's benefits. Only 4 of the 14,902 female rotired workers had children so entitled; few women of 65 or over have children under 18, other than stepchildren or adopted children, and such children as these female workers may have would, in many cases, not be dependent ${ }^{7}$ and therefore could not become entitled to child's benefits with respect to their mothers' wages.

## Married Male Deceased Workers

Of the 84,674 male workers with respect to whose wages claims for survivors' monthly benefits or lump-sum death payments were awarded, 77

[^5]Table 4.-Deceased workers on whose wages survivors' monthly bencfits or lump-sum death payments were atcarded, by age and sex of worker and family classification of beneficiaries initially entitled, 1940

| Age ${ }^{\text {a }}$ at death | $\underset{\substack{\text { work- } \\ \text { ors }}}{\text { All }}$ | Mnle workers |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Fomalo workers |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Total | Marricd |  |  |  |  | Other ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  | Total | $\left.\begin{array}{\|c} 1 \text { or } \\ \text { more } \\ \text { chit- } \\ \text { dronn on- } \\ \text { tilled } \end{array} \right\rvert\,$ | Elther or both paronts ontitled | $\underset{\text { monthly }}{\text { No }}$ benead. ary anulled |
|  |  |  | Total | Widow only oncitled | Widow and $10 r$ moro chlldren ontitled | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} 1 \text { or } \\ \text { more } \\ \text { chll. } \\ \text { dren } \\ \text { only en- } \\ \text { titlod } \end{array}\right\|$ | No monthly benenctary en. titled: | Total | 1 or moro chll. dren on- titled | Either or boeld parents entitled | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \text { No } \\ \text { monthly } \\ \text { bonenil. } \\ \text { ary cn- } \\ \text { titerl } \end{array}\right\|$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total. | 04, 163 | 84, 674 | 65, 323 | 4,330 | 23, 022 | 2, 610 | 35, 431 | 10,351 | 1,010 | 644 | 18, 888 | 0,470 | 818 | 200 | 8,761 |
| Under 20. | 304 | 315 | 30 | 0 | 13 | 1 | 10 | 285 | 0 | 1 | 294 | 70 | 1 | 0 | 78 |
| 20-24. | 4, 022 | 3, 052 | 872 | 0 | 430 | 18 | 415 | 2, 180 | 22 | 21 | 2, 137 | 070 | 24 | 2 | 044 |
| 25-20 | 8, 833 | 4,761 | 2,879 | 0 | 1,035 | 157 | 1,084 | 1, 888.5 | 110 | 34 | 1,741 | 1,074 | 70 | 6 | 089 |
| 30-34. | 6, 611 | 6, 550 | 3,946 | 0 | 2,288 | 389 | 1,270 | 1, 00.4 | 230 | 62 | 1,303 | 1,081 | 129 | 15 | 918 |
| 35-30. | 7,333 | 6,314 | 4,933 | 1 | 3, 023 | 520 | 1,383 | 1,381 | 207 | 100 | 084 | 1,019 | 103 | 37 | 879 |
| 40-44. | 8,506 | 7, 538 | 6,209 | 1 | 3,567 | 520 | 2, 121 | 1,329 | 292 | 111 | 02 A | 1,028 | 81 | 44 | 903 |
| 45-40 | 11,071 | 0, 938 | 8,357 | 10 | 4, 103 | 440 | 3, 744 | 1, 681 | 260 | 93 | 1,214 | 1. 133 | 88 | 38 | 1,037 |
| 60-54 | 13, 019 | 12, 028 | 10, 090 | 61 | 3,778 | 271 | 5,000 | 1, 038 | 209 | 67 | 1, 572 | 901 | 33 | 34 | 024 |
| 65-59 | 14, 000 | 13,085 | 10,687 | 210 | 2,535 | 148 | 7,774 | 2, 389 | 233 | 35 | 2, 120 | 0.15 | 10 | 20 | 915 |
| 60-04. | 12, 687 | 11,889 | 0, 523 | 751 | 1,204 | 65 | 7,156 | 2, 363 | 119 | 9 | 2, 230 | 608 | 1 | 3 | 694 |
| 65-69. | 7,035 | 7,248 | 6, 875 | 1,841 | 277 | 15 | 3, 542 | 1, 673 | 33 | 4 | 1,830 | 387 | 0 | 1 | 386 |
| $70-74$ | 1,884 | 1, 024 | 1,442 | 928 | 2 | 1 | 484 | 482 | 8 | 2 | 474 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 60 |
| $75-79$ | 804 | 771 | 528 | 304 | 10 | 0 | 124 | 2.16 | 1 | 0 | 245 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| 80 and ovor. | 202 | 288 | 172 | 143 | 1 | 0 | 28 | 116 | 0 | 0 | 110 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 |

[^6]${ }^{2}$ hepresents workors with respect to whose wages lump-sum doath payments wero nwardod.
percent were married at the time of death (tables 4 and 6). Of these married workers, 54 percent were not survived by either a widow or children who could qualify for survivors' monthly benofits in the month of the worker's denth, with the result that only a lump-sum death payment was awarded. In 39 percent of the cases the married worker was survived by children who became entitled to child's benefits, and in all but about onc-tenth of these cases the widow also became entitled to either widow's current or widow's benefits. In the remaining 7 percent-4,330 eases-only the widow became entitled to monthly benefits. ${ }^{\text {b }}$
Comparison of the proportion of married men among decoased male workers, age by age, with similar data of the 1930 consus and the family composition study would indicate that, excopt at ages $30-49$, there were relatively more married men among decoased workers than among the urban population as a whole and that the difforences were greatest at the higher ages:

| Age of worker at last birthday | Married as jercont of total |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Malo doconsed workers | Urban males, 1030 consus | Family compos tlon study |
| 20-24. | 20 | 20 | 22 |
| 25-29. | 00 | 60 | 69 |
| 30-34. | 71 | 75 | 70 |
| 35-30. | 78 | 80 | 82 |
| 40-14. | 82 | 82 | 84 |
| 45-49. | 84 | 82 | 84 |
| 30-54. | 84 | 81 | 83 |
| 85-59. | 82 | 70 | 81 |
| $60-01$. | 80 | 76 | 78 |
| $65-69$ | 78 | 71 | 73 |
| 70-74. | 76 | 64 | 0.5 |

Distribution into their correct classification of all decensed malo workers of unknown marital status would probably have incroased significantly the proportion married in the age groups $30-49$, sinco many of the former wero fathers of children (soo discussion bolow and table 9).
As in the case of retired male workers, no oxact oxplanation of the differences shown in this comparison can be given. As some studies have indicated a lower mortality for married mon than for nonmarried, it might have been expected that

[^7]among a group of decensed mon there would be a smaller proportion marriod than among a group of living mon of like age. On the other hand, a greater probability that marriod mon will be insured undoubtedly tonded to raise the percentages of married mon among the workors. Another factor may be the greator likelihood that claims will result from the deaths of the marriod male workers than from those of nommarried workers. The formor genorally have more dopendents, and thoir dopendents would more probably be able to qualify for survivors' monthly benefits, whereas in gonoral only relatively small lump-sum amounts aro payable to survivors of nommarriod male workers.

The proportion of male married workers survived by dependents who could become ontitled to survivors' monthly benefits in the month of the worker's death varied considerably with the age of the worker. Such benefits would be payable only if the worker had eithor an unmarried dependent child under age 18 or a wife agod 65 or over. 9 The probability that a workor will have a child undor 18 is greatost at ages 25-40, while the probability that his wife will be 65 or over is not significant until after the workor himself has attained age 65 . In consequence, the probability that the marriod male worker is survived by dopendents who become ontitled to survivors' monthly bonefits increnses until about age 40, thon docronses to about age 65, and incroasos again after age 65. The proportion of widows entitlod to widow's current benofits varios with the age of the widow (table 5) in much the same manner as the proportion of workers whose widows are so ontitled varies with the age of the workor (table 4). These proportions are as follows:

| Ago of widow (Inst birthday at denth of worker) | Porcent of widows ontitled to widow's current bonefits | Ago of widow (last blrthdny at death of worker) | Porcont of widows ontitled to widow's curront benonts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Under 20 | 45 | 40-44.................. | 85 |
| 20-24. | 80 | 48-40....................... | 42 |
| 25-20 | 04 | 60-64................... | 28 |
| 30-34 | 05 | 65-69 | 13 |
| 36-30................. | 04 | 00-04. | 8 |

- An aged dependent parent of a dcconsod male married worker who is not survived by unmarrlod children undor 18 might bocome entitled to paront's monthly benonts, provided the worker's surviving wifo doos not qualify as a whidow undor section 200 ( $($ ) of the act. Such cases must have boen relativoly fow in numbor, and their occurrence has beon ignored in tho tabulation of cinims datn by troating as nonmarrlod all male deceased workers whose parents became ontitiod to parent's benefts.

The percentages may understate, for many ages, the proportion of widows with unmarried children under 18, since the data do not include cases in which a child but not the widow herself becamo entitled to benefits. On the other hand, the likelihood that there is less nonfiling of claims when the worker is survived by unmarriod children under 18 than when he is not so survived introduces a factor tending to raise the proportion. Despite these limitations, the proportions do indicate the general trend in the probability that widows of various ages will have children under 18. The children, of course, may include stepchildron or adopted childron of the worker, or stepchildren of the widow. Despite this fact, the percentage of widows entitled to widow's current benefits drops to about 3 percent for widows aged 60-64,
while practically none of the widows 65 or over had in their caro children ontitled to child's benefits.

All but about 1 percent of the widows 65 and over became ontitled to widow's benefits. Thoso who did not become so entitled were probably in most cnses women who failed to qualify as widows under section 209 (j) of the act or who were not living with their husbands at the time of their husbands' death.

Failure to file claims for potential monthly benefits or lump-sum death payments with respect to the wages of decensed workers was naturally much less dependent upon the relative ages of worker and widow than the factor of nonretirement was upon the relative ages of primary bencficiary and wife. This fact may be seen from the close

Table 5.-Deceased married male workers on whose wages survivors' monthly benefits or lump-sum denth payments were atcarded, by age of worker, age of widove, and entitlement of widow to widow's or widow's current benefits, $1940{ }^{1}$


[^8]'All the widows under age 05 Included here and 3 of those aged $65-00$ becamo ontitled to whlow's current benonts; the remainder of the widows aged 65 or over became ontitled to widow's benefte.
agreement between average ages of the widows of the deceased workers and average ages derived from the family composition study:

| Ago group of husband ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Avorago } \\ \text { nge of } \\ \text { husband } \end{gathered}$ | A verage age of wlves ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Deceased worker data? | $\begin{gathered} \text { Family } \\ \text { compos. } \\ \text { ton study } \end{gathered}$ |
| 20-24..... | 22.8 | 21.5 | 21.3 |
| 23-29..... | ${ }_{32}^{27.2}$ | 24.8 | 20.0 |
| ${ }_{3}^{30} 30.39$. | 37.1 | 33.8 | 33.0 |
|  | 42.1 |  | 38.4 |
| 43-19. | 47.1 | 43.5 | 42.9 |
| ${ }_{5}^{50-54 .}$ | 62.1 67.0 | 585 | 82.1 |
|  |  |  |  |
| 60-44. | 01.0 | 67.0 61.0 | ${ }_{60.5}^{50.5}$ |
|  | 71.3 | 65.4 | O4.9 |
| 76 and over. | 77.0 | 60.6 | 60.0 |

IAt last birthday.
i Excludes cases in which the age of the widow was unknown. It is belleved that this oxclusion does not affect the avorages signifeantly.

This tabulation clearly indicates that the average seniority of the husband inereases steadily with advancing age of the husband. The reasons for this incrense have been indicated. Since the probability of a worker's having children under 18
is so largely dependent upon the age of his wife, it was to be expected that the average age of widows corresponding to each given age group of deceased workers would vary somewhat as between widows entitled to widow's current benefits and other widows. This variation becomes significant with respect to workers over age 40. With respect to workers aged $65-69$, for example, the average age of all widows, regardless of type of claim awarded, was 61 years, but the average age of widows who were entitled to widow's current benefits was only 52 years.

## Other Deceased Workers

Corresponding to the fact that the proportions of married men among the male decensed workers are generally higher than in the urban male data of the 1930 census, the proportions of single men and widowers (table 8) are generally lower. On the other hand, the proportions divorced are appreciably greator than among the urban males in the 1930 census. It is expected, however, that the 1940 census data will also show higher proportions of divorced than did the 1930 data; it is

Table 6.-Deceased workers on whose wages strvivors' monthly benefits or lump-sum death paymonts were atcarded, by marital status, sex, and age, 1940

| Sex and ago ${ }^{1}$ | 'l'otal | Marrlod |  | Single |  | Widowed |  | Dlvorced |  | Unknown marital status |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Numbor | Porcont |
| Malo, total. | 84,074 | 05. 323 | 77.2 | 0,082 | 11.4 | 5,100 | 6.0 | 2,097 | 2.6 | 2,472 | 2.9 |
| Under 20 | 315 | 30 | 0.6 | 282 | 89.5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1.0 |
| 20-24.. | 3, 052 | 872 | 28.6 | 2,088 | 08.4 | 13 | . 4 | 21 | . 7 | 68 | 1.9 |
| $25-20$ | 4,701 | 2,870 | 60.4 | 1,000 | 33.7 | 33 | .7 | $\begin{array}{r}81 \\ 185 \\ \hline 185\end{array}$ | 1.7 3.3 | 105 276 | 8. 6 |
| 30-34 | 6, 550 | 3,946 | 71.1 | 1,090 | 10.0 12.0 | 63 70 | 1.0 1.2 | 185 187 | 3.3 3.0 | 270 301 | 6.0 8.7 |
| 35-30. | 6. 314 | 4,933 | 78.1 | 757 | 12.0 | 70 | 1.2 | 187 | 3.0 | 301 | 6. 7 |
| 40-44. | 7, 538 | 6, 200 | 82.4 | 010 | 8.2 | 147 | 1.0 | 203 | 2.7 | 803 | 4.8 |
| 45-49. | 0, 038 | 8,357 | 84.1 | 607 | 6. 7 | 260 | 2.7 | 287 | 2.9 | 301 870 | 8.6 |
| 80-54 | 12,028 | 10,090 | 83.9 | 696 | 6. 8 | 548 026 | 4.6 | 324 <br> 348 | 2.7 2.7 | 870 205 | 8.12 |
| $85-69$. | 13,055 | 10, 607 | 81.7 80.1 | 819 833 | 0.3 b. | 920 1.300 | 7.1 11.0 | 348 270 | 2.7 2.3 | 295 154 | 2.2 1.8 |
| 60-64. | 11,880 | 0,820 | 80.1 | 633 | 6. 3 | 1.300 | 11.0 | 270 | 2.3 | 104 | 1.8 |
| $05-69$. | 7,248 | 5, 075 | 78.3 | 320 | 4.4 | 1,054 | 14.8 | 180 | 2.1 | 49 | . 7 |
| $70-74$. | 1, 024 | 1. 442 | 74.9 | 69 30 | 3.6 3.9 | 376 201 | 19.6 20.0 | 27 12 | 1.4 1.6 | 11 | .6 |
| ${ }^{75-79} 80$ and ovor | 774 288 | 528 172 | 08.2 69.7 | 30 9 | 3.9 3.1 | 202 | 20.0 36.4 | $\underline{2}$ | $\begin{array}{r}1.8 \\ .7 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 3 | 1.1 |
| Female, total. | 0,470 | 3, 984 | 42.0 | 2,800 | 30.3 | 1,300 | 13.7 | 040 | 0.8 | 688 | 7.2 |
| Under 20. | 79 | 13 | 10.6 | 84 | 81.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 27 | 2. 28 |
| 20-24. | 970 | 331 | 34.1 | 683 <br> 388 | 60.1 |  |  | 47 | 1.4 |  | 6. 4 |
| 25-29. | 1,074 | 540 $8: 0$ | 60.9 82.4 | 388 283 | 30.1 20.7 | 24 | 2.2 4.2 | 47 02 | 1.4 <br> B. | ${ }_{116}$ | 0.8 10.9 |
| 30-34 | 1,001 1,019 | $8: 60$ 624 | 82.4 51.4 | 223 | 21.9 | 05 | 6.4 | 76 | 7.8 | 181 | 12.8 |
| 40-44. | 1,028 | 518 | 60.4 | 204 | 19.8 | 93 | 9.0 | 00 | 8.8 | 123 | 12.0 |
| 48-49. | 1,133 | 609 | 44.9 | 251 | 22.2 | 162 | 14.3 | 111 | 9.8 | 100 | 8.8 |
| 60-54. | 001 | 404 | 40.8 | 247 | 24.9 | 178 | 18.0 | 97 | 9.8 | 05 | 6.6 |
| $55-50$ | 945 | 302 | 32.0 | 249 | 20.3 | 201 | 30.8 | 67 | 7.1 | 30 | 8.8 |
| co-04. | 008 | 194 | 27.8 | 217 | 31.1 | 230 | 32.9 | 48 | 0.9 | 9 | 1.3 |
| 6500. | 387 | 75 | 10.4 | 132 | 34.1 | 140 | 38.6 | 24 | 0.2 | 7 | 1.8 |
| 70-74. | 60 | 9 | 16.0 | 17 | 28.3 | 81 | 51.7 | 3 | 5.0 | 0 | 0 |
| 75-70. | 30 | 3 | 10.0 | 10 | 33.3 | 16 | 63.1 | 1 | 3.3 | 0 | ${ }^{0}$ |
| 80 and over. | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 25.0 | 2 | 60.0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 26.0 |

${ }^{1}$ Ago last birthday at death.

Table 7.-Deceased nonmarried ${ }^{1}$ male workers on whose wages lump-sum death payments were avarded, by age of worker and relationship of known survivors, 1940

| Age ${ }^{\prime}$ of worker | Workers survived by- |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | 1 or more dren 2 | No children' but by- |  |  | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { No } \\ \text { known } \\ \text { chill- } \\ \text { dren } \\ \text { or par- } \\ \text { ents } \end{gathered}\right.$ |
|  |  |  | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \text { Malo } \\ \text { paronts } \end{array}\right\|$ | Femalo parents | 13oth parents |  |
| Total.. | 16, 888 | 03 | 040 | 2, 241 | 3, 674 | 9,070 |
| Under 20. | 284 | 0 | 17 | 47 | 215 | 5 |
| 20-24- | 2, 137 | 2 | 108 | 400 | 1, 432 | 105 |
| 25-29. | 1,741 | 3 | 187 | 424 | 983 | 144 |
| 35-30..... | 1,303 084 | 12 | 167 117 | 383 274 | 510 250 | 233 331 |
| 40-44. | 028 | 7 | 01 | 205 | 120 | 494 |
| 45-40. | 1,214 | 10 | 68 | 185 | 75 | 870 |
| $50-54$. | 1, 572 | 10 | 52 | 140 | 43 | 1,318 |
| 55-50. | 2,120 | 2 | 30 | 115 | 22 | 1, 051 |
| 60-64. | 2,230 | 5 | 12 | 46 | 12 | 2,161 |
| 65-60. | 1,836 | 2 | 1 | 12 | 2 | 1, 519 |
| $70-74$ | 474 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 472 |
| 75-70 | 2.45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 245 |
| 80 and over. | 116 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 116 |

1 Singlo, widowed, divorced, or of unknown marital status.
; Ago last birthday at death
${ }^{2}$ Represents unmarried children under age 18 who did not come within the definition of the term "child" or were not, by deflnition, dependent on worker at time of his death. No lump-sum death payinent could ho awarded if an workers represented in any column of this table may have been survived by chlldren aged 18 or over or by married children under age 18.
also probable that census data generally understate the proportion divorced. The relative frequencies of the various marital-status groups may be distorted somewhat by the large proportion of workers of unknown marital status. As will be shown later, a large proportion of the workers of unknown marital status had children and were married, widowed, divorced, or separated. Generally, separated workers were tabulated as married, but it is believed that many of those of unknown status were actually separated and should also have been tabulated as married.

As in the case of female primary beneficiaries, the marital-status distribution of deceased female workers is more nearly a reflection of the distribution of females in covered employment than of urban females generally.
Survivorship by dependents who can become entitled to monthly benefits is much less common among deceased nonmarried male or deceased female workers than among decensed married male workers. Married men are naturally much more likely to have unmarried children under 18 who are dependent upon them. Moreover, if they are fully insured, their widows, if over 65 , may become entitled to monthly benefits even when they have no children who can be entitled to child's
benefits. On the other hand, parent's benefits may be awarded with respect to a deceased nonmarried male worker or a decensed female worker who is not survived by unmarried children under 18, but only if the parent has been wholly dependent upon the worker and has attained age 65 . Child's benefits were awarded with respect to 10 percent of the nonmarried male workers and about 5 percent of the female workers, and parent's benefits were awarded with respect to about 3 percent of the nonmarried male workers and about 2 percent of the female workers (table 4). In the remaining cases, lump-sum death payments were awarded. The proportion of the nonmarried male workers with respect to whose wages child's benefits were awarded was highest- 22 percent-for workers in the age groups $35-39$ and $40-44$. The latter age group had also the highest proportion of workers-about 8 percent-with respect to whose wages parent's benefits were awarded; parents of workers in the younger age groups were less likely to have attained age 65, while the parents of workers in the older age groups were less likely to have survived.

A more complete account of the survivorship of the nonmarried deceased male workers by their parents (including, in some cases, stepparents and adopting parents) may be obtained by referring to table 7 as well as to table 4. A total of 17,369 such workers ( 544 shown in table 4 and 16,825 in table 7) were not survived by any known unmarried children under age 18, and, of these, 7,399 or 43 percent were survived by at least one parent. It is estimated that about 3,800 or roughly 22 percent were survived by both parents. The proportions of nonmarried male workers in each age group survived by at least one or by both parents are as follows:

| Age of worker at last blrthday |
| :--- |

Table 8.-Number of workers on whose wages primary and child's benefits wore awarded, and number and average age of chilidron ${ }^{1}$ of these vorkers, by sex, ago, and marital status of worker, $1940^{2}$

| Sox and age ${ }^{2}$ of worker | Marltal status of workor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 'Total |  |  | Marrlod |  |  | Widowod |  |  | Divorcod |  |  | Unknown |  |  |
|  | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \text { Num: } \\ \text { ber of } \\ \text { workers } \end{array}\right\|$ | Numbor of chitl- liron $\qquad$ | Averago $n^{3}$ aroill. dren ${ }^{1}$ | Num. ber of workors | Num. bor of childron ${ }^{1}$ | Averago nge ${ }^{2}$ of childron 1 | Num. bor ol workors | Num: bor of chif- | Averngo ago ${ }^{3}$ of chli. dron ${ }^{1}$ | Numbor of workors | Num. ohll. dren 1 | Avorago ago of ohildron ${ }^{1}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Num- } \\ \text { bor of } \\ \text { workers } \end{gathered}$ | Num. olill-: dron: | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { A vor- } \\ \text { ago } \\ \text { ago } \\ \text { alot } \\ \text { dront } \\ \text { dron I } \end{array}$ |
| Malo, total............ | 8, 890 | 0,707 | 12.8 | 6,311 | 8,007 | 12.7 | 404 | 008 | 13.0 | 83 | 121 | 13.3 | 32 | 41 | 13.7 |
|  | 8,787345608 | $\begin{array}{r} 0,081 \\ 644 \\ 86 \\ 17 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12.8 \\ & 12.8 \\ & 13.1 \\ & 11.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4,950 \\ 310 \\ 43 \\ \hline 8 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 8,287 \\ 632 \\ 71 \\ \quad 17 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12.7 \\ & 12.7 \\ & 12.8 \\ & 11.8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 430 \\ 28 \\ 6 \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 043 \\ 44 \\ 11 \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 13.0 \\ 13.6 \\ 16.0 \\ \cdots \cdots \\ \hline \ldots \end{array}$ | 79400 | $\begin{array}{r} 117 \\ 4 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 13.3 <br> 14.0 <br> $\cdots \cdots$ <br> ..- | $\begin{array}{r}28 \\ 8 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 34430 | $\begin{array}{r}18.6 \\ 14.0 \\ 18.8 \\ \hline . .\end{array}$ |
| 60-99....................................... |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fomalo, total (05-00).. | $=-=$ | 0 | 11.0 | 1 | 1 | 10.0 | 3 | 8 | 11.1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | --.-....- |

1 Unmarriod elifldron undor ago 18 rogardloss of onttloment to child's benefits.
benonta rolate to initial entitloments only and luclucle 62 cases in whitoh rifo's bonents as well as primary and child's were awardod.

- Ago last birthay at workor's ontitloment to primary benofts.

It is of interest that three workers aged 70 or over were each survived by one parent, and a fourth by both parents.
That only about 5 percent of the surviving parents became initially entitled to parent's benefits arises from the fact that the parent must not only havo been wholly dependent on and supported by the worker at the time of the work-
er's death but he must also have attained nge 05. About 60 percent of the surviving parents were parents of workers who died bofore attaining age 30 , and probably only a small proportion of these parents had then reached ago 05 . In cases in which the worker had reached 45 before he died, it can be assumed that practically all the surviving parents had attained ago 05 , and in more than

Table 9.-Number of deceased workers on whose uages child's bonefits were awarded, and number and average age of ehildren' of these workers, by sex, age, and marital status of worker, $1940^{2}$

| Sex and ago ${ }^{2}$ of worker | Marital status of worker |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total |  |  | Married |  |  | Widowed |  |  | Ilvorced |  |  | Unknown |  |  |
|  | Number of ers | Num- ber of chilaren | A vernge ngo of dren | Num- ber of workcrs | Num. ber of chilaron ${ }^{1}$ | Avernge ago 0 dron ${ }^{1}$ | Num. ber of workcrs | Numis ber of chll. dron ${ }^{1}$ | Average clilldren' | Numwork. ors | Num. cliil. dron | Averago age ${ }^{\circ}$ of olill. dren ${ }^{1}$ | Num: ber of work ors | Numoliti. dron | A vorage age. 0 dron 1 |
| Malo, total. | 27, 481 | 84,735 | 10.0 | 25, 602 | 81,458 | 0.0 | 211 | 381 | 11.0 | 272 | 422 | 10.6 | 1,436 | 2, 474 | 11.6 |
| Under 20. | 14 | 14 | . 5 | 14 | 14 | .6 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| 20-21..... | 479 | 041 | 1.7 | 457 | 015 | 1.7 | 1 | 1 | 1.0 | ${ }^{6}$ | ${ }^{6}$ | 2.8 | 10 88 | ${ }^{19}$ | 1.8 |
| 25-29... | 1, 002 | 3, 223 | 3.4 | 1,702 | 3,001 | 3.3 58 | ${ }^{6}$ | 11 20 | 8.6 | 10 67 | 20 80 | 6.4 7.7 | 88 170 | 1204 | 8.1 |
| 30-34. | 2,015 3,846 | 8,883 8,732 | 5.0 8.6 | 2, 278 3,510 | 8,480 8,164 | 6.8 8.3 | 18 | 20 38 | 8.1 10.4 | 67 68 | 80 92 | 70.7 10.3 | 223 | 438 | 10.0 |
| 35-39. | 3,846 | 8,732 | 8.6 | 3, 510 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 40-44. | 4,370 4,872 | 10,001 10,111 | 10.4 11.5 | 4,087 4,003 | 9, 819 9,033 | 10.3 11.4 | 29 32 | 64 67 | 11.0 12.8 | 60 35 | 100 69 | 12.1 13.3 | 207 | 408 <br> 302 <br>  <br> 0 | 11.0 18.0 |
| ${ }_{80-41}$ | 4, 878 | $\underset{8}{10,111}$ | 11.8 12.3 | 4,003 4,049 | 9,033 7,760 | 11.4 | 42 | 67 77 | 12.8 | 35 22 | 31 | 13.1 | 232 | 403 | 18.5 |
|  | 4,348 | 8, 270 6,017 | 12.3 12.9 | 4,049 2,083 | 4,763 | 12.8 | 30 | 03 | 12.4 | 13 | 18 | 12.5 | 184 | 283 | 18.9 |
| co-al. | 1,437 | 2,251 | 13.2 | 1,319 | 2,007 | 13.2 | 24 | 39 | 14.2 | 8 | 8 | 14.6 | 80 | 140 | 18.6 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 65-69 \ldots . . . \\ & 70 \text { and over } \end{aligned}$ | 325 48 | 471 81 | 13.0 13.7 | 202 41 | $\begin{array}{r}131 \\ 63 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 12.9 <br> 13.8 | $\begin{array}{r}8 \\ 2 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 0 2 | 13.5 <br> 16.5 <br> 10.5 | 5 <br> 0 | ${ }_{0}^{8}$ | 18.0 | $\begin{array}{r}20 \\ 5 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 20 6 | 14.8 <br> 14.8 |
| Female, total. | 818 | 772 | 11.4 | 40 | 74 | 0.1 | 77 | 120 | 12.8 | 32 | 40 | 11.8 | 303 | 832 | 11.8 |
| Under 20 |  | 1 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 20-24... | 24 | 32 | 4.4 | 3 | ${ }^{6}$ | ${ }^{2.9}$ | $\frac{1}{8}$ | 2 | 8.5 | 1 | 1 | 1.0 7.6 | 19 64 | 24 | 4.7 |
| ${ }^{25-29}$. | 79888128 | 112 | 7.0 10.4 | $\stackrel{12}{20}$ | 29 | 10.2 | 12 | 22 | 10.6 10.6 | 7 | 10 | 11.3 | 89 | 129 | 10.8 |
|  | 103 | 168 | 10.4 12.7 | 3 | 8 | 12.2 | 20 | 31 | 13.0 | 8 | 15 | 12.3 | 72 | 114 | 12.5 |
| 40-41. |  |  | 13.0 | 6 |  | 10.5 | 10 | 15 | 14.2 | 6 | 8 | 15.3 | 60 | 98 | 13.6 |
| 45-19.. | 68 | 01 | 13.8 | 2 | 3 | 13.8 | 14 | 24 | 18.1 | 3 | 3 | 12.8 | 30 | 61 | 18.3 |
| 80 and over | 41 | 51 | 14.9 | 1 | , | 10.0 | 12 | 15 | 14.8 | 2 | 2 | 15.6 | 20 | 33 | 16.0 |
| I Unmarriod childiren undor age 18 regardloss of ontltloment to child's benents. <br> ${ }^{1}$ Data relate to Initlal entitlements only and includo casos in which both <br> widow's curront (or widow's) and cla <br> thoso in which child's benents only w <br> s Ago last birthdny at worker's deat |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bulletin, December 1941 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 27 |

one-fifth of these cases one parent at least did become entitled to parent's benefits.

Although data of similar detail are not available for female workers with respect to whose wages lump-sum death payments were awarded, it was found that of 8,761 such workers 12 percent had unmarried children under 18 who were not dependent upon them; for nonmarried male workers, by contrast, the proportion was less than 0.4 percent. To a large extent, this situation arises from the fact that many of the fomale workers were married, and the conditions under which, by definition, a child may be deemed dependent on its mother are not met when the child and both its parents have been living in the same houschold.

## Children in Families of Retired and Deceased Workers

Supplementary data on workers with respect to whose wages claims for child's benefits were awarded in 1940 are presented in tables 8-11. It should be noted that these data relate only to workers with at least one child entitled to child's benefits. However, the data include all unmarried children under 18 of such workers, whether or not they became entitled to child's benefits. Thus, there were 5,894 primary beneficiaries each having at least one child entitled to child's benefits. These workers had 9,776 unmarried children under ago 18 (table 8), of whom 8,204 became entitled to child's benefits. The remaining 1,572 children, while coming from families in which some children were entitled to child's benefits, did not become entitled themselves, probably because it was not deemed advantageous to file application in their behalf or because they did not meet the conditions of dependency prescribed in the act. Similarly, there were 27,999 deceased workers each of whom was survived by at least one child who became entitled to child's benefits. These workers had 55,507 unmarried children under 18 (table 9 ), of whom 50,730 became entitled to child's benefits. ${ }^{10}$

The workers represented in tables $8-11$ include all but a very small proportion of the total number of workers (tables 1 and 4) who had unmarried children under 18. So far as can be ascertained, there were but 2,530 workers, of whom 1,212 were retired and 1,318 were deceased, who had unmarried children under 18 none of whom became entitled to child's benefits. These deceased workers,

[^9]Table 10.-Married male vorkers on whose zoges primary and child's benefits vere atoarded, by number of children ${ }^{1}$ and age of worker, and total number of children, by age of worker, 1940:

| Age ${ }^{2}$ of worker | Total workers | Number of workers with- |  |  |  |  | Total 'obil. dreal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1 chlld | 2 chll dren 1 | 3 chlldren : | 4 chll. dron ' | 8 or more $\underset{\text { chill- }}{\substack{\text { chen } \\ \hline}}$ |  |
| Total. | b, 311 | 3,260 | 1,237 | 423 | 210 | 172 | 8,007 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 65-60........ } \\ & 70-74 \ldots . . . . \\ & 75-79 . \\ & 80 \text { and over } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4,950 \\ 310 \\ 43 \\ 8 \end{array}$ | 3,048 | 1,153 | 388 | 200 | 101 |  |
|  |  | 187 | 68 | 20 | 18 | 11 | ${ }_{63}$ |
|  |  | 23 | 13 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 71 |
|  |  | 2 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 17 |

1 See table 8, footnoto 1.
; 800 table 8 , footnoto 2 .
the majority of whom were married women, were in practically every case workers whose only unmarried children under 18 did not meet the required dependency conditions. On the other hand, the retired workers, most of whom were married men, included a considerable number whose children did meet these conditions and could have become entitled to child's benefits, but no application was made in their behalf. These cases were generally in families which had only one or two children under 18, and these were usually children 16 or 17 years of age and either out of school or earning $\$ 15$ or more a month in covered employment; to have filed application in their behalf would have been to no purpose, sinco the entitlement of these children would not result in an increase in benefits payable to the family. The exclusion from tables 8 and 10 of the many families of this type probably results in a disproportionately large weighting of the figures in favor of families with a considerable number of children whose average ages were several years below 18.

Including these 2,530 workers, the percentages of all workers in each sex and marital-status group with unmarried children under age 18 are as follows:

| Sex and marital status | Percont of rotirod workors | Porcont of deconsod; workers |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Malo: |  |  |
| Marricd. | 7.2 | 39.8 |
| Widowed. | 2.8 | 4.4 |
| Divorced. | 8. 2 | 14.3 |
| Unknown status. | 6.6 | 69.0 |
| Femalo: |  |  |
| Marrled. | . 6 | 24.9 |
| Wliowed | $0^{.2}$ | 7.2 .98 |
| Unknown status. | 0 | 85.0 |

Table 11.-Deceased married male workers on whose unges child's benefits were auarded, by number of children ${ }^{2}$ and age of worker, and total number of children, by age of worker, $1940^{2}$

| $\begin{gathered} \text { Aros }^{.3} \text { worker } \end{gathered}$ | Total work. er8 | Number of workers with- |  |  |  |  | Total chil. dron ${ }^{1}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1 child | 2 chlldron : | 3 chll. dren 1 | 4 chil. dren 1 | 8 or more childron 1 |  |
| Total. | 28, 602 | 11,828 | 7, 230 | 3,463 | 1, 695 | 1,460 | 81,488 |
| Under 20. | 14 487 | 14 335 | ${ }_{03}$ | 0 22 | 0 7 | 0 | 14 |
| $25-29$. | 1,792 | 955 | 830 | 229 | 60 | 20 | 3,001 |
| 80-31. | 2, 070 | 1,077 | 886 | 400 | 180 | 127 | B, 480 |
| $35-30$. | 3,840 | 1,240 | 1,105 | 614 | 200 | 285 | 8,164 |
| 40-44.. | 4,087 | 1,487 | 1,241 | 082 | 330 | 377 | 0,810 |
|  | 4,003 4,049 | 2,021 <br> 2,078 | 1,320 | 623 | 340 | 299 | 9,033 |
| 60-64. | 4,049 | 2,078 | 1,048 | 488 | 220 | 212 | 7,789 |
| 65-69. | 2,633 | 1, 851 | 002 | 264 | 118 | 88 | 4,683 |
| 60-64. | 1,319 | 860 | 288 | 104 | 37 | 80 | 2,067 |
| 65-69. 70 and over. | 202 41 | 202 32 | 87 0 | ${ }_{3}^{22}$ | 8 0 | 3 0 | 431 83 |

Bco tablo 9. footnoto 1.

- 8ce tablo 0, footnoto 2
- 8co tablo 0 , footnote 3.

These proportions should be interpreted in the light of the age distributions of workers involved (see tables 3, 0,8 , and 9 ). For example, it may be seen that, age group by age group, tho percentages of widowed male deceased workers with children who become entitled to child's bencfits did not differ greatly from the corresponding percentages of divorced male deceased workers. Since, however, the divorced workers were concentrated at younger ages than were the widowed workers, the over-all proportion of divorced workers with chil-
dren was about three times as great as that of widowed workers.

The high proportion of deceased workers of unknown marital status who had unmarried children under 18 arises from the fact that, when the only application with respect to the wages of a deceased worker was for child's bonefits, it was often impossible to determine conclusively the marital status of the worker from the application form. Most of the cases classified in table 6 as of unknown marital status arose from this situation.

For the group of male married deceased workers, which is large and embraces a wide range of ages, it is of interest to compare the data on the proportion of workers with children, average number of children, distribution by number of children, and average age of children, with corresponding data derived from the family composition study. ${ }^{11}$ Such comparisons show close resemblance in most respects (table 12).
The most significant difference is the fact that, except at ages under 30, the claims data show a smaller proportion of individuals with children than does the family composition study. The reasons for this difference are not exactly known, but it is believed that the deccased workers represented in the claims data are not entirely representative of the urban population. Furthermore, it is probable that married workers with children are subject to a lower rate of mortality
" See also Myors, Robert J., and Rasor, Eugene A., op. elt., pp. 0-10.

Table 12.-Deceased married male workers on whose wages survivors' monthly benefits or lump-sum death payments were atcarded in 1940, and married male family heads in the family composition study; ${ }^{1}$ proportion of each group with children' under age 18, average number of children, distribution by number of children, and average age of children, by age of vorker or family head

| Age ' of worker or fam- <br> lly head | Number of- |  | 1ercont with chlldrent |  | Workers and family heads with 1 or more children ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Decensed workers | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Fam- } \\ & \text { ily } \\ & \text { heads } \end{aligned}$ | Deceased workers | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Fam- } \\ & \text { hly } \\ & \text { hends } \end{aligned}$ | A verage number of chilliren of- |  | Porcent with- |  |  |  |  |  | Average nge ${ }^{\prime}$ of children of - |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 child |  | 2 chlldren |  | 3 or more chlldren |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Deceased workers | Famlly hends | Dccensed workers | Family heads | Dcceased workers | Family hends | Dcceasod workors | Family hends | Deceased workers | Family heads |
| 20-24................... | 872 | 22, 601 | 62 | 40 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 74 | 70 | 20 | 10 | 6 |  |  |  |
| 25-29.................... | 2,870 | 60, 003 | 62 | 69 | 1.7 | 1.6 | 83 | 88 | 30 | 29 | 17 | 13 | 3.7 | 8.8 |
| 35-39........................ | 3,040 | 72, 013 | 68 | 70 | 2.1 | 1.9 | 40 | 44 | 33 | 33 | 27 | 23 | 6.8 | 8.8 |
| 40-44. | 6, 200 | 80, 492 | 72 | 74 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 35 | 34 | 31 | 33 | 34 | 33 | 8.8 | 8.2 |
| 46-49 | 8, 357 | 70,051 | 65 | 62 | 2.3 | 2.4 | 30 | 33 | 30 | 31 | 34 | 30 | 10.3 | 10.1 |
| 60-84. | 10,090 | B7, 083 | 40 | 40 | 2.1 1.9 | 2.8 2.0 | 44 61 | 40 | 20 | 28 | 27 | 32 | 11.4 | 11,2 |
| 65-59 | 10, 107 | 40, 333 | 25 | 31 | 1.7 | 2.8 1.8 | ${ }_{6} 6$ | 48 86 | 20 | 20 | 23 | 20 | 12.2 | 12.1 |
| 60-04. | 9, 520 | 30, 000 | 14 | 17 | 1.6 | 1.7 | 05 | ${ }^{62}$ | 22 | 24 22 | 13 | 20 10 | 12.8 13.2 | 12.7 13.1 |
|  | B, 675 | 20,060 | 5 | 0 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 00 | 05 | 20 | 21 | 11 | 14 | 12.9 | 13.0 |

[^10]wero included as repular housohold members in the family composition study. a age at last birthday.
than are those without children and are therefore less likely to be included in a group of deceased workers. Long-range trends in birth rates may also have affected the comparisons.

Moreover, it should be remembered that the comparatively small volume of data on deceased workers permits a degree of error in the derived averages and distributions; the family composition study, on the other hand, was the result of less exact methods of enumeration, and it included foster children (not legally adopted) as children of the family head while it excluded many children living away from home. The data in table 12 on decensed workers with children are subject to
the same exclusions as are the data in tables 9 and 11; these exclusions, however, probably have no significant effect. It is of interest to note that in families of male married primary benoficiaries aged 65-69 with children ontitled to child's benefits, the average number of children per worker was 1.7 as compared with 1.5 for decensed workers of the same age, and the average age of children was 12.7 as compared with 12.9 for children of deceased workers. Though these differences are slight, they probably result from the exclusion from the retired-worker data of many cases in which there were only one or two children in the family and these childron just under age 18.


[^0]:    - Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance, Analysis Diviston.

    1 These family composition data have been presented and analyzed in several articies in the Bulletin. See Banders, Barkev B., "Family Composition in the United States,' Vol. 2, No. 4 (April 1030), pp. O-13, and related articles in subsequent issues. Only the urban data are used hero, slnce the inclusion of rural data would probably render the study less representative of the population covered by the old-age and survivors fasurance program.

[^1]:    S See the Bulletin, Jamuary 1041, p. 68, for definition of Initial and subeoquent ontitloments, and the 1 pril 1041 issue, pp. 80-87, for distribution by Inttial and subsequent entitioment of the farnily mombers to whom dependents' or survivors' monthly benefles wero awarded In 1940.

[^2]:    IFor a more detailed comparison of the two sets of data, seo Myers, Robert J., and Rasor, Eugene A., "Marltal and I'arental Status According to Age," Social Securify IBulletin, Vol. 4, No. 11 (November 1041), j. 8.

    - Blagle, widowed, divorced, or of unknown marital status.

[^3]:    -This fact is illustrated fin an articio in the Stalietical IBulletin of the Metropolitan Lifo Insurnace Company, Vol. 18, No. 6 (May 1037), pp. 6-8; whille thls article relates to first marriages only, it is not belleved that the fuclusion of subsequent marrlages would have made the tendency less pronounced.

[^4]:    ${ }^{\circ}$ Myers, Robert J., and Rasor, Eugone A., op. elt., pp. O-10.

[^5]:    ${ }^{1}$ Scetion 202 (c) of the Social Becurity Act provides that "a child shall bo deemed dependent upon $n$ mother, adopting mother, or stepparent . . . only If . . . no parent other than such Individual was contributing to the support of such child and such child was not living with its father or adopting father."

[^6]:    Age of worker at last birthday.
    glinglo, widowed, divorced, or of unknown marital status.

[^7]:    ' In 03 of these cases whidow's current benents only were nwarded; these were cases in which the decensed worker had already attained age 05 and become onttiled to primary benents; sinee hits chitiden had become entitled to child's benefts while the worker wes IVving and continued to be so entitled upon tho worker's denth, the whlow's current benents were the only benents awarded ss survivor benofits.

[^8]:    ${ }^{1}$ Data relate to Initial ontitlements only.
    ${ }_{2}$ Age.at last blrthday.

    - Includes 2,306 workers with widows of unknown age, 50 of whom became entitled to widow's current benents but none of whom became entitled to widow's benents.

[^9]:    if See the Bulletin, Apri 1041, p. 87, table 3.

[^10]:    8co toxt, foolnoto 1
    'Includes all unmarried children under ago 18 of decensed workers with at
    least one child entilied to child's benonts, and all children undor age 18 who

