

# Notes and Brief Reports

## Assistance Expenditures Per Inhabitant, 1955-56\*

The States differ widely in the size of their total population, in the number of recipients of public assistance, and in the total amount they spend for assistance. Furthermore, the population of the United States increases every year, and the number of recipients of public assistance and the amount of assistance they receive change from year to year. Because of all these variations, a comparison—State to State or year to year—of the size of public assistance programs cannot be based simply on the total amount of assistance paid or the total number of recipients. In answering the question, how does program size vary in terms of the number of recipients, the recipient rates—the proportions of the population that receive assistance—are used. In answering the question, how does the amount paid to recipients vary from year to year and State to State, the average monthly payment per recipient is used—the total amount of assistance payments for a year divided by the number of recipient months. In answering the question, how do program costs vary, the amount per inhabitant is computed by dividing total assistance costs by total population. The result is the cost in terms of what it would be if divided equally among all the persons living in an individual State or in the Nation as a whole. This measure removes the effect of State-to-State and year-to-year variations in size of population and reflects the combined effect of variations in the proportion of the population that receives assistance and the average monthly amount of assistance paid.

### National Changes From 1955

In the fiscal year 1955-56 the total spent from Federal, State, and local funds for public assistance payments amounted to \$16.63 per inhabitant of

\* Prepared in the Division of Program Statistics and Analysis, Bureau of Public Assistance.

the United States, about the same as in the preceding fiscal year. Per capita expenditures went up in 1956 for each of the federally aided programs, but the increases from 1955 in the two largest programs, old-age assistance and aid to dependent children, were insignificant. The amount for aid to the permanently and totally disabled, in contrast, increased 10 percent. The growth of this relatively new program, established in October 1950, was much slower, however, than in the earlier years of its operation. Expenditures per inhabitant for general assistance, which is financed entirely from State and local funds, went down 13 cents, or about 7 percent. Changes for the year are shown in the tabulation below.

Program	Expenditures per inhabitant		
	Amount including vendor payments for medical care		Percentage change
	1955-56	1954-55	
All programs..	\$16.63	\$16.53	+0.6
OAA.....	9.77	9.68	+ .9
ADC.....	3.82	3.78	+1.1
AB.....	.44	.42	+4.8
APTD.....	.99	.90	+10.0
GA.....	1.62	1.75	-7.4

The change in total expenditures per inhabitant for all programs combined was slight because the decline in the total number of persons receiving public assistance was accompanied by rises in average payments to recipients under each program. During the year, assistance standards were raised in a number of States because of the increase in the cost of living; in addition, generally larger amounts were paid directly to vendors for medical care. These changes, plus policy liberalizations in several States, resulted in increases in average payments to recipients ranging from 34 cents in the program of aid to dependent children to \$2.65 in general assistance. The number of persons receiving assistance changed significantly from 1955 in only two programs—aid to the permanently

and totally disabled (a 9-percent increase) and general assistance (a decrease of almost 14 percent). The number receiving old-age assistance remained about the same as in the preceding year, and the number receiving aid to dependent children and aid to the blind increased slightly.

Table 1.—Average monthly number of assistance recipients and average monthly payments, by program, 1955-56

Program	Average monthly number of recipients		Average monthly payment per recipient	
	Number, 1955-56	Percent-age change from 1954-55	Amount, 1955-56	Change from 1954-55
OAA.....	2,543,046	-0.8	\$53.53	+\$1.83
ADC.....	2,213,948	+1.6	24.07	+ .34
AB.....	104,823	+2.2	58.09	+1.75
APTD.....	246,300	+9.2	55.89	+1.56
GA.....	714,585	-13.6	31.52	+2.55

Shifts in the average monthly number of recipients and in average payments to recipients are shown in table 1.

### State Variation

In most States, as in the Nation as a whole, the year's changes in the amounts per inhabitant spent for public assistance were relatively small. The States were divided about evenly into those with increases and those with decreases. In almost half the States the amount of change was 50 cents or less, but shifts of \$1.50 or more occurred in seven States with increases and in one State with a decrease.

Nationally, the shifts in per capita expenditures were slight for each program except aid to the permanently and totally disabled. In that program the cost per capita rose in 9 out of every 10 States. Among the remaining programs, except old-age assistance, about three-fifths of the States had shifts in the same upward or downward direction as the program change for the country as a whole. For old-age assistance, a majority of the States had lower expenditures per inhabitant despite a slight overall increase for the Nation. A distribution of the States by type of

change in expenditures per inhabitant is shown below.

Program	Number of States with indicated change in expenditures per inhabitant <sup>1</sup>		
	Increase	Decrease	No change
OAA.....	23	29	1
ADC.....	31	20	1
AB.....	29	11	13
APTD.....	38	4	.....
GA.....	20	29	4

<sup>1</sup> Excludes States for which comparable program data are not available for both years.

The States varied considerably in the amounts spent per inhabitant during 1955-56 for each program and for all programs combined. Total expenditures for all programs, for example, amounted to less than \$10 per inhabitant in eight States but were more than twice that amount in a like number of States. Total State per capita expenditures were \$10.00-\$14.99 in 15 States and \$15.00-\$19.99 in 22 States. Virginia's expenditures of \$4.79 per capita were the smallest in the Nation and were about one-tenth the outlay of \$45.39 made by Colorado, which spent the most (table 2).

Total per capita expenditures are largely governed by the amounts spent for old-age assistance. Expenditures per inhabitant for that program constituted more than half the cost for all programs combined in two-thirds of the States and, nationally, accounted for almost 60 percent of the total. The per capita cost of old-age assistance for the country as a whole (\$9.77) was, however, higher than expenditures for that program in about two-thirds of the States, as shown in the accompanying chart. Colorado and Virginia, with expenditures of \$35.96 and \$1.75, respectively, again represented the extremes in the range of payments. The States fall into three nearly equal groups: those spending less than \$7.50, those spending \$7.50-\$9.99, and those spending \$10 or more.

Variations among States in per capita expenditures for assistance reflect differences in average payments per recipient and proportions of the population aided. Average payments

and recipient rates depend, in turn, on the interaction of the assistance standard (the State's definition of quality, quantity, and cost of the essentials of living) and such other factors as the State's per capita income, distribution of income among its population, and policies governing the determination of eligibility for

assistance—for example, limitations on income and resources, lien laws, and relatives' responsibility provisions. Per capita income and income distribution are particularly important for two reasons: (1) the scope of the assistance program is limited by the tax resources available to finance it, and (2) income distribution

Table 2.—Amount expended per inhabitant<sup>1</sup> for assistance payments, including vendor payments for medical care, by State and by program, fiscal years 1954-55 and 1955-56

State	Total		Old-age assistance		Aid to dependent children		Aid to the blind		Aid to the permanently and totally disabled		General assistance	
	1954-55	1955-56	1954-55	1955-56	1954-55	1955-56	1954-55	1955-56	1954-55	1955-56	1954-55	1955-56
U. S. average.....	\$16.53	\$16.63	\$9.68	\$9.77	\$3.78	\$3.82	\$0.42	\$0.44	\$0.90	\$0.99	\$1.75	\$1.62
Ala.....	12.26	17.02	7.89	12.13	2.93	3.15	.20	.22	1.22	1.51	.01	.01
Alaska.....	12.81	19.23	6.13	7.60	5.19	8.93	.18	.35	(?)	(?)	1.31	2.34
Ariz.....	16.90	16.41	9.97	9.55	5.38	5.30	.59	.60	(?)	(?)	.95	.96
Ark.....	16.35	16.65	11.88	12.07	2.85	2.76	.52	.64	.86	1.08	.25	.20
Calif.....	26.90	26.02	17.75	17.41	6.45	6.08	1.01	1.04	(?)	(?)	1.68	1.50
Colo.....	43.25	45.39	34.07	35.96	4.86	4.89	.17	.17	2.14	2.23	2.01	2.14
Conn.....	14.30	14.93	7.68	7.86	3.57	3.91	.16	.17	.92	1.30	1.98	1.68
Del.....	7.80	7.92	2.14	2.14	2.81	2.99	.42	.42	.30	.54	2.12	1.83
D. C.....	8.28	8.16	2.28	2.31	3.50	3.19	.21	.22	1.82	1.94	.47	.51
Fla.....	16.48	16.20	11.56	11.19	4.08	4.05	.51	.47	(?)	1.17	.33	.32
Ga.....	17.45	18.14	12.16	12.36	3.48	3.59	.47	.49	1.15	1.54	.18	.17
Hawaii.....	12.96	13.50	1.93	1.97	6.77	6.86	.14	.15	1.77	1.91	2.36	2.61
Idaho.....	15.59	15.15	9.94	9.26	4.63	4.52	.23	.23	1.02	1.06	1.09	1.09
Ill.....	16.19	16.34	7.46	7.20	3.48	3.87	.30	.30	.60	.72	4.35	4.26
Ind.....	8.85	8.50	5.07	4.92	2.15	2.18	.29	.30	(?)	(?)	1.34	1.09
Iowa.....	15.98	15.75	10.84	10.62	3.25	3.18	.46	.48	(?)	(?)	1.43	1.49
Kans.....	18.57	18.56	13.21	12.99	2.85	2.96	.26	.26	1.32	1.48	.92	.86
Ky.....	13.32	13.34	7.86	7.79	4.68	4.76	.43	.45	(?)	(?)	.35	.34
La.....	33.89	35.85	25.36	26.21	4.76	5.45	.41	.43	2.15	2.44	1.19	1.31
Maine.....	17.11	16.97	7.94	8.10	4.80	4.96	.37	.38	1.01	1.33	3.99	3.20
Md.....	6.67	6.54	2.19	2.13	2.71	2.69	.11	.11	1.04	1.20	.62	.42
Mass.....	25.65	25.42	16.85	16.61	3.92	3.95	.39	.43	2.34	2.56	2.15	1.87
Mich.....	14.79	14.10	7.05	6.75	3.67	3.57	.19	.19	.26	.29	3.62	3.30
Minn.....	19.57	20.17	13.05	13.52	3.48	3.69	.39	.36	.12	.22	2.53	2.37
Miss.....	13.91	14.48	10.63	11.39	2.17	1.78	.65	.76	.40	.47	.07	.07
Mo.....	27.15	26.56	19.43	18.90	4.22	4.08	.64	.77	2.17	2.02	.68	.79
Mont.....	20.99	19.64	10.39	9.69	4.31	4.01	.56	.54	1.76	1.75	3.97	3.65
Nebr.....	12.19	12.78	7.92	7.91	2.06	2.21	.36	.43	(?)	1.26	1.84	1.96
Nev.....	13.40	14.16	8.65	8.10	5.05	5.50	.42	.47	(?)	(?)	4.28	4.10
N. H.....	13.31	13.15	8.23	8.06	2.89	2.84	.38	.38	.33	.43	1.48	1.45
N. J.....	6.68	6.81	3.04	3.06	1.46	1.65	.13	.14	.52	.66	1.52	1.30
N. Mex.....	17.19	15.04	7.84	6.25	7.51	6.98	.29	.26	1.06	1.03	.49	.52
N. Y.....	16.21	16.15	6.07	5.97	5.39	5.61	.29	.29	2.50	2.57	1.97	1.70
N. C.....	10.10	10.45	4.56	4.60	3.27	3.36	.54	.55	1.08	1.29	.64	.64
N. Dak.....	14.90	16.31	9.69	10.52	3.20	3.46	.19	.13	1.14	1.34	.75	.87
Ohio.....	14.59	13.90	8.16	7.74	1.88	2.00	.29	.29	.53	.54	3.74	3.33
Okla.....	30.96	43.60	30.77	33.14	6.37	6.87	.79	.84	1.61	2.02	.42	.72
Oreg.....	17.86	16.80	9.44	8.80	3.32	2.96	.19	.18	1.69	1.74	3.22	3.12
Pa.....	10.11	9.59	2.94	2.72	3.32	3.32	.91	.94	.75	.76	2.19	1.84
P. R.....	5.11	5.18	1.88	1.85	2.27	2.32	.06	.07	.84	.90	.06	.06
R. I.....	18.43	18.33	6.92	6.96	5.34	5.53	.19	.17	1.45	1.66	4.53	4.01
S. C.....	11.09	11.23	7.22	7.27	1.97	2.00	.34	.35	1.23	1.32	.33	.30
S. Dak.....	15.60	15.48	8.72	8.35	4.12	3.99	.16	.16	.52	.62	2.08	2.36
Tenn.....	14.04	12.75	8.39	7.65	4.84	4.25	.48	.46	.19	.25	.14	.15
Tex.....	14.75	15.36	12.23	12.85	1.86	1.82	.40	.41	(?)	(?)	.27	.28
Utah.....	18.32	17.27	8.98	8.66	5.50	5.05	.23	.24	1.76	1.81	1.82	1.51
Vt.....	15.03	15.17	9.68	9.77	2.62	2.72	.25	.23	.64	.79	1.84	1.65
V. I.....	10.23	12.70	5.69	6.43	2.72	3.80	.30	.31	.82	.99	.75	1.17
Va.....	4.71	4.79	1.73	1.75	1.92	1.97	.16	.16	.59	.63	.31	.28
Wash.....	27.49	32.85	17.69	21.40	4.49	4.98	.29	.33	1.87	2.37	3.16	3.78
W. Va.....	15.67	14.51	4.39	3.87	8.43	7.80	.24	.22	1.60	1.58	1.00	1.04
Wis.....	15.64	15.14	8.93	8.80	3.44	3.48	.25	.25	.53	.37	2.69	2.23
Wyo.....	15.22	14.95	9.55	9.06	2.36	2.52	.18	.17	1.09	1.10	2.05	2.06

<sup>1</sup> Based on population data from the Bureau of the Census; excludes Armed Forces overseas.

<sup>2</sup> No program approved by the Social Security Administration.


<sup>3</sup> Program not in operation for full year. State plans approved for Federal participation as follows:

Florida, July 1955; Maine, April 1955; Nebraska, October 1955; and Nevada, July 1955.

<sup>4</sup> Data incomplete.

<sup>5</sup> Program administered under State law without Federal participation.

Chart 1.—Amount expended per inhabitant<sup>1</sup> for assistance payments, including vendor payments for medical care, fiscal year 1955-56



1/ BASED ON TOTAL POPULATION ESTIMATED BY BUREAU OF CENSUS AS OF JULY 1, 1955, EXCLUDES ARMED FORCES OVERSEAS. 2/ AID TO THE BLIND. 3/ AID TO THE PERMANENTLY AND TOTALLY DISABLED.  
 2/ VENDOR PAYMENTS FOR MEDICAL CARE OF \$1.19 PER INHABITANT FOR MASSACHUSETTS, 60 CENTS PER INHABITANT FOR NEW YORK, AND 52 CENTS PER INHABITANT FOR WASHINGTON. 3/ ESTIMATED.  
 3/ INCOMPLETE.

■ TOTAL PAYMENTS    ▨ VENDOR PAYMENTS    \* VENDOR PAYMENTS FOR MEDICAL CARE OF LESS THAN 50 CENTS PER INHABITANT.

is a large factor in determining the number of persons who qualify as needy individuals under the State's standard of assistance. In old-age assistance, another important factor is the beneficiary rate and the average benefit amount under old-age and survivors insurance, the other major public program of income maintenance for aged persons in the United States.

The factors affecting expenditures per inhabitant for old-age assistance are applicable for all the programs. In general, States with relatively high per capita costs have the following characteristics—a comparatively large proportion of the population receiving assistance, relatively high assistance standards, and relatively liberal policies governing eligibility for as-

sistance. In contrast, States with comparatively low expenditures have standards and eligibility requirements that are less liberal and, with few exceptions, provide aid to a small proportion of the population.

Among the seven States with the largest per capita expenditures for old-age assistance, for example, all except Massachusetts have comparatively high recipient rates coupled with average payments that are either high compared with those in other States or are near the national median. In Massachusetts the relatively high average payment is primarily responsible for the relatively high per capita cost; the State's recipient rate was at the median for the Nation in December 1955. Assistance standards in Louisiana and Missouri—the only

two of these seven States that have average payments in the middle range—are not high in relation to those of other States. Nevertheless, the proportion of the population with little or no income is relatively large in these two States, so that, even under their moderate assistance standards, a comparatively high proportion of aged persons qualifies for assistance. The seven States vary in per capita income and old-age and survivors insurance beneficiary rate. Three (California, Massachusetts, and Washington) rank high among all States in both per capita income and beneficiary rates for old-age and survivors insurance. Colorado and Missouri, on the other hand, are in the middle range with respect to both per capita income and beneficiary rate. The two

**Table 3.—Number of States with specified amount of expenditures per inhabitant for vendor payments for medical care, by program, fiscal year 1955-56**

Expenditures per inhabitant for vendor payments for medical care	Total, all programs	Old-age assistance	Aid to dependent children	Aid to the blind	Aid to the permanently and totally disabled	General assistance
Average, all States.....	\$1.51	\$0.78	\$0.14	\$0.02	\$0.14	\$0.43
Total number of States.....	53	53	53	53	45	53
No vendor payments.....	12	27	29	27	23	13
Vendor payments.....	41	26	24	26	22	40
Less than \$0.50.....	13	14	21	26	19	19
0.50-0.99.....	4	2	3	0	2	9
1.00-1.49.....	4	3	0	0	1	7
1.50-1.99.....	8	2	0	0	0	3
2.00 or more.....	12	5	0	0	0	2

remaining States (Louisiana and Oklahoma) have relatively low income per capita and low beneficiary rates, both indicative of potentially greater need.

In contrast to the above group, all but one of the seven States with the lowest per inhabitant expenditures for old-age assistance aid a comparatively small proportion of their aged population but vary in size of average payment, per capita income, and old-age and survivors insurance beneficiary rate. In Puerto Rico the recipient rate is among the highest in the Nation, but the average payment (\$7.90 in December 1955), per capita income, and old-age and survivors insurance beneficiary rate are among the lowest in the Nation. Four States (Delaware, the District of Columbia, Maryland, and Pennsylvania) have comparatively high per capita income and an average or larger-than-average proportion of the aged population with income from old-age and survivors insurance or the Federal civil-service retirement program; these two factors bring their per inhabitant expenditures down despite the fact that their assistance standards are about at the national average. Hawaii and Virginia—the other two States in this group—are in the middle range when States are ranked according to per capita income. In Hawaii the old-age and survivors insurance beneficiary rate is relatively high, and in Virginia it is near the median for the Nation. Assistance standards in these two States were low in relation to those in other States.

Much the same sort of variation

occurred among the States with respect to the other assistance programs. The distribution of States by amount of assistance expenditures per inhabitant for the fiscal year 1955-56 is shown below for each of the assistance programs, and for all categories combined.

Expenditures per inhabitant	Total, all programs	OAA	ADC	AB	APTD	GA
Total number of States.....	53	53	53	53	45	53
Less than \$0.50.....	0	0	0	44	9	13
0.50-0.99.....	0	0	0	8	10	8
1.00-1.49.....	0	0	0	1	10	7
1.50-1.99.....	0	3	5	0	9	9
2.00-2.99.....	0	4	13	0	7	7
3.00-3.99.....	0	2	15	0	0	6
4.00-4.99.....	1	2	9	0	0	3
5.00-7.49.....	3	7	9	0	0	0
7.50-9.99.....	4	18	2	0	0	0
10.00-14.99.....	15	10	0	0	0	0
15.00-19.99.....	22	3	0	0	0	0
20.00 or more.....	8	4	0	0	0	0

### Vendor Payments for Medical Care

For the country as a whole, payments to vendors of medical care in 1955-56 amounted to \$253 million for all programs combined, or 9 percent of the total cost of assistance; they represented an expenditure of \$1.51 per inhabitant. More than half the total per capita cost was met from old-age assistance funds (78 cents), and relatively large expenditures were also made from general assistance funds (43 cents). Costs were small in the other programs, however, amounting to 14 cents each in the programs of aid to dependent children and aid to the permanently and

totally disabled and to 2 cents in aid to the blind.

The States use a variety of methods for providing medical care to recipients. All but 12 States made payments to vendors under at least one of their assistance programs. Some of the 12 States not making vendor payments may provide for medical care needs through the money payment to the recipient, and others may rely largely on other public agencies to meet medical need. A number of the States making vendor payments also use other methods for furnishing medical care to recipients.

States varied considerably, also, in the program funds used to pay the vendors of medical care. General assistance funds continued to be the most widely used source for vendor payments, and such payments were an important part of total expenditures for this program. Nationally, vendor payments accounted for about one-fourth of the total per capita cost of general assistance, and in 11 States they made up more than half the total. Moreover, though three-fourths of the States used general assistance funds for vendor payments, fewer than half the States used funds from each of the other programs for this purpose. At least 15 States used general assistance funds, however, to pay vendors for medical bills incurred by recipients of one or more of the special types of public assistance. Thus, of all general assistance funds spent for vendor payments in the country as a whole, the proportion used for recipients of the special types of assistance is known to have been at least 15 percent and—because a number of States did not identify the programs supplemented—might have been as high as 44 percent.

The distribution of States making vendor payments, by the amount of their per capita expenditure for this purpose, shows that the cost was less than 50 cents per inhabitant in about half the States for old-age assistance and general assistance, in all the States for aid to the blind, and in all but three States for aid to dependent children and aid to the permanently and totally disabled (table 3). For old-age assistance, however, five States spent at least \$2 per capita,

and three spent more than \$4. By comparison, for general assistance only two States spent more than \$2 per inhabitant for vendor payments.

## Old-Age Insurance Benefits, January-June 1956

### Benefits Awarded

During the first half of 1956, old-age benefits were awarded to nearly 409,000 persons, about 100,000 less than the number in the corresponding months of 1955. The 1955 period included a large number of awards to persons affected by the liberalization in the retirement test under the 1954 amendments. (These provisions, which became effective in January 1955, changed the earnings test for wage earners from a monthly to an annual basis, raised to \$1,200 the amount that beneficiaries can earn in a year before any benefits are withheld, and lowered from 75 to 72 the age at which beneficiaries can receive benefits regardless of the amount of their earnings.) Self-employed farmers and other workers qualifying for benefits solely as the result of work newly covered under the 1954 amendments could be eligible for benefits as early as the second quarter of 1956. Although workers in this group are represented to only a small extent in the awards of the first half of 1956, their number will be more significant in awards of the second half of the year and the early part of 1957.

*Method of benefit computation.*—About 94 percent of the beneficiaries

**Table 1.—Average old-age benefits awarded in January-June 1956, by benefit-computation method and sex**

[Based on 10-percent sample; average benefits shown to the nearest dollar]

Benefit-computation method	Total	Male	Female
Total.....	\$70	\$76	\$57
Beneficiary not eligible for dropout.....	40	41	37
Beneficiary eligible for dropout.....	72	78	59
Benefit based on earnings after 1936.....	49	52	45
Benefit based on earnings after 1950.....	78	83	64

**Table 2.—Percentage distribution of old-age benefits awarded in January-June 1956, by benefit-computation method and sex**

[Based on 10-percent sample]

Benefit-computation method	Total	Male	Female
Total number.....	408,671	282,024	126,647
Total percent.....	100	100	100
Benefit based on earnings after 1936.....	23	21	28
Benefit based on earnings after 1950.....	77	79	72
Total percent.....	100	100	100
Beneficiary not eligible for the dropout.....	6	6	7
Benefit based on earnings after 1936.....	4	4	4
Benefit based on earnings after 1950.....	2	2	3
Beneficiary eligible for the dropout.....	94	94	93
Benefit based on earnings after 1936.....	19	16	24
Beneficiary not eligible for benefit based on earnings after 1950.....	14	12	18
Beneficiary eligible for benefit based on earnings after 1950.....	5	5	6
Benefit based on earnings after 1950.....	75	77	69
1952 benefit formula plus 1954 conversion table.....	2	1	3
1954 benefit formula.....	73	77	66

awarded old-age benefits in the first half of 1956 were eligible for the dropout—that is, up to 5 years of lowest earnings could be excluded in the calculation of their average monthly wage (table 2). The dropout provision may be applied if the worker has 6 quarters of coverage after June 1953, or if he first becomes eligible—that is, fully insured and of retirement age—for old-age benefits after August 1954. The remaining 6 percent of the beneficiaries had been eligible for benefits since August 1954 or earlier but did not have sufficient work after June 1953 to qualify for

the dropout under the alternative qualifying condition. Such cases should occur infrequently after 1956 because, for applications filed after October 1956, the beneficiary would lose one or more monthly benefits from failure to file a timely application.

In some instances, though workers were eligible for a benefit computation based on earnings after 1950, their benefits were higher when the computation was based on earnings after 1936. Among workers eligible for a benefit computation based on earnings after 1950 with the dropout,

**Table 3.—Number, percentage distribution, and average monthly amount of old-age benefits awarded in January-June 1956, by starting date used in benefit computation, age, and sex**

[Based partly on 10-percent sample]

Age <sup>1</sup>	Total			Male			Female		
	Number	Percent	Average monthly amount	Number	Percent	Average monthly amount	Number	Percent	Average monthly amount
Total.....	408,671	100	\$69.99	282,024	100	\$75.62	126,647	100	\$57.46
65-69.....	301,186	74	71.31	201,747	72	77.88	99,439	79	57.97
70-74.....	81,061	20	70.79	61,223	22	74.78	19,858	16	58.48
75-79.....	20,359	5	54.06	14,662	5	56.17	5,697	4	48.63
80 and over.....	6,045	1	47.56	4,392	2	48.47	1,653	1	45.15
Based on earnings after 1950.....	314,850	100	76.90	223,725	100	82.58	91,125	100	62.95
65-69.....	224,018	71	79.07	156,273	70	85.39	67,745	74	64.47
70-74.....	70,035	22	75.74	52,984	24	80.22	17,051	19	61.81
75-79.....	15,989	5	59.25	11,138	5	62.98	4,851	5	50.68
80 and over.....	4,808	2	51.25	3,330	1	53.36	1,478	2	46.49
Based on earnings after 1936.....	93,821	100	46.84	58,299	100	48.94	35,522	100	43.39
65-69.....	77,168	82	48.79	45,474	78	52.07	31,694	89	44.07
70-74.....	11,046	12	39.40	8,239	14	39.78	2,807	8	38.26
75-79.....	4,370	5	35.07	3,524	6	34.63	846	2	36.89
80 and over.....	1,237	1	33.23	1,062	2	33.14	175	( <sup>2</sup> )	33.80

<sup>1</sup> Age on birthday in 1956.

<sup>2</sup> Less than 0.5 percent.