# Social Security Beneficiaries Enrolled in the Direct Deposit Program, December 1983 

by Joseph Bondar*

In 1975, Social Security beneficiaries were given the option of having their monthly benefit payments sent directly to their banks through an electronic funds transfer system. Since then, beneficiaries have been enrolling in this program in rapidly increasing numbers. At the end of 1976, fewer than 5 million beneficiaries-14 percent of the total-were enrolled in the program. By the end of 1983, the number of direct depositors had risen to nearly 14 million-or 2 of every 5 beneficiaries. This article gives an overview of the direct deposit program and the events that led to the initiation of the electronic funds transfer system. Detailed data on the demographic characteristics of those using the program are also presented.

Each month, nearly 14 million Social Security beneficiaries have a total of $\$ 6$ billion in benefit payments deposited directly into their bank accounts via an electronic funds transfer (EFT) system. The Social Security Administration (SSA) has been using the EFT system for monthly benefit payments since late 1975. Through a series of electronic financial transactions involving SSA, the Department of the Treasury, and the Federal Reserve Banks, the monthly amount is credited to the individual's bank account. ${ }^{1}$

The transition to this modern EFT system was a gradual result of various policy decisions as well as legislation. Before November 1970, direct deposit was restricted to those individuals who specifically requested it because of extenuating circumstances. This was accomplished by the beneficiary filing a "power-of-attorney" with the bank receiving the deposit. In November 1970, the direct deposit option was extended to all beneficiaries.

On August 7, 1972, with the enactment of Public Law

[^0]92-366, the power-of-attorney requirement was eliminated, and Federal agencies were authorized to draw checks payable to a financial institution for crediting to the beneficiary's account. Under the power-of-attorney payment method in effect until that time, the check was drawn to the individual but was mailed to the bank. The legislation also permitted the issuance of composite checks in situations where a single financial institution received monthly checks for more than one beneficiary. Thus, Public Law 92-366 cleared the way for the present direct deposit program.

In November 1973, SSA and the Department of the Treasury conducted a study and issued a report recommending a comprehensive direct deposit program, preferably accomplished through an EFT system. The report concluded that direct deposit should result in improved service to beneficiaries and reduced administrative costs. ${ }^{2}$

In 1977, 2 years after implementation of the EFT program, SSA and the Department of the Treasury contracted with Temple University to have data collected for a study of direct deposit. ${ }^{3}$ The two principal objectives of the study were to determine why Social Security beneficiaries had enrolled in, had not enrolled in, or had

[^1]cancelled enrollment in the direct deposit program, and to see if any modifications were necessary. Among the important findings of the study were the following:
(1) Convenience was the primary reason for requesting direct deposit, followed by safety/security and physical problems involved in going to the bank.
(2) The major reasons for beneficiary withdrawal from the program were change of address, dissatisfaction with bank procedures, and belief that it was more convenient to receive checks directly.
(3) The desire to see and personally handle their checks was the principal reason given by beneficiaries for not electing the option.
(4) A considerable percentage of beneficiaries was unaware that direct deposit was available.
(5) The more educated the beneficiary, the more likely he or she was to elect direct deposit.
The Temple University study concentrated on why beneficiaries chose to use or not use direct deposit and explored possible changes to be made in the existing program. This article provides insight into who among the beneficiaries has opted to participate in the direct deposit program, identifying the depositors by such demographic characteristics as age, race, sex, and area of residence.

## General Characteristics

At the end of December 1983, 13.8 million Social Security beneficiaries- 38.2 percent of the beneficiary population-were using the direct deposit option (table 1). Seven years earlier, only 4.7 million beneficiaries ( 14.3 percent of all beneficiaries) had been using the op-
tion. During that same 1976-83 period, the monthly amount of direct deposit payments rose from $\$ 1.1$ billion to $\$ 6.0$ billion.

Among all beneficiary groups, more retired workers (43 percent) than any other group were enrolled in the direct deposit program. The next highest proportion was found among aged widows, widowers, and parents (41 percent), followed by spouses of retired workers (36 percent). The high participation rate of these groups can be attributed to their ages rather than to the type of benefit received. As indicated in table 2, older beneficiaries are generally more likely than younger beneficiaries to enroll in the program. At age 80, however, the percentage declines.

Although the proportion of minority beneficiaries using direct deposit has increased substantially since 1978, minorities continue to be direct depositors less frequently. At the end of 1978, 9 percent of black beneficiaries were using direct deposit, compared with 25 percent of white beneficiaries. ${ }^{4}$ In December 1983, 17 percent of black beneficiaries were enrolled, compared with 41 percent of white beneficiaries.

As the Social Security benefit amount increases, the percentage of direct depositors increases; but white beneficiaries participate in larger proportions at every benefit level than do blacks. This pattern holds true at both the national level and when individual State data are examined.

The beneficiary's sex, in itself, was not a significant factor affecting the use of direct deposit. Generally, the proportion of women enrolled in the direct deposit program is slightly higher than that of men.

[^2]Table 1.-Number and percent of beneficiaries using direct deposit, by type of beneficiary, 1976-83

|  | December 1976 |  | December 1978 |  | December 1980 |  | December 1982 I |  | December 19831 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Type of beneficiary - | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Total. | 4,716,111. | 14.3 | 7,947,425 | 23.0 | 10,393,684 | 29.2 | 12,602,920 | 35.2 | 13,757,740 | 38.2 |
| Retired workers and dependents . . . | 3,374,514 | 16.3 | 5,617,632 | 25.5 | 7,429,390 | 32.0 | 9,284,770 | 38.2 | 10,281,110 | 41.3 |
| Retired workers | 2,908,752 | 16.9 | 4,871,222 | 26.5 | 6,498,125 | 33.2 | 8,185,050 | 39.5 | 9,092,550 | 42.5 |
| Wives and husbands | 424,847 | 14.7 | 677,096 | 22.7 | 847,968 | 28.1 | 1,013,560 | 33.5 | 1,103,710 | 36.4 |
| Children.. | 40,915 | 6.3 | 69,314 | 10.5 | 83,297 | 13.0 | 86,160 | 15.4 | 84,850 | 16.5 |
| Disabled workers and dependents . . . . | 449,465 | 9.7 | 818,034 | 16.8 | 990.721 | 21.2 | 993,770 | 24.9 | 1,001,540 | 26.3 |
| Disabled workers | 325,395 | 12.2 | 597,670 | 20.8 | 735,609 | 25.7 | 773,420 | 29.6 | 794,140 | 31.0 |
| Wives and husbands | 37,669 | 7.9 | 69,037 | 14.0 | 80,040 | 17.3 | 72,810 | 19.8 | - 63,210 | 20.4 |
| Children | 86,401 | 5.8 | 151,327 | 10.1 | 175,072 | 12.9 | 147,540 | 14.7 | 144,190 | 15.4 |
| Survivors | 875,478 | 11.7 | 1,490,166 | 19.6 | 1,952,234 | 25.7 | 2,307,020 | 31.1 | 2,459,630 | 34.0 |
| Widows, widowers, and parents... | 605,937 | 15.1 | 1,032,043 | 24.4 | 1,394,436 | 31.5 | 1,730,170 | 37.6 | 1,903,360 | 40.6 |
| Widowed mothers and fathers . . . . | 54,153 | 9.4 | 93,523 | 16.2 | 115,192 | 20.5 | 120,320 | 23.4 | 100,730 | 25.2 |
| Children. | 215,388 | 7.4 | 364,600 | 13.1 | 442,606 | 17.0 | 456,530 | 19.7 | 455,540 | 21.3 |
| Special age-72 . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 16,654 | 8.9 | 21,593 | 16.1 | 21,339 | 23.0 | 17,360 | 28.1 | 15,460 | 30.8 |

[^3]Table 2.-Number and percent of beneficiaries and average monthly amount of benefits, by depositor status, age, sex, and race, December 1983


## Monthly Benefit

Direct depositors had higher average monthly benefits than nondirect depositors in all beneficiary categories. In December 1983, retired and disabled workers enrolled in the direct deposit program had average monthly benefits of $\$ 466.65$ and $\$ 491.09$, respectively. The corresponding averages for nondirect depositors were $\$ 421.72$ and $\$ 440.26$ (table 3).

As shown in table 4 and previously stated, the higher the monthly benefit, the higher the percentage of beneficiaries using the direct deposit option. Generally, the pattern holds true regardless of the type of benefit received. For example, only 29 percent of retired workers with a benefit amount of less than $\$ 200$ were enrolled in the program, compared with 50 percent of those receiving benefits of $\$ 600$ or more (table 5 ). Similarly, the percentage of disabled workers using direct deposit increased from 16 percent to 40 percent as the benefit rose from the less than $\$ 200$ to the $\$ 600$ or more level (table 6).

As noted earlier, generally the proportion of women
using direct deposit (41 percent) was slightly higher than that of men ( 40 percent). At the higher benefit levels, however, the percentage of women enrolled in the program became significantly higher: at the $\$ 600$ or more benefit level, 54 percent of the women, compared with 47 percent of the men, used direct deposit (table 4). In fact, the proportion of women enrolled at all benefit levels exceeding $\$ 200$ was substantially higher than that for men. For the total beneficiary population, however, the difference was only 1 percent. This narrow gap occurs because many more women than men are at the lower benefit levels, which have a relatively low participation rate, thus reducing the overall participation rate for women.

## State of Residence

Beneficiaries residing in the Western United States used direct deposit more frequently than those in other areas. Of the 10 States with the highest participation rates, only Florida and Kansas were outside the West

Table 3.-Number and percent of beneficiaries, monthly amounts, and average monthly amount of benefit, by type of beneficiary and depositor status, December 1983
[Based on 10-percent sample]

|  | All beneficiaries |  |  | Direct depositors |  |  |  |  | Nondirect depositors |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Type of beneficiary | Number | Monthly amount (in thousands) 1 | Average monthly amount | Number | Percent | Monthly amount (in thousands) ! | Percent | Average monthly amount | Number | Percent | Monthly amount (in thousands)! | Percent | Average monthly amoun |
| - Total. | 36,018,290 | \$14,150,246 | \$392.86 | 13,757,740 | 38.2 | \$5,950,702 | 42.1 | \$432.53 | 22,260,550 | 61.8 | \$8,199,544 | 57.9 | \$368.34 |
| Retired workers and dependents. . . | 24,922,040 | 10,198,555 | 409.22 | 10,281,110 | 41.3 | 4,532,269 | 44.4 | 440.83 | 14,640,930 | 58.7 | 5,666,287 | 55.6 | 387.02 |
| Retired workers . | 21,373,920 | 9,422,401 | 440.84 | 9,092,550 | 42.5 | 4,243,045 | 45.0 | 466.65 | 12,281,370 | 57.5 | 5,179,356 | 55.0 | 421.72 |
| Wives and husband | 3,032,330 | 685,145 | 225.95 | 1,103,710 | 36.4 | 271,270 | 39.6 | 245.78 | 1,928,620 | 63.6 | +113,875 | 60.4 | 214.60 |
| Children. | 515,790 | 91,009 | 176.45 | 84,850 | 16.5 | 17,954 | 19.7 | 211.59 | 430,940 | 83.5 | 73,056 | 80.3 | 169.53 |
| Disabled workers and dependents. . . . . | 3,810,860 | 1,336,561 | 350.72 | 1,001,540 | 26.3 | 423,916 | 31.7 | 423.26 | 2,809,320 | 73.7 | 912,644 | 68.3 | 324.86 |
| Disabled workers.. | 2,565,530 | 1,169,873 | 456.00 | 794,140 | 31.0 | 389,997 | 33.3 | 491.09 | 1,771,390 | 69.0 | 779,876 | 66.7 | 440.26 |
| Wives and husbands | 309,710 | 40,084 | 129.42 | 63,210 | 20.4 | 9,610 | 24.0 | 152.04 | 246,500 | 79.6 | 30,474 | 76.0 | 123.63 |
| Children. | 935,620 | 126,603 | 135.31 | 144,190 | 15.4 | 24,309 | 19.2 | 168.59 | 791,430 | 84.6 | 102,294 | 80.8 | 129.25 |
| Survivors. Aged widows, widowers, | 7,235,130 | 2,608,627 | 360.55 | 2,459,630 | 34.0 | 992,513 | 38.0 | 403.52 | 4,775,500 | 66.0 | 1,616,115 | 62.0 | 338.42 |
| and parents . . . . . . . Disabled widows and | 4,584,560 | 1,817,860 | 396.52 | 1,872,320 | 40.8 | 794,759 | 43.7 | 424.48 | 2,712,240 | 59.2 | 1,023,101 | 56.3 | 377.22 |
| widowers . . . . . . <br> Widowed mothers and | 109,150 | 27,233 | 249.50 | 31,040 | 28.4 | 8,363 | 30.7 | 269.43 | 78,110 | 71.6 | 18,869 | 69.3 | 241.57 |
| fathers | 399,470 | 123,649 | 309.53 | 100,730 | 25.2 | 34,988 | 28.3 | 347.35 | 298,740 | 74.8 | 88,661 | 71.7 | 296.78 |
| Children. | 2,141,950 | 639,886 | 298.74 | 455,540 | 21.3 | 154,403 | 24.1 | 338.94 | 1,686,410 | 78.7 | 485,483 | 75.9 | 287.88 |
| Special age-72 | 50,260 | 6,503 | 129.38 | 15,460 | 30.8 | 2,004 | 30.8 | 129.62 | 34,800 | 69.2 | 4,499 | 69.2 | 129.27 |

Table 4.-Number and percent of beneficiaries using direct deposit, by race, monthly amount, and sex, December 1983
[Based on 10-percent sample]

| Monthly amount | Total |  |  | White ${ }^{\text {c }}$ |  |  | Black |  |  | Other |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent of direct depositors 1 | Percent of all beneficiaries | Number | Percent of direct depositors 1 | Percent of all beneficiaries | Number | Percent of direct depositors 1 | Percent of all beneficiaries | Number | Percent of direct depositors 1 | Percent of . all beneficiaries |
| Total. | 13,757,740 | 100.0 | 38.2 | 13,041.010 | 100.0 | 40.8 | 576.700 | 100.0 | 16.8 | 140,030 | 100.0 | 22.5 |
| Less than \$100.00 | 145,830 | 1.1 | 12.7 | 125,300 | 1.0 | 15.1 | 16,250 | 2.8 | 6.4 | 4,280 | 3.1 | 6.4 |
| \$100.00-\$199.90. | 1,052,220 | 7.6 | 24.4 | 955,490 | 7.3 | 27.7 | 79,880 | 13.9 | 10.8 | 16,850 | 12.0 | 13.5 |
| \$200.00-\$299.90. | 2,344,090 | 17.0 | 33.3 | 2,193,490 | 16.8 | 36.0 | 123,530 | 21.4 | 15.1 | 27,070 | 19.3 | 20.8 |
| \$300.00-\$399.90. | 2,386,910 | 17.3 | 36.6 | 2,236,330 | 17.1 | 39.0 | 124,570 | 21.6 | 18.4 | 26,010 | 18.6 | 24.0 |
| \$400.00-5499.90. | 3,034,700 | 22.1 | 43.3 | 2,906,340 | 22.3 | 44.9 | 103,940 | 18.0 | 22.7 | 24,420 | 17.4 | 29.7 |
| \$500.00-\$599.90. | 2,669,820 | 19.4 | 47.4 | 2,572,960 | 19.7 | 48.7 | 75,320 | 13.1 | 25.3 | 21,540 | 15.4 | 36.0 |
| \$600.00 or more | 2,124,170 | 15.4 | 48.9 | 2,051,100 | 15.7 | 50.0 | 53,210 | 9.2 | 27.9 | 19,860 | 14.2 | 40.8 |
| Men, total. | 5,228,300 | 38.0 | 39.7 | 4,976,780 | 38.2 | 42.2 | 192,470 | 33.4 | 17.1 | 59.050 | 42.2 | 25.8 |
| Less than \$100.00 | 5,560 | $\ldots$ | 17.3 | 5,210 | $\ldots$ | 19.6 | 230 | $\ldots$ | 5.4 | 120 | . 1 | 9.8 |
| \$100.00-\$199.90. | 182,110 | 1.3 | 26.0 | 166,620 | 1.3 | 29.4 | 12,000 | 2.1 | 10.8 | 3,490 | 2.5 | -15.0 |
| \$200.00-\$299.90. | 335,850 | 2.4 | 27.1 | 306,210 | 2.3 | 30.1 | 23,740 | 4.1 | 12.6 | 5,900 | 4.2 | 17.3 |
| \$300.00-\$399.90. | 546,000 | 4.0 | 30.9 | 502,970 | 3.9 | 34.1 | 34,420 | 6.0 | 14.0 | 8,610 | 6.1 | 19.8 |
| \$400.00-\$499.90. | 1,093,800 | 8.0 | 39.4 | 1,040,510 | 8.0 | 41.6 | 42,020 | 7.3 | 18.3 | 11,270 | 8.0 | 24.7 |
| \$500.00-\$599.90. | 1,530,780 | 11.1 | 45.1 | 1,472,790 | 11.3 | 46.7 | 43,660 | 7.6 | 22.0 | 14,330 | 10.2 | 33.7 |
| \$600.00 or more | 1,534,200 | 11.2 | 47.2 | 1,482,470 | 11.4 | 48.4 | 36,400 | 6.3 | 24.8 | 15,330 | 10.9 | 39.0 |
| Women, tota | 7,844,860 | 57.0 | 40.7 | 7,482,630 | 57.4 | 42.9 | 298,020 | 51.7 | 18.9 | 64,210 | 45.9 | 25.8 |
| Less than \$100.00. | 83,690 | . 6 | 18.4 | 75,860 | . 6 | 21.0 | 6,040 | 1.0 | 8.3 | 1,790 | 1.3 | 9.0 |
| \$100.00-\$199.90. | 713,970 | 5.2 | 27.0 | 660,510 | 5.1 | 30.2 | 44,690 | 7.7 | 11.3 | 8,770 | 6.3 | 15.0 |
| \$200.00-\$299.90. | 1,831,590 | 13.3 | 36.9 | 1,738,830 | 13.3 | 39.2 | 75,950 | 13.2 | 16.6 | 16,810 | 12.0 | 25.0 |
| \$300.00-\$399.90. | 1,698,340 | 12.3 | 40.8 | 1,610,000 | 12.3 | 42.6 | 73,790 | 12.8 | 22.1 | 14,550 | 10.4 | 29.0 |
| \$400.00-\$499.90. | 1,845,510 | 13.4 | 47.3 | 1,780,850 | 13.7 | 48.3 | 53,000 | 9.2 | 28.0 | 11,660 | 8.3 | 38.4 |
| \$500.00-\$599.90. | 1,093,500 | 7.9 | 52.2 | 1,058,650 | 8.1 | 53.2 | 28,520 | 4.9 | 32.5 | 6,330 | 4.5 | 43.8 |
| \$600.00 or more | 578,260 | 4.2 | 54.4 | 557.930 | 4.3 | 55.1 | 16,030 | 2.8 | 38.3 | 4,300 | 3.1 | 48.9 |
| Children, total 2 | 684,580 | 5.0 | 19.1 | 581,600 | 4.5 | 21.4 | 86,210 | 14.9 | 11.8 | 16,770 | 12.0 | 11.8 |
| Less than \$100.00. | 56,580 | . 4 | 8.6 | 44,230 | . 3 | 10.1 | 9.980 | 1.7 | 5.7 | 2,370 | 1.7 | 5.2 |
| \$100.00-\$199.90. | 156,140 | 1.1 | 16.1 | 128,360 | 1.0 | 18.5 | 23,190 | 4.0 | 10.0 | 4,590 | 3.3 | 10.7 |
| \$200.00-\$299.90. | 176,650 | 1.3 | 20.8 | 148,450 | 1.1 | 22.9 | 23,840 | 4.1 | 13.7 | 4,360 | 3.1 | 14.9 |
| \$300.00-\$399.90. | 142,570 | 1.0 | 23.9 | 123,360 | . 9 | 25.5 | 16,360 | 2.8 | 16.9 | 2,850 | 2.0 | 19.1 |
| \$400.00-5499.90. | 95,390 | . 7 | 28.3 | 84,980 | . 7 | 29.2 | 8,920 | 1.5 | 22.2 | 1,490 | 1.1 | 23.6 |
| \$ $\$ 00.00$ or more | 57,250 | .4 | 31.6 | 52,220 | . 4 | 31.9 | 3,920 | . 7 | 27.7 | 1,110 | . 8 | 32.5 |

[^4][^5]Table 5.-Number and percent of retired-worker beneficiaries using direct deposit, by race, monthly amount, and sex, December 1983
[Based on 10-percent sample]


1 Totais may not add due to rounding.
Table 6.-Number and percent of disabled-worker beneficiaries using direct deposit, by race, monthly amount, and sex, December 1983
[Based on 10-percent sample]

| Monthly amount | Total |  |  | ${ }^{\text {W }}$ White |  |  | Black |  |  | Other |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent of direct deposiitors 1 | Percent of disabledworker beneficiaries | Number | Percent of direct depositors 1 | Percent <br> of disabledworker beneficiaries | Number | Percent of direct depositors 1 | Percent of disabledworker beneficiaries | Number | Percent of direct depositors ! | Percent of disabledworker beneficiaries |
| Total | 794,140 | 100.0 | 31.0 | 712,890 | 100.0 | 33.7 | 70,210 | 100.0 | 17.8 | 11,040 | 100.0 | 20.6 |
| Less than \$200.00. | 18,950 | 2.4 | 15.8 | 15,680 | 2.2 | 18.2 | 2,750 | 3.9 | 9.3 | 520 | 4.7 | 12.1 |
| \$200.00-\$299.90. | 78,390 | -9.9 | 22.5 | 66,800 | 9.4 | 25.5 | 10,180 | 14.5 | 13.4 | 1,410 | 12.8 | 14.0 |
| \$300.00-\$399.90. | 153,180 | 19.3 | 26.7 | 132,700 | 18.6 | 29.6 | 17,950 | 25.6 | 16.1 | 2,530 | 22.9 | 18.1 |
| \$400.00-\$499.90. | 150,440 | 18.9 | 30.9 | 132,930 | 18.6 | 33.4 | 15,420 | 22.0 | 19.6 | 2,090 | 18.9 | 21.6 |
| \$500.00-\$599.90. | 170,300 | 21.4 | 36.0 | 155,660 | 21.8 | 37.9 | 12,650 | 18.0 | 22.8 | 1,990 | 18.0 | 25.7 |
| \$600.00 or mare | 222,880 | 28.1 | 39.6 | 209,120 | 29.3 | 40.8 | 11,260 | 16.0 | 26.4 | 2,500 | 22.6 | 32.1 |
| Men, total. | 524,250 | 66.0 | 30.3 | 475,010 | 66.6 | 33.0 | 42,300 | 60.2 | 16.6 | 6,940 | 62.9 | 18.8 |
| Less than \$200.00. | 5,190 | . 7 | 11.5 | 4,450 | . 6 | 12.9 | 520 | . 7 | 6.2 | 220 | 2.0 | 10.8 |
| \$200.00-\$299.90. | 21,180 | 2.7 | 15.8 | 17,140 | 2.4 | 18.0 | 3,470 | 4.9 | 10.4 | 570 | 5.2 | 10.3 |
| \$300.00-\$399.90. | 64,370 | 8.1 | 21.6 | 54,340 | 7.6 | 24.6 | 8,750 | 12.5 | 12.8 | 1,280 | 11.6 | 14.4 |
| \$400.00-\$499.90. | 92,110 | 11.6 | 27.7 | 80,850 | 11.3 | 30.4 | 10,150 | 14.5 | 17.1 | 1,110 | 10.1 | 16.6 |
| \$500.00-\$599.90. | 136,360 | 17.2 | 34.5 | 124,810 | 17.5 | 36.6 | 9,930 | 14.1 | 20.8 | 1,620 | 14.7 | 24.5 |
| \$ 600.00 or more | 205,040 | 25.8 | 39.1 | 193,420 | 27.1 | 40.4 | 9,480 | 13.5 | 24.9 | 2,140 | 19.4 | 30.4 |
| Women, total | 269,890 | 34.0 | 32.3 | 237,880 | 33.4 | 35.0 | 27,910 | 39.8 | 20.1 | 4,100 | 37.1 | 24.4 |
| Less than \$200.00. | 13.760 | 1.7 | 18.3 | 11,230 | 1.6 | 21.8 | 2,230 | 3.2 | 10.4 | 300 | 2.7 | 13.2 |
| \$200.00-\$299.90. | 57,210 | 7.2 | 26.7 | 49,660 | 7.0 | 29.7 | 6,710 | 9.6 | 15.8 | 840 | 7.6 | 18.6 |
| \$300.00-\$399.90. | 88,810 | 11.2 | 32.2 | 78,360 | 11.0 | 34.4 | 9,200 | 13.1 | 21.3 | 1,250 | 11.3 | 24.5 |
| \$400.00-\$499.90. | 58,330 | 7.3 | 37.9 | 52,080 | 7.3 | 39.6 | 5,270 | 7.5 | 27.2 | 980 | 8.9 | 32.6 |
| \$500.00-\$599.90. | 33,940 | 4.3 | 43.4 | 30,850 | 4.3 | 44.6 | 2,720 | 3.9 | 34.4 | 370 | 3.4 | 32.2 |
| \$600.00 or more. | 17,840 | 2.2 | 45.9 | 15,700 | 2.2 | 46.9 | 1,780 | 2.5 | 38.3 | 360 | 3.3 | 48.6 |

[^6](chart 1). For the most part, participation rates were lowest-below 30 percent-in the South.
As indicated in table 7, six States had more than half their beneficiary population enrolled in the direct deposit program: Florida ( 58 percent), Arizona ( 57 percent), Oregon ( 55 percent), Washington ( 55 percent), Idaho ( 52 percent), and Montana ( 50 percent). An additional 16 States had a participation rate between 40 percent and 50 percent.
With few exceptions, the same characteristics described earlier in this article about direct depositors on the national level were applicable in individual States. Just as the highest proportion of direct depositors was found nationally among retired workers, older beneficiaries, and white beneficiaries, so it was in the individual States. In December 1983, more than 50 percent of retired workers in the States of Arizona, Florida, Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Montana, New Mexico, Utah,

Wyoming, Nevada, and Kansas had elected direct deposit (table 8).
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Chart 1.-Percent of beneficiaries using direct deposit, December 1983


Table 7.-Direct depositor rank, number, and average monthly amount of benefits, by State and depositor status, December 1983
[Based on 10-percent sample]

| State | Rank 1 | All beneficiaries |  | Direct depositors |  |  | Nondirect depositors |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Number | Average monthly amount | Number | Percent | Average monthly amount | Number. | Percent | Average monthly amount |
| Total. | . . | 36,018,180 | \$392.86 | 13,757,740 | 38.2 | \$432.53 | 22,260,440 | 61.8 | \$368.34 |
| Alabama | 46 | 640,090 | 345.92 | 179,150 | 28.0 | 404.72 | 460,940 | . 72.0 | 323.07 |
| Alaska. | 39 | 23,550 | 389.93 | 7,420 | 31.5 | 426.27 | 16,130 | 68.5 | 373.22 |
| Arizona | 2 | 461,580 | 402.58 | 264,070 | 57.2 | 433.45 | 197,510 | 42.8 | 361.31 |
| Arkansas | 37 | 433,860 | 337.61 | 146,390 | 33.7. | 388.60 | 287,470 | 66.3 | 311.64 |
| California | 18 | 3,263,370 | 405.03 | 1,391,760 | 42.6 | 432.25 | 1,871,610 | 57.4 | 384.79 |
| Colorado. | 14 | 345,490 | 387.38 | 157,310 | 45.5 | 409.97 | 188,180 | 54.5 | 368.49 |
| Connecticut. | 23 | 486,490 | 445.34 | 191,940 | 39.5 | 473.66 | 294,530 | 60.5 | 426.88 |
| Delaware | 16 | 91,910 | 415.53 | 39,740 | 43.2 | 459.20 | 52,170 | 56.8 | 382.27 |
| District of Columbia | 42 | 82,490 | 349.91 | 24,730 | 30.0 | 378.68 | 57,760 | 70.0 | 337.60 |
| Florida. . . . . . . . . | 1 | 2,187,420 | 402.02 | 1,270,160 | 58.1 | 429.02 | 917,260 | 41.9 | 364.64 |
| Georgia | 43 | 781,800 | 350.91 | 234,350 | 30.0 | 406.54 | 547,450 | 70.0 | 327.09 |
| Hawaii. | 33 | 118,950 | 384.49 | 44,290 | - 37.2 | 424.47 | 74,660 | 62.8 | 360.77 |
| Idaho. . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 5 | 140,140 | 386.70 | 72,670 | 51.9 | 413.18 | 67,470 | 48.1 | 358.16 |
| Illinois. | 34 | 1,650,750 | 424.29 | 610,720 | 37.0 | 453.57 | 1,040,030 | 63.0 | 407.10 |
| Indiana | 29 | 829,710 | 415.27 | 320,950 | 38.7 | 445.05 | 508,760 | 61.3 | 396.49 |
| Iowa | 15 | 499,550 | 400.05 | 223,950 | 44.8 | 421.00 | 275,600 | 55.2 | 383.02 |
| Kansas. | 9 | 381,890 | 401.89 | 185,680 | 48.6 | 421.63 | 196,210 | 51.4 | 383.21 |
| Kentucky . . . . . . . . . . . . | 50 | 596,240 | 345.73 | 160,890 | 27.0 | 398.93 | 435,350 | 73.0 | 326.07. |
| Louisiana. . . . . . . . . . . . | 51 | 573,950 | 344.25 | 127,740 | 22.3 | 408.80 | 446,210 | 77.7 | 325.77 |
| Maine | 32 | 196,870 | 370.97 | 73,930 | 37.6 | 403.56 | 122,940 | 62.4 | 351.38 |
| Maryland. . | 40 | 547,440 | 402.84 | 167,700 | 30.6 | 434.82 | 379,740 | 69.4 | 388.71 |
| Massachusetts | 21 | 928,270 | 411.29 | 380,810 | 41.0 | 441.43 | 547,460 | 59.0 | 390.31. |
| Michigan. | 19 | 1,383,840 | 422.71 | 385,350 | 42.3 | 454.09 | 798,490 | 57.7 | 399.70 |
| Minnesota | 20 | 622,670 | 387.62 | 258,330 | 41.5 | 417.17 | 364,340 | 58.5 | 366.66 |
| Mississippi. . . . . . . . . . | 44 | 421,400 | 314.96 | 121,440 | 28.8 | 383.57 | 299,960 | 71.2 | 287.19 |
| Missouri | 30 | 858,070 | 385.64 | 329,070 | 38.4 | 414.69 | 529,000 | 61.6 | 367.56 |
| Montana | 6 | 122,890 | 388.66 | 61,650 | 50.2 | 414.55 | 61,240 | 49.8 | 362.59 |
| Nebraska. . . . . . . . . . . . | 12 | 255,380 | 391.44 | 118,200 | 46.3 | 412.73 | 137,180 | 53.7 | 373.10 |
| Nevada . . . . . . . . . . . . | 10 | 110,590 | 408.39 | 51,980 | 47.0 | 429.51 | - $\quad \mathbf{5 8 , 6 1 0}$ | - 53.0 | 389.66 |
| New Hampshire. . . . . . . | 11 | 144,210 | 407.55 | 66,970 | 46.4 | 430.86 | 77,240 | 53.6 | 387.34 |
| New Jersey. | 36 | 1,160,380 | 437.93 | 399,660 | 34.4 | 469.82 | 760,720 | 65.6 | 421.18 |
| New Mexico. . . . . . . . . . | 13 | 176,990 | 357.36 | 80,970 | 45.7 | 405.44 | ,96,020 | 54.3 | 316.80 |
| New York . . . . . . . . . . | 27 | 2,797,010 | 429.19 | 1,087,530 | 38.9 | 464.36 | 1,709,480 | 61.1 | 406.82 |
| North Carolina . . . . . . . | 49 | 918,760 | 356.88 | 251,640 | 27.4 | 419.70 | 667,120 | 72.6 | 333.18 |
| North Dakota . . . . . . . . | 26 | 105,020 | 364.59 | 40.980 | 39.0 | 392.24 | 64,040 | 61.0 | 346.89 |
| Ohio | 35 | 1,651,620 | 408.15 | 587,370 | 35.6 | 439.35 | 1,064,250 | - 64.4 | 390.93 |
| Oklahoma . . . . . . . . . . . | 25 | 484,780 | 370.83 | 190,420 | 39.3 | 407.16 | 294,360 | 60.7 | 347.32 |
| Oregon. . . . . . . . . . . . . | 3 | 431,010 | 410.50 | 238,820 | 55.4 | 431.71 | 192,190 | 44.6 | 384.13 |
| Pennsylvania . . . . . . . . . | 38 | 2,102,080 | 416.67 | 679,500 | 32.3 | 449.19 | 1,422,580 | , 67.7 | 401.14 |
| Rhode Island. . . . . . . . . | 31 | 171,670 | 407.44 | 64,890 | 37.8 | 437.20 | 106,780 | 62.2 | 389.35 |
| South Carolina | 45 | 463,240 | 353.27 | 131,500 | 28.4 | 419.03 | 331,740 | 71.6 | 327.20 |
| South Dakota. . . . . . . . . | 17 | 120,740 | 361.24 | 51,630 | 42.8 | 385.90 | 69,110 | 57.2 | 342.81 |
| Tennessec. . . . . . . . . . . | 48 | 744,070 | 353.41 | 206,880 | 27.8 | 414.93 | 537.190 | 72.2 | 329.71 |
| Texas................ | 24 | 1,869,230 | 366.57 | 735,440 | 39.3 | 409.13 | 1,133,790 | 60.7 | 338.97 |
| Utah | 8 | 158,990 | 402.41 | 78,280 | 49.2 | 424.36 | 80,710 | 50.8 | 381.11 |
| Vermont | 22 | 82,290 | 387.72 | 33.690 | 40.9 | 414.55 | 48,600 | 59.1 | 369.13 |
| Virginia............... | 41 | 740,230 | 366.39 | 222,990 | 30.1 | 411.56 | \$17,240 | 69.9 | 346.92 |
| Washington........... | 4 | 606,920 | 416.36 | 333,300 | 54.9 | 437.66 | 273,620 | 45.1 | 390.42 |
| West Virginia . . . . . . . . . | 47 | 352,960 | 370.23 | 98,240 | 27.8 | 419.49 | 254,720 | 72.2 | 351.23 |
| Wisconsin . . . . . . . . . . | 28 | 776,580 | 410.65 | 300,590 | 38.7 | 442.41 | 475,990 | 61.3 | 390.59 |
| Wyoming. . . . . . . . . . . | 7 | 52,530 | 392.95 | 26,170 | 49.8 | 414.77 | 26,360 | 50.2 | 371.29 |
| Puerto Rico . . . . . . . . . . | 53 | $543,740$ | 221.70 | 27,810 | 5.1 | 343.69 | \$15,930 | 94.9 | 215.12 |
|  | 52 | 326,480 | 290.13 | 20,100 | 6.2 | 371.73 | 306,380 | 93.8 | 284.78 |

[^7]2 Includes American Samoa, Guam, and the Virgin Islands.

Table 8.-Number and percent of beneficiaries using direct deposit, by State and type of beneficiary, December 1983
[Based on 10-percent sample]

| State | Total |  | Retired workers 1 |  | Disabled workers |  | Wives and husbands |  | Widows, widowers, and parents 2 |  | Children |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent | Number | Per- cent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Total | 13,757,740 | 38.2 | 9,108,010 | 42.5 | 794,140 | 31.0 | 1,166,920 | 34.9 | 2,004,090 | 39.3 | 684,580 | 19.1 |
| Alabama | 179,150 | 28.0 | 107,690 | 32.5 | 12,680 | 23.4 | 14,460 | 22.6 | 31,300 | 29.7 | 13,020 | 15.3 |
| Alaska. | 7,420 | 31.5 | 4,490 | 37.4 | 460 | 25.0 | 470 | 33.3 | 960 | 37.8 | 1,040 | 18.1 |
| Arizona | 264,070 | 57.2 | 181,890 | 63.6 | 15,740 | 49.6 | 24,820 | 55.0 | 30,210 | 56.4 | 11,410 | 25.4 |
| Arkansas | 146,390 | 33.7 | 90,370 | 38.0 | 11,340 | , 30.0 | 13,110 | 28.4 | 22,010 | 34.8 | 9,560 | 19.6 |
| California | 1,391,760 | 42.6 | 953,770 | 47.1 | 82,910 | 33.8 | 122,950 | 41.4 | 177,020 | 43.4 | 55,110 | 19.0 |
| Colorado. | 157,310 | 45.5 | 102,140 | 49.8 | 8,240 | 35.8 | 15,010 | 41.7 | 23,150 | 48.5 | 8,770 | 26.0 |
| Connecticut | 191,940 | 39.5 | 139.190 | 42.2 | 8,490 | 30.5 | 13,110 | 39.7 | 24,420 | 40.0 | 6,730 | 19.2 |
| Delaware . . . . . . . . | 39,740 | 43.2 | 26,190 | 46.9 | 2,430 | 34.4 | 3,360 | 44.0 | 5,900 | 46.3 | 1,860 | 21.5 |
| District of Columbia . | 24,730 | 30.0 | 17,460 | 33.7 | 1,170 | 20.2 | 1,330 | 26.9 | 3,610 | 30.8 | 1,160 | 14.1 |
| Florida . . . . . . . . . | 1,270,160 | 58.1 | 898,910 | 62.5 | 64,760 | 47.6 | 117,570 | 57.6 | 147,950 | 57.4 | 40,970 | 27.1 |
| Georgia | 234,350 | 30.0 | 143,280 | 34.2 | 19,930 | 25.7 | 17,120 | 26.2 | 36,000 | 31.9 | 18,020 | 16.9 |
| Hawaii. . . . . . . . . | 44,290 | 37.2 | 31,220 | 41.8 | 2,310 | 35.8 | 3,130 | 29.8 | 4,590 | 38.3 | 3,040 | 19.8 |
| Idaho. . . . . . . . . . . | 72,670 | . 51.9 | 49,120 | 36.6 | 3,560 | 43.3 | 7.140 | 48.2 | 9,230 | 54.9 | 3,620 | 26.7 |
| Illinois. . . . . . . . . . | 610,720 | 37.0 | 407,990 | 39.9 | 29,270 | 30.1 | 48,150 | - 34.8 | 94,790 | 39.7 | 30,520 | 19.9 |
| Indiana . . . . . . . . . | 320,950 | 38.7 | 210,220 | 42.3 | 18,960 | 32.5 | 24,890 | 34.2 | 48,540 | 40.8 | 18,340 | 22.4 |
| lowa . . . . . . . . . . . | 223,950 | 44.8 | 144,060 | 47.2 | 9,050 | . 35.9 | 21,980 | 39.4 | 39,060 | 51.2 | 9,800 | 26.3 |
| Kansas. . . . . . . . . . | 185,680 | 48.6 | 121,230 | 50.8 | 7.710 | 40.4 | 17,100 | ᄂ 43.2 | 31,240 | 55.6 | 8,400 | 29.6 |
| Kentucky. . . . . . . . | 160,890 | 27.0 | 93,750 | 31.3 | 13,130 | 23.7 | 14,170 | 20.9 | 28,590 | 29.2 | 11,250 | 14.9 |
| Louisiana . . . . . . . | 127,740 | 22.3 | 69,760 | 26.0 | 9,880 | 19.5 | 13,350 | 20.6 | 24,680 | 24.6 | 10,070 | 11.2 |
| Maine . . . . . . . . . . | 73,930 | 37.6 | 49,240 | 40.7 | 4,660 | 33.1 | 6,010 | 34.5 | 10,110 | 37.5 | 3,910 | 22.6 |
| Maryiand. . . . . . . . . | 167,700 | 30.6 | 111,490 | 33.6 | 9,460 | 25.6 | 12,110 | 28.1 | 25,190 | 30.9 | 9,450 | 17.5 |
| Massachusetts . . . . . | 380,810 | 41.0 | 264,910 | 43.4 | 18,620 | 34.5 | 28,540 | 41.4 | 52,460 | 41.9 | 16,280 | 23.4 |
| Michigan. . . . . . . . | 585,350 | 42.3 | 376,260 | 47.1 | 39,650 | 37.0 | 51,000 | 39.5 | 89,050 | 43.3 | 29,390 | 20.4 |
| Minnesota . . . . . . . . | 258,330 | 41.5 | 171,340 | 43.9 | 9,850 | 33.3 | 24,460 | 37.4 | 41,540 | 46.3 | 11.140 | 23.5 |
| Mississippi. . . . . . . | 121,440 | 28.8 | 70,530 | 33.3 | 10,650 | 25.6 | 9,370 | 23.5 | 20,580 | 32.4 | 10,310 | 15.9 |
| Missouri | 329,070 | 38.4 | 210,550 | 40.9 | 20,860 | 34.1 | 26,750 | 33.1 | 52,880 | 43.4 | 18,030 | 22.7 |
| Montana | 61,650 | 50.2 | 39,640 | 54.2 | 3,460 | 44.2 | 6,010 | 46.5 | 9,170 | 55.3 | 3,370 | 27.2 |
| Nebraska | 118,200 | 46.3 | 77,260 | 48.4 | 4,940 | 40.4 | 11,350 | 39.9 | 19,520 | 54.1 | 5,130 | 27.0 |
| Nevada . . . . . . . . . . | \$1,980 | 47.0 | 36,350 | 51.6 | 3,880 | 42.7 | 3,620 | 44.1 | 5,300 | 44.3 | 2,830 | 25.8 |
| New Hampshire. . . . | - 66,970 | 46.4 | 47,270 | 49.0 | 3,520 | 40.5 | 5,480 | 50.6 | 7,690 | 46.1 | 3,010 | 25.9 |
| New Jersey . . . . . . . | 399,660 | 34.4 | 280,490 | 37.5 | 21,080 | 26.7 | 27,490 | . 33.4 | 53,780 | 34.6 | 16,820 | 17.6 |
| New Mexico. . . . . . . | 80,970 | 45.7 | 51,850 | 33.8 | 51,020 | 39.8 | 7,710 | - 39.8 | 10,820 | 45.8 | 5,570 | 22.2 |
| New York | 1,087,530 | 38.9 | 761,450 | 42.8 | 60,580 | 31.5 | 73,760 | 35.6 | 144,230 | 38.8 | 47,510 | 19.4 |
| North Carolina | 251,640 | 27.4 | 162,510 | 30.7 | 18,710 | 23.4 | 17,500 | 23.9 | 36,020 | 27.2 | 16,900 | 16.3 |
| North Dakota | 40,980 | 39.0 | 25,130 | 41.3 | 1,920 | 38.3 | 4,580 | 32.5 | 7,420 | 46.0 | 1,930 | 21.5 |
| Ohio. | 587,370 | 35.6 | 368,280 | 39.0 | 35,280 | 29.9 | 56,530 | 33.2 | 99,590 | 37.6 | 27,690 | 18.0 |
| Oklahoma | 190,420 | 39.3 | 118,960 | 42.2 | 11,300 | 36.6 | 16,720 | 33.0 | 32,520 | 42.8 | 10,920 | 24.0 |
| Oregon .... | 238,820 | 55.4 | 165,320 | 59.4 | 12,180 | 47.5 | 20,630 | 51.5 | 30,260 | 56.8 | 10,430 | '30.9 |
| Pennsylvania........ | 679,500 | 32.3 | 439,610 | 34.5 | 40,940 | 29.1 | 57,170 | 29.5 | 109,690 | 33.6 | 32,090 | 19.4 |
| Rhode Island. | 64,890 | 37.8 | 45,440 | 40.0 | 3,900 | 30.8 | 4,050 | 38.1 | 8,500 | 39.8 | 3,000 | 22.4 |
| South Carolina | 131,500 | 28.4 | 82,190 | 32.6 | 12,070 | 25.0 | 9,140 | 26.0 | 17,810 | 27.7 | 10,290 | 16.2 |
| South Dakota | 51,630 | 42.8 | 31,660 | 44.2 | 2,270 | 36.4 | 5,060 | 36.3 | 9,420 | 51.4 | 3,220 | 30.3 |
| Tennessee | 206,880 | 27.8 | 125,470 | 31.0 | 15,170 | 22.7 | 17.210 | 23.6 | 34,260 | 30.4 | 14,770 | 17.1 |
| Texas. | 735,440 | 39.3 | 451,390 | 43.8 | 36,300 | 31.8 | 73,860 | 36.4 | 128,290 | 43.7 | 45,600 | 20.0 |
| Utah | 78,280 | 49.2 | 52,160 | 53.3 | 3,000 | 39.4 | 7,450 | 45.3 | 9,890 | 51.3 | 5.780 | 32.6 |
| Vermont | 33,690 | '40.9 | 22,180 | 44.1 | 1,770 | 31.6 | 2,780 | 38.3 | 4,970 | 43.6 | 1,990 | 25.7 |
| Virginia... | 222,990 | 30.1 | 142,050 | 33.8 | 14,110 | 23.0 | 17,690 | 26.6 | 35,370 | 31.9 | 13,770 | 17.0 |
| Washington. . | 333,300 | 54.9 | 232,180 | 59.7 | 16,780 | 44.0 | 28,790 | 51.8 | 41,870 | 56.0 | 13,680 | 27.5 |
| West Virginia. | 98,240 | 27.8 | 54,630 | 32.6 | 8,160 | 23.9 | 9,120 | 21.6 | 19,530 | 31.1 | 6,800 | 14.7 |
| Wisconsin | 300,590 | 38.7 | 202,690 | 41.6 | 15,690 | 34.4 | 24,530 | 33.1 | 44,330 | 41.7 | 13,350 | 21.0 |
| Wyoming. . . . . . . . . | 26,170 | 49.8 | 17,370 | 53.1 | 980 | 36.4 | 2,250 | 47.1 | 3,880 | 57.0 | 1,690 | 30.6 |
| Puerto Rico | 27,810 | 5.1 | 14,480 | 7.2 | 4,380 | 5.7 | 2,760 | 3.8 | 2,730 | 4.9 | 3,460 | 2.5 |
| Abroad ${ }^{3}$. | 20,100 | 6.2 | 12,950 | 8.7 | 980 | 9.1 | 2,220 | 5.3 | 2,170 | 3.3 | 1,780 | 3.0 |

[^8]3 Includes American Samoa, Guam, and the Virgin Islands.


[^0]:    * Office of Research, Statistics, and International Policy, Office of Policy, Social Security Administration. The author wishes to acknowledge the assistance of Robert H. Finch, Jr. The data for this study were derived from a 10 -percent sample of SSA's Master Beneficiary Record, which contains detailed information for all Social Security beneficiaries. For a discussion of the methodology used and sampling variability, see Joseph Bondar, Social Security Beneficiaries Enrolled In the Direct Deposit Program, December 1982 (Research and Statistics Note No. 4), Office of Research, Statistics, and International Policy, Office of Policy, Social Security Administration, 1983.
    ' For further information on the EFT system, see Computers and Banking: Electronic Funds Transfer Systems and Public Policy, Kent W. Colton and Kenneth L. Kraemer, editors (New York: Plenum Press, 1980), and August Bequai, The Cashless Society: EFTS at the Crossroads (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1981).

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ Social Security Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and Department of the Treasury, Report on the Method of Paying Social Security Beneficiaries by Credit to Accounts in Financial Organizations, November 1973.
    ${ }^{3}$ See Operations Planning and Research Staff, Department of the Treasury, Direct Deposit of Social Security Payments: A Beneficiary Survey, May 1979, and Office of Program Planning and Policy, Social Security Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Direct Deposit of Social Security Checks, December 1978.

[^2]:    *Barbara A. Lingg, Social Security Beneficiaries Using the Direct Deposit Procedure, December 1978 (Research and Statistics Note No. 3), Social Security Administration, 1980, page 2.

[^3]:    1 Based on 10 -percent sample.

[^4]:    1 Totals may not add due to rounding.

[^5]:    2 Data by sex not available for children.

[^6]:    1 Totals may not add due to rounding.

[^7]:    1 Ranked by percentage of direct depositors.

[^8]:    1 Includes special age-72 beneficiaries.
    2 Includes widowed mothers and fathers.

