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FOREWORD

During my service as chairman of the House Select Committee on Aging, it has become abundantly clear to me that we must improve the ability of the Congress to anticipate potential problems resulting from economic, social, and political changes that will occur in the population over the next 50 years. If present trends continue unabated, by the year 2030 the population of over 65ers will more than double.

This so-called "graying of America" does have significant social implications and has already demanded our reconsideration of mandatory retirement and social security legislation. It is clear that careful examination of demographic variables are extremely important for policymakers today and in the future. In order to create policy and determine how best to serve and be served by our senior citizens, we must understand the present and future size, structure, and location of our elderly population. We must understand their present and future health care, income maintenance, housing and transportation needs. We have a constant need for demographic information to enable us and future Congresses to cope more effectively with the problems and promises arising from population change.

I am hopeful that this publication "Every Ninth American" will help shed some light on the questions we have concerning our aging population, and provide policymakers nationwide with more than education guesses about what our older population is like and how it is likely to change.

We would like to express our appreciation to Mr. Herman B. Brotman, former Assistant Commissioner on Aging, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, for preparing this publication. I trust it will be a valuable tool for all of us as we try to improve the lives of older Americans.

CLAUDE PEPPER,
Chairman.
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EVERY NINTH AMERICAN

1982 Edition

When we declared our independence, every 50th American was a so-called older person (aged 65 or over—65+). They came to some 50,000 out of an estimated total population of 2.5 million or 2 percent.

By the beginning of this century, the numbers of older persons had increased much more rapidly than did the young and they represented every 26th American (3.1 million or 4 percent of the 76 million total).

The 1980 census counted over 25.5 million older persons. The approximately 26.6 million older Americans at the beginning of 1982 made up over 11 percent of the population or “Every Ninth American.”

But in the more recent years something uniquely different with new potentials for study and concern has become evident. In the past, the numbers of persons in all age groups increased even while the proportion of older persons in the population grew somewhat faster than did the younger age groups. Recent trends, however, have been different.

Fertility rates since the end of the postwar baby boom have actually been below that necessary for zero population growth. A continuation of these trends over a lengthy period of time will bring us an aging society with an increasing median age and an eventually declining total population by the middle of the 21st century. This is further compounded by the newly increasing life expectancy in the later years as death rates from some of the major killers of older persons decline.

Even a very cursory consideration indicates the enormous implications for retirement and income policies, the role of technology, the shifting of product markets and advertising, social and recreational facilities, location and types of housing, health care facilities and personnel, entertainment, etc., and the distribution of rising costs.

This presentation examines what the older population is like, how it has changed and how it continues to change.

GROWTH IN NUMBERS

In the 80 years between 1900 and 1980 (the last census), the total population of the United States grew almost threefold while the...
older part grew more than eightfold. The 65+ population continues to grow faster than the under-65 portion. Between 1960 and 1970, older Americans increased in number by 21 percent as compared with 13 percent for the under-65 population; for 1970-1980, the increase was 27.9 percent for the 65+ group but only 9.7 percent for the under 65.

The most rapid growth (the largest percentage increases) in 1960-1970 occurred in Arizona (79.0 percent), Florida (78.2), Nevada (70.4), Hawaii (51.3), and New Mexico (37.7), all States with significant numbers of older in-migrants. The fastest growth rates (over 30 percent in 1970-1980 occurred in Nevada (112.9 percent), Arizona (90.7), Hawaii (72.7), Alaska (71.4), Florida (71.1), New Mexico (65.7), and South Carolina (51.1).

Florida still has the highest proportion of older people in its population (17.3 percent in 1980, 14.5 percent in 1970). Alaska remains the State with the smallest number and the smallest proportion of older persons (11,530 or 2.9 percent in 1980).

STATE HIGHLIGHTS

In 1980, the largest concentrations of older persons—13 percent or more of a State's total population—occurred in 8 States: Florida (17.3 percent), Arkansas (13.7), Rhode Island (13.4), Iowa (13.3), Missouri and South Dakota (13.2), Nebraska (13.1), and Kansas (13.0). California and New York each had more than 2 million older people, while Florida, Pennsylvania, Texas, Illinois, and Ohio each had more than 1 million.

Almost a quarter of the Nation's older people live in just three States (California, New York, and Florida). Adding five more States (Pennsylvania, Ohio, Texas, Illinois, and Michigan) brings the eight State total to almost half the older population of the United States. It takes 12 more States (New Jersey, Massachusetts, Missouri, North Carolina, Indiana, Wisconsin, Tennessee, Georgia, Virginia, Minnesota, Alabama, and Washington) or a total of 20 States to account for just over three-quarters of the older population. It requires an additional 10 States or a total of 30 to include 90 percent. The remaining 10 percent of the 65+ population lives in the remaining 20 States and the District of Columbia. (See Appendix A, "State Trends in the Older Population, 1970-1980," for the actual figures and a detailed analysis.)

The older population is not a homogeneous group not is it static. Every day, approximately 5,200 Americans celebrate their 65th birthday. Every day, approximately 3,600 persons aged 65+ die. The net increase is about 1,600 per day or almost 600,000 per year, but the 5,200 "newcomers" each day are quite different from and have experienced a quite different life history from those already 65+ and are worlds apart from those already centenarians who were born shortly after the Civil War.

* Computed from Census Bureau estimates of the components of population change
In 1980, most older Americans were under 75 (61.0 percent). Over half were under 73, and more than a third (34.4 percent) were under 70. Over 2.2 million Americans were 85+. As a result of the significantly longer life expectancy for females, the preponderance of women over men increases rapidly with age. (See "Sex Ratios" and "Projections" and "Marital Status").

Preliminary data from the 1980 census enumeration show that about 32,000 persons reported themselves as age 100+ (centenarians). In June 1980, 15,258 persons were receiving cash social security benefits after having produced at some time a "proof of age" that indicated they were now centenarians.

Older economic units continue to have about half the income of their younger counterparts. Retirement from the labor force usually brings a half to two-thirds cut in income and thrusts many older persons into a low-income category. Price inflation continues to present severe difficulties for older persons. Despite post facto indexing of social security and some other benefit systems, much of the income of the elderly comes from sources which are not indexed, such as most private pension plan payments, commercial annuities, certain investments, such as bonds, and so forth.

Families

In 1980, half of the 9.2 million families headed by an older person had incomes of less than $12,881 ($248 a week) as compared with $22,548 ($434 a week) for the 51.1 million families with under-65 heads. Both family medians represent an increase over 1979 that matches the increase in the Consumer Price Index and indicates no change in real purchasing power.

The skewing of the income distribution for older families toward the lower income levels is confirmed by the fact that the arithmetic average (mean) income of $16,918 is $4,037 or 31.3 percent greater than the median ($12,881), reflecting the impact of the smaller number of high-income older families.

Thus, while the poverty rate for older families is high (see below), many have high incomes. More than 335,000 or 9.1 percent of older families had 1980 incomes of between $20,000 and $25,000; 1,304,000 or 14.2 percent had incomes between $25,000 and $50,000; and 307,000 or 3.3 percent had incomes in excess of $50,000. In summary, almost 22 percent of the older families had incomes in 1980 that were higher than the median for the younger families.

---

1 Computed from the Census Bureau enumeration and Current Population Reports, from National Center for Health Statistics reports on mortality and life expectancy in the Monthly Vital Statistics Reports, and from estimates of centenarian beneficiaries supplied by the Social Security Administration.

2 Computed from data collected by the Census Bureau in the March 1981 monthly Current Population Survey on money income in 1980 and published in "Advance" Current Population Reports. Detailed data such as by type of family, by source of income, etc. is not yet available.
Unrelated Individuals

The 1980 median income of the 8.0 million unrelated individuals aged 65+ who were living alone or with nonrelatives was $5,095 ($98 a week) as compared with $10,526 ($202 a week) for the 19.1 million aged 14 through 64. The small increase over 1979 was about half the increase in the Consumer Price Index and represented a loss of purchasing power.

The mean (arithmetic average) income for older individuals was $7,176 or $2,081 or 40.8 percent higher than the median. Over 1.2 million or 15.3 percent of the older unrelated individuals had 1980 incomes between $10,000 and $25,000 and 190,000 or 2.4 percent had $25,000 or more.

Poverty

(This analysis is based solely on cash money income and does not consider services, third-party payments, or noncash benefits and their impact on the standard of living. See below for partial data on numbers of recipients of such benefits.)

In 1980, the total number of persons of all ages living in households in which the total income was below the official poverty threshold for that size and type of household rose again to 29.3 million (13.0 percent of the U.S. population), an increase of 3.2 million over the 25.2 million (11.6 percent) in 1979.

Some 3.9 million older persons (15.7 percent or over a sixth) were poor by the official definition (for example, $4,954 for an older couple, household or $3,941 for an older individual living alone). The increase in the number of aged poor in 1980 (from 3.6 million or 15.1 percent in 1979) was the second since 1975.

Women and minority elderly are heavily overrepresented among the aged poor.

POVERTY RATES (PERCENT IN EACH CATEGORY LIVING IN POOR HOUSEHOLDS), 1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>All ages</th>
<th>Under 65</th>
<th>65+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female head, no husband present</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nevertheless, this is still a significant improvement over the 4.7 million or a quarter of the elderly who lived in "poor" households in 1970, and results primarily from the increases in social security benefits. It must also be remembered that many of the aged poor became poor after reaching these age levels because of the half to two-thirds cut in income that comes with retirement from the labor force. Reductions in living costs after retirement are usually considerably less than the loss in income.
Adequacy—The Retired Couple Budget

In the early 1960's, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, with the help of a group of experts, developed a theoretic retired couple budget to provide a modest but adequate standard of living for a retired couple consisting of a 65+ husband and his wife, assumed to be self-supporting and living in an urban area, to be in reasonably good health and able to take care of themselves, and to own a reasonable inventory of furniture and equipment.

Before 1969, the annual cost of the budget was calculated by actually pricing out all of the items in the budget and applying the appropriate “weighting.” Since 1969, the cost of the budget is determined by applying to the cost for each division or component in the previous year the change in the comparable component of the Consumer Price Index for the urban wage earners and clerical workers. This procedure produces an approximation of unknown accuracy since spending patterns in the two measures are different as are the weights.

In 1980, the “intermediate” retired couple budget cost $9,434 ($181 a week). Of the 7.9 million two-person husband-wife families with 65+ heads, about 2.5 million or 32 percent had less than this amount of income.

The cost of the “lower” budget, $6,644 ($128 a week), providing a reduced standard of living but well above the poverty level, could not be met by 1.3 million or 16 percent of these older couples.

The cost of the “higher” budget, $13,923 ($268 a week), providing some “luxury” items, gifts, contributions, and taxes, was beyond the income of 4.3 million or 54 percent of the 7.9 million older couples.

Noncash Benefits

A special question in the Census Bureau's March 1981 Current Population Survey of a sample of households solicited information on receipt of certain noncash benefits (food stamps and subsidized housing) and eligibility for third-party payments for health care (medicare and medicaid) during 1980. The table below analyzes the responses, based on an “economic unit” concept of household (one or more persons and headed by a person aged 65+) and related to that household's money income. A special analysis to determine the data for households receiving various specific combinations of one or more such noncash benefits in order to evaluate the impact on “poverty” has been requested.

---

* Data on budget costs from the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Number of couples within budget cost levels computed from unpublished Census Bureau tabulations of 1980 money income.
NONCASH BENEFITS AND THIRD-PARTY PAYMENTS IN HOUSEHOLDS OF ONE OR MORE PERSONS AND
HEADED BY A 65+ PERSON, 1980

(Number in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total households</th>
<th>Receiving food stamps</th>
<th>Covered by medicare</th>
<th>Covered by medicad</th>
<th>Living in other than usual housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of households</td>
<td>16,544</td>
<td>1,055</td>
<td>16,032</td>
<td>2,711</td>
<td>883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median income</td>
<td>$7,878</td>
<td>$3,941</td>
<td>$7,749</td>
<td>$4,769</td>
<td>$4,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of households below poverty line receiving these benefits</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of households above poverty line receiving these benefits</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>98.1</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Represents 3.0 million households.
2 Represents 134 million households.

INCOME MAINTENANCE

Old-Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance

In July 1981, cash social security payments were sent to 35.7 million persons of all ages for a total of almost $12.0 billion.

Of this total for the month, almost 314 million retired workers and their dependents or survivors received $10.2 billion from the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number (thousands)</th>
<th>Amount (millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retired workers</td>
<td>19,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wives and husbands</td>
<td>3,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>3,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed mothers</td>
<td>547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widows and widowers</td>
<td>4,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents (sole survivor)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And just under 82,000 special age-72 beneficiaries received $9.5 million.

Also, in July 1981, 4.6 million under-65 disabled workers and their dependents received almost $1.4 billion from the disability trust fund, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number (thousands)</th>
<th>Amount (millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disabled workers</td>
<td>2,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wives and husbands</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>1,306</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average monthly benefit, July 1981

Retired workers and their dependents.

- Retired workers | $883.30 |
- Wives and husbands | 193.41 |
- Children | 157.65 |

Survivors of deceased workers:

- Children | 268.99 |
- Widowed mothers | 273.15 |
- Widows and widowers | 344.66 |
- Parents (sole survivor) | 308.96 |

Disabled workers and their dependents:

- Disabled workers | 413.60 |
- Wives and husbands | 122.15 |
- Children | 122.99 |

Special age-72 beneficiaries | 116.12 |

Almost 60 percent of all retired workers are receiving "reduced benefits" since they started drawing social security payments prior to reaching age 65. They represent a combination of voluntary "early retirements," including health reasons, and "discouraged workers" who have been unemployed and believe they cannot find new employment.

1 Computed from data in selected issues of the monthly Social Security Bulletin and the Annual Statistical Supplements of the Social Security Administration.
During July 1981, Medicare disbursements totaled $3,691 million, of which $2,568 million, or close to 70 percent, was paid out under hospital insurance and $1,123 million under supplementary medical insurance. (See also "Personal Health Care Expenditures.")

### Status of Social Security Insurance Trust Funds, Fiscal Year 1981

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Old-age and survivors</th>
<th>Disability</th>
<th>Hospital</th>
<th>Supplementary medical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Receipts and interest</td>
<td>$121,572</td>
<td>$12,993</td>
<td>$31,493</td>
<td>$12,451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program payments</td>
<td>121,006</td>
<td>16,875</td>
<td>26,909</td>
<td>12,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative costs</td>
<td>1,298</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assets at end of fiscal year 1981</td>
<td>23,834</td>
<td>3,392</td>
<td>18,093</td>
<td>3,743</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Supplemental Security Income

In 1974, the Federal supplemental security income (SSI) needs-tested program replaced the Federal-State assistance program. It sets up Federal payments to the aged, the blind, and the disabled, based on Federal eligibility and payment standards with automatic adjustments for increases in the Consumer Price Index.

States are encouraged to establish State supplement programs under their own laws and may then choose (1) to have the Federal Government pay the Federal payment and the State supplement in a single check to recipients in that State and bill the State for such supplementary payments, or (2) to make State payments separately to their own residents whether or not they receive Federal payments.

In July 1981, the Federal Government sent checks to 1,726,000 needy aged (65+) persons, totaling over $175,000,000 of Federal payments. An estimated additional 24,000 65+ persons qualified.
for SSI as "blind" and 409,000 as "disabled", both providing higher
payment levels than for the "aged." Thus, while there were some
3,900,000 older persons living in households where the income was
below the poverty level in 1980, SSI payments were made to a total
of 2,159,000.

In the 27 States which have arranged for the Federal Government
to administer the State supplement, the combined checks went
to some 500,000 65+ persons and State supplements totaled
about $75,000,000. The combined payments averaged a low of
$78.11 in Maine to a high of $205.65 in California.

In the 25 States in which the State makes supplementary pay-
ments directly to the recipient (a separate check in addition to the
Federal payment), there were a total of 541,000 Federal recipients
but only 135,150 State supplements totaling $9,576,000 averaging
$70.86 per State recipient.

In the only State that pays no State supplement, Texas, Federal
payments went to 141,000 "aged" recipients.

Seventeen States made State payments in July 1981 to 28,700
older persons who were not receiving Federal payments. These pay-
ments totaled $2,639,000 or an average of $92.00.

HEALTH

National Health Expenditures 8.

(Note. Includes personal health care, prepayment and adminis-
trative costs, governmental public health activities, and the costs of
research and construction of medical facilities.)


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Expenditure</th>
<th>Amount (billions of dollars)</th>
<th>Per capita (dollars)</th>
<th>Percent of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>247.2</td>
<td>189.3</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,057.06</td>
<td>835.57</td>
<td>210.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount (billions of dollars)</td>
<td>143.0</td>
<td>110.0</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita (dollars)</td>
<td>617.10</td>
<td>485.29</td>
<td>156.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of total</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>74.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount (billions of dollars)</td>
<td>104.2</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita (dollars)</td>
<td>449.96</td>
<td>350.27</td>
<td>54.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of total</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of expenditure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount (billions of dollars)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>247.2</td>
<td>189.3</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal health care</td>
<td>217.9</td>
<td>156.7</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepayment and administration</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government public health activities</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction of medical facilities</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent distribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal health care</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>85.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepayment and administration</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government public health activities</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction of medical facilities</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Compiled from data and estimates prepared by the Health Care Finance Administration.
Between the years 1965 (before medicare became effective) and 1980, the total health bill rose from $41.7 billion (6.0 percent of the GNP) to $247.2 billion (9.4 percent of the GNP). The sixfold increase in total costs in 15 years results from technological changes, very rapid increases in prices and labor costs, the impact of the growth and the “aging” of the older population, and increased utilization made possible by increased resources, especially through public programs. Nursing home, hospital, and physician costs, all exceptionally important to health care of the elderly, were among the most rapidly rising areas.

**Personal Health Care Expenditures**

(Note. Excludes prepayment and administrative costs, cost of research and construction of medical facilities, and governmental public health activities such as control of contagious diseases.)

Total personal health care expenditures rose from $35.8 billion or $180.73 per capita in 1965 to $166.7 billion or $735.57 per capita in 1978. The estimate for 1980 is $217.9 billion or $940.62 per capita but age distributions are not yet available.

### ANALYSIS OF PERSONAL HEALTH CARE EXPENDITURES BY TYPE OF EXPENDITURE, SOURCE OF FUNDS, AND AGE GROUP, 1978

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of expenditure</th>
<th>All ages</th>
<th>Under 65</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>State/local</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount (millions of dollars)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>167,911</td>
<td>118,545</td>
<td>49,366</td>
<td>18,192</td>
<td>31,175</td>
<td>26,780</td>
<td>4,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital care</td>
<td>76,025</td>
<td>54,856</td>
<td>21,169</td>
<td>2,645</td>
<td>18,524</td>
<td>17,165</td>
<td>1,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physician’s services</td>
<td>35,250</td>
<td>26,340</td>
<td>8,910</td>
<td>3,620</td>
<td>5,290</td>
<td>5,120</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentists services</td>
<td>13,300</td>
<td>11,917</td>
<td>1,383</td>
<td>1,338</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other professional services</td>
<td>4,275</td>
<td>3,185</td>
<td>1,090</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs and drug sundries</td>
<td>15,098</td>
<td>11,867</td>
<td>3,231</td>
<td>2,728</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eyeglasses and appliances</td>
<td>3,819</td>
<td>3,274</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing home care</td>
<td>15,751</td>
<td>13,127</td>
<td>12,624</td>
<td>6,790</td>
<td>5,834</td>
<td>3,336</td>
<td>2,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other health services</td>
<td>4,333</td>
<td>3,979</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita (dollars)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>752.98</td>
<td>598.82</td>
<td>2,026</td>
<td>1,746</td>
<td>1,279</td>
<td>1,099</td>
<td>180.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital care</td>
<td>340.93</td>
<td>276.17</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>106.55</td>
<td>760.30</td>
<td>704.52</td>
<td>65.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physician’s services</td>
<td>158.08</td>
<td>132.61</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>148.58</td>
<td>217.12</td>
<td>219.15</td>
<td>6.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentists services</td>
<td>59.64</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>54.92</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other professional services</td>
<td>19.17</td>
<td>16.03</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>25.90</td>
<td>18.84</td>
<td>17.28</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs and drug sundries</td>
<td>67.70</td>
<td>59.74</td>
<td>132.6</td>
<td>111.97</td>
<td>20.64</td>
<td>10.84</td>
<td>9.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eyeglasses and appliances</td>
<td>17.40</td>
<td>15.48</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>16.62</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>8.17</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing home care</td>
<td>70.64</td>
<td>13.74</td>
<td>518.14</td>
<td>278.69</td>
<td>239.45</td>
<td>136.92</td>
<td>102.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other health services</td>
<td>219.45</td>
<td>20.03</td>
<td>14.53</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>13.10</td>
<td>10.14</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent distribution by type of expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital care</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physician’s services</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentists services</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other professional services</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs and drug sundries</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eyeglasses and appliances</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing home care</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other health services</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In 1978, for the 65+ population, total-health care costs came to $49.4 billion, for the under-65, it came to $118.5 billion. On a per capita basis, however, the $2,026.19 for an older person was 3.4 times the $596.82 for an under-65 individual. Of the $49.4 billion for older persons, $18.2 billion or 37 percent came from private funds and $31.2 billion or 63 percent from public programs. Of the total public outlays, $26.8 billion or 86 percent came from Federal programs and $4.4 billion or 14 percent from State and local programs.

Hospital care was the largest item by far in health care costs of older persons. The $21.2 billion ($868.86 per capita) for hospital payments used 43 percent of the total expenditures in 1978. Some $18.5 billion or almost 88 percent of these hospital payments came from public programs, of which 93 percent were Federal funds.

The next largest expenditure for older persons, nursing home care, came to $12.6 billion or $518.14 per capita (as compared with $4.1 billion or $204.87 per capita in 1970). The 1978 figure represents almost 26 percent of the total health bill for older persons, with 46 percent paid by public agencies (of which, 57 percent was Federal money and 43 percent State and local).

The third largest expenditure, physicians' services, totaled $8.9 billion or $365.70 per capita. This was 18 percent of total expenditures for older persons, 60 percent was paid by public programs, of which 97 percent was Federal.

The other five categories of expenditures each accounted for less than 7 percent of the total. Noteworthy is the fact that in four (dentists' services, other professional services, drugs and drug sundries, and eyeglasses and appliances) of the five categories (fifth is other health services), private payments accounted for between 58 percent and 97 percent of the costs, reflecting to a very large extent the fact that these services and supplies are not usually provided by public programs.
Data for a comparison of levels and sources of payments that indicate the role of direct out-of-pocket, insurance, and philanthropic sources on a per capita basis for 1966 (the year Medicare became effective) and a recent year are not yet available. The following compares 1966 and 1977:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Direct out of pocket</th>
<th>Third-party payments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>$155</td>
<td>$79</td>
<td>$76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>1,745</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>1,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent distribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>48.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>68.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>73.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This comparison shows both a significant increase in utilization as well as a doubling of health care prices, with a pronounced shift toward third-party payment arrangements, especially through public programs. The nominal dollar increase in out-of-pocket payments by older persons loses significance if allowances is made for the rapid price increases for the same amount of care plus the actual increase in utilization as a result of payment resources.

**EXPENDITURES BY PUBLIC PROGRAMS IN PERSONAL HEALTH CARE FOR PERSONS AGED 65+, BY PROGRAM, 1978**

(In millions of dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>State/local</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31,175</td>
<td>26,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare</td>
<td>21,775</td>
<td>21,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid</td>
<td>6,611</td>
<td>3,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other medical public assistance</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans' Administration</td>
<td>1,053</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Defense</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workmen's Compensation</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State and local hospitals (net)</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Older persons comprised slightly over 11 percent of the total population in 1978 but accounted for 29.4 percent of the personal health care costs. Some 63 percent of the total payments for persons 65+ came from public programs with 91 percent coming from Medicare (69.8) and Medicaid (21.2).
Health Status

In a recent household interview survey of a sample of the noninstitutionalized population, over two-thirds (68 percent) of the older persons reported their health good or excellent as compared with "others of their own age." A little more than 22 percent reported their health as fair and almost 9 percent as poor. Minority group members, residents of the south, residents of nonmetropolitan areas, and persons with low incomes were more likely to report themselves in poor health.

Counting the approximately 5 percent of older people who live in institutions as being in poor health, a total of about a seventh (14 percent) of older people consider themselves in poor health.

In 1979 (based on the new Ninth Revision of the International Classification of Diseases), the chronic conditions most frequently reported by the noninstitutionalized elderly were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arthritis</td>
<td>44.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypertension</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing impairment</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heart disease</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arteriosclerosis</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual impairment</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the 1979 survey, almost half (45 percent) of the 65+ respondents said they had some limitation on their "usual" activity because of a chronic condition. About 17 percent were unable to perform their usual activity at all, 22 percent reported limitation in the amount of kind of usual activity, and about 6 percent were limited outside the usual activity.

A 1977 study showed that of the over 22 million older persons not in institutions, 2.1 percent were confined to bed, 2.6 percent needed help to get about in the house, 6.0 percent needed help to get about in the neighborhood, and 8.4 percent needed help outside the neighborhood. In terms of needing help in daily functions, 3.8 percent needed help with bathing, 2.6 percent needed help with dressing, 0.8 percent with eating, and 1.4 percent with toilet. (See the table below for an analysis of the differences by age groups within the 65+ population. This is especially significant in view of the current concern over long-term or continuing care and the rapid growth in the oldest part of the older population, since the need for both types of "helps" increases markedly with age.)

*Computed from published and unpublished data supplied by the National Center for Health Statistics, based on the National Household Interview Survey, the National Hospital Discharge Survey, the National Nursing Home Survey, etc.*
## Impact of Disability Resulting from Chronic Conditions, Noninstitutionalized Persons Aged 65+, 1977

(Numbers in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>65-74</th>
<th>75-84</th>
<th>85+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22.266</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>14.259</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confined to bed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs help getting around</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In house</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In neighborhood</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside neighborhood</td>
<td>1,331</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs help with</td>
<td>1,852</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathing</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dressing</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilet</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Utilization

Persons aged 65+ are subject to more than twice as much disability, have four times the activity limitation, see physicians 42 percent more often, and have about twice as many hospital stays that last about 50 percent longer than persons under 65. Still, some 82 percent of older persons reported no hospitalization in the previous year.

In 1980, the average length of stay in a short-stay hospital for persons with one or more hospital stays was 7.3 days for all ages and 10.7 for those 65+. Averaging together those with hospital stays and the vast majority with no stays, the average number of hospital days was 1.9 for ages 55-64, 3.2 days for ages 65-74, and 6.0 days for those 75+. Using the same averaging approach for persons with and without nursing home stays, a 1976 survey showed a fraction of one day in a nursing home for persons aged 55-64, 4.4 days for those aged 65-74, a jump to 21.5 days for those aged 75-84, and to 86.4 days for the 85+.

Of the 1.1 million older people in nursing homes at the time of a 1977 study, 19 percent were aged 65-74, 41 percent were 75-84, and 40 percent were 85+ (in the total older population, the comparable percentages were 62, 29, and 9). In the nursing home population, 74 percent were women (60 percent in the total older population), 69 percent were widowed, 14 percent were single, and 12 percent were married, 93 percent were white. Of every 100 residents in nursing homes, almost 40 came from their own residences (only 14 had been living alone), 34 came from general hospitals, 13 from other nursing homes or related facilities, and the rest (about 15) came from a variety of mental and other health facilities and other arrangements.
### SELECTED DATA FROM THE 1980 HOUSEHOLD SURVEY OF THE NONINSTITUTIONAL POPULATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All ages</th>
<th>65+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restricted-activity days per person per year</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bed-disability days per person per year</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of acute conditions per person per year</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of physician visits per person per year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in doctor's office, clinic, or group practice</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in hospital outpatient department or emergency room</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By telephone</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interval since last physician visit (percent distribution of persons)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>79.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 6 months</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>69.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-11 months</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4 years</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5+ years</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of dental visits per person per year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interval since last dental visit (percent distribution of persons)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 6 months</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-11 months</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4 years</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5+ years</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average length of stay (days)</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of hospital episodes per year (percent distribution of persons)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>89.6</td>
<td>81.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 episode</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 episodes</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3+ episodes</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average length of stay for persons with hospital stays by number of episodes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, all episodes</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 episode</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 episodes</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3+ episodes</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>38.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Death Rates**

Death rates for every age group and both sexes have been declining since 1950 except for 15-24-year-old males. Between 1977 and 1978, death rates declined except for males aged 1-4, and both males and females aged 15-24 and 75-84.

In the period between 1965 and 1978, annual death rates for older persons dropped about 12 percent from 6 per 100 to 5.3 per 100. Within the older population, the rate for persons 65-74 dropped 19 percent from 3.7 to 3.1 per 100, the rate for those 75-84 declined 14 percent from 8.4 to 7.2 per 100, while the rate for the 85+ dropped 27 percent from 20.1 to 14.7 per 100.

The rate for deaths of older persons from heart disease dropped 18 percent, from 2.8 to 2.3 per 100. The death rate from stroke fell 35 percent, from 0.9 to 0.6 per 100 but the rate of deaths from cancer increased 11 percent, from 0.9 to 1.0 per 100. These declines

---

9 Computed from mortality data prepared by the Division of Vital Statistics of the National Center for Health Statistics and based on the death certificate reporting system.
Heart disease, stroke, and cancer accounted for three quarters of the deaths of older persons in 1978 as they did in 1965. The following table analyzes the number and proportion of deaths accounted for by the major causes of death in 1978 for all ages and for 10-year age groupings in the middle and upper age groups. Particularly noteworthy are the increasing proportions of deaths from heart disease and stroke with advancing age (also true at a lower level for influenza and pneumonia) but the sharp drop in the proportion of deaths caused by cancer. While accidental deaths have traditionally been most prevalent among the younger, the more recent increase in suicides among the very young have overshadowed the situation for the aged.

### SELECTED MAJOR CAUSES OF DEATH IN 1978, ALL AGES AND AGE GROUPS OVER 45

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cause</th>
<th>All ages</th>
<th>65-74</th>
<th>75-84</th>
<th>85+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number (thousand)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All causes</td>
<td>1,928</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major cardiovascular diseases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diseases of the heart</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerebrovascular diseases</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>~63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arteriosclerosis</td>
<td>29 (*)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malignant neoplasms</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influenza and pneumonia</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes mellitus</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accidents</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suicides</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent distribution</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Major Cardiovascular Diseases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cause</th>
<th>All ages</th>
<th>65-74</th>
<th>75-84</th>
<th>85+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diseases of the heart</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerebrovascular diseases</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arteriosclerosis</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malignant neoplasms</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influenza and pneumonia</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes mellitus</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accidents</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suicides</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Less than 500.

**HOUSING**

The 1980 annual housing survey showed 16.4 million elderly households (households with heads aged 65 + ) and they constituted 20.3 percent of the total 80.4 million households in the United States.

---

11 Basic data from special and unpublished analyses of the Annual Housing Survey of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and from selected administrative summaries of program activities.
Broad measures of housing conditions showed many similarities between the elderly and the younger households but there were differences in many of the details arising from the somewhat lower proportion of the elderly living in metropolitan areas, their relative concentration in the inner city, their generally lower income level, the greater age of their homes and the accompanying maintenance costs and problems, the presence of excess space as maturing family members leave the parental home, etc. In general, about 90 percent of housing was evaluated as "adequate" (no defects or flaws in plumbing, maintenance, public halls, heating, or electrical areas).

In the 1978 annual housing survey, 12 percent of all elderly-headed households lived in physically inadequate units, compared with 10 percent of all households. Seven percent of all owner-occupied housing units and 16 percent of all renter households were physically inadequate compared with 11 and 17 percent respectively for elderly-headed households. While 14 percent of all households living in adequate units paid more than 30 percent of their income for housing costs (40 percent of income for owners with mortgages), 19 percent of the elderly-headed households were cost burdened. Approximately 11 percent of elderly owners living in adequate units were cost burdened and 39 percent of elderly renters paid more than 30 percent of their income for housing costs.

Over half (54.3 percent) of all elderly-headed households had 50 percent or less of median family income (adjusted for family size and location). Seventeen percent of poorer elderly-headed households lived in physically inadequate units and an additional 31 percent were cost burdened. Approximately 37 percent of poor elderly owners had housing related problems and the majority of poor elderly renters (68 percent) lived in inadequate units or were cost burdened.

### HOUSING PROBLEMS IN HOUSEHOLDS HEADED BY PERSONS AGED 65+, 1978

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Owners</th>
<th>Renters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Poor 1</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total occupied units</td>
<td>15,844</td>
<td>8,607</td>
<td>11,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With housing problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate</td>
<td>5,074</td>
<td>4,197</td>
<td>1,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate but crowded</td>
<td>1,956</td>
<td>1,472</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost burdened 2</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,040</td>
<td>2,697</td>
<td>1,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent distribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total occupied units</td>
<td>100 0</td>
<td>100 0</td>
<td>100 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With housing problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate</td>
<td>32 0</td>
<td>48 8</td>
<td>22 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate but crowded</td>
<td>12 3</td>
<td>17 1</td>
<td>10 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost burdened 2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19 2</td>
<td>31 3</td>
<td>11 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Family income is half or less of median family income adjusted for family size
2 Gross housing expenses greater than 30 percent of income (40 percent for owners with mortgages)

The 1980 annual housing survey shows home ownership is more prevalent among the aged than the younger households (72.4 percent versus 63.9 percent). The elderly tend to live in much older structures than did younger families. Fifty-three percent of the elderly households live in structures built before 1950 as compared
with 36 percent for the younger. Pre-war housing is occupied by 40.3 percent of the older households and only 27.6 percent of the younger.

CHARACTERISTICS OF HOUSEHOLDS WITH UNDER-65 AND 65+ HEADS, 1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part k-Grand Total</th>
<th>Number (Thousands)</th>
<th>Percent of total, all ages</th>
<th>Percent distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heads all ages</td>
<td>Heads under 65</td>
<td>Heads 65+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total households</td>
<td>80,424</td>
<td>64,065</td>
<td>16,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeowner</td>
<td>52,803</td>
<td>40,965</td>
<td>11,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash rent</td>
<td>25,927</td>
<td>21,870</td>
<td>4,057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No cash rent</td>
<td>1,695</td>
<td>1,230</td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year structure built</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After March 1970</td>
<td>18,399</td>
<td>16,333</td>
<td>2,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965-1970</td>
<td>8,944</td>
<td>7,418</td>
<td>1,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960-1964</td>
<td>7,855</td>
<td>6,508</td>
<td>1,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-1959</td>
<td>13,483</td>
<td>10,743</td>
<td>2,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940-1949</td>
<td>7,657</td>
<td>5,327</td>
<td>2,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before 1940</td>
<td>24,287</td>
<td>17,692</td>
<td>6,594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units in structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>55,114</td>
<td>43,989</td>
<td>11,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>9,707</td>
<td>7,727</td>
<td>1,981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5+</td>
<td>11,723</td>
<td>9,307</td>
<td>2,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In mobile home</td>
<td>3,879</td>
<td>3,043</td>
<td>836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In hotel or rooming house</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of bathrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None or shared</td>
<td>1,755</td>
<td>1,178</td>
<td>577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 but separated</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>47,094</td>
<td>36,157</td>
<td>10,937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>11,329</td>
<td>9,248</td>
<td>2,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14,011</td>
<td>11,868</td>
<td>2,143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5+</td>
<td>5,907</td>
<td>5,372</td>
<td>535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of heating equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>43,790</td>
<td>36,086</td>
<td>7,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steam</td>
<td>13,629</td>
<td>10,533</td>
<td>3,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric</td>
<td>5,876</td>
<td>4,756</td>
<td>1,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor/Wall</td>
<td>6,300</td>
<td>4,885</td>
<td>1,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room heater</td>
<td>4,049</td>
<td>2,764</td>
<td>1,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/malfunctional</td>
<td>6,781</td>
<td>5,041</td>
<td>1,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air conditioner</td>
<td>56,118</td>
<td>47,285</td>
<td>8,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/private system</td>
<td>67,512</td>
<td>53,731</td>
<td>13,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual well</td>
<td>11,832</td>
<td>9,509</td>
<td>2,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1,080</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity connected</td>
<td>80,268</td>
<td>63,956</td>
<td>16,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of sewage disposal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public sewer</td>
<td>59,069</td>
<td>47,129</td>
<td>11,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Septic tank/cesspool</td>
<td>20,641</td>
<td>16,494</td>
<td>4,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical toilet</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privy</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHARACTERISTICS OF HOUSEHOLDS WITH UNDER-65 AND 65+ HEADS, 1980
Part B.—Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Number (thousands)</th>
<th>Heads under 65%</th>
<th>Heads 65+</th>
<th>Percent of total, all ages</th>
<th>Percent distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heads all ages</td>
<td>Heads under 65%</td>
<td>Heads 65+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total households</td>
<td>54,902</td>
<td>44,634</td>
<td>10,268</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeowner</td>
<td>33,872</td>
<td>26,915</td>
<td>6,957</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash rent</td>
<td>20,242</td>
<td>17,154</td>
<td>3,088</td>
<td>84.1</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No cash rent</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year structure built</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After March 1970</td>
<td>11,877</td>
<td>10,634</td>
<td>1,243</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965-March 1970</td>
<td>6,035</td>
<td>5,105</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960-1964</td>
<td>5,774</td>
<td>4,900</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>84.9</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-1959</td>
<td>9,924</td>
<td>8,091</td>
<td>1,833</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940-1949</td>
<td>5,215</td>
<td>3,883</td>
<td>1,331</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before 1940</td>
<td>16,077</td>
<td>12,024</td>
<td>4,053</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units in structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>34,859</td>
<td>28,886</td>
<td>6,173</td>
<td>82.7</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>7,761</td>
<td>6,273</td>
<td>1,488</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5+</td>
<td>10,651</td>
<td>8,482</td>
<td>2,169</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In mobile home</td>
<td>1,631</td>
<td>1,193</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In hotel or rooming house</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of bathrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None or shared</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 but separated</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>31,575</td>
<td>24,730</td>
<td>6,846</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>7,991</td>
<td>6,662</td>
<td>1,329</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9,763</td>
<td>8,336</td>
<td>1,427</td>
<td>85.4</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5+</td>
<td>4,722</td>
<td>4,062</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of heating equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>30,810</td>
<td>25,770</td>
<td>5,040</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steam</td>
<td>11,402</td>
<td>8,839</td>
<td>2,564</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric</td>
<td>3,385</td>
<td>2,773</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>81.9</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor wall</td>
<td>4,461</td>
<td>3,598</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room heater</td>
<td>1,970</td>
<td>1,445</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/inadequate</td>
<td>2,874</td>
<td>2,208</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air conditioned</td>
<td>32,201</td>
<td>26,542</td>
<td>5,659</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/private system</td>
<td>50,365</td>
<td>40,879</td>
<td>9,487</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual well</td>
<td>4,771</td>
<td>3,532</td>
<td>1,239</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity connected</td>
<td>54,806</td>
<td>44,570</td>
<td>10,236</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of sewage disposal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public sewer</td>
<td>46,332</td>
<td>37,593</td>
<td>8,739</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Septic tank cesspool</td>
<td>8,453</td>
<td>6,986</td>
<td>1,465</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical toilet</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privy</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHARACTERISTICS OF HOUSEHOLDS WITH UNDER-65 AND 65+ HEADS, 1980

Part C. In Nonmetropolitan Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Number (thousands)</th>
<th>Percent of total, all ages</th>
<th>Percent distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heads all ages</td>
<td>Heads under 65</td>
<td>Heads 65+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total households</td>
<td>25,522</td>
<td>19,431</td>
<td>6,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeowner</td>
<td>18,930</td>
<td>14,050</td>
<td>4,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash rent</td>
<td>5,665</td>
<td>4,715</td>
<td>949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No cash rent</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year structure built</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After March 1970</td>
<td>6,522</td>
<td>5,701</td>
<td>821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955-1969</td>
<td>2,909</td>
<td>2,312</td>
<td>597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960-1964</td>
<td>2,081</td>
<td>1,608</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-1959</td>
<td>3,558</td>
<td>2,652</td>
<td>906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before 1940</td>
<td>2,242</td>
<td>1,488</td>
<td>754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure in structures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20,225</td>
<td>15,303</td>
<td>4,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>1,946</td>
<td>1,454</td>
<td>493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5+</td>
<td>1,072</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In mobile home</td>
<td>2,248</td>
<td>1,850</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In hotel or rooming house</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of bathrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None or shared</td>
<td>1,128</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 but separate</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15,518</td>
<td>11,428</td>
<td>4,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3,338</td>
<td>2,586</td>
<td>751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,248</td>
<td>3,532</td>
<td>716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5+</td>
<td>1,185</td>
<td>1,066</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of heating equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>12,979</td>
<td>10,316</td>
<td>2,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steam</td>
<td>2,226</td>
<td>1,694</td>
<td>532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric</td>
<td>2,491</td>
<td>1,982</td>
<td>508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor/wall</td>
<td>1,840</td>
<td>1,286</td>
<td>553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room heater</td>
<td>2,079</td>
<td>1,319</td>
<td>760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/inadequate</td>
<td>3,907</td>
<td>2,833</td>
<td>1,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air conditioned</td>
<td>13,917</td>
<td>10,743</td>
<td>3,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/private system</td>
<td>17,147</td>
<td>12,852</td>
<td>4,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual well</td>
<td>7,551</td>
<td>5,971</td>
<td>1,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity connected</td>
<td>25,462</td>
<td>19,386</td>
<td>6,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of sewage disposal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public sewer</td>
<td>12,737</td>
<td>9,536</td>
<td>3,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Septic tank/cesspool</td>
<td>12,188</td>
<td>9,526</td>
<td>2,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical toilet</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privy</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As expected, household income, value of owned home, and monthly rental are considerably larger for all households than for the older households, moreover, it must be remembered that some other costs, like food and health care, absorb larger proportions of the incomes of older households.
### HOUSEHOLD INCOME, VALUE OF HOME, AND MONTHLY RENTAL, 1980

(Numbers in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of household and head (householder)</th>
<th>Owner occupied</th>
<th>Renter occupied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All ages</td>
<td>65+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52,516</td>
<td>19,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2+ person</td>
<td>44,562</td>
<td>22,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married couple</td>
<td>37,509</td>
<td>23,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other male</td>
<td>2,026</td>
<td>20,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other female</td>
<td>5,027</td>
<td>13,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-person</td>
<td>7,954</td>
<td>7,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2,692</td>
<td>12,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5,262</td>
<td>6,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Value of home                          | 41,945 | 51,300 | 26,874 | 241 |
| 2+ person                              | 36,403 | 53,500 | 17,213 | 261 |
| Married couple                         | 36,707 | 54,900 | 4,475 | 45,700 |
| Other male                             | 1,587 | 52,000 | 303 | 39,600 |
| Other female                           | 4,109 | 44,000 | 879 | 38,500 |
| 1-person                               | 5,543 | 39,300 | 9,662 | 210 |
| Male                                   | 1,771 | 42,300 | 643 | 36,000 |
| Female                                 | 3,772 | 38,300 | 2,354 | 35,700 |

| Monthly rental                         | 368 | 3600 | 368 | 3600 | 368 | 3600 | 368 | 3600 | 368 | 3600 | 368 | 3600 |

**Household income**

---

**Value of home**

---

**Monthly rental**

---

---
### SUMMARY OF HUD ELDERLY HOUSING PROGRAM ACTIVITIES, MID-1981

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section No</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Current status</th>
<th>Number of projects</th>
<th>Number of units</th>
<th>Value (millions)</th>
<th>Estimated elderly units</th>
<th>Period covered through</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title II</td>
<td>Low-income public housing</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>10,750</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>552,000</td>
<td>46 9/30/79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>Direct loans for housing of elderly and handicapped</td>
<td>Inactive, 1</td>
<td>330+</td>
<td>45,275</td>
<td>574 6</td>
<td>45,275</td>
<td>100 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>Mortgage insurance for housing for elderly</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>1,006</td>
<td>90,323</td>
<td>4,130 2</td>
<td>79,185</td>
<td>89 6/30/81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221(d)(3)</td>
<td>Multifamily rental housing for low- and moderate-income families do</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>66,285</td>
<td>1,158 1</td>
<td>66,285</td>
<td>100 6/30/81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221(d)(4)</td>
<td>Home ownership assistance for low- and moderate-income families</td>
<td>Inactive, 1</td>
<td>7 472,050</td>
<td>473,032</td>
<td>8,456 7</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA                Revised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>Low-income rental assistance</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>76,034</td>
<td>78,034</td>
<td>2,768 8</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA                6/30/81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>Rental and Co-op assistance for low- and moderate-income families do</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>2,633</td>
<td>275,588</td>
<td>3,944 1</td>
<td>3,380</td>
<td>1+ 6/30/81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202/236</td>
<td>202/236 conversion</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>4,056</td>
<td>435,231</td>
<td>7,492 8</td>
<td>55,784</td>
<td>13 6/30/81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>Nursing home and intermediate care facilities</td>
<td>Inactive, 1</td>
<td>147,336</td>
<td>1,676 5</td>
<td>147,336</td>
<td>100 6/30/81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nonconstruction programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td>Rehabilitation loans</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>8,225</td>
<td>524,586</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>283,741</td>
<td>54 6/30/81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Low rent leased housing</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>1,654</td>
<td>117,904</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>41,394</td>
<td>35 6/30/81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>Nonconstruction programs</strong></td>
<td><strong>Exist.</strong></td>
<td><strong>330+</strong></td>
<td><strong>45,275</strong></td>
<td><strong>574 6</strong></td>
<td><strong>45,275</strong></td>
<td><strong>100 1977</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes elderly occupied units which were not specifically designed for the elderly
* Figures for original program reported through program revision
* Figures for revised sec 202/8 represent cumulative project reservations through June 30, 1981
* Figures represent cumulative fund reservations through reporting date
* Figures do not include sec 8 commitments attached to sec 202/8 fund reservations
* Figures represent loan commitments only
* Figures represent number of mortgages
* Beds

---

**Notes:**
- Figures for rental and co-op assistance for low- and moderate-income families do not include cumulative funds.
- Figures for rehabilitation loans do not include cumulative funds.
- Figures for low rent leased housing do not include cumulative funds.

---

**Figures for rental section 202/3 represent current reservations through June 30, 1981.**

---

**Figures represent cumulative number of mortgages.**
In 1978, life expectancy (average remaining years of life) reached new highs for the United States. Life expectancy at birth for both sexes combined was 73.3 years but the 77.2 years for females was 7.7 years longer than 69.5 for males.

At age 65, the combined expectancy was 16.3 years with the 18.4 years for women exceeding by 4.4 years the remaining years for men, 14.0.

The 26-year or 55 percent increase in life expectancy at birth since 1900 (when it was 47.3) results to a large extent, from the wiping out of most of the killers of infants and of the young. Only since midcentury has life expectancy in the upper ages begun to improve as death rates from the killers of older persons, chronic conditions and diseases, begun to decrease. Thus, during the first half of this century, growing numbers of persons reached older ages but once there, did not live much longer than did their ancestors who reached such age. Since the 1950's life expectancy at the upper ages has also increased and current decreases in death rates from cardiovascular conditions and stroke portend further added years of life.

The gap between whites and “others” (primarily black) in life expectancy at birth has narrowed in recent decades. Also, for those who do reach advanced age, at about age 70, life expectancy is slightly higher for those in the “others” category than for whites.

The tables that follow analyze in detail the changes in life expectancy by sex and color at selected ages for selected years between 1900 and 1978, the translation of these trends into estimates of the number of babies born in 1900 and in 1978 expected to reach selected ages (for example, about 40 percent of babies born in 1900 were expected to reach age 65 as compared with 76 percent for the babies born in 1978, and a listing of the countries having the highest male and female life expectancies as reported by the United Nations.

**LIFE EXPECTANCY AT SELECTED AGES, 1900-78**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age and year</th>
<th>Total Male</th>
<th>Total Female</th>
<th>White Male</th>
<th>White Female</th>
<th>Other Male</th>
<th>Other Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>60.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>63.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Increase 1900-78*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>26.0</th>
<th>23.2</th>
<th>28.9</th>
<th>26.4</th>
<th>23.6</th>
<th>29.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>59.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Computed from basic data on mortality and life expectancy published by the Vital Statistics Division of the National Center for Health Statistics Simulated projections prepared by the author.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age and year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At age 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase 1900-78</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At age 45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase 1900-78</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At age 65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase 1900-78</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At age 75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase 1900-78</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At age 85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase 1900-78</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PERCENT OF BABIES BORN IN 1900 AND 1978 EXPECTED TO SURVIVE TO SELECTED AGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survival age and year of birth</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reach age 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio 1978/1900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reach age 45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio 1978/1900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reach age 65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio 1978/1900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reach age 75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio 1978/1900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reach age 85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio 1978/1900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LIFE EXPECTANCY AT BIRTH, SELECTED COUNTRIES

(Adapted from United Nations Demographic Yearbook)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>1977-78</td>
<td>1977-78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>1974-78</td>
<td>1974-78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>1977-78</td>
<td>1977-78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>1968-73</td>
<td>1968-73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>England and Wales</td>
<td>1974-76</td>
<td>1974-76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>1970-72</td>
<td>1970-72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Germany (Federal Republic)</td>
<td>1976-78</td>
<td>1976-78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>1970-72</td>
<td>1970-72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Germany (Democratic Republic)</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>1970-72</td>
<td>1970-72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>1976-76</td>
<td>1976-76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Czechoslovakia</td>
<td>1976-76</td>
<td>1976-76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>1976-76</td>
<td>1976-76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>1965-57</td>
<td>1965-57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>1976-78</td>
<td>1976-78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>1975-76</td>
<td>1975-76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>1971-72</td>
<td>1971-72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The table represents the life expectancy at birth for selected countries, with data for both males and females from various years.
As a result of the as yet unexplained longer (and more rapidly increasing) life expectancy for females as compared to males, most older persons are women—15.2 million women and 10.3 million men in mid-1980. Death rates are higher for males than for females at every age (including the fetus) so that although there are approximately 105 boy babies born for every 100 girl babies, the numbers at the same age even out by the end of the teens and then females outnumber males in ever larger numbers thereafter.

For the total 65+ population, there are 148 women per 100 men. In the 65-74 age group, the ratio is 131, rising to 180 women per 100 men for those 75+. For the 85+ group, there are 229 women per 160 men. (See “Marital Status” and “Projections” below.)

### Marital Status

In 1980, most older men were married (7.6 million or 78 percent) but most older women were widowed (7.1 million or 51 percent). There are 5.3 times as many older widows as there are widowers. Among the 75+ women, almost 70 percent were widows. About 34 percent of the married 65+ men have under-65 wives.

#### Marital Status, by Sex and Age Group, 1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex and marital status</th>
<th>Number (Thousands)</th>
<th>Percent distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>55-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10,982</td>
<td>9,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>9,347</td>
<td>8,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not married</td>
<td>1,615</td>
<td>1,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single 1</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>11,670</td>
<td>11,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>9,222</td>
<td>7,713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not married</td>
<td>2,447</td>
<td>3,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single 1</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>2,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>1,074</td>
<td>735</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Ratio                  |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| Total                  | 106    | 112    | 131    | 167    | 100    | 100    | 100    | 100    |
| Married                | 99     | 92     | 80     | 56     | 99     | 92     | 80     | 56     |
| Not married            | 152    | 228    | 354    | 419    | 152    | 228    | 354    | 419    |
| Single 1               | 79     | 89     | 134    | 242    | 79     | 89     | 134    | 242    |
| Widowed                | 466    | 524    | 618    | 474    | 466    | 524    | 618    | 474    |
| Divorced               | 145    | 150    | 118    | 177    | 145    | 150    | 118    | 177    |

* Never married  
* Women per 100 men

The impact of differential life expectancies by sex may be illustrated by a theoretic application of life expectancies in 1978 to an assumed 100 marriages in 1980 where all grooms are aged 25 and all brides are aged 20.

---

In order to illustrate the extreme case, it is assumed that the male deaths are all among the married men with a spouse present while all of the female deaths were among the already widowed.

In 1979, there were approximately 2.3 million marriages of persons of all ages. The rate (number per 1,000 in the specific group who are theoretically eligible to marry) was 53.6 for females and 65.1 for males, as compared with 16.2 for 65+ males and only 2.7 for 65+ females. The marriage rate (see table below) for older grooms was almost 6 times that of the older brides, partly because there are fewer males in these age groups and partly because men usually marry women younger than themselves (contrary to what life expectancy analyses would suggest). About three-quarters of the older brides and grooms were previously widowed.

MARRIAGE RATES FOR 65+ PERSONS, 1979

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Husband</th>
<th>Wife</th>
<th>Number expected to reach that age</th>
<th>Widens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Husband</td>
<td>Wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 1979, about half of all older Americans had less than a 10th grade education (2 years of high school); the median for the 25-64 age group was high school graduation. About 2.1 million or 9 percent of the older people were "functionally illiterate," having had no schooling or less than 5 years. At the other end of the scale, about 8 percent were college graduates.

The increasing educational attainment of the older population (an increase of more than a year of schooling in the median since 1970) results from a classic example of a cohort effect rather than the aging process since, in the past, each succeeding generation has been given the opportunity to receive more schooling than did its predecessor. Thus, as each cohort with more years of schooling
reaches age 65 and the oldest cohort with less schooling dies off, the median increases.

**LIVING ARRANGEMENTS**

In 1980, 83 percent of the older men but only 57 percent of the older women lived in a family setting. The others lived alone or with nonrelatives except for the one in twenty who lived in an institution (a figure that jumps to one in five in the 85+ age group).

Three-quarters of the older men (75.5 percent) lived in families that included the wife but only slightly more than a third of the older women (38 percent) lived in families that included the husband. Four of every 10 older women lived alone. Almost four times as many older women lived alone or with nonrelatives than did older men.

**LIVING ARRANGEMENTS OF THE 65+ NONINSTITUTIONAL POPULATION, 1980**

(Numbers in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age and living arrangements</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9,783</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with spouse</td>
<td>7,363</td>
<td>75.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with other relative</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living alone or with nonrelative</td>
<td>1,367</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6,549</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with spouse</td>
<td>5,199</td>
<td>79.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with other relative</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living alone or with nonrelative</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,234</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with spouse</td>
<td>2,180</td>
<td>67.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with other relative</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living alone or with nonrelative</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLACE OF RESIDENCE**

In 1980, a slightly smaller proportion of the older noninstitutionalized population lived in metropolitan areas than was true of the younger (64 percent vs. 68 percent) but in a reversal of the previous pattern, more than half of the older people in metropolitan areas lived in the suburbs rather than the central city, primarily because of the “aging” of the inhabitants of the suburbs (rather than movement from the central city to the suburbs) in the larger (over a million) metropolitan areas. The preponderance of suburbanites among the under-65 population increased substantially so that 60 percent of the under-65 residents of metropolitan areas lived outside the central city.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential category</th>
<th>1970</th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>Index $^1$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>180,584</td>
<td>19,235</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In central cities</td>
<td>124,714</td>
<td>12,344</td>
<td>69.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside central cities</td>
<td>56,236</td>
<td>6,640</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside central cities</td>
<td>68,478</td>
<td>5,704</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan areas of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000,000+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In central cities</td>
<td>30,506</td>
<td>3,816</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside central cities</td>
<td>41,682</td>
<td>3,484</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1,000,000-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In central cities</td>
<td>25,729</td>
<td>2,825</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside central cities</td>
<td>26,796</td>
<td>2,220</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonmetropolitan areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55,870</td>
<td>6,891</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In counties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With no place of 2,500+</td>
<td>6,269</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With place of 2,500-24,999</td>
<td>35,246</td>
<td>4,479</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With place of 25,000+</td>
<td>14,334</td>
<td>1,511</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated metropolitan since 1970</td>
<td>7,520</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^1$ Index = proportion of 65+ divided by proportion under 65 x 100. Index of over 100 means that relatively more older people than younger people live in the residential category in percentage terms.

$^2$ Ratio = index for 1980 divided by index for 1970 x 100. Ratio of over 100 means that proportionately the residential category has more older people in 1980 than in 1970.
Proportionately more older than younger people lived in nonmetropolitan areas with the largest concentrations in the smaller areas (containing no county with more than 2,500 inhabitants).

As may be seen from the summary table below, the last column (ratio) shows that the changes between 1970 and 1980 involve the growth of the older population in the metropolitan area suburbs (the aging of the suburbs), especially in the larger areas. Although the older population in the nonmetropolitan areas also increased, the major patterns remained approximately the same.

The above analysis and the table below are based on the total population. Patterns for the white elderly and the black elderly are, however, fundamentally different. Older blacks as well as blacks of all ages are much more concentrated in metropolitan areas than are whites and better than three-quarters of the older blacks in metropolitan areas live in the central city.

VOTER PARTICIPATION 14

In the 1976 Presidential election, older people made up 15 percent of the voting age population but cast 16 percent of the votes. Some 62 percent of the older population voted, a much higher proportion than the under-35 group but somewhat lower than the 35-64 groups. A higher proportion of older men than of older women voted, but the women voters still outnumbered the men. Voter participation falls off sharply after age 75.

In the 1978 congressional election, when, as usual, there is smaller total voter turnout, older people still made up 15 percent of the voting age population but cast 18 percent of the votes. Some 56 percent of the older population voted, a much higher proportion than in the under-35 and about the same as in the 35-64 group.

The two detailed tables below analyze registration and voting behavior in the 1980 Presidential election, by age groups. While the long-term trend toward lower turnouts for voting in all elections continued, the relative patterns by age group remained about the same. Highest percentage voting remains with the middle-aged population, followed by the 65-74 group and a falling off in the 75+, and a very low turnout for the young adults. Whites voted in greater proportions than did the blacks who, in turn, voted in larger proportions than did the Hispanics. Persons aged 65+ made up 15.4 percent of the voting-age population but cast 16.8 percent of the votes. Older men had better voting records than older women but the larger number of women still meant more female votes (8.7 million vs 7.0 million).

---

14 Computed from data published by the Census Bureau as a result of a supplementary question on the November 1976, 1978, and 1980 Current Population Surveys
REPORTED REGISTRATION AND VOTING, BY AGE GROUP, NOVEMBER 1980—ALL RACES  
[Civilian noninstitutional population, numbers in thousands]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>18+</th>
<th>18-44</th>
<th>45-64</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>65-74</th>
<th>75+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both sexes</td>
<td>157,085</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>89,423</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>43,569</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered</td>
<td>105,035</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>54,039</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>30,232</td>
<td>71.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted</td>
<td>93,066</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>47,183</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>29,200</td>
<td>69.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not vote</td>
<td>11,569</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>6,856</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>2,824</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not registered</td>
<td>52,050</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>35,384</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>10,541</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not U.S. citizen</td>
<td>6,343</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4,420</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1,345</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>74,082</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>43,326</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>20,837</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered</td>
<td>49,344</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>25,620</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>15,093</td>
<td>76.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted</td>
<td>43,753</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>22,215</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>14,554</td>
<td>69.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not vote</td>
<td>5,591</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>3,460</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>1,348</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not registered</td>
<td>24,738</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>17,705</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>4,934</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not U.S. citizen</td>
<td>2,942</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2,164</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>83,003</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>40,097</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>22,732</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered</td>
<td>55,691</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>28,188</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>17,135</td>
<td>75.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted</td>
<td>49,312</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>24,657</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>15,651</td>
<td>68.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not vote</td>
<td>6,378</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>3,419</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>1,475</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not registered</td>
<td>27,312</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>17,678</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>5,606</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not U.S. citizen</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2,255</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>137,676</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>77,225</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>38,703</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered</td>
<td>94,112</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>47,888</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>23,808</td>
<td>77.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted</td>
<td>83,855</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>42,943</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>27,365</td>
<td>70.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not vote</td>
<td>10,257</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5,756</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>2,443</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not registered</td>
<td>43,564</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>29,327</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>8,895</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not U.S. citizen</td>
<td>4,782</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3,260</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1,084</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>16,423</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>10,224</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>4,159</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered</td>
<td>9,849</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>5,537</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>2,885</td>
<td>69.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted</td>
<td>8,287</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>4,530</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>2,546</td>
<td>61.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not vote</td>
<td>1,562</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>1,005</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not registered</td>
<td>6,574</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>4,688</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>1,663</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not U.S. citizen</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentages may not add to 100.0 due to rounding.
### REPORTED REGISTRATION AND VOTING, BY AGE GROUP, NOVEMBER 1980—ALL RACES—Continued

(Civilian noninstitutional population; numbers in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>18+</th>
<th>18-44</th>
<th>45-64</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>65-74</th>
<th>75+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish origin 2</td>
<td>8,210</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>5,874</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1,798</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered</td>
<td>2,984</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>1,837</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>50.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted</td>
<td>2,453</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>1,488</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not vote</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not registered 3</td>
<td>5,226</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>4,037</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not U.S. citizen</td>
<td>2,645</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>1,987</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Includes "not known" and "unreported"  
2 May be of any race.
### COMPARISON OF DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION AND OF VOTERS, BY AGE GROUP, NOVEMBER 1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>18+</th>
<th>18-44</th>
<th>45-64</th>
<th>65+</th>
<th>65-74</th>
<th>75+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Persons</td>
<td>Voters</td>
<td>Persons</td>
<td>Voters</td>
<td>Persons</td>
<td>Voters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All races, total</td>
<td>100 0</td>
<td>100 0</td>
<td>56 9</td>
<td>50 7</td>
<td>27 7</td>
<td>32 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>100 0</td>
<td>100 0</td>
<td>58 5</td>
<td>50 8</td>
<td>28 1</td>
<td>33 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>100 0</td>
<td>100 0</td>
<td>55 5</td>
<td>50 6</td>
<td>27 4</td>
<td>31 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>100 0</td>
<td>100 0</td>
<td>56 1</td>
<td>50 3</td>
<td>28 1</td>
<td>32 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>100 0</td>
<td>100 0</td>
<td>62 3</td>
<td>54 7</td>
<td>25 3</td>
<td>30 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic origin 1</td>
<td>100 0</td>
<td>100 0</td>
<td>71 5</td>
<td>60 7</td>
<td>21 9</td>
<td>31 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All races, total</td>
<td>100 0</td>
<td>100 0</td>
<td>100 0</td>
<td>100 0</td>
<td>100 0</td>
<td>100 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>87 2</td>
<td>47 0</td>
<td>48 5</td>
<td>47 1</td>
<td>47 8</td>
<td>48 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>92 8</td>
<td>52 0</td>
<td>51 5</td>
<td>52 9</td>
<td>52 2</td>
<td>51 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>87 6</td>
<td>90 1</td>
<td>86 4</td>
<td>89 3</td>
<td>88 8</td>
<td>90 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>10 5</td>
<td>8 9</td>
<td>11 4</td>
<td>9 6</td>
<td>9 5</td>
<td>8 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic origin 1</td>
<td>5 2</td>
<td>2 6</td>
<td>6 6</td>
<td>3 2</td>
<td>4 1</td>
<td>2 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. May be of any race

---

**MOBILITY**

There are two ways of examining the mobility of older persons. One, called "general mobility" by the Census Bureau, is based on a more geographic approach and measures movers (people who change residences) as to whether they moved across county, State, and regional lines. The other, called "detailed mobility" by the Census Bureau, is based on the type of residential area approach and measures movers in relation to residence in central city or suburb of a metropolitan area or of places in a nonmetropolitan area.

**General Mobility**

In the March 1980 household survey, almost 5 million or 21 percent of the 65+ noninstitutionalized population reported that they had moved in the 5-year period since 1975 (compared with over 48 percent of the total population aged 4+). Of the nearly 5 million older movers, 57 percent moved within the same county, 22 percent moved to another county in the same State, a little over 5 percent moved to a contiguous State, and 15 percent moved to a noncontiguous State. Although differing in proportions, older movers followed a pattern quite similar to that of movers of all ages as shown in the table below.

**GENERAL MOBILITY, PERSONSAGED 4-64 AND 65+, 1975-80**

(Numbers in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region and residence in 1980 compared to region and residence in 1975</th>
<th>4-64</th>
<th>65+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total in 1980</td>
<td>178,473</td>
<td>100 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same house (nonmovers)</td>
<td>88,550</td>
<td>49 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different house in United States (movers)</td>
<td>86,198</td>
<td>48 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same county</td>
<td>49,279</td>
<td>57 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different county</td>
<td>36,918</td>
<td>42 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same State</td>
<td>19,468</td>
<td>22 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### General Mobility, Persons Aged 4-64 and 65+, 1975-80—Continued

**(Numbers in thousands)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region and residence in 1980 compared to region and residence in 1975</th>
<th>4-64</th>
<th>65+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different State</td>
<td>17,451</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contiguous</td>
<td>5,416</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncontiguous</td>
<td>12,035</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast in 1975</td>
<td>3,354</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central in 1975</td>
<td>4,470</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South in 1975</td>
<td>5,613</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West in 1975</td>
<td>3,809</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movers from abroad</td>
<td>3,725</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast in 1980</td>
<td>39,732</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same house (nonmovers)</td>
<td>23,500</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different house in United States (movers)</td>
<td>15,422</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same county</td>
<td>10,143</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different county</td>
<td>5,260</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same State</td>
<td>3,235</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different State</td>
<td>2,207</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast in 1975</td>
<td>1,139</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central in 1975</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South in 1975</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West in 1975</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movers from abroad</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central in 1980</td>
<td>47,388</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same house (nonmovers)</td>
<td>24,554</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different house in United States (movers)</td>
<td>22,234</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same county</td>
<td>13,408</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different county</td>
<td>8,874</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same State</td>
<td>5,411</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different State</td>
<td>3,463</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast in 1975</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central in 1975</td>
<td>1,539</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South in 1975</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West in 1975</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movers from abroad</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South in 1980</td>
<td>57,885</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same house (nonmovers)</td>
<td>27,535</td>
<td>47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different house in United States (movers)</td>
<td>29,477</td>
<td>50.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same county</td>
<td>15,539</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different county</td>
<td>13,937</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same State</td>
<td>6,767</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different State</td>
<td>7,170</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast in 1975</td>
<td>1,339</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central in 1975</td>
<td>1,545</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South in 1975</td>
<td>3,281</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West in 1975</td>
<td>1,004</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movers from abroad</td>
<td>1,074</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A special analysis of the regional pattern of interstate movers over the 5-year period 1975-1980 (see table below) shows some degree of concentration of movement but very far from the stereotypic belief of a large flow to the "sunbelt." First of all, only 1 million (4.2 percent or every 25th) of the older noninstitutionalized population in 1980 reported an interstate move in the previous 5 years; this represents about a fifth (20.2 percent) of the movers.

Starting with residence in 1975, of the 257,000 who lived in the Northeast and moved, about 30 percent moved to another State in the Northeast, 44 percent moved to the South, and 23 percent to the West. Of the 285,000 movers who lived in the North Central States in 1975, about 18 percent moved to another State within the region, 50 percent moved to the South and 32 percent to the West. Of the 269,000 movers who lived in the South in 1975, almost 60 percent moved within the South, about 24 percent moved northwards, and some 16 percent moved West. Of the 191,000 older movers who lived in a Western State in 1975, about half moved within the West and 31 percent to a State in the South.

### Regional Patterns for Interstate Movers Aged 65+, 1975-80

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Northeast</th>
<th>North Central</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total percent (1975)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>33.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total percent (1980)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>33.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Detailed Mobility

In 1980, 18.7 million or about 79 percent of the noninstitutionalized older people reported that they lived in the same house as they did in 1975. A quarter of these nonmovers were living within the central city of a metropolitan area, 26 percent were still living in a suburb, and about 29 percent were still in a nonmetropolitan area.

Of the 4.9 million movers (21 percent of the older population), 44 percent reported a move within the same metropolitan area with 20 percent moving within the central city, 15.2 percent moving within the suburbs, and 8.7 percent between the central city and the suburbs (both directions).

About 15 percent of the movers moved from one metropolitan area to another with about a third of these moving from a suburb in one area to a suburb in the new area.

More than a quarter of the movers moved from one nonmetropolitan area to another nonmetropolitan area with the remaining 15 percent of the movers moving in a criss-cross pattern (see table below).

### Detailed Mobility, Persons Aged 4-64 and 65+, 1975-80

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence in 1980 compared to residence in 1975</th>
<th>4-64</th>
<th>65+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>178,473</td>
<td>23,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same house (nonmovers)</td>
<td>88,550</td>
<td>18,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC of SMSA</td>
<td>22,823</td>
<td>5,657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance of SMSA</td>
<td>37,211</td>
<td>6,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside SMSA</td>
<td>26,515</td>
<td>6,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different house within United States (movers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within same SMSA</td>
<td>39,452</td>
<td>4,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within CC</td>
<td>14,775</td>
<td>990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within balance of SMSA</td>
<td>16,541</td>
<td>751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC to balance of SMSA</td>
<td>5,749</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance of SMSA to CC</td>
<td>2,385</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between SMSA's</td>
<td>13,798</td>
<td>753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between CC's</td>
<td>3,239</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between balance of SMSA's</td>
<td>4,948</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC to balance of SMSA</td>
<td>3,723</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance of SMSA to CC</td>
<td>1,885</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From outside SMSA to an SMSA</td>
<td>5,736</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To CC</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To balance of SMSA</td>
<td>3,437</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From SMSA to outside SMSA</td>
<td>6,856</td>
<td>481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From CC</td>
<td>3,007</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From balance of SMSA</td>
<td>3,509</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside SMSA at both dates</td>
<td>20,358</td>
<td>1,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movers from abroad</td>
<td>3,725</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To CC of SMSA</td>
<td>1,587</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To balance of SMSA</td>
<td>1,509</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To outside SMSA</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. CC = Central city; SMSA = Standard metropolitan statistical area
2. Number of movers = 100 percent.
As may be seen from the above table, veterans are an increasingly large proportion of the older male population, reaching 64.1 percent within the next 10 years and 70.8 percent within 20 years. Aware of this rapidly increasing responsibility, the Veterans Administration has initiated a large number of programs in domiciliary, home, and institutional care areas, as well as extensive research in both the biomedical and social/behavioral aspects of health and aging. Beginning in 1973, the Veterans Administration has established 8 geriatric research, education, and clinical centers (GRECC) serving 10 VA medical centers scattered across the country from Massachusetts to California, providing both direct programs and support to the other VA programs and facilities.

In 1981, the Veterans Administration spent $1.62 billion in health care of the older veterans.

EMPLOYMENT

In 1900, the male labor force numbered 27,640,000. In the 45-64 age group, there were 4,958,000 men in the labor force out of a total male population in this age group of 5,465,000 or a labor force participation rate of 90.3. The 65+ male population totaled 1,555,000 so the 987,000 in the labor force represented a rate of 63.1. In the female labor force of 4,999,000, there were 672,000 aged 45-64 in the labor force or 13.6 percent of the 4,935,000 women aged 45-64 in the population. In the 65+ group, there were 127,000 in the labor force out of a population of 1,525,000 older women or a rate of 8.3.

Between 1900 and 1950, the male 45-64 labor force participation rate remained relatively constant while the 65+ rate fell rapidly, especially after the onset of the depression of the 1930’s and the passage of the Social Security Act. The 45-64 rate for women showed a steady increase as women entered the labor market but the 65+ rate moved slowly between 8 and 10 percent.
The following table analyzes the trends since 1950 in some detail. The long-term trends for women continue as previously but for men the decrease in labor force participation has moved down to just below 60 years of age. This "early retirement" phenomenon (which also showed up in the increase in the number of persons claiming social security payments prior to age 65, even at reduced benefit amounts) is probably a combination of persons under 65 voluntarily opting for early retirement (especially if they have other retirement income), of persons unable to find jobs in their later years (the so-called discouraged worker), and of persons who for health or physical reasons cannot continue to work.

**CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION RATES, PERSONS AGED 45+, BY AGE GROUP AND SEX, 1950-80**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Men:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-year groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>96.5</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>95.6</td>
<td>94.2</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>91.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td>87.9</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>85.6</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>72.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-year groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>96.6</td>
<td>96.1</td>
<td>95.3</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>93.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>90.1</td>
<td>89.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>91.6</td>
<td>90.2</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>81.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>61.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-year groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>59.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-year groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>57.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Not available

The following table presents a more detailed analysis of the labor force and the status of its components for the monthly averages in 1981 by sex and 5-year age groupings. Noteworthy are the sharp decreases in labor force participation rates with increasing age, the increase in the proportion of employed workers in agriculture with advancing age, especially for men, and the decrease in unemployment rate (though not the duration of unemployment).
### LABOR FORCE STATUS OF THE 45+ CIVILIAN NONINSTITUTIONAL POPULATION, BY AGE GROUP AND SEX, MONTHLY AVERAGE 1981

**Numbers in thousands**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>45-49</th>
<th>50-54</th>
<th>55-59</th>
<th>60-64</th>
<th>65+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,301</td>
<td>5,496</td>
<td>5,423</td>
<td>4,728</td>
<td>10,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In labor force</td>
<td>4,948</td>
<td>4,920</td>
<td>4,404</td>
<td>2,766</td>
<td>1,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation rate</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>4,741</td>
<td>4,737</td>
<td>4,243</td>
<td>2,666</td>
<td>1,812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of employed</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in labor force</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>1,019</td>
<td>1,962</td>
<td>3,803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of total</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>81.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,650</td>
<td>5,975</td>
<td>6,094</td>
<td>5,511</td>
<td>14,681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In labor force</td>
<td>3,628</td>
<td>3,474</td>
<td>3,003</td>
<td>1,795</td>
<td>1,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation rate</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>3,449</td>
<td>3,227</td>
<td>2,883</td>
<td>1,732</td>
<td>1,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of employed</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in labor force</td>
<td>2,222</td>
<td>2,501</td>
<td>3,091</td>
<td>3,714</td>
<td>13,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of total</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>92.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following table analyzes the employment and unemployment status for the monthly averages in 1981 for older members of the labor force according to their full-time or part-time attachment to the labor force. Especially noteworthy is the very rapid increase in the proportion of part-time workers, both men and women, with advancing age.

### FULL-TIME/PART-TIME STATUS OF THE CIVILIAN NONINSTITUTIONAL POPULATION, BY AGE GROUP AND SEX, MONTHLY AVERAGE 1981

**Numbers in thousands**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>45-49</th>
<th>50-54</th>
<th>55-59</th>
<th>60-64</th>
<th>65+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time labor force</td>
<td>9,685</td>
<td>6,779</td>
<td>6,685</td>
<td>6,354</td>
<td>949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>9,306</td>
<td>6,551</td>
<td>6,306</td>
<td>6,104</td>
<td>949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full time</td>
<td>9,047</td>
<td>6,354</td>
<td>6,104</td>
<td>5,854</td>
<td>949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part time (economic reasons)</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in labor force</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of total labor force</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time labor force</td>
<td>8,685</td>
<td>8,685</td>
<td>8,685</td>
<td>8,685</td>
<td>8,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>8,306</td>
<td>8,306</td>
<td>8,306</td>
<td>8,306</td>
<td>8,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full time</td>
<td>8,047</td>
<td>8,047</td>
<td>8,047</td>
<td>8,047</td>
<td>8,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part time (economic reasons)</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in labor force</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of total labor force</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Full-Time/Part-Time Status of the Civilian Noninstitutional Population, by Age Group and Sex, Monthly Average 1981—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>45-54</th>
<th>55-64</th>
<th>65+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time labor force</td>
<td>5,687</td>
<td>3,706</td>
<td>525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>5,452</td>
<td>3,502</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>5,087</td>
<td>3,329</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part time (economic reasons)</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of unemployed</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time labor force</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part time (economic reasons)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of unemployed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Automobile Ownership

As is true for major household appliances, automobile ownership by older households is well below that of households with younger heads but part of the difference depends on income level rather than age, health, or choice. A 1974 survey showed that 62 percent of older households owned at least one car as compared with 86 percent for the younger. There is, however, a strong relationship between income level and automobile ownership at all ages so the lower income level of the older households accounts in part for the lower ownership rate. Other factors are also present.

#### Projections

(Note: Revised projections based on the 1980 decennial census counts and new assumptions will be released later in 1982. The projections below should be used with caution.)

The “safest” Census Bureau projections of the size and composition of the population through 2050 are the so-called “Series II” projections, which are based on an ultimate cohort fertility rate of 2.1 (2.1 children per woman or eventual zero population growth), small improvements in life expectancy (including that for older persons), narrowing of the gap between whites and blacks, constant 400,000 net immigration, but no new major medical “cures” of chronic diseases.

These projections show a total population of 260.4 million by 2000 with 31.8 million or 12.2 percent aged 65+ (11.3 percent in 1980). The number of 85+ persons would almost double to 3.8 million and the ratio of 65+ women to men would rise to 150/100 as compared to 148/100 in 1980.

---

17 Basic data from the discontinued Census Bureau series on consumer buying intentions.
### POPULATION PROJECTIONS (SERIES II), TOTAL 65+, 1980-2050

**Numbers in Thousands**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>All ages</th>
<th>65+</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent of all ages</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>226,505</td>
<td>25,544 11.3</td>
<td>10,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>232,880</td>
<td>27,305 11.7</td>
<td>11,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>243,513</td>
<td>29,824 12.3</td>
<td>11,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>252,750</td>
<td>31,401 12.4</td>
<td>12,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>260,378</td>
<td>31,822 12.2</td>
<td>12,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>267,603</td>
<td>32,436 12.1</td>
<td>12,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>275,335</td>
<td>34,837 12.7</td>
<td>13,978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>283,164</td>
<td>39,519 14.0</td>
<td>16,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>290,115</td>
<td>43,102 15.6</td>
<td>18,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>295,742</td>
<td>49,920 17.2</td>
<td>20,861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>300,486</td>
<td>55,024 18.3</td>
<td>22,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>304,486</td>
<td>55,805 18.3</td>
<td>22,434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>308,400</td>
<td>54,925 17.8</td>
<td>21,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2045</td>
<td>312,054</td>
<td>54,009 17.3</td>
<td>21,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2050</td>
<td>315,622</td>
<td>55,904 17.6</td>
<td>22,055</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 1980 census enumeration.

If the present fertility rate of approximately 1.8 (children per women) should continue at this low level rather than the 2.1 rate (zero population growth) assumed above, the size of the total population would be smaller but the proportion of older people would be greater. The increasing number and proportion of older persons reflects both the impact of longer life expectancy and the movement of the post-World War II baby boom through the population pyramid. Projections based on lower fertility rates also show a much smaller rate of growth for the older population after 2030 when today's babies and youngsters start reaching age 65.

The above projections represent averages for the whole 65+ age group as if it were a homogeneous mass. Important differences by sex and age group within the 65+ population are as follows:

### PROJECTED TRENDS WITHIN THE 65+ AGE GROUP, 1976-2050

**Sex and age**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Both sexes, 65+</td>
<td>+38.8</td>
<td>+60.0</td>
<td>+9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>+22.8</td>
<td>+77.5</td>
<td>-6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-84</td>
<td>+56.9</td>
<td>+41.1</td>
<td>+14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>+91.1</td>
<td>+32.4</td>
<td>+91.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male, 65+</td>
<td>+35.8</td>
<td>+64.0</td>
<td>+5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>+44.4</td>
<td>+79.1</td>
<td>-6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-84</td>
<td>+55.0</td>
<td>+44.1</td>
<td>+13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>+68.8</td>
<td>+29.9</td>
<td>+92.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female, 65+</td>
<td>+40.8</td>
<td>+57.3</td>
<td>+11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>+21.6</td>
<td>+76.2</td>
<td>-7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-84</td>
<td>+58.0</td>
<td>+39.4</td>
<td>+14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>+101.4</td>
<td>+33.4</td>
<td>+91.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, comparison of the approximately 25-year timespans shows continuing increase to 2000, very rapid growth from 2000 to 2025 as
the postwar babies reach the later years, then a sharp deceleration as the current low birth rates are reflected in a smaller cohort reaching age 65. Significantly, the usually more rapid growth in the number of older women is reversed in the 2000-2025 period. But of even greater note is the fact that between now and 2000 the oldest part of the older population will grow most rapidly, then be reversed between 2000 and 2025 and return to the current trend after 2025 when all rates of growth will be much slower, especially in the "younger" aged.

DEPENDENCY RATIOS

Does the age shift in the population distribution create insurmountable "burdens"? Computation of a gross dependency ratio based on the assumption that the young (under 18) and the old (65+) are dependent on the middle, so-called "productive age" population, tends to show a quite reasonable "burden" on the middle groups under reasonable economic and labor force assumptions, especially in light of the higher ratios in the past, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number under 18 per 100 aged 18-64</th>
<th>Number 65+ per 100 aged 18-64</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>59.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>64.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>81.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>79.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>65.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>63.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>63.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>59.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>67.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>73.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>71.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2050</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>71.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Projections, series II
EXHIBIT A

RECENT STATE TRENDS IN THE OLDER POPULATION, 1970-1980

Between 1970 and 1980, the Nation’s older population (65+) increased from 20 million to 26.5 million and from 9.8 percent to 11.3 percent of the total population. As has been true for most of the 20th century, the older population grew considerably faster in 1970-1980 (2.7.9 percent) than did the under-65 population (9.7 percent). These national trends, however, represent the averaging out of a variety of different State trends. Details and analyses are presented below.

PROPORTION OF THE POPULATION AGED 65+

For the Nation as a whole (50 States and the District of Columbia), the proportion of the total population in the 65+ group rose from 9.8 percent in 1970 to 11.3 percent in 1980. The proportions ranged from lows of 2.9 percent in Alaska and 7.5 percent in Utah to highs of 13.7 percent in Arkansas and 17.3 percent in Florida.

In Wyoming, the only State where the under-65 group grew faster than the 65+, the proportion of older persons dropped from 9.1 percent in 1970 to 8.0 percent in 1980. In 13 States, the increase in the proportion of the State’s aged population was less than one percentage point; in 26 States, it was between one and two percentage points; and in 11 States, the increase was greater than two percentage points.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent Range</th>
<th>States</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17-13</td>
<td>Florida, Arkansas, Idaho, Nebraska, Kansas,</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Massachusetts, Maine, Oklahoma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-13</td>
<td>Iowa, Missouri, South Dakota, South Dakota,</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nebraska, Kansas, Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-11</td>
<td>New York, North Dakota, West Virginia,</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wisconsin, Minnesota, Connecticut, New</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jersey, District of Columbia, Mississippi,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oregon, Vermont</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-10</td>
<td>Alabama, Arizona, Tennessee</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-9</td>
<td>Kentucky, New Hampshire, Illinois, Ohio,</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indiana, Montana, Washington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-8</td>
<td>California, North Carolina, Delaware,</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Idaho, Michigan, Louisiana, Texas, Georgia,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maryland, Virginia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-7</td>
<td>South Carolina, New Mexico, Colorado</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-6</td>
<td>Nevada, Wyoming, Hawaii, Utah</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-5</td>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* National average

** Computed from reports from the 1970 and 1980 census enumerations (42)
DISTRIBUTION AMONG THE STATES

The older population tends to be distributed among the States in the same general pattern as the total population except that there is a slightly greater concentration of older persons in some of the larger States. In the analytical table by State rank order (see last table of this Exhibit), at the points where the States in the total population column and the 65+ population match exactly, the percentages are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States</th>
<th>All ages</th>
<th>Age 65+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of United States</td>
<td>Cumulative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Ohio, Florida</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>51.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina, Massachusetts, Indiana, Georgia, Virginia, Missouri, Wisconsin, Tennessee</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>69.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland, Louisiana, Washington, Minnesota, Alabama, Kentucky</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>80.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina, Connecticut, Oklahoma, Iowa, Colorado, Arizona, Oregon, Mississippi, Kansas, Arkansas</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>92.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>93.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>94.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah, New Mexico, Maine, Hawaii, Rhode Island, Idaho, New Hampshire, Nevada, Montana, South Dakota, North Dakota, District of Columbia</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>99.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>99.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>99.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>99.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANALYSIS OF RESIDENT POPULATION AGED 65+, BY STATE, 1970 AND 1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>1,752</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>1,089</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>96.9</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>1,951</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Carolina</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>1,267</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Carolina</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Corrected for errors in number of centenarians.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Total, all ages (thousands)</th>
<th>Age 65+ (thousands)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>23,669</td>
<td>2,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>17,557</td>
<td>1,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>14,228</td>
<td>1,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>11,887</td>
<td>1,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>11,418</td>
<td>1,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>10,797</td>
<td>1,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>9,740</td>
<td>1,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>9,258</td>
<td>1,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>7,364</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>5,874</td>
<td>727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>5,737</td>
<td>648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>5,490</td>
<td>602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>5,464</td>
<td>585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>5,346</td>
<td>564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>4,917</td>
<td>518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>4,705</td>
<td>517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>4,591</td>
<td>505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>4,216</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>4,204</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>4,130</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>4,077</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>3,850</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>3,661</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>3,119</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>2,108</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>3,025</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>2,913</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>2,889</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>2,718</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>2,633</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>2,521</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>2,363</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>2,286</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>1,950</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>1,570</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>1,461</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>1,125</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>799</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>787</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>District of Columbia</th>
<th>638</th>
<th>99</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Delaware</th>
<th>595</th>
<th>99</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>