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Trends in expectation for old-age security from children and the number of legal cases of parents suing their children for support: Japan, 1950-2004


Sources: Supreme Court, Annual Report of Judicial Statistics, various years.
Population Problems Research Council of the Mainichi Newspapers, Changing Family Norms among Japanese Women in a Era of Lowest-Iow Fertility 2004.

Trends in Norms and Expectations about Care for the Elderly: Japan, 1950-2004


Proportion of those who would take care of parents under any circumstances, when their parents get older and need some help in their daily lives due to poor health, Japan, United States and China, 2005


Source: Japan Youth Research Institute, High School Students' Lifestyle Survey, 2005.
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## Projected total population, 2000-2025




出典：日本大学人口研究所，「人口•経済•社会保障モデルによる長期展望一人的資本に基づくアプ

## The Bottom Line

$\checkmark$ Rapid aging appears to be virtually certain

- Life expectancy continues to rise
- Low fertility is resistant to policy
- Immigration is of limited help
$r$ How best do we accommodate the aging of our populations?


## Three Strategies for Responding to an Aging Society

r Strategy 1: Retire Later
rStrategy 2: Expand Transfer Programs
rStrategy 3: Accumulate Pension Funds

## Strong Trend toward Early Retirement in West



## Labor force participation rates aged 65 and over, 1960-2003



Source: Statistics Bureau, Ministry of Public Management, Home Affairs, Post and Telecommunications,

## Asia is Joining the Trend toward Early Retirement



IMandatory retırement age in Japan, by tırm sıze, 2003
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Source: Statistics and Information Department, 2004. Minister's Secretariat, Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare,

## Average age of mandatory retirement in large firms



Irends in reasons tor quitting job tor persons aged 65 and over: Japan, 1950-2004


Change in retirement age at large-scale businesses and ife expectancies at age 20 for men and women: Japan, 1965-2002

$\rightarrow$ Retirement age $\rightarrow-$ Male life expectacy at age $20 \rightarrow-$ Female life expectancy at age 20

|  | Reason for quitting job |  |  | Female | Reason for quitting job |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male | Mandatory retirement | Health | Personal curtailment, liquidation or bankruptcy of the company |  | Mandatory retirement | Health | Personal curtailment, liquida or bankruptcy of the compa |
| 55-59 |  |  |  | 55-59 |  |  |  |
| 1982 | 29.3 | 13.4 | 13.4 | 1982 | 11.0 | 24.1 | 1 |
| 1992 | 14.7 | 14.3 | 14.4 | 1992 | 8.1 | 19.8 |  |
| 2002 | 5.7 | 9.0 | 28.2 | 2002 | 3.2 | 12.4 | 2 |
| 60-64 |  |  |  | 60-64 |  |  |  |
| 1982 | 50.0 | 18.5 | 7.9 | 1982 | 18.6 | 37.4 |  |
| 1992 | 54.1 | 15.8 | 6.2 | 1992 | 25.4 | 24.7 |  |
| 2002 | 46.1 | 10.3 | 16.7 | 2002 | 23.4 | 16.3 | 1 |
| 65-69 |  |  |  | 65-69 |  |  |  |
| 1982 | 43.8 | 32.5 | 6.6 | 1982 | 14.6 | 57.5 |  |
| 1992 | 57.6 | 22.0 | 4.4 | 1992 | 26.8 | 36.4 |  |
| 2002 | 52.4 | 17.9 | 10.7 | 2002 | 27.6 | 24.8 | $\underline{1}$ |
| \% of working among those who left job by mandatory retirement |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 55-59 |  |  |  | 55-59 |  |  |  |
| 1982 | 67.4 |  |  | 1982 | 22.1 |  |  |
| 1992 | 77.5 |  |  | 1992 | 29.6 |  |  |
| 2002 | 74.4 |  |  | 2002 | 37.7 |  |  |
| 60-64 |  |  |  | 60-64 |  |  |  |
| 1982 | 51.4 |  |  | 1982 | 17.2 |  |  |
| 1992 | 52.3 |  |  | 1992 | 22.9 |  |  |
| 2002 | 41.3 |  |  | 2002 | 20.7 |  |  |
| 65-69 |  |  |  | 65-69 |  |  |  |
| 1982 | 41.5 |  |  | 1982 | 15.8 |  |  |
| 1992 | 40.7 |  |  | 1992 | 16.3 |  |  |
| 2002 | 32.4 |  |  | 2002 | 13.6 |  |  |

## NUJLSOA

Nihon University Japan Longitudinal Study of Aging

Survey in 1999, 2001 and 2003

## Grouping for analysis

$\mathrm{Y}=1$ if the individual was not working in 1999
$\mathrm{Y}=2$ if the individual was working in 1999 but not in 2001
Y = 3 if the individual was working in 1999 and 2001, but not in 2003
$Y=4$ if the individual was working in 1999, 2001, and 2003

## Labor force transition by respondents aged 65-84



Women


## Percent of respondents with difficulty in performing NAGI index activities in 1999, 2001, and 2003
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| Men |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | :---: |
|  | Year of survey |  |  |
| Age | 1999 | 2001 | 2003 |
| $65-69$ | 27.3 | 27.8 | 22.7 |
| $70-74$ | 32.3 | 36.8 | 36.0 |
| $75-79$ | 39.3 | 43.3 | 40.8 |
| $80-84$ | 48.6 | 48.5 | 47.2 |
|  | Women |  |  |
| Year of survey |  |  |  |
| Age |  |  |  |
| $65-69$ | 359 | 2001 | 2003 |
| $70-74$ | 45.9 | 47.6 | 47.0 |
| $75-79$ | 57.8 | 58.7 | 56.3 |
| $80-84$ | 680 | 69.6 | 639 |

Estimated ertect on prodabilities of working in 1999

|  | Men | Women |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Predicted mean | 32.8 | 16.3 |
| NAGI score |  |  |
| Some difficulty | 20.7 ** | 11.9 ** |
| No difficulty+ | 39.0 | 21.1 |
| Age |  |  |
| 65-69 | 42.3 ** | 26.4 ** |
| 70-74 | 37.1 ** | 20.1 ** |
| 75-79 | 29.0 * | 13.1 |
| 80-84+ | 24.8 | 11.6 |
| Education |  |  |
| Junior high or lower+ | 28.8 | 15.3 |
| Senior high | 36.6 ** | 17.8 |
| Univ or Junior college | 43.7 ** | 22.2 ** |
| Marital status \& spouse's health |  |  |
| Married and spouse is health) | 34.2 | 18.8 * |
| Married and spouse is not he: | 25.2 ** | 13.5 |
| Not married+ | 35.8 | 15.5 |
| Longest job |  |  |
| Self-employed or agriculture | 55.0 ** | 31.6 ** |
| Others+ | 21.7 | 7.6 |
| Living with child |  |  |
| Yes | 33.7 | 16.0 |
| No+ | 32.1 | 16.8 |
| Living with pre-schooler |  |  |
| Yes | 32.6 | 17.6 |
| No+ | 32.8 | 16.2 |
| Current residence |  |  |
| Urban | 29.8 ** | 14.7 ** |
| Rural+ | 37.0 | 17.9 |
| Home ownership |  |  |
| Yes | 32.9 | 16.3 |
| No+ | 32.3 | 15.8 |
| Log likelihood | -888.6 | -809.9 |
| Sample size | 1691 | 2280 |

## Estimated effect on probabilities of working

|  | From 1999 to 2001 |  |  | From 2001 to 2003 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Men |  | Women | Men | Women |
| Predicted mean | 64.5 |  | 56.0 | 74.2 | 69.4 |
| NAGI score in 1999 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Some difficulty | 58.3 | * | 54.2 | 58.9 * | 66.7 |
| No difficulty+ | 65.5 |  | 56.8 | 76.1 | 70.4 |
| Change in NAGI from previous survey |  |  |  |  |  |
| -3 (improvement) | 75.6 | * | 69.3 ** | 95.0 ** | 90.3 ** |
| 0 (no change) | 65.1 | * | 57.4 ** | 77.8 ** | 72.6 ** |
| +3 (deterioration) | 52.9 | * | 44.4 ** | 40.6 ** | 46.4 ** |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |
| 65-69 | 77.7 |  | 69.5 ** | 76.4 | 77.9 |
| 70-74 | 63.2 |  | 61.1 ** | 75.8 | 70.8 |
| 75-79 | 55.2 |  | 49.1 * | 73.8 | 67.7 |
| 80-84+ | 54.5 |  | 30.7 | 69.4 | 63.2 |
| Education |  |  |  |  |  |
| Junior high or lower+ | 61.0 |  | 57.7 | 68.8 | 61.8 |
| Senior high | 65.8 |  | 51.8 | 82.9 ** | 87.3 ** |
| Univ or Junior college | 75.4 |  | 69.9 | 74.9 | 44.5 |
| Marital status \& spouse's health |  |  |  |  |  |
| Married and spouse is healthy | 64.8 |  | 58.8 | 73.5 | 67.0 |
| Married and spouse is not hea | 69.6 |  | 51.0 | 79.9 | 78.8 |
| Not married+ | 57.0 |  | 55.6 | 72.8 | 67.9 |
| Longest job |  |  |  |  |  |
| Self-employed or agriculture | 70.4 |  | 57.9 | 78.3 | 75.3 ** |
| Others+ | 57.0 |  | 51.8 | 69.3 | 54.5 |
| Living with child |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes | 69.5 |  | 53.3 | 74.8 | 73.7 |
| No+ | 59.4 |  | 59.7 | 73.6 | 64.4 |
| Living with pre-schooler |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes | 54.9 |  | 28.4 | 80.7 | 46.0 |
| No+ | 65.0 |  | 56.8 | 74.0 | 70.4 |
| Current residence |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 60.7 | * | 59.4 | 73.0 | 78.5 ** |
| Rural+ | 68.9 |  | 52.2 | 75.5 | 61.4 |
| Home ownership 74.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes | 63.2 | * | 56.8 | 74.4 | 69.7 |
| No+ | 77.8 |  | 48.0 | 71.9 | 66.5 |
| Log likelihood | -242.4 |  | -153.6 | -110.2 | -54.0 |

## Estımated eftect on probabilites of men working sequentalily, conditional on working in the previous survey period, by region

|  | From 1999 to 2001 |  | From 2001 to 2003 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Urban | Rural | Urban | Rural |
| Predicted mean | 61.0 | 65.8 | 75.0 | 72.1 |
| NAGI score in 1999 |  |  |  |  |
| Some difficulty | 59.2 | 51.6 * | 35.1 ** | 77.4 |
| No difficulty+ | 61.3 | 68.6 | 79.1 | 71.3 |
| Change in NAGI from previous survey |  |  |  |  |
| -3 (improvement) | 59.6 | 89.1 ** | 95.2 ** | 95.4 ** |
| 0 (no change) | 60.9 | 67.5 ** | 76.9 ** | 77.7 ** |
| +3 (deterioration) | 62.1 | 35.5 ** | 38.2 ** | 41.7 ** |
| Age |  |  |  |  |
| 65-69 | 70.9 ** | 73.9 | 67.2 | 83.0 ** |
| 70-74 | 74.8 ** | 48.5 ** | 85.1 | 79.3 |
| 75-79 | 48.3 | 54.0 ** | 85.5 | 63.2 |
| 80-84+ | 42.3 | 78.6 | 87.9 | 54.3 |
| Education |  |  |  |  |
| Junior high or lower+ | 55.6 | 65.2 | 73.7 | 66.0 |
| Senior high | 63.0 | 65.0 | 77.9 | 88.1 ** |
| Univ or Junior college | 69.1 | 78.0 | 72.2 | 83.2 |
| Marital status \& spouse's health |  |  |  |  |
| Married and spouse is healthy | 62.8 | 68.3 ** | 75.5 | 69.7 |
| Married and spouse is not health | 52.8 | 71.6 ** | 66.1 | 83.5 |
| Not married+ | 59.0 | 43.6 | 76.2 | 64.9 |
| Longest job |  |  |  |  |
| Self-employed or agriculture | 68.3 ** | 68.8 | 83.2 | 73.8 |
| Others+ | 54.8 | 59.4 | 70.0 | 68.3 |
| Living with child 70.4 |  |  |  |  |
| Yes | 64.8 | 70.1 | 77.4 | 74.6 |
| No+ | 57.6 | 60.4 | 73.2 | 68.4 |
| Living with pre-schooler 60.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Yes | 49.9 | 60.0 | 48.7 | $\ldots$ |
| No+ | 61.4 | 66.2 | 75.5 | $\ldots$ |
| Home ownership |  |  |  |  |
| Yes | 58.9 | 65.0 | 75.7 | $\ldots$ |
| $\mathrm{No}+$ | 73.5 | 93.9 | 69.8 |  |
| Log likelihood | -139.3 | -99.3 | -48.1 | -44.7 |

## children for old-age security, 2001 and 2003



## Simulations

## Use NUPRI Model:

Assume Mandatory Retirement Age raised from 60 to 65

In response, employment rates for persons 60 to 64 rise to those of persons 55 to 59

Based on these assumptions, use NUPRI model to recalculate GDP and GDP per capita


## Economic Projections from NUPRI Model

Item Base Case Base Case

Real Yen)

| Real GDP | 4.43 | 5.2 | 5.74 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Per Capita
(million
yen)

## The Second Dividend

$r$ Life expectancy is increasing
rStimulates the accumulation of wealth
rMore wealth leads to a permanent increase in income

## 年齢別資産プロファイル

## Wealth Profiles



## Household Financial Assets



## Real Assets



Lifecycle Deficit by Age, Japan, 1999 Actual and 2025 Age Distribution
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# Future Japanese elderly persons 

wil be wealthier-

## Elderly population by heath status, Japan 2000-25
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## Future Japanese elderly persons

## will be

# not only wealthier but also healthier! 

# Future Japanese elderly persons will be 

wealthier, healthier
and
ceverer!

## Length of demographic bonus period



# Future Japanese elderly persons 

## may save

Japan!


