are to be administered by a three-man Accident Compensation Commission. The Commission, in the Department of Labor under the Minister of Social Security, will have control over the collection of contributions, the payment of cash benefits and awards, the assessment of incapacity, the investigation of injuries, and the development, coordination, and supervision of accident prevention and rehabilitation programs. The Commission can delegate much of its authority for administering the two programs; it can, for example, appoint “agents” to collect contributions and handle claims.

It is not known at present what role the insurance industry will play. The Woodhouse Report emphasized the importance of a centralized administration and advised against private insurance companies participating in any aspect of the two accident compensation programs. The Accident Compensation Act is unclear as to their role. No private group may underwrite the Government-established funds, but there does appear to be a role for private companies in the handling of claims. The Act states that the Commission “may” from time to time appoint as one of its agents any insurance company or association. Such agents will be paid for services rendered either by fees or by commissions.

Research Grants Studies

Section 1110 of the Social Security Act provides for a cooperative research grants program. The grants given by the Social Security Administration under this program are to nonprofit organizations for research in the broad area of social security. Reports on two recently completed grants projects are summarized below. Similar summaries will be published in the BULLETIN as the projects are concluded.

WORK AFTER RETIREMENT

What psychological factors influence men to continue working after mandatory retirement and what effect do different retirement systems have on retirement-related attitudes? Social Security Research Grants Project 56047 produced two reports in this area—“Work After Retirement: Some Psychological Factors” and “A Comparison of the Effects of Two Retirement Systems.” The exploratory research was carried out at the Center for the Study of Aging and Human Development of Duke University and involved men on university faculties who were in good health and financially secure.

The authors, Gerda G. Fillenbaum and George L. Maddox (Director of the Center), found that the retirement decision is based on a set of mutually reinforcing preretirement factors—such as the importance of the work being done, personal involvement in work-related matters, a distaste for retirement, and an attempt to circumvent retirement. Although environmental matters (assurance of continued access to work facilities and local availability of paid work, for example) seemed to have little relevance to continued working, certain specific matters (such as the possession of particular skills) did appear to be important.

The reports indicate that those under a “flexible” retirement system (that is, they lost tenure at age 65 and were forcefully reminded about retirement for the next 5 years) were more likely to favor retirement, to have made plans for both work and leisure, and to be better adjusted after retirement than were those under a more “abrupt” retirement system—mandatory retirement at age 70.

* * *

DETERMINANTS OF INTERSTATE MIGRATION OF THE ELDERLY

The literature dealing with patterns and determinants of population mobility is massive. Most of the published research concentrates on population movements as a whole, or on movements of the labor force.

Interstate migration rates of persons aged 65 and over are the focus of a research project directed by Steve L. Barsby and Dennis R. Cox at the College of Business and Public Administration, University of Arizona, 1970-72. They found that research directed primarily at migration patterns of the elderly is extremely scarce.