

Recipients of Old-Age Assistance: Income and Resources

by CHARLES E. HAWKINS*

Because of the nature of the program, all persons receiving old-age assistance have two characteristics in common. They must be aged 65 or over, and they must be "needy" under the definition of the State from which they receive assistance. Detailed information about the recipients—their requirements, income, resources, and social characteristics—were obtained in a nationwide study conducted in early 1953 by the Bureau of Public Assistance in cooperation with State assistance agencies. The information on their income and resources is summarized in the following pages.

PROBABLY the chief feature that distinguishes State public assistance programs from social insurance programs or from other income-maintenance measures is that, in public assistance, payments are related to an individual's need. Although the determination of each individual's needs and resources involves the use of the often unpopular "means test," this determination represents one of the greatest strengths of public assistance—flexibility to meet quickly changing economic and social situations.

The amount of money needed to purchase a defined level of living is usually determined by a State on the basis of quantity-quality-price standards for specified consumption items. For any person applying for or receiving assistance, there is consideration of the extent to which these items are or can be supplied by his other income and resources, if any.

There are no federally established standards of individual need. The Social Security Act provides for Federal grants-in-aid to States for the assistance of "needy" individuals of specified types—the aged, the blind, the disabled, and children deprived of parental support or care and living with relatives who care for them—but each State defines for itself who is a "needy" person. The level of assistance in each State depends, as the

Act recognizes, on "the conditions in such State." Accordingly, the States differ widely in the types of items that they recognize as necessary and in the amounts established as the costs of these items. Similarly, considerable variation occurs in the limits that States establish on the amounts of property or other resources that an individual may retain and still receive assistance as a needy person.

If public assistance programs are to be administered equitably, the same measure of need must be applied to all persons within a State who are in similar circumstances. To achieve this result, each State establishes uniform standards of quantity and quality for specified consumption items that people require. Uniform costs may be established for use throughout a State, or costs may be varied according to local price differentials. Policies regarding resources and the method by which they shall be taken into account are also established to govern decisions throughout the State.

A State's willingness to support needy persons and its fiscal capacity to do so are reflected in (1) its definition of who is needy in terms of assets that may be retained, (2) the level at which it sets the total cost of the requirements with which an individual's income and resources will be compared, and (3) the amount of money it makes available for assistance. These three factors, in turn, affect the number of persons determined to be needy under the State's standards and the amounts of assistance pay-

ments to them. Many States place, by law or regulation, a maximum on the amount of the assistance payment that may be made after consideration of any income or resources. Such a provision limits the amount of assistance that may be paid to persons whose needs exceed the State's specified maximum on assistance to be paid, but it does not place at a disadvantage those individuals whose need for assistance falls within the maximum. Since some States make exceptions to their maximums to meet the costs of medical care or nursing-home care, assistance needs resulting from specified types of costs are not subject in those States to the usual limits. In the States where available funds are insufficient to meet in full the amount of need that is recognized under the State standards, reductions in assistance payments are usually made on a percentage or other basis.

The objective and equitable determination of whether a person is needy and how much assistance he is to receive is a complex process influenced by many factors, including the person's requirements, income, and resources. Information of this type concerning aged recipients of assistance was obtained in 1953, when each State made a sample study of its aged recipients as part of a nationwide project sponsored by the Bureau of Public Assistance.¹ These data show the extent to which recipients have resources, the amounts and sources other than assistance from which income was received, the total requirements of recipients, and—for certain groups—the detailed items that made up the total requirements. Data on the resources and current income of recipients are summarized and analyzed in this article.

* Mr. Hawkins was formerly on the staff of the Division of Program Statistics and Analysis, Bureau of Public Assistance; he is now Legislative Reference Officer, Office of the Commissioner.

¹ For tabular data by State and highlights from this study see *Recipients of Old-Age Assistance in Early 1953 (Part I—State Data)*, Public Assistance Report No. 26, June 1955.

A later article will analyze the information concerning the requirements of the recipients.

Resources Other Than Current Income

Persons who own their home and who are found to be needy under State assistance programs are usually permitted to retain the home; sometimes the State takes a lien that is enforceable after the recipient's death. In some instances the needy person may have a limited amount of other property that provides some current income, or he may have cash or liquid assets that constitute a reserve for meeting the expenses of his last illness and burial. While the amounts of cash or property other than a home that a recipient may hold and still receive assistance are limited in all States, the limits vary, and the extent to which recipients actually have such resources probably varies even more widely. The possession of such assets is frequently the factor that determines whether aged persons need or qualify for public assistance, and in other instances the income derived from or the essentials

of living provided by such assets affect the amount of assistance needed.

In the study the property holdings of recipients were classified according to type: (1) a home occupied or usually occupied by the recipient; (2) cash or cash equivalents, including practically all types of "liquid" assets; (3) income-producing property, real or personal, including rented land or buildings, small business operations, livestock or poultry raised for sale, produce, and so on; and (4) other real or personal property, such as vacant land, farm equipment, or automobiles that were not being used to produce income. This type of "other" property was reported only when the recipient had none of the first three types. Personal effects, household goods, and burial lots were excluded from the study entirely.

The value of cash and other liquid assets is usually readily ascertainable and is established on a fairly uniform basis from State to State. The bases for determining the values of other types of property holdings vary widely among the States, however, and State data on such values would have limited comparability.

For this reason, data collected on all types of property held by recipients relate only to the fact of possession and do not cover the monetary values of such holdings.

Slightly more than half, 53.3 percent, of all recipients had no property (table 1). Property holdings were less common in urban areas and more common among recipients living on farms or in towns or villages of less than 2,500 population. More than half the recipients in these small towns and villages owned property.

Considerably wider variation was found in the type of property owned. While 28 percent of all recipients owned homes, the percentage was only 12.4 in cities of 100,000 or more but was 45.2 in the towns and villages of less than 2,500 population. In contrast, while about one-sixth of all recipients had some cash or liquid assets, the proportion was one-fourth in metropolitan areas but less than one-tenth for the recipients on farms or in rural-nonfarm areas outside towns. A substantial majority of the homeowners and a majority of the recipients with cash reserves owned only the one type of property. While only 4 percent of all recipients had income-producing property, two-thirds of these recipients owned other types of property as well. About 1 recipient in every 20 owned neither a home, cash or other liquid assets, nor income-producing property but reported real or personal holdings of the fourth type listed—property that was not income-producing.

Property of some type was owned by about the same proportions of male and of female recipients and by only a slightly smaller proportion of nonwhite than of white recipients. Homeownership was more usual for men than for women, while women had cash substantially more often than men. Income-producing property and other real and personal property were more frequently held by nonwhite recipients than by white recipients; in contrast, cash or liquid assets were nearly three times as common among the white recipients. Homeownership tended to decline with advancing age, as did the proportion of recipients with property of any type. Cash and liquid assets, on the other hand, were found some-

Table 1.—Recipients of old-age assistance, by type of property owned and by characteristics, early 1953

Characteristics of recipients	Percent with—					
	No property	Some property				
		Total ¹	Home	Cash or liquid assets	Income-producing property	Other property only ²
All recipients ³	53.3	46.7	28.0	17.7	4.0	5.5
Married couples (2 old-age assistance payments).....	37.0	63.0	47.3	18.7	6.8	5.5
Others.....	60.6	39.4	18.8	17.1	2.7	6.1
Men.....	53.6	46.4	30.8	14.6	4.7	5.4
Women.....	53.0	47.0	26.2	19.8	3.5	5.6
White.....	52.6	47.4	28.3	19.9	4.0	4.6
Nonwhite.....	56.4	45.6	26.9	7.3	4.2	10.0
Metropolitan areas.....	57.1	42.9	16.8	25.3	2.5	5.4
Cities of 100,000 or more.....	59.9	40.1	12.4	25.0	2.2	5.9
Other ⁴	53.1	46.9	23.2	26.2	3.0	4.7
Nonmetropolitan areas.....	50.5	49.5	36.0	12.3	5.0	5.6
Cities of 2,500-49,999.....	55.1	44.9	30.0	16.3	3.0	4.6
Rural-nonfarm.....	47.8	52.2	40.9	12.3	4.9	4.6
Farm.....	48.8	51.2	35.7	8.2	8.8	9.4
Age:						
65-69.....	51.8	48.2	31.0	16.9	4.7	5.2
70-74.....	51.3	48.7	29.9	17.7	4.2	5.8
75 and over.....	55.1	44.9	25.6	18.0	3.6	5.5

¹ Totals do not equal sum of subdivisions because some recipients had more than one kind of property.
² Reported only for those recipients who did not own a home or have cash or income-producing property.

³ For married couples living together, includes income of the recipient and/or spouse.

⁴ Cities of 2,500-99,999 and rural-nonfarm and farm areas.

what more often in the older age groups than in the younger ones.

These findings, on both the sex and the age distributions of recipients with property of particular types, strongly suggest that an owned home is likely to be kept as long as both members of a couple survive and can live there and that it is likely to be sold when only one of the couple is left. An examination of the data on property holdings of married couples receiving assistance gives further support to this presumption. All but about 5 percent of such couples maintain their own households. Nearly two-thirds of the couples who do maintain households own one or more types of property, and fully half of them own their own homes. In contrast, of the nonmarried recipients who maintained their own households, slightly less than half owned any type of property and barely more than one-third owned their homes.

Recipients living elsewhere than in their own households—in the homes of sons or daughters, for example—owned property in smaller proportions than those with their own households. While the difference lay almost entirely in homeownership, the absence of homeownership among the recipients who did not maintain their own households was not compensated in any appreciable degree by an increased frequency of other types of property holding.

Current Income From Sources Other Than Assistance

Income that is received on a monthly or other basis by recipients of assistance is of two general types: (1) money and (2) income in kind—that is, items that are supplied directly in return for the recipient's efforts or as contributions to his support and maintenance, or items that derive from his ownership of property, such as a home. The most important item in this second classification is shelter contributed to recipients or earned by them. Also considered as income in kind are the money values that have been attributed to homeownership and home produce, for example, and such items as medical costs or insurance premiums that are paid in behalf of the recipient by some other person.

About the same proportion of recipients have some income in kind as have cash income from sources other than assistance payments—somewhat fewer than half the married couples receiving two assistance payments and a third or slightly more of the other recipients (table 2). Income in kind is not assigned a money value in all States, but on the basis of information for States that do assign a money value to such income its significance is estimated to be about half that of cash income. It is probably less significant for married couples, more of whom live in their own establishments, and of slightly greater significance for the nonmarried recipients, more of whom live with children or other relatives.

The cash income of recipients is derived from all the sources from which persons ordinarily get money—earnings, retirement benefits, interest or dividends, rentals, contributions in cash from children or other relatives, and so on. Of the married couples with both members receiving

old-age assistance, 43.4 percent had cash income from some source other than assistance payments; the median amount was \$36.81 per couple. Of all other recipients, 33.4 percent had such income, with a median amount of \$28.70.

Of all sources of income other than assistance payments, old-age and survivors insurance was the most important. Approximately half the recipients with cash income had income from old-age and survivors insurance, and the median amounts from this source—\$51.91 for couples and \$32.28 for other recipients—were substantially higher than those from any other source that was identified. Of all cash income received by the married couples, 71 percent was from old-age and survivors insurance benefits. Fifty-four percent of the cash income of the other recipients was derived from such benefits. Of all income other than assistance payments, fully half of that received by the married couples and almost a third of that received by other recipients are esti-

Table 2.—Recipients of old-age assistance, by type of income and by characteristics, early 1953

Characteristics of recipients	Percent with—						Income in kind
	No income other than old-age assistance	Some income other than old-age assistance					
		Total ¹	Cash				
			All sources ¹	Old-age and survivors insurance benefits	Earnings	Contributions from children	
All recipients ²	38.7	61.3	35.6	17.4	7.0	6.5	37.9
Married couples (2 old-age assistance payments).....	31.6	68.4	43.4	21.8	9.4	7.1	43.1
Others.....	40.7	59.3	33.4	16.1	6.3	6.3	36.4
Men.....	35.4	64.6	43.2	23.9	10.6	5.1	36.4
Women.....	41.0	59.0	30.5	12.9	4.5	7.4	38.9
White.....	40.3	59.7	35.2	18.8	4.7	6.8	35.5
Nonwhite.....	31.3	68.7	37.5	10.7	17.7	4.7	49.1
Metropolitan areas.....	43.9	56.1	39.4	25.0	3.5	7.7	24.5
Cities of 100,000 or more.....	45.7	54.3	40.8	26.9	3.2	7.3	19.9
Other ³	41.2	58.8	37.4	22.2	3.9	8.4	31.2
Nonmetropolitan areas.....	35.1	64.9	33.0	12.0	9.4	5.0	47.4
Cities of 2,500-49,999.....	40.7	59.3	35.0	18.8	6.4	6.3	35.9
Rural-nonfarm.....	38.5	61.5	29.7	10.2	8.1	5.5	45.6
Farm.....	18.3	81.7	36.2	4.2	17.3	4.5	70.5
Age:							
65-69.....	30.2	69.8	48.0	28.1	11.1	5.2	37.7
70-74.....	34.7	65.3	41.3	22.2	8.8	6.3	38.2
75-79.....	42.5	57.5	30.9	14.1	5.0	6.5	37.4
80 and over.....	47.3	52.7	22.6	5.2	2.9	7.7	38.3

¹ Totals do not equal sum of subdivisions because some recipients had more than one kind of income and because data for other sources of cash income are not shown.

² For married couples living together, includes income of the recipient and/or spouse.

³ Cities of 2,500-99,999 and rural-nonfarm and farm areas.

mated to have come from old-age and survivors insurance benefits.

Cash contributions from children ranked second among the identified sources of cash income but for the married couples accounted for only about one-tenth as many dollars as did old-age and survivors insurance benefits and for the other recipients about one-sixth as many. Such contributions were received by 7.1 percent of the married couples and had a median value of \$16.04. For the 6.3 percent of the other recipients who received such contributions, their median value was \$13.92.

Earnings, the last and smallest of the identified sources of cash income, were somewhat more widespread but were considerably smaller among the married couples than were cash contributions from children. Among the other recipients, earnings were received by about the same number that received cash contributions, and—while the median amount of earnings was smaller than the median amount of contributions—the two amounts were not far apart. Among the 9.4 percent of the couples that had earnings, either one or both members might be working, but the median earnings of \$10.23 a month clearly indicate that the average extent of employment was small. Similarly, the median amount of \$12.38 for the 6.3 percent of the other recipients with earnings shows that most of them did not have regular jobs. A few recipients, of course, had more substantial earnings; 0.2 percent of the married couples and 0.3 percent of the other recipients had \$50 or more monthly from this source.

Cash income from sources other than those identified made up about one-sixth of the total (excluding assistance payments) for the couples and somewhat more than one-fourth of the total for other recipients. It is reasonable to suppose that amounts received for rental of rooms and small amounts of interest on liquid assets contributed substantially to income of this type.

The recipients' possession of any income other than assistance, the amount of such income, and the source of income all varied with the social characteristics of the recipients.

Recipients with a spouse who was also receiving old-age assistance were more likely to have income from some source other than assistance. Nearly 70 percent of the married couples had other income in cash or kind from some source, compared with slightly less than 60 percent of the other recipients. Relatively more married couples had income in kind, and relatively more also had cash income. They were also more often recipients of cash income from each of the three major sources that were identified—old-age and survivors insurance benefits, earnings, and contributions from children.

The proportion of recipients with other income tended to decline for the older recipients. Of the recipients aged 65-69 who were married to another recipient of old-age assistance, fully three-fourths had income from some source other than public assistance, but fewer than 60 percent of the couples aged 80 and over had other income. Among the other recipients, income other than assistance was received by somewhat fewer than 70 percent of those aged 65-69 and by slightly more than half of those aged 80 and over.

Income from old-age and survivors insurance benefits and from earnings declined most sharply with increasing age. Income in kind showed relatively little change, and contributions from children were received more frequently by the older recipients than by the recipients in the younger age groups.

Relatively more of the men than of the women receiving assistance had other income; the difference was attributable to the substantially more frequent receipt of old-age and survivors insurance benefits and of earnings by the men. Women apparently had other types of income slightly more often than the men.

Nonwhite recipients had income other than the assistance payment more frequently than white recipients. The reason was the substantially greater proportions of the nonwhite group with earnings and with income in kind. The larger proportions of nonwhite recipients with income from these sources more than offset the smaller proportions receiving old-age and survivors insurance

benefits and contributions from children.

Recipients in cities had other income less often than rural recipients, but the difference is attributable to the more frequent receipt of income in kind in the rural areas. In contrast, the proportion of recipients with cash income was about one-fifth higher in metropolitan areas than elsewhere. The proportion of metropolitan recipients who were receiving old-age and survivors insurance benefits was more than twice that for all other recipients; it was six times that for recipients living on farms. Contributions from children were received somewhat more often by the metropolitan recipients than by those living in nonmetropolitan areas. Earnings, like income in kind, were more usual for recipients living in rural areas and most frequent for those living on farms.

Summary

Some type of property other than household goods or personal effects was owned by almost half the aged persons receiving old-age assistance in early 1953. Homes were the most common type of property held by persons receiving assistance and were most likely to be owned by married couples and by recipients living in small towns and rural areas. Cash or liquid assets were more usual for urban recipients. Nonwhite recipients less frequently owned homes or had cash than did white recipients but more often had income-producing property or other types of property.

Some income other than assistance payments was received by a majority of the recipients. About equal numbers received income in cash and income in kind, but the income in cash was estimated to have about twice the dollar value of income in kind. Recipients with some cash income were more frequently found among those who were married, younger, urban residents, men, and nonwhite persons. The most important source of cash income was old-age and survivors insurance; these benefits were more often received by recipients under age 75, by men and by married women, and by recipients living in urban places. Earnings were more

(Continued on page 27)

Table 12.—Aid to dependent children: Recipients and payments to recipients, by State, January 1956¹

[Includes vendor payments for medical care and cases receiving only such payments]

State	Number of families	Number of recipients		Payments to recipients			Percentage change from—			
		Total ²	Children	Total amount	Average per—		December 1955 in—		January 1955 in—	
					Family	Recipient	Number of families	Amount	Number of families	Amount
Total.....	605,674	2,205,913	1,670,728	\$53,470,912	\$88.28	\$24.24	+0.5	+0.1	-0.8	+2.2
Alabama.....	19,175	74,550	57,429	786,966	41.04	10.56	+ .7	+1.3	+12.5	+7.6
Alaska.....	1,359	4,731	3,486	137,644	101.28	29.09	+2.0	+2.1	+15.8	+60.2
Arizona.....	4,609	17,808	13,498	416,053	90.27	23.36	+ .5	+ .3	+4.7	+5.3
Arkansas.....	7,500	28,162	21,797	415,734	55.43	14.76	+4.5	+5.2	-8.6	-7.1
California.....	52,624	179,540	137,780	6,571,212	124.87	36.60	+ .6	-2.0	-4.2	-4.4
Colorado.....	5,806	22,031	16,967	636,492	109.63	28.89	+ .8	+ .9	-1.6	+11.3
Connecticut.....	5,326	17,240	12,822	708,417	133.01	41.09	- .6	-2.3	+10.4	+8.2
Delaware.....	1,153	4,480	3,444	96,312	83.53	21.50	+3.9	+2.5	+13.3	+9.6
District of Columbia.....	2,050	8,730	6,817	224,258	109.39	25.69	- .7	- .4	-15.8	-12.7
Florida.....	21,323	75,608	57,684	1,171,968	54.96	15.50	- .1	- .1	+2.2	+3.0
Georgia.....	14,859	54,564	41,690	1,125,514	75.75	20.63	+1.0	+1.1	+2.3	+3.4
Hawaii.....	3,253	12,316	9,751	287,374	88.34	23.33	- .9	-6.0	+2.1	- .4
Idaho.....	1,832	6,650	4,900	236,221	128.94	35.52	+ .2	- .2	-2.9	+ .2
Illinois.....	21,953	85,486	64,810	2,961,347	134.89	34.64	+ .9	+1.4	+7.3	+10.2
Indiana.....	8,687	30,645	22,755	790,421	90.99	25.79	+ .8	+ .5	+1.4	+1.5
Iowa.....	6,621	23,899	17,844	726,102	109.67	30.38	+1.0	+1.1	+1.8	-1.0
Kansas.....	4,557	16,720	12,885	510,951	112.12	30.56	+ .8	+ .6	+4.5	+5.5
Kentucky.....	18,709	67,621	50,637	1,191,968	63.71	17.63	+ .1	(³)	+ .1	+1.6
Louisiana.....	19,138	74,937	57,149	1,378,806	72.05	18.40	+ .5	+ .9	+7.6	+20.3
Maine.....	4,443	15,361	11,094	377,098	84.87	24.55	+ .4	+ .4	+1.3	+5.3
Maryland.....	6,259	25,606	19,906	606,895	96.96	23.70	+ .4	+ .9	-1.7	- .2
Massachusetts.....	12,673	42,528	31,522	1,641,626	129.54	38.60	- .1	+ .6	- .8	+2.0
Michigan.....	18,915	65,101	47,453	2,165,818	114.50	33.27	- .5	- .4	-5.4	-1.4
Minnesota.....	7,963	26,999	20,747	1,000,293	125.62	37.05	+ .7	+2.3	+3.6	+9.1
Mississippi.....	11,713	43,459	33,661	323,787	27.64	7.45	-1.1	-1.2	-26.2	-22.1
Missouri.....	20,530	72,663	54,064	1,398,479	68.12	19.25	+ .4	+ .7	-5.0	-4.0
Montana.....	2,094	7,424	5,641	224,371	107.15	30.22	+1.2	+2.1	-1.7	+1.8
Nebraska.....	2,623	9,661	7,264	258,707	98.63	26.78	+ .7	+ .8	+2.7	+8.5
Nevada.....	339	1,195	902	29,913	88.24	25.03	+7.3	+11.2	(⁴)	(⁴)
New Hampshire.....	1,019	3,789	2,855	134,740	132.23	35.56	+ .6	(⁵)	-2.5	(⁵) - .3
New Jersey.....	6,308	21,122	15,993	763,752	121.08	36.16	(⁶)	+1.1	+11.5	+16.1
New Mexico.....	6,020	22,380	17,093	471,716	78.36	21.08	+ .3	+ .5	-12.3	-6.7
New York.....	54,131	196,418	144,319	7,608,100	140.55	38.73	+ .8	-1.2	+2.3	+6.1
North Carolina.....	19,403	74,396	57,037	1,207,063	62.21	16.22	+1.0	+1.1	+1.4	+2.4
North Dakota.....	1,549	5,666	4,337	1,186,849	120.63	32.98	+2.0	+3.9	+5.6	+8.0
Ohio.....	16,451	62,499	47,483	1,502,216	91.31	24.04	+1.7	+ .4	+10.9	+9.0
Oklahoma.....	15,556	50,613	38,721	1,218,830	78.35	24.08	- .2	+ .2	+1.4	+5.8
Oregon.....	3,517	12,572	9,520	428,094	121.72	34.05	+1.3	+1.2	-8.9	-10.7
Pennsylvania.....	29,051	111,063	84,106	3,091,045	108.40	27.83	+1.1	+1.9	-1.7	- .6
Puerto Rico.....	41,245	143,887	110,366	430,368	10.43	2.99	(⁵)	- .5	-1.5	+1.0
Rhode Island.....	3,410	11,805	8,712	392,213	115.02	33.22	+1.0	+3.4	+ .9	+3.9
South Carolina.....	8,184	31,771	24,797	389,047	47.54	12.25	+ .5	+ .3	+ .7	+1.5
South Dakota.....	2,776	9,276	7,064	227,840	82.07	24.56	+1.2	+1.4	-1.9	-1.4
Tennessee.....	19,730	71,054	53,060	1,189,245	60.28	16.74	- .8	- .8	-9.0	-7.9
Texas.....	20,892	84,120	63,600	1,224,888	58.63	14.56	- .1	+ .6	-6.1	-8.0
Utah.....	2,925	10,268	7,533	323,697	112.34	32.00	0	-1.0	-7.1	-7.4
Vermont.....	1,090	3,789	2,846	87,613	80.38	23.12	+ .9	+1.1	+ .3	+3.3
Virgin Islands.....	217	828	678	7,631	35.17	9.22	+ .5	+1.1	+17.9	+74.9
Virginia.....	8,916	34,803	26,953	590,667	66.25	16.97	+1.0	+1.6	+1.9	+2.5
Washington.....	8,918	30,685	22,565	1,072,763	120.29	34.96	+1.7	+1.4	+ .3	+16.4
West Virginia.....	17,610	66,821	52,008	1,298,043	73.71	19.43	- .2	- .1	-6.5	-5.5
Wisconsin.....	8,067	28,398	21,021	1,152,412	142.86	40.58	+ .3	+1.3	- .8	+4.9
Wyoming.....	603	2,175	1,662	66,443	110.19	30.55	+2.9	+2.6	+11.0	+13.3

¹ For definition of terms see the *Bulletin*, January 1953, p. 16. All data subject to revision.

² Includes as recipients the children and 1 parent or other adult relative in families in which the requirements of at least 1 such adult were considered in determining the amount of assistance.

³ Increase of less than 0.05 percent.

⁴ Not computed; July 1955 first month of operation under approved plan.

⁵ Decrease of less than 0.05 percent.

⁶ In addition to these payments from aid to dependent children funds, supplemental payments of \$143,510 from general assistance funds were made to 3,903 families.

⁷ Based on data excluding vendor payments for medical care for January 1955

OAA RECIPIENTS

(Continued from page 6)

frequent in rural areas and among younger and nonwhite recipients.

Average earnings were small in amount. Cash contributions from children were more often received by older, married recipients and those

living in urban places. Income in kind went to more of the married recipients, women, rural residents, and nonwhite persons.