

Homeownership and Financial Assets: Findings From the 1968 Survey of the Aged

by JANET MURRAY*

Equity in the owned home and holdings of financial assets are the two major forms of savings held by those aged 65 and over, according to the 1968 Survey of the Aged. More than three-fourths of the married couples studied and more than a third of the nonmarried persons owned homes, mostly free of mortgage. Ownership was widely diffused among the socioeconomic groups studied, but the amount of equity varied with income to a greater extent than with the rate of owned homes. Although many had some financial assets, more than half the married couples reported amounts of \$1,800 or less and for about half the nonmarried persons the amount was as low as \$250 or less. Median amounts held by various socioeconomic groups were usually related closely to the median income of the group. Half the aged units who reported some income from assets had amounts of only \$250 or less.

SAVING for old age—or a “rainy day”—has been a traditional family goal, particularly during the late middle years when earnings reach their peak and when children have grown and either left home or become earners themselves. To what extent has this goal, if indeed it has operated, been achieved by those who have reached “old age?”

Half the married couples and nonmarried persons aged 65 and over reported some income from assets in 1967—more of the former than of the latter. Only income in the form of retirement benefits—mostly OASDHI—was reported more frequently than assets. Many of those reporting income from assets, however, had only small amounts, and the proportion of aggregate income from this source was smaller than that from benefits and earnings.

This information on the income of the aged is from the 1968 Survey of the Demographic and Economic Characteristics of the Aged (DECA), which was based on supplemental questions asked in the monthly Current Medicare Survey

(CMS). The DECA questions were asked of two CMS samples—the outgoing 1967 panel and the new 1968 panel. The reference period for the questions was the calendar year 1967. The sample consisted of 9,128 persons, of whom 8,248 were interviewed. The survey design, estimation techniques, reliability of the estimates, and nonsampling errors are described in the Technical Note in an earlier BULLETIN article on the survey findings.¹

Respondents in this survey were also asked the amount of their holdings of various financial assets, defined to include money in banks or credit unions or left with insurance companies or other institutions, United States Government savings bonds, stocks and bonds, and personal loans and mortgages. Half the married couples who reported on such assets had amounts less than \$2,000; two-thirds of the nonmarried persons had less than \$1,500. Clearly, a majority of the elderly could not have counted on much income from such savings.

About three-fourths of married couples but a smaller proportion of nonmarried men and women reported having assets of another type—equity in their homes. Homes and various durable goods—such as automobiles, household equipment, and house furnishings—may be included among family assets, although they yield services and satisfactions directly rather than the money income provided by most financial assets. Sometimes an “imputed” income from equity in the owned home is estimated and added to money income; less frequently such estimates are made

¹ Lenore E. Bixby, “Income of People Aged 65 and Older: Overview From the 1968 Survey of the Aged,” *Social Security Bulletin*, April 1970; see tables 2 and 3 in that article for data on income sources and income shares.

Other *Bulletin* articles on the findings of this survey are Patience Lauriat, “Benefit Levels and Socio-economic Characteristics,” August 1970; Walter Kolodrubetz, “Private and Public Retirement Pensions,” September 1970; Janet Murray, “Living Arrangements of People Aged 65 and Older,” September 1971.

* Division of Retirement and Survivors Studies, Office of Research and Statistics.

for other durable goods. In this study no such estimates have been made.

The net worth of individual units sometimes obtained by combining the home equity and financial and other assets and subtracting debts could not be computed in this study because no questions were asked on the value of business and farm assets, equity in rental property, and debts other than property debt. In any case, equity in the family home is generally better reported than the value of other assets.²

This article deals first with the extent of ownership and the amount of equity in the home and then with financial asset holdings. Data on the financial assets of homeowners and nonowners provide a link between the two analyses.³

Information on both home equity and financial assets is given for married couples and for non-married men and women classified in various ways—by beneficiary status, by age, by race, and by living arrangements. In addition to these familiar groups, the financial assets of the aged with different types and combinations of retirement benefits are examined as well as the assets of beneficiaries and nonbeneficiaries who did and did not work in 1967.

The assets held by the various groups of the aged are often found to be related to their level of income. The relationship between assets and income may be seen more directly when the aged units at various income levels are distributed by the amounts of their home equity and by financial assets. For discussion purposes, however, a more convenient way of summarizing the income effect

lies in comparing those classified as “poor” and “not poor,” on the basis of income thresholds developed by the Social Security Administration, and those with incomes below and above the moderate income level as defined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.⁴ The assets of beneficiaries with benefits based on primary insurance amounts at the minimum and higher levels are also examined.

EQUITY IN THE OWNED HOME

In the United States, homeownership is generally preferred to renting: 63 percent of all occupied housing units were occupied by owners in 1970. The practice varies somewhat with location. Homeownership rates are higher in the North Central region and the South than in the Northeast and West and in rural areas than in urban areas. Similar regional variations in homeownership occur among the aged, according to the survey data.

Homeownership rates among those aged 65 and over in 1967 were particularly high for the married couples: 77 percent owned their homes, compared with 37 percent of the nonmarried (table 1). A relatively large proportion of the elderly owned their homes free of mortgage; more than four-fifths of the homeowners did so (table 2).⁵

Some differences in homeownership rates appear when the aged are classified by such demographic factors as age, race, living arrangements, and beneficiary status. Higher homeownership rates are evident for the younger age groups, the white units, and those not living with rela-

² See *The Aged Population of the United States: The 1963 Social Security Survey of the Aged*, Social Security Administration Research Report No. 19, 1966, pages 211-213. Data from that survey and from the Federal Reserve Board's *Survey of Financial Characteristics of Consumers* (1966) showed comparable reporting on home equity, but holdings of marketable securities and other assets appeared to be considerably understated in the Survey of the Aged. Examination of the 1963 and 1968 survey data on home equity and financial assets indicates that financial assets have continued to be underreported in comparison with home equity. See Lenore E. Bixby, *op. cit.*, for an adjustment in the estimated share of aggregate income from assets from 15 percent to 25 percent, based on information from Internal Revenue Service administrative records.

³ The institutional population, comprising 8 percent of the nonmarried persons, were not asked questions on homeownership but were asked about their financial and other assets. In this article, for the most part, they have been considered as nonowners.

⁴ For background on the poverty index, see Mollie Orshansky, “Counting the Poor” and “Who's Who Among the Poor,” *Social Security Bulletin*, January and July 1965; for recent revisions, see the Bureau of the Census, *Current Population Reports: Consumer Income*, Series P-60, No. 76, 1970. For background on the “moderate” levels see Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Retired Couple's Budget for a Moderate Living Standard* (Bulletin No. 1570-4), 1968. In 1967, the threshold levels for the aged poor and not poor and for the “moderate” level were \$2,020 and \$3,930 for the married couples, \$1,615 and \$2,190 for the nonmarried men, and \$1,595 and \$2,140 for the women.

⁵ In 1960, 43 percent of owner-occupied nonfarm dwelling units were not mortgaged. See *Statistical Abstract of the United States*, 1971, table 1118, see also tables 1109, 1110, and 1116 for regional and farm-nonfarm comparisons.

tives as indicated by the tabulation that follows.

Characteristics of aged units	Percent homeowners	
	Married couples	Non-married persons
Aged 65-72.....	78	41
73 and over.....	75	35
White.....	77	38
Negro.....	67	32
Living with relatives.....	75	32
Not living with relatives ¹	77	40
Beneficiaries ²	77	39
Nonbeneficiaries.....	79	35

¹ Assumes institutional population were nonowners

² Excludes beneficiaries who received their first benefit February 1976 or later, the transitionally insured, and special age-72 beneficiaries.

The value of the equity in the home was obtained by asking for the respondent's estimate of how much the property would sell for on the current market (spring 1968) and deducting the amounts owed in the form of mortgages on the property or any other debt, such as back taxes or unpaid amounts of home-improvement loans. About 89 percent of the married couples who were owners and 83 percent of the nonmarried were able to provide this information.

The median reported value of equity in the home was \$12,000 for married couples and \$10,000 for nonmarried men and women. For 45-50 percent of the aged units the value was between \$5,000 and \$15,000, and for 10-15 percent it was \$25,000 or more.

These comparisons suggest no significant age differences. Those living alone tend to have homes of somewhat higher value than do those with relatives, but the major differences appear to be income-related. The value of the home equity was much greater for the white aged units, for example, than it was for the Negro.

The direct relationship between income and homeownership status is clear from table 2, which gives the income distribution of owners, with and without a mortgage, and of nonowners, and from table 3, which presents the distribution of homeowners at each income level by the amount of equity in the home.

The median incomes of the owners, particularly of those not yet free of mortgage debt (often those in the younger age group) were consistently greater than the medians of the nonowners (table 2). Thus, the median income of the married couples who still had to make

payments on their homes was \$3,840 compared with \$3,011 for the nonowners. As indicated above, by the time that owners reach age 65 or over most of them have completely paid off the mortgage.

In general, fewer at the higher than at the lower income levels were free of mortgage—a reflection of the interaction of age and income and also perhaps a greater propensity of those with higher incomes to move into new homes upon retirement. As expected, the proportion who are homeowners and the median value of the home both rise with the level of money income (table 3).

A summary of the income effect is obtained by comparing the data for those classified as "poor" and "not poor" with those with incomes below and above the BLS moderate budget level (table 4).

These data show that there were fewer homeowners among the poor than among those not poor or among those with incomes above the moderate levels and that the median value of the equity in the home for the poor was about half that of the higher income groups. These expected relationships, however, are not, perhaps, the most revealing aspect of these figures. The relative importance of the owned home to those at the lower income levels is clearly evident: For the married couples classified as poor, the proportion who were homeowners was 71 percent—only 7 percentage points below the proportion of homeowners among those not poor; and 32 percent of the nonmarried poor were homeowners, compared with 44 percent of those not poor.

To be sure, most of the poor had modest homes. At any rate, half of them had an equity of only \$6,000-\$7,000. Yet, nearly a fifth of the poor homeowners reported an equity of \$15,000 or more. This group (about 7 percent of all aged units with very low incomes) may have had at one time incomes substantially above their present levels.

The higher income groups not only have higher equity in their homes but also carry a larger amount of debt (table 5). The median amount of the property debt of the married couples classified as poor was \$3,000; for those with incomes above the moderate level, it was \$5,000. The corresponding medians for the nonmarried were \$2,000 and \$4,900. Most of the homeowners—both poor and nonpoor—reported zero amounts, how-

ever, and the average indebtedness reported by all homeowners was therefore less than \$1,000.

Though this indebtedness does not seem great in the aggregate, it may be pointed out that debt of \$5,000 or more was reported by more than a third of the married couples and nearly a fifth of the nonmarried homeowners who had debt and who were classified as poor. These aged units, however, comprised only about 1 percent of the total aged population classified as poor.

Those concerned with the social security pro-

gram need information on the economic resources of social security beneficiaries receiving the minimum level, compared with those beneficiaries with larger benefits. An earlier survey report⁶ examines the size and sources of income of beneficiaries in the DECA sample, grouped by primary insurance amounts (PIA—the benefit amount based on the worker's average monthly earnings that would be payable to a retired

⁶ Patience Lauriat, *op. cit.*

TABLE 1.—Amount of equity in the home: Number of homeowners, and percentage distribution of aged units by amount of equity in the home, by beneficiary status, age, race, and living arrangements, 1967

Amount of home equity	All	Beneficiary status		Age		Race		Living arrangements				
		Beneficiaries ¹	Non-beneficiaries	65-72	73 and over	White	Negro	With relatives ²			No relatives	
								Total	Children	Grandchildren	Total	Alone
All units												
Number (in thousands)												
Total	15,779	12,446	2,146	7,567	8,212	14,526	1,205	4,852	3,474	1,368	10,926	9,580
Homeowners ³	8,234	6,673	1,061	4,458	3,776	7,693	522	2,024	1,469	442	6,210	5,990
Percent of total ⁴	52	54	49	59	46	53	43	42	42	32	57	63
Reporting home equity ⁴	7,102	5,812	879	3,909	3,193	6,643	439	1,705	1,245	383	5,397	5,212
Percent of units	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Less than \$5,000	15	15	15	14	16	13	47	20	19	28	14	14
5,000-9,999	25	25	26	25	26	25	33	27	27	28	25	24
10,000-14,999	23	24	21	23	24	24	12	20	20	19	24	24
15,000-19,999	16	16	15	16	16	17	4	13	14	13	16	16
20,000-24,999	8	8	7	9	6	8	2	8	8	4	8	8
25,000 or more	13	12	16	14	12	14	2	12	12	8	13	13
Median equity ⁵	\$11,000	\$11,000	\$11,000	\$12,000	\$10,000	\$12,000	\$5,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$8,000	\$12,000	\$12,000
Married couples												
Number (in thousands)												
Total	5,989	4,913	720	3,666	2,323	5,584	386	1,133	874	265	4,858	4,763
Homeowners ³	4,508	3,761	565	2,866	1,732	4,327	259	845	687	185	3,754	3,696
Percent of total ⁴	77	77	79	78	75	77	67	75	75	70	77	78
Reporting home equity ⁴	4,086	3,358	495	2,542	1,544	3,855	218	753	584	160	3,333	3,282
Percent of units	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Less than \$5,000	13	13	11	13	13	11	46	18	17	29	12	12
5,000-9,999	24	25	21	23	26	24	36	26	25	33	24	24
10,000-14,999	24	24	22	23	25	24	10	20	21	22	24	24
15,000-19,999	16	16	14	16	15	16	4	14	14	7	16	16
20,000-24,999	8	8	11	9	8	9	2	7	8	1	9	9
25,000 or more	15	14	21	16	13	16	1	14	15	8	15	15
Median equity ⁵	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$11,000	\$12,000	\$5,000	\$10,000	\$10,500	\$6,800	\$12,000	\$12,000
Nonmarried persons												
Number (in thousands)												
Total	9,789	7,533	1,426	3,901	5,888	8,943	818	3,719	2,600	1,103	6,071	4,818
Homeowners ³	3,635	2,912	496	1,592	2,044	3,366	263	1,179	802	257	2,456	2,295
Percent of total ⁴	37	39	35	41	35	38	32	32	31	23	40	48
Reporting home equity ⁴	3,016	2,455	384	1,367	1,649	2,788	221	952	661	223	2,064	1,929
Percent of units	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Less than \$5,000	18	18	19	17	19	15	50	21	21	28	17	17
5,000-9,999	26	26	32	25	25	26	29	28	28	24	20	26
10,000-14,999	23	23	20	22	24	24	14	20	18	17	24	24
15,000-19,999	16	16	15	15	16	17	4	13	15	17	17	17
20,000-24,999	7	7	3	8	5	7	2	8	9	7	6	6
25,000 or more	10	9	11	9	11	11	2	10	9	7	10	10
Median equity ⁵	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$9,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$4,500	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$9,000	\$10,000	\$10,000

See footnotes at end of table

worker who begins to receive benefits at age 65 or later). A direct correlation between PIA level and total money income was found. Table 6 shows the extent of homeownership and the amount of home equity by PIA levels for married couples and for the nonmarried.

Among the married couples, homeownership rates appear to be unrelated to benefit levels: There were as many homeowners with minimum benefits as with higher benefits. Among the nonmarried, homeownership rates tended somewhat to be greater at the highest than at the lowest benefit levels. Though the proportion of homeowners appeared to be about the same at high and low benefit levels, the median amount of home equity tended to increase fairly consis-

tently with the level. The proportion of homeowners was greater among widow beneficiaries than among retired workers, nonmarried men, or nonmarried women, but the median amount of home equity did not differ significantly.

FINANCIAL ASSETS

Respondents were asked whether they had money in banks or credit unions or left with insurance companies or other institutions and how much such holdings amounted to. They were also asked the amounts in U.S. Government savings bonds, stocks and bonds, and personal loans and mortgages.

(In addition to the questions on financial assets,

TABLE 1.—Amount of equity in the home: Number of homeowners, and percentage distribution of aged units by amount of equity in the home, by beneficiary status, age, race, and living arrangements, 1967—Continued

Amount of home equity	All	Beneficiary status		Age		Race		Living arrangements				
		Beneficiaries ¹	Non-beneficiaries	65-72	73 and over	White	Negro	With relatives ²			No relatives	
								Total	Children	Grandchildren	Total	Alone
Nonmarried men												
Number (in thousands):												
Total.....	2,356	1,928	302	944	1,411	2,090	251	784	489	257	1,571	1,189
Homeowners ³	821	669	124	308	513	752	66	262	166	87	559	528
Percent of total ⁴	35	35	41	33	36	36	26	33	34	26	36	44
Reporting home equity ⁴	711	586	105	270	441	650	69	227	148	58	484	457
Percent of units.....	100	100	100	100	100	100	(*)	100	100	(*)	100	100
Less than \$5,000.....	21	22	23	21	21	18	(*)	26	27	(*)	19	20
5,000-9,999.....	24	24	24	26	22	23	(*)	24	26	(*)	24	24
10,000-14,999.....	22	23	18	21	23	23	(*)	18	12	(*)	24	22
15,000-19,999.....	16	15	28	15	18	18	(*)	15	18	(*)	17	17
20,000-24,999.....	6	6	2	6	6	6	(*)	8	8	(*)	5	5
25,000 or more.....	11	11	4	10	11	12	(*)	9	9	(*)	11	12
Median equity ⁵	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	(*)	\$9,922	\$9,000	(*)	\$10,000	\$10,000
Nonmarried women												
Number (in thousands):												
Total.....	7,434	5,605	1,125	2,957	4,477	6,852	567	2,934	2,112	846	4,499	3,628
Homeowners ³	2,814	2,243	372	1,283	1,531	2,614	197	917	636	190	1,897	1,766
Percent of total ⁴	38	40	33	43	34	38	35	31	30	22	42	49
Reporting home equity ⁴	2,305	1,869	279	1,096	1,208	2,138	163	724	514	165	1,580	1,472
Percent of units.....	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Less than \$5,000.....	17	17	17	16	18	15	46	19	19	29	16	16
5,000-9,999.....	27	26	35	28	26	27	29	29	29	25	26	26
10,000-14,999.....	23	24	21	23	24	24	16	21	20	19	25	24
15,000-19,999.....	16	16	10	15	16	17	4	12	14	16	17	18
20,000-24,999.....	7	8	4	9	5	7	3	9	9	6	6	6
25,000 or more.....	10	9	13	9	10	10	2	10	9	6	10	10
Median equity ⁵	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$8,500	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$5,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$9,000	\$10,000	\$10,000

¹ Excludes beneficiaries who received their first benefit February 1967 or later, the transitionally insured, and special "age-72" beneficiaries

² Units were counted in each category where children or grandchildren were present but only once in the total. Total also includes units with no children or grandchildren present but with other relatives (parents, siblings)

³ The institutional population was not asked questions on homeownership; the survey data therefore actually represent homeowners in the noninstitutional population, since there may be few homeowners in the noninstitutional population, the percentages shown are assumed to be the better estimate for the total population. For the nonmarried, the percentages are

a few points lower than those based on the information for the noninstitutional population, which would be more nearly comparable with the data from the 1963 Survey of the Aged.

⁴ Farm homes were not explicitly excluded from questions on home equity, but most of those reporting on home equity are believed to have been urban homeowners.

⁵ Assets were often reported in round numbers and considerable clustering thus occurred around even values in the hundreds or thousands, when the computer identified the median respondent, his response tended to be in such a cluster.

⁶ Not shown where base is less than 100,000.

the respondents were asked if they had other assets and what were the amounts held. About 94 percent of the units answered this question, and most of them reported that they had no such assets—95 percent of the married couples and nearly 98 percent of the nonmarried. In general, the additional assets reported were real

TABLE 2.—Income and homeownership: Percentage distribution of aged units by income, by home tenure, and percentage of homeowners free of mortgage, 1967

Total money income	Homeowners			Non-homeowners	Percent of homeowners mortgage free
	Total	Home not mortgaged	Home mortgaged		
All units					
Number (in thousands):					
Total	8,234	6,567	1,397	6,571	82
Reporting on income	6,203	4,934	1,146	5,382	81
Percent of units	100	100	100	100	
Less than \$1,000	12	13	8	28	88
1,000-1,499	16	17	11	23	87
1,500-1,999	13	13	11	16	84
2,000-2,499	11	11	12	11	79
2,500-2,999	8	8	10	5	78
3,000-3,499	7	7	8	4	80
3,500-3,999	6	6	7	2	79
4,000-4,999	8	8	8	4	81
5,000-7,499	10	10	12	4	77
7,500-9,999	4	4	8	2	67
10,000-14,999	2	2	4	1	69
15,000 or more	2	1	(¹)	(²)	
Median income	\$2,404	\$2,289	\$2,928	\$1,480	
Married couples					
Number (in thousands):					
Total	4,598	3,522	932	1,366	79
Reporting on income	3,352	2,549	747	1,053	77
Percent of units	100	100	100	100	
Less than \$1,000	3	3	3	4	(²)
1,000-1,499	6	6	5	7	82
1,500-1,999	10	11	6	14	86
2,000-2,499	11	11	11	14	77
2,500-2,999	10	10	11	10	78
3,000-3,499	9	9	10	12	77
3,500-3,999	9	9	8	8	78
4,000-4,999	12	12	10	9	80
5,000-7,499	16	15	17	13	75
7,500-9,999	7	7	10	6	69
10,000-14,999	4	3	6	2	66
15,000 or more	2	2	3	1	(²)
Median income	\$3,508	\$3,434	\$3,940	\$3,011	
Nonmarried persons					
Number (in thousands):					
Total	3,635	3,045	466	5,216	86
Reporting on income	2,851	2,384	399	4,329	86
Percent of units	100	100	100	100	
Less than \$1,000	23	24	17	34	89
1,000-1,499	27	28	21	27	89
1,500-1,999	16	16	19	18	83
2,000-2,499	11	10	14	10	81
2,500-2,999	6	6	10	4	78
3,000-3,499	5	5	4	2	89
3,500-3,999	3	3	3	1	(²)
4,000-4,999	3	3	4	2	(²)
5,000-7,499	3	3	3	2	(²)
7,500-9,999	1	1	4	1	(²)
10,000-14,999	1	1	2	(¹)	(²)
15,000 or more	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	(²)
Median income	\$1,474	\$1,445	\$1,792	\$1,260	

See footnotes at end of table.

estate or investments in business but some non-income-producing assets were listed—for example, valuable art collections. Although less than 5 percent of the units reported such items, the amounts were often relatively large.)

Types of Assets

Most of the respondents (97 percent) answered "yes" or "no" to the questions about money in a specified type of institution or in a specified form. When the respondents were asked "Altogether, how much do you (and your spouse) have in these places?" only 76 percent gave an amount or any answer to this and to the same question on the value of U.S. savings bonds, or stocks, bonds, or shares in mutual funds and on personal loans to others or mortgages held. The proportions of the aged units reporting holding

TABLE 2.—Income and homeownership: Percentage distribution of aged units by income, by home tenure, and percentage of homeowners free of mortgage, 1967—Continued

Total money income	Homeowners			Non-homeowners	Percent of homeowners mortgage free
	Total	Home not mortgaged	Home mortgaged		
Nonmarried men					
Number (in thousands):					
Total	821	694	102	1,282	87
Reporting on income	677	574	88	1,119	87
Percent of units	100	100	(²)	100	
Less than \$1,000	14	15	(²)	22	(²)
1,000-1,499	21	20	(²)	24	94
1,500-1,999	16	16	(²)	20	82
2,000-2,499	15	14	(²)	16	82
2,500-2,999	9	9	(²)	5	(²)
3,000-3,499	7	8	(²)	2	(²)
3,500-3,999	3	3	(²)	3	(²)
4,000-4,999	5	6	(²)	3	(²)
5,000-7,499	6	6	(²)	2	(²)
7,500-9,999	1	(¹)	(²)	1	(²)
10,000-14,999	1	1	(²)	(¹)	(²)
15,000 or more	1	1	(²)	(¹)	(²)
Median income	\$1,957	\$1,957	(²)	\$1,597	(²)
Nonmarried women					
Number (in thousands):					
Total	2,814	2,352	364	3,934	87
Reporting on income	2,175	1,810	311	3,210	85
Percent of units	100	100	100	100	
Less than \$1,000	27	27	20	38	90
1,000-1,499	29	31	22	28	89
1,500-1,999	16	15	19	15	83
2,000-2,499	9	9	12	8	81
2,500-2,999	5	5	10	3	73
3,000-3,499	4	4	4	2	(²)
3,500-3,999	3	2	2	1	(²)
4,000-4,999	3	2	4	2	(²)
5,000-7,499	2	2	3	2	(²)
7,500-9,999	1	1	2	1	(²)
10,000-14,999	1	1	2	(¹)	(²)
15,000 or more	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	(²)
Median income	\$1,330	\$1,308	\$1,684	\$1,170	

¹ 0.5 percent or less

² Not shown where base is less than 100,000

some assets of the types specified in table 7 probably indicate more reliably than do the estimates of those reporting nonzero amounts of financial assets (assets shown in tables 9-11 and 14-16) the level of ownership of such assets. Thus, 80 percent of the couples reported ownership of liquid assets, but nonzero amounts were

reported by only 74 percent of the couples reporting on the value of financial asset holdings—a broader classification that includes also stocks, negotiable bonds, etc.

Money in banks was much more frequently reported than any other type of asset: 74 percent of the married couples and 58 percent of

TABLE 3.—Percentage distribution of aged homeowner units by amount of equity in home, by income, 1967

Amount of home equity	Reporting on income	Income							Not reporting income
		Less than \$1,000	\$1,000-1,499	\$1,500-1,999	\$2,000-2,999	\$3,000-4,999	\$5,000-7,499	\$7,500 or more	
All units									
Number (in thousands)									
Total.....	12,186	2,585	2,314	1,709	2,121	1,900	858	699	3,592
Homeowners.....	6,203	774	975	792	1,192	1,315	625	529	2,031
Percent of total.....	51	30	42	46	56	69	73	76	57
Reporting home equity.....	5,525	626	812	702	1,069	1,232	573	510	1,577
Percent of units.....	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
None or negative.....	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	1	(¹)	1	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)
\$1-1,999.....	5	11	9	6	4	3	1	1	2
2,000-2,999.....	4	10	6	7	4	2	2	(¹)	1
3,000-4,999.....	8	13	12	9	7	6	4	3	4
5,000-7,499.....	17	24	24	17	19	14	11	9	8
7,500-9,999.....	11	8	11	11	12	12	12	7	9
10,000-14,999.....	24	18	19	24	25	27	28	21	23
15,000-19,999.....	15	8	10	14	16	17	20	19	20
20,000-24,999.....	7	3	6	5	6	8	7	13	11
25,000 or more.....	10	7	2	7	7	10	16	28	24
Median equity ²	\$10,000	\$6,000	\$7,000	\$9,500	\$10,000	\$11,200	\$13,000	\$16,000	\$15,000
Married couples									
Number (in thousands):									
Total.....	4,417	135	276	493	978	1,313	670	553	1,572
Homeowners.....	3,352	93	204	340	716	1,010	533	456	1,246
Percent of total.....	76	69	74	69	73	77	80	82	79
Reporting home equity.....	3,066	84	184	283	640	954	481	439	1,020
Percent of units.....	100	(¹)	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
None or negative.....	(¹)	(²)	1	1	1	1	1	(¹)	(¹)
\$1-1,999.....	3	(²)	12	5	3	4	1	1	1
2,000-2,999.....	4	(²)	9	13	5	2	2	(¹)	1
3,000-4,999.....	8	(²)	11	15	9	7	5	3	2
5,000-7,499.....	15	(²)	26	18	20	13	12	10	8
7,500-9,999.....	11	(²)	10	11	14	14	9	7	9
10,000-14,999.....	24	(²)	20	18	22	27	30	23	22
15,000-19,999.....	15	(²)	3	10	14	16	18	19	19
20,000-24,999.....	8	(²)	6	4	5	8	8	14	11
25,000 or more.....	11	(²)	4	4	7	9	15	25	26
Median equity ²	\$10,500	(²)	\$6,000	\$7,000	\$9,000	\$11,000	\$13,000	\$16,000	\$15,000
Nonmarried persons									
Number (in thousands):									
Total.....	7,770	2,450	2,038	1,216	1,145	587	188	146	2,020
Homeowners.....	2,851	681	771	452	476	306	93	73	784
Percent of total.....	37	28	38	37	42	52	49	50	39
Reporting home equity.....	2,459	541	628	419	429	278	93	70	557
Percent of units.....	100	100	100	100	100	100	(²)	(²)	100
None or negative.....	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	1	(¹)	1	(²)	(¹)	(¹)
\$1-1,999.....	7	11	8	6	6	2	(²)	(¹)	2
2,000-2,999.....	5	9	6	3	3	2	(¹)	(¹)	1
3,000-4,999.....	8	12	13	5	5	5	(¹)	(¹)	6
5,000-7,499.....	19	25	23	16	17	14	(¹)	(¹)	6
7,500-9,999.....	10	8	12	11	7	7	(¹)	(¹)	9
10,000-14,999.....	23	18	19	28	29	26	(¹)	(¹)	25
15,000-19,999.....	15	10	12	16	19	19	(¹)	(¹)	20
20,000-24,999.....	6	2	6	6	6	11	(¹)	(¹)	11
25,000 or more.....	8	6	2	9	8	13	(¹)	(¹)	19
Median equity ²	\$10,000	\$6,000	\$7,500	\$10,000	\$10,480	\$13,000	(²)	(¹)	\$14,500

See footnotes at end of table.

the nonmarried men and women did so. It is reasonable, therefore, to find a smaller number reporting income from assets than reporting asset ownership since not all assets necessarily yield income (checking accounts in banks, for example). Money in savings and loan (or building) associations was not a very close second: About one-fourth of the married couples and less than one-fifth of the nonmarried reported this type of asset. About 18 percent of the married couples and 10 percent of the nonmarried had U.S. savings bonds, only slightly more than the proportion who reported having other securities. Except for 13 percent of the married couples who had money left with insurance companies, each of the other specified types of assets was reported by fewer than 10 percent of the respondents.

The direct relationship between income and holdings of various types of assets is evident from

the data in table 7, summarized for the "poor" and "not poor" in table 8.

Just about half the aged units who were poor had no liquid assets in any of the reported forms, compared with about a fifth of those who were not poor and only a little more than a tenth of those with incomes above the moderate level. As income rises, not only do more units report having at least one type of liquid asset, but more units have two or more of these types of assets.

Differences between those aged 65-72 and those aged 73 and over are not very great or consistent in direction. Fewer of the older group report having money in credit unions, however. This finding is indeed to be expected as fewer among the older group work and therefore have convenient access to credit unions. In addition, somewhat fewer of that group reported security ownership or money in savings and loan associations.

TABLE 3.—Percentage distribution of aged homeowner units by amount of equity in home, by income, 1967—Continued

Amount of home equity	Reporting on income	Income						Not reporting income	
		Less than \$1,000	\$1,000-1,499	\$1,500-1,999	\$2,000-2,999	\$3,000-4,999	\$5,000-7,499		\$7,500 or more
Nonmarried men									
Number (in thousands)									
Total.....	1,954	393	447	350	428	218	69	49	402
Homeowners.....	677	94	139	112	163	109	39	21	145
Percent of total.....	35	24	31	32	38	50	57	43	36
Reporting home equity.....	610	72	115	112	149	102	39	21	101
Percent of units.....	100	(¹)	100	100	100	100	(¹)	(¹)	100
None or negative.....	1	(¹)	(¹)	2	(¹)	2	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)
\$1-1,999.....	10	(¹)	19	11	8	2	(¹)	(¹)	2
2,000-2,999.....	7	(¹)	10	6	4	6	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)
3,000-4,999.....	6	(¹)	12	6	6	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	2
5,000-7,499.....	16	(¹)	24	12	15	18	(¹)	(¹)	9
7,500-9,999.....	9	(¹)	14	8	6	4	(¹)	(¹)	7
10,000-14,999.....	21	(¹)	8	22	26	26	(¹)	(¹)	27
15,000-19,999.....	16	(¹)	8	17	22	21	(¹)	(¹)	16
20,000-24,999.....	5	(¹)	4	4	5	11	(¹)	(¹)	11
25,000 or more.....	8	(¹)	(¹)	12	6	9	(¹)	(¹)	25
Median equity ²	\$10,000	(¹)	\$5,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$12,000	(¹)	(¹)	\$15,000
Nonmarried women									
Number (in thousands)									
Total.....	5,816	2,057	1,591	886	717	369	119	97	1,618
Homeowners.....	2,175	688	632	340	313	197	64	51	640
Percent of total.....	37	29	40	39	44	53	45	53	40
Reporting home equity.....	1,849	469	514	308	280	176	54	49	456
Percent of units.....	100	100	100	100	100	100	(¹)	(¹)	100
None or negative.....	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)
\$1-1,999.....	6	10	6	5	4	1	(¹)	(¹)	2
2,000-2,999.....	4	8	4	2	3	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	2
3,000-4,999.....	9	11	13	6	4	8	(¹)	(¹)	7
5,000-7,499.....	20	26	23	17	18	12	(¹)	(¹)	6
7,500-9,999.....	10	9	11	12	8	8	(¹)	(¹)	9
10,000-14,999.....	23	18	22	30	29	26	(¹)	(¹)	25
15,000-19,999.....	14	10	12	16	18	18	(¹)	(¹)	20
20,000-24,999.....	6	2	6	7	7	11	(¹)	(¹)	11
25,000 or more.....	8	6	2	7	9	15	(¹)	(¹)	18
Median equity ²	\$10,000	\$6,500	\$8,000	\$10,000	\$10,500	\$13,000	(¹)	(¹)	\$14,500

¹ 0.5 percent or less

² Assets were often reported in round numbers and considerable clustering thus occurred around even values in the hundreds or thousands, when the

computer identified the median respondent, his response tended to be in such a cluster.

³ Not shown where base is less than 100,000.

TABLE 4.—Home equity, by poverty status:¹ Percent of homeowners among aged units and amount of home equity, by poverty status, 1967

Poverty status	Number (in thousands)	Percent homeowners	Homeowners reporting home equity ¹		
			Percent with—		Median
			Less than \$15,000	\$15,000 or more	
Married couples:					
Poor.....	922	71	84	16	\$6,000
Not poor.....	3,867	78	59	41	12,000
Below moderate level.....	2,653	73	76	24	9,000
Above moderate level.....	2,136	81	50	50	14,500
Poverty status unknown.....	1,200	78	47	53	15,000
Nonmarried men and women:					
Poor.....	4,760	32	81	19	7,000
Not poor.....	3,334	44	61	39	12,000
Below moderate level.....	5,978	33	78	22	8,000
Above moderate level.....	2,116	48	56	44	13,000
Poverty status unknown.....	1,695	37	52	48	14,000

¹ Of those not reporting on income, 73 percent did report on home equity (86 percent of all homeowners reported their equity).

Differences between beneficiaries and nonbeneficiaries are limited to the nonmarried persons. Among these units, more of the beneficiaries than nonbeneficiaries reported holdings of the various types of assets.

Homeowners and Nonowners

Homeowners not only have the equity in their

TABLE 5.—Amount of debt, by poverty status: Number and percent of homeowners among aged units and percent with debt, by amount of debt, 1967

Poverty status	Number of homeowners (in thousands)	Homeowners with debt ¹			
		Percent with—			Median amount ⁽²⁾
		None	Less than \$5,000	\$5,000 or more	
Married couples:					
Poor.....	652	84	64	37	\$3,000
Not poor.....	3,004	78	55	44	4,000
Below moderate level.....	1,934	80	56	35	2,600
Above moderate level.....	1,722	76	49	51	5,000
Poverty status unknown.....	943	86	43	57	5,200
Nonmarried men and women:					
Poor.....	1,543	89	81	19	2,000
Not poor.....	1,457	83	57	43	4,000
Below moderate level.....	1,988	87	76	24	2,000
Above moderate level.....	1,012	84	52	48	4,900
Poverty status unknown.....	635	91	42	58	6,000

¹ Mortgage and any other debt on the home (back taxes or amounts due on home-improvement loans, for example).

² Excludes those with no debt.

home, but, in general, they also have more money in the bank or in stocks, bonds, or loans than nonowners do. The data in table 9 on the median financial assets of homeowners and nonowners having such assets and the proportions reporting zero amounts indicate these differences. About a fifth of the married couples who were homeowners reported no financial assets, for example, compared with two-fifths of the nonowners. The differences were about the same for the nonmarried men but not so great for the nonmarried women: women reporting zero amounts represented 30 percent of the owners and 47 percent of the nonowners. The medians also reveal the greater financial resources of the owners.

TABLE 6.—Home equity by primary insurance amount: Percent of homeowners among aged units and amount of home equity, by primary insurance amount,¹ 1967

Primary insurance amount as of February 1968 ¹	Number (in thousands)	Percent homeowners ²	Homeowners reporting home equity		
			Percent with—		Median
			Less than \$15,000	\$15,000 or more	
Married couples					
Total.....	4,907	77	62	38	\$12,000
Less than \$100.....	1,591	77	73	27	9,000
55 00.....	432	79	74	25	8,000
55 10-79 90.....	455	73	71	28	9,000
80 00-99 90.....	704	78	74	27	10,000
100 00-119 90.....	717	74	64	36	10,000
120 00-139 90.....	950	76	64	36	11,000
140 00 or more.....	1,579	77	49	51	15,000
Nonmarried persons					
<i>Men</i>					
Total.....	1,928	35	68	32	\$10,000
Less than \$100.....	848	28	81	19	7,000
55 00.....	251	29	(³)	(³)	(³)
55 10-79 90.....	283	29	(³)	(³)	(³)
80 00-99 90.....	314	25	(³)	(³)	(³)
100 00-119 90.....	342	38	72	29	10,000
120 00-139 90.....	374	37	62	37	10,000
140 00 or more.....	351	46	51	48	13,000
<i>Women</i>					
Retired workers.....	3,217	36	69	31	10,000
Less than \$100.....	2,185	35	75	24	9,000
55 00.....	915	37	81	19	8,000
55 10-79 90.....	623	35	74	27	9,000
80 00-99 90.....	647	34	69	30	10,000
100 00-119 90.....	470	36	62	38	12,000
120 00-139 90.....	300	35	(³)	(³)	(³)
140 00 or more.....	247	42	(³)	(³)	(³)
Widow beneficiaries.....	2,386	45	66	35	10,000
Less than \$100.....	1,075	38	74	26	9,000
55 00.....	261	36	(³)	(³)	(³)
55 10-79 90.....	383	46	68	32	10,000
80 00-99 90.....	452	33	78	22	8,500
100 00-119 90.....	401	43	71	29	10,000
120 00-139 90.....	507	50	64	37	10,000
140 00 or more.....	389	61	48	53	15,000

¹ Excludes beneficiaries who received their first benefit February 1967 or later, the transitionally insured, and special "age-72" beneficiaries.

² Assumes institutional population were nonowners (see table 1, footnote 3).

³ Not shown where base is less than 100,000.

Other Socioeconomic Groups

Age.—It might be presumed that assets would decrease with age, both because the income of those aged 73 and over is in general less than the

income of those aged 65–72 and because, after retirement, savings would tend to be used up rather than added to. Differences with age in the amount of financial assets were not statistically significant, however.

TABLE 7.—Type of asset: Percent of aged units reporting, with specified financial asset, by beneficiary status, age, and income class, 1967

Type of financial asset	Beneficiary status		Age		Total reporting income	Income							Not reporting income	
	All	Bene- fici- aries ¹	Non- bene- fici- aries	65-72		73 and over	Less than \$1,000	\$1,000- 1,499	\$1,500- 1,999	\$2,000- 2,999	\$3,000- 4,999	\$5,000- 7,499		\$7,500 or more
All units														
Any liquid assets.....	71	73	59	72	69	66	43	58	66	72	83	88	95	87
Money in.....														
Banks.....	64	66	54	66	63	60	37	51	58	64	77	82	91	83
Credit unions.....	4	4	5	6	2	4	(²)	1	2	3	6	10	16	5
Savings and loan associations.....	22	22	19	24	20	19	6	10	18	21	29	35	43	32
Insurance.....	10	10	9	11	8	8	2	6	6	9	14	17	22	14
Other.....	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	4	4	3
U.S. savings bonds.....	13	13	12	15	11	13	5	7	9	13	20	28	32	13
Stocks and corporate bonds.....	10	9	10	11	8	9	2	3	7	8	14	22	37	12
Loans or mortgages.....	4	4	3	4	4	5	2	2	4	4	8	9	11	3
Married couples														
Any liquid assets.....	80	79	78	79	80	76	48	50	62	68	81	88	95	92
Money in.....														
Banks.....	74	74	74	74	75	70	43	45	55	61	74	81	91	89
Credit unions.....	6	6	9	8	4	6	(²)	1	2	5	11	17	7	7
Savings and loan associations.....	26	26	25	27	26	24	7	10	15	18	25	33	44	34
Insurance.....	13	12	16	14	11	12	1	3	5	7	13	17	24	16
Other.....	3	2	4	2	3	2	(²)	2	2	3	4	4	4	3
U.S. savings bonds.....	18	18	19	19	17	18	5	9	9	11	20	28	31	18
Stocks and corporate bonds.....	13	12	15	14	11	13	4	3	3	7	12	18	35	13
Loans or mortgages.....	6	6	6	6	6	7	8	4	2	4	6	10	12	4
Nonmarried persons														
Any liquid assets.....	65	69	50	66	65	61	43	59	67	75	88	89	97	84
Money in.....														
Banks.....	58	62	44	59	58	54	37	51	59	66	82	82	93	78
Credit unions.....	2	2	3	4	1	2	1	1	2	3	7	5	11	3
Savings and loan associations.....	19	19	16	20	18	16	6	10	19	24	38	42	39	31
Insurance.....	8	8	6	8	7	7	2	6	6	10	16	18	13	12
Other.....	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	2	3	4	3	8	4	2
U.S. savings bonds.....	10	10	8	10	9	10	5	7	9	14	21	27	33	9
Stocks and corporate bonds.....	8	8	7	9	6	7	1	3	8	10	19	36	48	11
Loans or mortgages.....	3	4	1	3	3	3	2	2	5	4	10	5	7	2
Nonmarried men														
Any liquid assets.....	64	64	59	58	67	60	37	49	62	70	90	86	100	81
Money in.....														
Banks.....	58	58	54	53	62	55	33	42	57	60	88	86	100	79
Credit unions.....	3	2	7	4	2	3	(²)	2	3	3	6	3	19	4
Savings and loan associations.....	16	16	15	18	15	15	4	8	12	20	35	26	29	26
Insurance.....	8	9	6	9	8	8	1	5	7	10	19	23	10	11
Other.....	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	(²)	10	5	4
U.S. savings bonds.....	11	10	17	10	11	10	4	7	8	12	20	27	36	12
Stocks and corporate bonds.....	9	9	11	12	8	9	2	5	7	10	16	31	53	10
Loans or mortgages.....	5	5	3	4	5	5	4	3	5	4	12	3	9	4
Nonmarried women														
Any liquid assets.....	66	70	47	68	64	61	44	62	69	78	86	91	95	84
Money in.....														
Banks.....	58	63	42	61	57	54	38	54	60	69	78	80	89	78
Credit unions.....	2	2	2	4	1	2	1	1	2	4	8	6	7	3
Savings and loan associations.....	19	20	16	21	18	16	7	11	21	27	39	50	44	33
Insurance.....	7	8	6	7	7	6	3	6	6	10	13	14	15	12
Other.....	3	3	2	2	3	3	2	2	3	4	5	7	3	2
U.S. savings bonds.....	9	10	6	10	8	10	6	7	10	15	22	26	31	8
Stocks and corporate bonds.....	7	7	6	8	6	6	1	3	8	10	21	39	45	11
Loans or mortgages.....	3	3	1	3	3	3	1	2	5	3	9	6	5	2

¹ Excludes beneficiaries who received their first benefit February 1967 or later, the transitionally insured, and special "age-72" beneficiaries

² 0.5 percent or less

Race.—There can be no doubt about the significance of the differences in the levels of financial assets of the white and the Negro aged. The median amounts for those reporting some financial assets were 7 to 10 times greater for the white groups than for the Negro units, and a much larger proportion of the latter reported zero amounts. For them, not only the lower incomes of the present but those of the past as well help to account for such large differences.

Living arrangements.—The living arrangements of the aged are determined by a number of factors, but there is considerable evidence that, when the income of the aged person or couple is very low, doubling up with relatives is more frequent than at moderate or higher income levels and that, particularly among the nonmarried, more nonhomeowners than homeowners lived with relatives.

To the extent that economic resources and living arrangements are related, one would expect to find the assets of the aged units living alone to be greater than those of the units living with relatives.⁷ As table 9 shows, both the proportion reporting any financial assets and the median amounts of such assets were indeed greater for those living alone than for those with relatives.

Two other patterns emerge from the data in table 9, consistent with previous findings: (1) Most of the nonmarried men and women in institutions have no financial assets or very small amounts (74 percent had none or less than \$500); and (2) the married couples and nonmarried women who lived in households with grandchildren had zero financial assets more often than did those living with relatives but not with grandchildren, and, when some financial assets were reported for these groups, the median amount was smaller if the household included grandchildren than if it did not. It would appear that the aged move in with married sons or daughters and grandchildren in general only when they have very meager assets or none.

Receipt of pensions.—Table 10 shows the financial assets of aged units by type of retirement pensions.⁸ Ninety percent of all units aged 65 and over received some retirement benefits in

⁷ Janet Murray, *op. cit.*

⁸ See Walter W. Kolodrubetz, *op. cit.*

1967, and more than three-fourths of those with retirement income were receiving OASDHI benefits only. There is considerable interest in the information on those receiving both OASDHI benefits and private or other public benefits, as well as on those with no OASDHI benefits who were receiving pensions from Federal, State, or local programs or from railroad retirement. Such a very small number received only a private pension or pensions from three sources that data for these units are not shown separately.

The median incomes of units receiving dual pensions were definitely greater than those receiving only one type of benefit. Those receiving no benefits had median incomes that were relatively high among the married couples and very low among the nonmarried.

The financial assets followed the income pattern. Those receiving pensions from two sources were more likely to have assets, and asset holders had assets greater than those receiving pensions from one source only. Among the nonmarried, those without retirement benefits were most likely not to have any assets and those with assets had smallest amounts. Median incomes and financial assets of these groups are shown below, by receipt of retirement benefit.

Type of retirement benefit	Married couples		Nonmarried			
			Men		Women	
	Median income	Median financial assets	Median income	Median financial assets	Median income	Median financial assets
OASDHI benefits and—						
Private group pension	\$4,087	\$4,000	\$2,580	\$1,800	\$2,302	\$2,300
Other public pension	4,382	2,000	2,812	2,000	2,342	2,907
No other pension.....	2,748	1,000	1,500	130	1,230	300
Public pension other than OASDHI.....	3,748	2,000	(¹)	(¹)	1,290	600
No retirement benefit..	6,270	2,000	1,175	0	1,007	0

¹ Not shown where base is less than 100,000

In general, these data appear to be consistent with the findings of other studies that provide evidence for the hypothesis that coverage under pension plans stimulates rather than weakens the tendency to save.⁹

Work experience.—The relationship between the level of income and of assets may also be

⁹ See George Katona, *Private Pensions and Individual Savings*, University of Michigan, 1965.

TABLE 8.—Type of financial asset, by poverty status: Percent of aged units with specified type of asset, by poverty status, 1967

Type of asset	Percent with specified asset					
	Married couples		Nonmarried			
			Men		Women	
	Poor	Not poor	Poor	Not poor	Poor	Not poor
Any liquid assets.....	56	83	43	78	52	80
Money in						
Banks.....	50	77	37	72	46	71
Credit unions.....	1	8	1	4	1	5
Savings and loan associations.....	12	29	6	23	10	30
Insurance.....	4	14	3	12	5	10
Other.....	1	3	3	4	2	4
U S savings bonds.....	8	21	5	16	6	15
Stocks and corporate bonds.....	3	16	3	15	2	14
Loans or mortgages.....	3	7	3	6	2	5

explored by examining data on work experience in 1967 of the aged units. About half the married couples had either the husband or the wife as a worker, or both members worked. Most often it was only the husband who worked, but in about one-fourth of the households with work experience the wife also worked and in nearly a fifth of them the woman was the only worker. Among the nonmarried, those having any work experience during the year were a much smaller group: 23 percent of the men and 15 percent of the women had worked.

Median financial assets were greater in those households in which someone worked than in households in which no one worked (table 11). This pattern is also clear for median income. The income-financial asset relationship is not so clear when the comparisons are made on the basis of which member of the couple was working. The median income, but not the median asset level, was greatest when both husband and wife worked. Although the median income was almost the same whether only the man worked or only the woman worked, the median financial asset level was more than twice as much when it was the man who was the sole worker.

Information was also obtained on whether the respondents worked full time, the full year—or only part of the time (part-time, full-year, or full-time, part-year). These classifications, together with beneficiary status, permit comparisons of the income-asset circumstances of those who could be considered fully retired (receiving benefits, not working), not retired (no benefits, work-

ing full time), and with an ambiguous retirement situation since they received OASDHI benefits but also worked. A fourth group, those who had neither earnings nor OASDHI, was not very numerous (3 percent of the married couples and 12 percent of the nonmarried) but rather diverse. This group included those relatively well off, with public employee pensions or other “independent” sources of income, as well as the very low-income “disadvantaged” group, many of whom were probably receiving public assistance.

Among the married couples, the small, not retired group had the highest income and financial assets and the even smaller group with neither work nor OASDHI had the lowest level of income and assets, as the tabulation that follows demonstrates.

Beneficiary and work status of married couples	Median	
	Income	Financial assets
Not retired (only husband working, full time), not receiving benefits.....	\$6,500	\$3,500
Fully retired, receiving benefits.....	2,630	1,500
Not working, not receiving benefits.....	2,490	300

The large group of the partly retired who received OASDHI benefits and earnings (two-fifths of all married couples) was complex in terms of the combinations of husband-wife full-time or part-time work arrangements. Table 12 gives the median income and financial assets as well as the number in each of these groups.

The higher levels of financial assets tended roughly to be associated with higher levels of income, but there were exceptions. The motivations and opportunities for one or both members to continue working after receiving benefits are probably many and diverse, and these data do not reveal whether the desire to add to assets is an element in work continuation or whether the presence of assets is one motivating force in the retirement decision.

Comparisons of the work status-retirement group among the nonmarried men and women are simpler than among the married couples, in part because some of the possible classifications contain too small a number to provide a basis for computing the medians. Seventy percent of the nonmarried were fully retired, and only 2 per-

cent were nonbeneficiaries who worked. About 20 percent of the men and 13 percent of the women

received both benefits and earnings. Table 13 gives the median income and financial assets of

TABLE 9.—Financial assets: Percentage distribution of aged units by amount of financial assets, by beneficiary status, homeownership, age, race, and living arrangements, 1967

Financial assets	Beneficiary status		Homeownership (noninstitutional)		Age		Race		Living arrangements						
	All	Beneficiaries ¹	Non-beneficiaries	Owners	Non-owners	65-72	73 and over	White	Negro	With relatives ²			No relatives		
										Total	Children	Grandchildren	Total	Alone	In institutions
All units															
Number (in thousands)															
Total	15,779	12,446	2,146	8,234	6,571	7,567	8,212	14,526	1,205	4,852	3,474	1,368	10,926	9,580	832
Reporting on financial assets	12,040	9,494	1,671	6,060	5,271	5,708	6,332	10,861	1,140	3,950	2,882	1,178	8,090	7,044	637
Percent of units	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
None	36	33	49	24	46	34	37	31	77	48	48	53	31	27	62
\$1-499	12	12	10	11	13	11	12	12	13	11	12	10	12	12	12
500-999	7	7	6	7	7	7	7	7	4	8	7	7	6	7	3
1,000-1,499	5	6	3	5	5	5	5	5	2	5	5	6	5	5	3
1,500-1,999	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	3	3	2
2,000-2,499	4	4	3	5	3	4	4	4	1	3	3	3	4	5	1
2,500-2,999	1	1	2	2	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	2	1
3,000-4,999	7	7	5	8	6	7	7	7	1	6	7	6	7	8	4
5,000-7,499	7	7	5	9	5	7	6	8	1	6	7	5	7	8	4
7,500-9,999	3	3	2	4	2	3	3	3	(³)	2	2	3	3	4	2
10,000-14,999	5	6	4	7	4	5	5	6	(³)	3	3	3	6	7	3
15,000-19,999	3	3	2	2	2	3	3	3	(³)	2	2	3	3	3	1
20,000 or more	8	8	7	12	5	9	7	9	(³)	4	3	2	10	11	2
Median amount: ⁴															
All reporting units	\$550	\$700	\$15	\$1,800	\$100	\$750	\$500	\$980	0	\$125	\$65	0	\$1,000	\$1,280	0
Units with financial assets	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,800	2,000	3,000	2,900	3,000	384	2,000	2,000	1,500	3,500	3,600	\$1,500
Married couples															
Number (in thousands)															
Total	5,989	4,913	720	4,598	1,356	3,666	2,323	5,584	386	1,133	874	265	4,856	4,763	26
Reporting on financial assets	4,397	3,660	514	3,356	1,032	2,674	1,723	4,034	348	917	701	223	3,481	3,407	14
Percent of units	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	(⁵)
None	26	26	28	21	41	26	25	22	69	40	41	53	22	21	(⁵)
\$1-499	10	11	8	10	12	10	11	10	14	13	14	11	10	10	(⁵)
500-999	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	6	7	6	6	7	7	(⁵)
1,000-1,499	5	5	3	5	4	4	6	5	2	4	4	4	5	5	(⁵)
1,500-1,999	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	1	1	1	1	3	3	(⁵)
2,000-2,499	5	5	4	5	3	4	6	5	2	4	4	4	5	5	(⁵)
2,500-2,999	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	4	2	2	(⁵)
3,000-4,999	8	8	7	8	6	8	7	8	1	4	5	6	9	9	(⁵)
5,000-7,499	8	8	7	8	5	7	8	8	2	6	5	4	8	8	(⁵)
7,500-9,999	4	4	3	4	3	4	4	4	(⁵)	3	3	2	5	5	(⁵)
10,000-14,999	7	7	8	8	4	7	6	7	(⁵)	4	4	1	7	7	(⁵)
15,000-19,999	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	(⁵)	4	4	1	4	4	(⁵)
20,000 or more	13	12	16	14	9	13	12	14	(⁵)	7	6	3	15	15	(⁵)
Median amount: ⁴															
All reporting units	\$1,800	\$1,500	\$2,000	\$2,100	\$300	\$2,000	\$1,600	\$2,000	0	\$200	\$200	0	\$2,000	\$2,190	(⁵)
Units with financial assets	4,000	4,000	5,000	4,400	3,000	4,200	3,600	4,200	500	2,500	2,250	2,000	4,400	4,500	(⁵)
Nonmarried persons															
Number (in thousands)															
Total	9,789	7,533	1,426	3,635	5,216	3,901	5,888	8,943	818	3,719	2,660	1,103	6,071	4,818	806
Reporting on financial assets	7,643	5,835	1,157	2,703	4,239	3,034	4,609	6,827	792	3,033	2,181	940	4,609	3,637	623
Percent of units	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
None	42	38	58	28	47	41	42	37	80	47	50	53	38	33	62
\$1-499	12	13	11	12	13	12	13	12	12	11	11	10	13	14	12
500-999	7	7	6	8	6	6	7	7	3	8	8	7	6	6	13
1,000-1,499	5	6	3	6	5	6	5	6	2	6	6	6	5	5	3
1,500-1,999	2	2	1	3	2	2	2	2	(⁵)	2	2	2	2	2	2
2,000-2,499	3	4	2	5	3	3	3	4	(⁵)	3	3	2	3	4	1
2,500-2,999	1	1	2	2	1	2	1	1	(⁵)	1	1	1	1	2	1

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 9.—Financial assets: Percentage distribution of aged units by amount of financial assets, by beneficiary status, home-ownership, age, race, and living arrangements, 1967—Continued

Financial assets	Beneficiary status		Homeownership (noninstitutional)		Age		Race		Living arrangements						
	All	Beneficiaries ¹	Non-beneficiaries	Owners	Non-owners	65-72	73 and over	White	Negro	With relatives ²			No relatives		
										Total	Children	Grandchildren	Total	Alone	In institutions
Nonmarried persons—Continued															
\$3,000-4,999.....	6	7	4	8	6	6	7	7	1	7	7	6	6	7	4
5,000-7,499.....	7	7	4	8	5	7	6	7	1	6	6	6	7	7	4
7,500-9,999.....	2	3	1	3	2	3	2	3	(*)	2	1	1	3	3	2
10,000-14,999.....	5	5	3	6	4	4	5	5	(*)	3	2	3	6	6	3
15,000-19,999.....	2	2	1	3	2	2	2	2	(*)	2	2	1	2	2	1
20,000 or more.....	5	6	3	9	4	6	5	6	(*)	3	2	2	7	8	2
Median amount: ⁴															
All reporting units.....	\$250	\$400	0	\$1,000	\$89	\$300	\$200	\$500	0	\$100	\$5	0	\$369	\$600	0
Units with financial assets.....	2,200	2,375	\$2,000	3,000	1,900	2,375	2,100	2,500	\$300	1,900	1,500	\$1,350	2,800	3,000	\$1,500
Nonmarried men															
Number (in thousands):															
Total.....	2,356	1,928	302	821	1,282	944	1,411	2,090	251	784	489	257	1,571	1,189	209
Reporting on financial assets.....	1,961	1,615	242	672	1,098	765	1,196	1,707	240	671	425	223	1,290	991	163
Percent of units.....	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
None.....	40	40	46	23	48	47	36	34	80	42	42	41	39	34	58
\$1-499.....	11	12	8	10	13	10	12	11	12	10	11	12	12	13	10
500-999.....	6	6	6	7	6	4	8	7	2	7	7	7	6	6	6
1,000-1,499.....	5	5	3	5	5	5	6	5	1	6	5	6	4	4	1
1,500-1,999.....	2	2	3	2	1	3	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2
2,000-2,499.....	3	3	4	5	1	3	3	3	(*)	3	3	3	2	2	2
2,500-2,999.....	2	1	4	3	(*)	2	1	2	(*)	(*)	1	(*)	2	2	4
3,000-4,999.....	7	7	6	9	6	6	8	7	2	7	8	9	7	7	6
5,000-7,499.....	7	7	6	10	6	7	7	8	2	8	10	9	6	7	(*)
7,500-9,999.....	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	(*)	2	2	2	2	2	4
10,000-14,999.....	6	7	5	10	4	5	7	7	(*)	5	5	6	7	7	4
15,000-19,999.....	3	3	4	4	3	2	3	3	(*)	2	1	2	3	4	1
20,000 or more.....	6	6	3	10	4	4	7	7	(*)	3	2	2	8	7	1
Median amount: ⁴															
All reporting units.....	\$300	\$300	\$100	\$2,000	\$49	\$100	\$500	\$633	0	\$200	\$200	\$200	\$600	\$600	0
Units with financial assets.....	3,000	3,000	2,725	4,375	2,000	2,725	3,000	3,200	\$315	2,100	2,100	2,000	3,200	3,400	\$2,000
Nonmarried women															
Number (in thousands):															
Total.....	7,434	5,605	1,125	2,814	3,934	2,957	4,477	6,852	567	2,934	2,112	846	4,499	3,628	596
Reporting on financial assets.....	5,682	4,219	915	2,032	3,141	2,269	3,413	5,120	552	2,362	1,756	726	3,320	2,646	460
Percent of units.....	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
None.....	42	37	62	30	47	39	44	38	80	49	52	56	37	33	63
\$1-499.....	13	13	11	13	13	12	13	13	12	11	11	10	14	14	13
500-999.....	7	7	5	8	7	7	6	7	3	8	8	7	6	6	3
1,000-1,499.....	5	6	2	6	6	6	5	6	3	6	6	6	5	6	3
1,500-1,999.....	2	2	1	3	2	2	2	2	(*)	2	2	2	2	2	2
2,000-2,499.....	4	4	2	5	3	3	4	4	1	3	3	2	4	5	(*)
2,500-2,999.....	1	1	1	2	1	2	(*)	1	(*)	1	1	1	1	1	(*)
3,000-4,999.....	6	7	4	7	6	6	7	7	(*)	7	7	5	6	7	3
5,000-7,499.....	6	7	4	9	5	5	6	7	1	5	5	5	7	7	5
7,500-9,999.....	2	3	1	3	2	3	2	3	(*)	2	1	1	3	3	2
10,000-14,999.....	4	5	2	5	4	4	4	5	(*)	3	2	2	5	6	2
15,000-19,999.....	2	2	1	2	1	2	2	2	(*)	2	1	(*)	2	2	2
20,000 or more.....	5	5	4	8	4	6	5	6	(*)	3	2	2	7	8	2
Median amount: ⁴															
All reporting units.....	\$223	\$470	0	\$875	\$100	\$350	\$200	\$400	0	\$35	0	0	\$350	\$600	0
Units with financial assets.....	2,000	2,000	\$1,500	2,600	1,800	2,100	2,000	2,108	\$300	1,500	\$1,500	\$1,200	2,450	2,500	\$1,199

¹ Excludes beneficiaries who received their first benefit February 1967 or later, the transitionally insured, and special "age-72" beneficiaries

² Units were counted in each category where children or grandchildren were present but only once in the total Total also includes units with no children or grandchildren present but with other relatives (parents, siblings).

³ 0.5 percent or less

⁴ Assets were often reported in round numbers and considerable clustering thus occurred around even values in the hundreds or thousands, when the computer identified the median respondent, his response tended to be in such a cluster.

⁵ Not shown where base is less than 100,000

TABLE 10.—Financial assets: Percentage distribution of aged units by amount of financial assets, by receipt of pensions, and retirement benefits, 1967

Financial assets	Married couples with—					Nonmarried men with—					Nonmarried women with—				
	OASDHI benefits and—			Public pension other than OASDHI	No retirement benefit	OASDHI benefits and—			Public pension other than OASDHI	No retirement benefit	OASDHI benefits and—			Public pension other than OASDHI	No retirement benefit
	Private group pension	Other public pension	No other pension			Private group pension	Other public pension	No other pension			Private group pension	Other public pension	No other pension		
Number (in thousands):															
Total.....	1,009	392	3,438	166	525	287	128	1,476	109	172	317	348	4,876	234	853
Reporting on financial assets..	721	293	2,643	122	379	227	96	1,288	80	155	195	257	3,760	165	744
Percent of units..	100	100	100	100	100	100	(¹)	100	(¹)	100	100	100	100	100	100
None.....	15	15	30	25	29	27	(¹)	44	(¹)	59	19	18	39	35	68
\$1-499.....	10	15	10	10	8	12	(¹)	13	(¹)	6	10	6	14	12	11
500-999.....	6	4	7	6	7	3	(¹)	6	(¹)	8	6	9	7	8	5
1,000-1,499.....	5	7	5	4	3	3	(¹)	5	(¹)	3	4	6	6	4	2
1,500-1,999.....	2	6	3	3	2	4	(¹)	1	(¹)	1	5	5	2	3	1
2,000-2,499.....	5	4	5	12	2	3	(¹)	2	(¹)	2	6	5	4	3	1
2,500-2,999.....	1	2	2	2	2	1	(¹)	1	(¹)	5	1	2	1	4	1
3,000-4,999.....	9	8	7	4	8	10	(¹)	6	(¹)	5	11	9	7	4	4
5,000-7,499.....	12	6	7	4	8	8	(¹)	7	(¹)	5	8	9	7	7	3
7,500-9,999.....	5	7	4	1	3	1	(¹)	2	(¹)	2	8	3	2	6	(²)
10,000-14,999.....	8	6	6	14	6	12	(¹)	6	(¹)	1	7	12	4	7	1
15,000-19,999.....	5	6	4	4	4	7	(¹)	2	(¹)	1	9	3	1	1	(²)
20,000 or more.....	17	13	10	11	18	8	(¹)	6	(¹)	3	6	13	5	5	3
Median amount ³															
All reporting units..	\$4,000	\$2,000	\$1,000	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$1,800	(¹)	\$130	(¹)	0	\$2,300	\$2,907	\$300	\$600	0
Units with financial assets..	6,000	3,725	3,075	3,000	5,500	4,400	(¹)	2,500	(¹)	\$2,000	4,150	4,976	2,000	2,550	\$900

¹ Not shown where base is less than 100,000.

² 0.5 percent or less

³ Assets were often reported in round numbers and considerable clustering

thus occurred around even values in the hundreds or thousands; when the computer identified the median respondent, his response tended to be in such a cluster

the nonmarried men and women by work status.

Unlike the situation with respect to median income, financial assets of the nonmarried men did not tend to be higher than the income of women in comparable beneficiary work-status groups. Thus, for a given level of income, the assets of the nonmarried women seemed to be somewhat above those of the nonmarried men. One explanation that might be advanced for this finding is the greater proportion of widowed persons among the women than among the men: Four-fifths of the nonmarried women and three-fifths of the nonmarried men aged 65 and over were widowed. Women are much more likely than men to receive insurance benefit payments upon the death of the spouse. In October 1966, 60 percent of all death benefit payments were made to wives, and only 3 percent to husbands.¹⁰

Income and Financial Assets

Information on the direct relationship of income and financial assets may be obtained from table 14, which gives the distribution of aged

units at each income level by the amount of their financial assets, and the median amounts. It is, however, convenient again to summarize the income effect on financial assets in terms of the "poor" and "not poor," and of those below and above the "moderate" levels, as was done in the discussion of home equity (table 15).

Approximately half of the poor reported having no financial assets at all, and half of those who reported that they did had amounts less than \$1,200. On the other hand, 86 percent of the aged units with incomes above the moderate level reported having financial assets, and half of that group had amounts of \$7,000 or more; more than a fourth had \$20,000 or more.

These differences between the low and high income levels are in the direction expected and similar to those found in relation to home equity. One difference in the two sets of figures may seem puzzling. Those whose poverty status was not reported but who did report on home ownership had equity values much closer to the pattern of the higher income groups than to that of the lower income groups—an indication that those not reporting income were probably at the higher income levels.

¹⁰ *Life Insurance Fact Book, 1968, page 43.*

TABLE 11.—Financial assets: Percentage distribution of aged units by amount of financial assets, by work status and beneficiary status, 1967

Financial assets	Married couples					Nonmarried persons					
	With work in 1967				Neither worked	Total		Men		Women	
	Total	Both worked	Man only worked	Woman only worked		Worked	Did not work	Worked	Did not work	Worked	Did not work
All units											
Number (in thousands)											
Total.....	3,012	773	1,705	535	2,977	1,636	8,154	531	1,825	1,104	6,329
Reporting on financial assets.....	2,221	564	1,235	422	2,176	1,203	6,440	424	1,537	779	4,903
Percent of units.....	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
None.....	21	23	20	25	30	32	44	33	42	31	44
\$1-499.....	11	10	10	15	10	14	12	10	7	10	12
500-999.....	8	9	8	8	6	6	7	6	5	7	7
1,000-1,499.....	4	4	3	6	6	6	5	5	5	6	5
1,500-1,999.....	3	1	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	3	3
2,000-2,499.....	5	4	6	4	4	4	3	2	3	5	3
2,500-2,999.....	3	4	2	2	1	2	1	3	1	2	1
3,000-4,999.....	8	8	10	7	7	8	6	8	6	8	6
5,000-7,499.....	8	7	9	7	7	8	6	7	7	9	6
7,500-9,999.....	5	4	4	6	4	3	2	4	2	2	2
10,000-14,999.....	6	5	8	5	7	5	5	7	6	4	4
15,000-19,999.....	4	8	4	2	4	3	2	5	2	2	2
20,000 or more.....	13	11	15	9	13	7	5	8	6	6	5
Median amount. ¹											
All reporting units.....	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,500	\$1,000	\$1,300	\$700	\$200	\$1,000	\$200	\$623	\$200
Units with financial assets.....	4,000	3,200	4,500	2,500	4,000	3,000	2,000	3,850	2,700	2,000	2,000
Beneficiary units*											
Number (in thousands)											
Total.....	2,259	564	1,210	485	2,654	1,301	6,232	429	1,499	872	4,734
Reporting on financial assets.....	1,712	412	911	389	1,984	956	4,878	354	1,261	602	3,617
Percent of units.....	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
None.....	22	26	19	25	29	30	39	34	41	28	39
\$1-499.....	12	12	11	16	10	15	12	12	12	18	12
500-999.....	8	10	7	9	6	7	7	7	6	8	7
1,000-1,499.....	5	5	4	6	6	6	6	5	5	7	6
1,500-1,999.....	3	1	4	3	3	2	2	1	2	3	2
2,000-2,499.....	5	6	5	3	4	4	4	2	3	5	4
2,500-2,999.....	2	2	2	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1
3,000-4,999.....	9	8	10	7	7	7	7	8	7	7	7
5,000-7,499.....	9	8	10	8	7	8	7	6	7	9	7
7,500-9,999.....	5	4	4	7	4	3	2	4	1	3	3
10,000-14,999.....	6	4	8	4	7	6	5	9	6	4	5
15,000-19,999.....	4	7	4	2	4	2	2	3	3	2	2
20,000 or more.....	11	9	13	9	13	6	6	8	6	5	6
Median amount. ¹											
All reporting units.....	\$2,000	\$1,200	\$2,350	\$1,000	\$1,500	\$623	\$350	\$600	\$200	\$623	\$400
Units with financial assets.....	3,500	3,000	4,000	2,500	4,200	2,150	2,375	3,500	3,000	2,000	2,200
Nonbeneficiary units											
Number (in thousands)											
Total.....	517	134	349	34	203	222	1,204	61	240	161	964
Reporting on financial assets.....	358	104	226	28	156	160	997	43	200	118	798
Percent of units.....	100	100	100	(¹)	100	100	100	(¹)	100	100	100
None.....	22	15	23	(¹)	42	36	62	(¹)	50	38	65
\$1-499.....	8	7	8	(¹)	10	5	12	(¹)	10	7	12
500-999.....	6	5	7	(¹)	10	1	6	(¹)	8	2	6
1,000-1,499.....	3	5	2	(¹)	4	5	2	(¹)	2	4	2
1,500-1,999.....	1	2	(¹)	(¹)	3	3	1	(¹)	2	2	1
2,000-2,499.....	4	(¹)	6	(¹)	4	3	2	(¹)	5	4	1
2,500-2,999.....	4	13	(¹)	(¹)	1	2	2	(¹)	2	(¹)	2
3,000-4,999.....	9	7	11	(¹)	2	14	3	(¹)	5	14	2
5,000-7,499.....	8	7	10	(¹)	5	11	3	(¹)	5	11	3
7,500-9,999.....	3	5	3	(¹)	1	2	1	(¹)	1	(¹)	2
10,000-14,999.....	9	7	8	(¹)	5	3	3	(¹)	6	4	2
15,000-19,999.....	5	11	3	(¹)	3	4	1	(¹)	1	(¹)	1
20,000 or more.....	19	17	20	(¹)	8	11	2	(¹)	2	13	2
Median amount. ¹				(¹)				(¹)			
All reporting units.....	\$3,300	\$3,000	\$4,000	(¹)	\$300	\$1,763	0	(¹)	\$3	\$1,000	0
Units with financial assets.....	5,900	5,250	5,700	(¹)	2,000	4,540	\$1,000	(¹)	2,000	4,540	\$800

¹ Assets were often reported in round numbers and considerable clustering thus occurred around even values in the hundreds or thousands; when the computer identified the median respondent, his response tended to be in such a cluster.

² Excludes beneficiaries who received their first benefit February 1967 or later, the transitionally insured, and special "age-72" beneficiaries

³ Not shown where base is less than 100,000

⁴ 0.5 percent or less

On the other hand, for the group reporting financial assets but not reporting income and thus with undetermined poverty status, the patterns were closely similar to those for the "poor" or "below moderate" groups. Only about a fifth of those whose poverty status was unknown reported on their financial assets, however—a much smaller proportion than that for those reporting on home equity. Thus, some did not report on either income or financial assets, and these units were in the higher income and probably higher asset group. Reporting on equity in the home, as has been emphasized, is generally more nearly adequate than it is on financial assets.

With allowance made for the general understatement of the level of financial assets—particularly among the higher income groups—the data provide some evidence on the size of two groups: (1) those with currently very low incomes but "enough" savings in the form of financial assets, bank accounts, bonds, and stocks to "live on" or to help out for awhile and (2) those who, in spite of currently "adequate" (relatively high) income, nevertheless have very small amounts of resources. Without attempting to define precisely the admittedly difficult terms of "small," "large," "enough," the following figures show the percentage of the total with relatively low and relatively high incomes who have specified amounts of financial assets.

[Percent]			
Amount of financial assets	Married couples	Nonmarried	
		Men	Women
	Less than \$1,500		
\$5,000 or more.....	13	8	11
10,000 or more.....	6	3	4
15,000 or more.....	4	2	2
	\$5,000 or more		
Less than—			
\$500.....	15	11	17
1,000.....	21	13	18
2,000.....	25	19	21

Thus, about 10 percent of the aged units with incomes under \$1,500 reported financial assets of \$5,000 and over; but most of these had assets of between \$5,000 and \$15,000, since only about 2 percent had the latter amount, or more. On the other hand, an appreciable number—about 15

TABLE 12.—Income and financial assets, by work experience: Number of beneficiary couples¹ and amount of their income and financial assets, 1967

Work experience of beneficiary couples	Number (in thousands)	Median	
		Income	Financial assets
Both husband and wife worked ¹	564	\$4,865	\$1,200
Full year, full time.....	275	5,655	2,000
Full year, part time.....	132	3,745	755
Part year.....	157	4,000	800
Husband only worked.....	1,210	3,760	2,350
Full year, full time.....	334	6,500	2,500
Full year, part time.....	296	3,375	3,000
Part year.....	580	3,470	2,000
Wife only worked.....	485	4,235	1,000
Full year, full time.....	155	5,790	1,200
Full year, part time.....	73	-----	-----
Part year.....	256	3,730	600

¹ Excludes beneficiaries who received their first benefit February 1967 or later, the transitionally insured, and special "age-72" beneficiaries
² Based on husband's work experience if known, otherwise on wife's experience

percent—of aged units with incomes of \$5,000 and over reported no financial assets or amounts of less than \$500, and about a quarter of all these with current incomes at relatively high levels (well above the moderate level) reported no more than \$2,000 in financial assets.

The financial assets of beneficiaries at the minimum level (PIA) are compared with the assets of those at higher levels in table 16. Unlike the rate of homeownership, which bore little or no relationship to benefit level, the proportion of those reporting no financial assets declined with reasonable consistency as the benefit level increased, and the proportion with larger amounts of such assets (\$3,000 or more) increased as consistently.

TABLE 13.—Financial assets, by work experience: Median amount of income and financial assets of nonmarried persons, by beneficiary¹ and work status, 1967

Retirement and beneficiary status	Nonmarried persons			
	Men		Women	
	Median income	Median financial assets	Median income	Median financial assets
Not retired (working, not receiving benefits) ²	(³)	(³)	\$3,305	\$1,000
Fully retired (not working, receiving benefits).....	\$1,610	\$200	1,230	400
Partly retired (working, receiving benefits).....	2,350	600	2,140	625
Full year, full time.....	(³)	(³)	3,000	500
Full year, part time.....	(³)	(³)	1,970	500
Part year.....	2,085	600	1,960	800
Not working (not receiving benefits).....	1,140	0	1,020	0

¹ Excludes beneficiaries who received their first benefit February 1967 or later, the transitionally insured, and special "age-72" beneficiaries.
² Includes a few who worked part time
³ Not shown where base is less than 100,000.

INCOME FROM ASSETS

and income from assets includes some income from real estate and business holdings, not grouped under financial assets, a reasonable con-

Though not all financial assets yield an income

TABLE 14.—Percentage distribution of aged units by amount of financial assets, by income class, 1967

Financial assets	Reporting on income	Income							Not reporting income
		Less than \$1,000	\$1,000-1,499	\$1,500-1,999	\$2,000-2,999	\$3,000-4,999	\$5,000-7,499	\$7,500 or more	
All units									
Number (in thousands):									
Total.....	12,186	2,585	2,314	1,709	2,121	1,800	858	699	3,592
Reporting amount of assets.....	11,126	2,400	2,142	1,596	1,914	1,705	766	603	914
Percent of units.....	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
None.....	36	60	45	36	30	17	13	6	37
\$1-499.....	12	12	15	14	13	9	8	3	10
500-999.....	7	6	7	9	7	7	5	5	8
1,000-1,499.....	5	4	6	6	5	6	4	2	6
1,500-1,999.....	2	1	3	2	4	3	2	1	1
2,000-2,499.....	4	3	4	4	4	5	4	4	4
2,500-2,999.....	1	1	1	2	1	2	2	3	1
3,000-4,999.....	7	5	6	8	8	9	8	8	4
5,000-7,499.....	7	4	7	6	7	9	10	11	5
7,500-9,999.....	3	1	2	3	3	5	6	5	3
10,000-14,999.....	5	1	3	8	6	10	8	8	4
15,000-19,999.....	3	1	1	2	3	5	6	8	4
20,000 or more.....	8	1	1	2	7	14	24	36	14
<i>Median amount</i> ¹									
All reporting units.....	\$542	0	\$100	\$500	\$900	\$3,000	\$5,700	\$10,000	\$600
Units with financial assets.....	3,000	\$1,000	1,300	2,000	2,907	5,000	8,000	12,200	3,050
Married couples									
Number (in thousands):									
Total.....	4,417	135	276	493	976	1,313	670	553	1,572
Reporting amount of assets.....	4,031	126	261	454	883	1,203	612	491	367
Percent of units.....	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
None.....	28	54	53	16	34	19	13	6	24
\$1-499.....	10	9	13	8	13	10	8	3	9
500-999.....	7	6	3	8	9	7	6	6	7
1,000-1,499.....	5	3	5	7	5	3	4	2	5
1,500-1,999.....	3	5	4	2	3	3	3	(?)	3
2,000-2,499.....	5	7	4	6	4	6	4	4	4
2,500-2,999.....	2	(?)	(?)	2	1	2	2	4	1
3,000-4,999.....	8	2	3	4	8	9	9	9	6
5,000-7,499.....	8	4	7	5	5	9	9	12	5
7,500-9,999.....	4	2	2	2	4	5	7	5	2
10,000-14,999.....	7	2	3	4	7	8	7	7	7
15,000-19,999.....	4	2	1	1	3	4	6	8	6
20,000 or more.....	12	5	1	1	5	11	22	35	21
<i>Median amount</i> ¹									
All reporting units.....	\$1,765	0	0	\$200	\$550	\$2,100	\$5,000	\$8,500	\$2,000
Units with financial assets.....	4,000	(?)	\$1,550	1,180	2,000	4,000	7,000	10,000	6,000
Nonmarried persons									
Number (in thousands):									
Total.....	7,770	2,450	2,038	1,216	1,145	587	188	146	2,020
Reporting amount of assets.....	7,095	2,275	1,881	1,142	1,031	501	154	112	548
Percent of units.....	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
None.....	41	60	44	34	26	12	14	4	45
\$1-499.....	13	12	16	13	14	4	6	3	11
500-999.....	6	6	7	9	6	5	(?)	4	9
1,000-1,499.....	5	4	8	5	6	5	3	2	6
1,500-1,999.....	2	1	2	2	4	2	2	2	(?)
2,000-2,499.....	3	3	4	3	4	5	1	2	3
2,500-2,999.....	1	1	1	2	2	4	1	(?)	1
3,000-4,999.....	7	5	7	9	9	5	3	6	3
5,000-7,499.....	7	4	7	7	9	10	12	4	5
7,500-9,999.....	2	1	2	3	3	5	3	6	3
10,000-14,999.....	5	1	3	9	6	12	12	13	2
15,000-19,999.....	2	1	1	2	3	8	7	11	2
20,000 and over.....	5	(?)	1	3	8	24	34	41	9
<i>Median amount</i> ¹									
All reporting units.....	\$250	0	\$125	\$600	\$1,178	\$7,100	\$11,700	\$15,000	\$150
Units with financial assets.....	2,300	1,600	1,200	2,500	3,000	9,500	13,000	15,400	2,000

See footnotes at end of table.

sistency exists between the distributions of aged units by the amounts of their financial assets as shown in table 9 and by the amounts of reported income from assets (with an assumed return of 4-5 percent) shown in table 17. Thus, 67 percent of all units reported financial assets of less than \$3,000 and 70 percent reported income from assets of less than \$150. At the other end of the scale, 8 percent of all units had financial assets of \$20,000 or more and 8 percent had income from assets of \$1,000 or more. Despite the underreporting of income from assets, the median amounts are believed to reflect with reasonable accuracy the extent to which the income of the elderly is supplemented through their savings. Half the

married couples who reported any income from assets had amounts less than \$300 and the non-married had \$210.

SUMMARY

Savings of the aged population in the form of financial assets may provide a supplement to basic retirement income from pensions or a resource to be drawn upon in time of need. Many respondents in the 1968 Survey of the Demographic and Economic Characteristics of the Aged did indeed report having some assets of this type.

TABLE 14.—Percentage distribution of aged units by amount of financial assets, by income class, 1967—Continued

Financial assets	Reporting on income	Income							Not reporting income	
		Less than \$1,000	\$1,000-1,499	\$1,500-1,999	\$2,000-2,999	\$3,000-4,999	\$5,000-7,499	\$7,500 or more		
Nonmarried men										
Number in thousands										
Total.....	1,954	393	447	350	428	218	69	49	402	
Reporting amount of assets.....	1,849	370	438	336	405	191	62	47	111	
Percent of units.....	100	100	100	100	100	100	(¹)	(¹)	100	
None.....	40	64	51	39	30	7	(¹)	(¹)	47	
\$1-499.....	11	10	18	10	11	7	(¹)	(¹)	14	
500-999.....	6	8	6	7	6	3	(¹)	(¹)	11	
1,000-1,499.....	5	5	5	5	5	5	(¹)	(¹)	6	
1,500-1,999.....	2	(²)	2	(²)	5	1	(¹)	(¹)	(²)	
2,000-2,499.....	3	1	3	3	3	6	(¹)	(¹)	2	
2,500-2,999.....	1	1	1	1	3	2	(¹)	(¹)	6	
3,000-4,999.....	7	5	6	8	9	7	(¹)	(¹)	2	
5,000-7,499.....	7	2	4	9	11	13	(¹)	(¹)	2	
7,500-9,999.....	2	4	1	(²)	1	5	(¹)	(¹)	2	
10,000-14,999.....	6	1	1	12	6	18	(¹)	(¹)	(²)	
15,000-19,999.....	3	(²)	1	3	3	7	(¹)	(¹)	2	
20,000 or more.....	6	1	1	4	6	19	(¹)	(¹)	8	
Median amount ¹										
All reporting units.....	\$365	0	0	\$600	\$1,000	\$7,100	(¹)	(¹)	5	
Units with financial assets.....	3,900	\$764	\$1,000	3,525	3,000	8,125	(¹)	(¹)	\$1,009	
Nonmarried women										
Number (in thousands):										
Total.....	5,816	2,057	1,591	866	717	369	119	97	1,618	
Reporting amount of assets.....	5,246	1,905	1,443	806	625	310	92	65	436	
Percent of units.....	100	100	100	100	100	100	(¹)	(¹)	100	
None.....	42	60	41	32	24	14	(¹)	(¹)	44	
\$1-499.....	13	13	15	14	16	3	(¹)	(¹)	11	
500-999.....	7	5	8	9	6	7	(¹)	(¹)	9	
1,000-1,499.....	5	5	6	5	6	5	(¹)	(¹)	6	
1,500-1,999.....	2	1	2	2	4	3	(¹)	(¹)	(²)	
2,000-2,499.....	3	3	4	3	4	4	(¹)	(¹)	4	
2,500-2,999.....	1	1	1	2	1	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	1	
3,000-4,999.....	7	5	7	9	9	9	(¹)	(¹)	2	
5,000-7,499.....	6	4	8	6	8	8	(¹)	(¹)	6	
7,500-9,999.....	2	2	2	4	4	5	(¹)	(¹)	3	
10,000-14,999.....	4	2	3	8	7	9	(¹)	(¹)	3	
15,000-19,999.....	2	1	1	2	2	8	(¹)	(¹)	2	
20,000 or more.....	5	(²)	1	2	10	26	(¹)	(¹)	9	
Median amount ¹										
All reporting units.....	\$223	0	\$200	\$600	\$1,200	\$6,510	(¹)	(¹)	\$200	
Units with financial assets.....	2,000	\$1,000	1,500	2,300	3,000	9,780	(¹)	(¹)	2,000	

¹ Assets were often reported in round numbers and considerable clustering thus occurred around even values in the hundreds or thousands, when the computer identified the median respondent, his response tended to be in

such a cluster

² 0.5 percent or less

³ Not shown where base is less than 100,000

TABLE 15.—Financial assets, by poverty status: Number of aged units reporting on financial assets and percent of units with assets, by amount, 1967

Poverty status	Number (in thousands)	Reporting on financial assets (in thousands)	Units reporting on financial assets			
			Percent with—			Median
			None	\$1-2,999	\$3,000 or more	
Married couples.						
Poor.....	922	851	47	36	17	\$55
Not poor.....	3,867	3,295	19	30	50	2,500
Below moderate level.	2,653	2,440	35	36	29	515
Above moderate level.	2,136	1,706	11	25	64	5,700
Poverty status unknown.....	1,200	251	32	34	33	800
Nonmarried men and women.						
Poor.....	4,760	4,407	52	31	17	0
Not poor.....	3,334	2,746	23	31	46	2,000
Below moderate level.	5,978	5,555	48	32	20	50
Above moderate level.	2,116	1,598	17	26	56	4,000
Poverty status unknown.....	1,695	490	50	32	18	0

TABLE 16.—Financial assets, by primary insurance amount: Number of aged units¹ reporting on financial assets, by amount of assets, and by primary insurance amount level, 1967

Primary insurance amount	Number (in thousands)	Reporting on financial assets (in thousands)	Percent with financial assets		
			None	\$1-2,999	\$3,000 or more
Married couples					
Total.....	4,907	3,653	26	32	42
Less than \$100.....	1,591	1,294	35	35	30
55.00.....	432	355	40	34	28
55.10-79.90.....	455	365	36	36	29
80.00-99.90.....	704	574	30	37	33
100.00-119.90.....	717	564	26	37	37
120.00-139.90.....	950	709	24	31	46
140.00 or more.....	1,579	1,037	16	27	57
Nonmarried persons					
<i>Men</i>					
Total.....	1,928	1,615	40	29	32
Less than \$100.....	848	738	52	28	20
55.00.....	251	220	52	20	17
55.10-79.90.....	283	261	61	26	13
80.00-99.90.....	314	256	44	25	29
100.00-119.90.....	342	302	30	38	33
120.00-139.90.....	374	362	33	30	37
140.00 or more.....	351	280	26	18	55
<i>Women</i>					
Retired workers.....	3,217	2,426	36	36	29
Less than \$100.....	2,185	1,758	39	39	22
55.00.....	915	756	42	38	19
55.10-79.90.....	623	474	40	39	21
80.00-99.90.....	647	528	34	38	27
100.00-119.90.....	470	345	29	33	38
120.00-139.90.....	300	183	25	23	51
140.00 or more.....	247	126	10	23	67
Widow beneficiaries.....	2,386	1,791	40	31	29
Less than \$100.....	1,075	913	51	27	21
55.00.....	281	228	61	22	17
55.10-79.90.....	363	311	49	28	23
80.00-99.90.....	452	373	48	30	23
100.00-119.90.....	401	305	27	44	29
120.00-139.90.....	507	343	32	28	41
140.00 or more.....	389	221	21	32	47

¹ Excludes beneficiaries who received their first benefit February 1967 or later, the transitionally insured, and special "age-72" beneficiaries

Nearly four-fifths of the aged reported having liquid assets; most of them, however, reported money in banks or in savings or loan associations. Of those reporting on the amounts of their holdings, only those with income at the higher levels had enough to provide much additional income.

TABLE 17.—Income from assets: Percentage distribution of aged units by amount of income from assets, by OASDHI beneficiary status, 1967

Amount of income	All units	Married couples	Nonmarried persons		
			Total	Men	Women
All units					
Number (in thousands).					
Total.....	15,779	5,989	9,789	2,356	7,434
Reporting on income from assets.....	12,829	4,620	8,209	2,050	6,159
Percent of units.....	100	100	100	100	100
None (or loss).....	52	42	57	58	57
\$1-149.....	18	19	17	15	18
150-299.....	8	9	7	8	7
300-499.....	7	7	6	6	6
500-999.....	7	10	6	6	5
1,000-1,499.....	3	5	2	3	3
1,500-1,999.....	1	2	1	1	1
2,000-2,999.....	2	3	1	1	1
3,000-4,999.....	1	2	1	1	1
5,000 or more.....	1	2	1	1	1
Median income of units with asset income.....	\$250	\$300	\$210	\$250	\$200
Beneficiary units¹					
Number (in thousands)					
Total.....	12,446	4,913	7,533	1,928	5,605
Reporting on income from assets.....	10,142	3,858	6,285	1,686	4,599
Percent of units.....	100	100	100	100	100
None (or loss).....	50	42	54	56	53
\$1-149.....	19	19	18	15	20
150-299.....	8	8	8	8	8
300-499.....	7	8	7	7	7
500-999.....	7	10	6	7	6
1,000-1,499.....	3	4	3	3	3
1,500-1,999.....	1	2	1	2	1
2,000-2,999.....	2	3	1	1	1
3,000-4,999.....	1	2	1	1	1
5,000 or more.....	1	2	1	1	1
Median income of units with asset income.....	\$250	\$300	\$210	\$250	\$200
Nonbeneficiary units					
Number (in thousands):					
Total.....	2,146	720	1,426	302	1,125
Reporting on income from assets.....	1,734	508	1,226	258	998
Percent of units.....	100	100	100	100	100
None (or loss).....	63	46	70	63	71
\$1-149.....	13	15	12	14	11
150-299.....	7	12	5	9	4
300-499.....	5	6	5	5	5
500-999.....	5	11	3	5	2
1,000-1,499.....	3	3	2	3	2
1,500-1,999.....	1	2	1	(²)	1
2,000-2,999.....	1	4	(²)	(²)	(²)
3,000-4,999.....	1	1	1	1	1
5,000 or more.....	(²)	(²)	(²)	1	(²)
Median income of units with asset income.....	\$240	\$250	\$216	(²)	\$240

¹ Excludes beneficiaries who received their first benefit February 1967 or later, the transitionally insured, and special "age-72" beneficiaries.

² 0.5 percent or less

³ Not shown where base is less than 100,000.

About 10 percent of the aged with low incomes (less than \$1,500) had financial assets of \$5,000 or more, and fewer than 5 percent had as much as \$15,000 or more. Half of the aged units classified as "poor" who reported assets had \$1,200 or less; the median financial assets of the nonpoor was about four times greater.

The ownership of the home, on the other hand, is an asset much more widely diffused among all income groups than are the financial assets that yield appreciable additions to money income. Among the married couples classified as poor, 71 percent owned their own home—mostly free of debt—compared with 78 percent of the nonpoor. Even among the nonmarried men and women, a third of the poor but 44 percent of the nonpoor owned their homes.

Although other studies have shown that in aggregate value home equity constitutes less than a third of the assets of the aged population,¹¹ the 1968 Survey of the Aged supports the findings that the owned home is an important asset of many in the lower and moderate income groups.

TECHNICAL SUPPLEMENT

The Technical Note of the first DECA article included a discussion of the survey design and definitions, estimation procedures, reliability of the estimates, and nonsampling errors.¹² The rough approximations of standard errors presented in that Note also pertain to the data presented here. Table I, which follows, supplements table IV of that Note. It presents confidence limits based on ungrouped data for median amounts of home equity of homeowning married couples and nonmarried men and women, and median financial assets of aged units with specified characteristics. These limits should be very close to those obtained by using extrapolation of the generalized standard errors shown in table III of the earlier Technical Note.

¹¹ See *The Aged Population of the United States*, *op. cit.*, pages 60-211; and Dorothy S. Projector and Gertrude S. Weiss, *op. cit.*, page 111.

¹² Lenore E. Bixby, *op. cit.*

TABLE I.—Approximate sampling variability of selected median amounts of home equity and of financial assets for aged married and nonmarried units

Characteristics of aged units	Median	Confidence interval		Number of units (in thousands)
		68 percent	95 percent	
Married couples				
Home equity: Homeowners.....	\$12,000	\$12,000-12,000	\$11,200-12,000	4,066
Financial assets: ¹				
Beneficiaries ²	1,500	1,468-1,949	1,200-2,000	3,660
Nonbeneficiaries.....	2,000	1,200-2,500	800-3,300	514
Aged 65-72.....	2,000	1,500-2,000	1,300-2,190	2,674
Aged 73 and over.....	1,600	1,361-2,000	1,075-2,000	1,723
Both worked in 1967.....	2,000	1,400-2,500	1,000-3,000	564
Did not work.....	1,800	1,140-1,500	1,000-2,000	2,176
Pension receipt:				
OASDHI benefits and Private pension group.....	4,000	3,500-5,000	2,600-5,300	721
Other public pension.....	2,000	1,500-3,000	1,280-4,295	293
No other public pension.....	1,000	1,000-1,225	800-1,500	2,643
Public pension other than OASDHI.....	2,000	1,000-2,000	400-4,000	122
No retirement benefits.....	2,000	1,000-3,000	600-4,100	379
Nonmarried men				
Home equity: Homeowners.....	\$10,000	\$10,000-10,000	\$9,000-11,900	711
Financial assets: ¹				
Beneficiaries ²	300	200-600	150-600	1,615
Nonbeneficiaries.....	100	3-500	3-1,000	242
Aged 65-72.....	100	11-200	11-400	765
Aged 73 and over.....	500	300-600	200-900	1,196
Worked in 1967.....	1,000	600-1,250	315-2,500	424
Did not work.....	200	125-300	93-500	1,537
Pension receipt:				
OASDHI benefits and Private pension group.....	1,800	1,000-3,000	400-4,000	227
Other public pension.....	(?)	(?)	(?)	96
No other public pension.....	130	80-200	20-330	1,283
Public pension other than OASDHI.....	(?)	(?)	(?)	80
No retirement benefits.....	0	-----	-----	155
Nonmarried women				
Home equity: Homeowners.....	\$10,000	\$10,000-10,000	\$10,000-10,000	2,305
Financial assets: ¹				
Beneficiaries ²	470	400-500	300-500	4,219
Nonbeneficiaries.....	0	-----	-----	915
Aged 65-72.....	350	295-491	200-500	2,269
Aged 73 and over.....	200	125-200	100-300	3,413
Worked in 1967.....	623	500-620	300-1,000	779
Did not work.....	200	140-200	100-275	4,903
Pension receipt:				
OASDHI benefits and Private pension group.....	2,300	1,800-4,000	1,050-4,750	195
Other public pension.....	2,907	2,000-3,700	1,200-5,000	257
No other public pension.....	300	295-400	200-460	3,760
Public pension other than OASDHI.....	600	300-1,000	1-2,000	165
No retirement benefits.....	0	-----	-----	744

¹ Data include reporting units.

² Excludes beneficiaries who received their first benefit February 1967 or later, the transitionally insured and special "age-72" beneficiaries.

³ Not shown where base is less than 100,000.