

Potential Improvements to the Supplemental Poverty Measure for 2021: Resources

Liana E. Fox
U.S. Census Bureau

SEHSD Working Paper # 2020-06

Brookings Expert Meeting
May 28, 2020

The views expressed in this research, including those related to statistical, methodological, technical, or operational issues, are solely those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the official positions or policies of the U.S. Census Bureau or Bureau of Labor Statistics. The author accepts responsibility for all errors. This presentation is released to inform interested parties of ongoing research and to encourage discussion of work in progress. This presentation reports the results of research and analysis undertaken by U.S. Census Bureau and Bureau of Labor Statistics staff. It has undergone more limited review than official publications. This presentation meets all of the U.S. Census Bureau's Disclosure Review Board (DRB) standards and has been assigned DRB approval number CBDRB-FY20-POP001-0119. Do not cite or distribute without author permission.

Shape
your future
START HERE >

United States[®]
Census
2020

Changes Under Consideration

	SPM	Potential Changes
Resource measure	<p>Sum of cash income,</p> <p>PLUS: in-kind benefits (SNAP, LIHEAP, WIC, Housing subsidies)</p> <p>MINUS: Taxes, child support paid, work expenses (including child care), medical out-of-pocket expenses</p>	<p>Use state data to set WIC benefits</p> <p>Cap nutritional assistance programs at food portion of threshold</p> <p>Move to household unit of analysis</p> <p>Adjust equivalence scales</p>

Using State-Varying WIC Values

- Currently, the value of WIC in the SPM is estimated using the average national benefit amount. The proposed change would allow the benefit amount to vary by state.
 - For 2019, national average monthly WIC benefit value was \$40.87, while states ranged from \$26.45 (Texas) to \$56.78 (New Jersey)
- Will be more consistent with threshold imputations
- Would allow for analysis of future state-level changes in WIC generosity
- Very small impact on poverty rates

Impact of Moving to State-Varying WIC Values

Characteristic	Using National WIC Average		Using State WIC Average		Difference
	Estimate	m.o.e	Estimate	m.o.e	Estimate
All People	15.57	0.16	15.58	0.16	Z
WIC Recipients	31.10	1.69	31.18	1.72	0.08
Sex					
Male	14.84	0.22	14.84	0.22	Z
Female	16.28	0.22	16.29	0.22	0.01
Age					
Under 18 years	17.09	0.32	17.10	0.32	0.02
18 to 64 years	15.28	0.20	15.28	0.20	Z
65 years and older	14.41	0.41	14.41	0.41	0
Region					
Northeast	14.88	0.39	14.88	0.39	0
Midwest	12.15	0.32	12.15	0.32	0
South	15.97	0.26	15.99	0.26	0.02
West	18.54	0.33	18.53	0.33	-0.01

* An asterisk following an estimate indicates difference is statistically different from zero at the 90 percent confidence level.
Z Rounds to zero.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2015 Annual Social and Economic Supplement.

Cap Nutritional Assistance Programs

- Currently, we cap housing subsidies at the housing portion of the threshold, but do not cap nutritional assistance programs at the food portion of the threshold.
- This proposed change would eliminate this inconsistency by proportionately capping all nutritional assistance programs in the SPM (SNAP, WIC and School Lunch).
- Impact: ~1-2% of sample would face cap
- Overall Impact: 0.1 ppt increase in poverty overall

Impact of Capping Nutritional Assistance Programs

Characteristic	Current Estimates		Capped Nutritional Asst. Programs		Difference
	Estimate	m.o.e	Estimate	m.o.e	Estimate
All People	12.77	0.27	12.82	0.27	0.05 *
Nutritional Asst. Recipients	18.64	0.61	18.80	0.60	0.16 *
Age					
Under 18 years	13.68	0.52	13.83	0.52	0.15 *
18 to 64 years	12.21	0.28	12.24	0.28	0.03 *
65 years and older	13.59	0.47	13.61	0.47	0.02 *

* An asterisk following an estimate indicates difference is statistically different from zero at the 90 percent confidence level.
 Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2019 Annual Social and Economic Supplement.

Move to Household Unit of Analysis

- More comparable to international measures
- Simple and straightforward
- Less consistent with threshold unit of analysis (consumer units)

- Overall, decreases poverty (0.7%). Among the biggest decreases for unrelated individuals (3.9%), non-workers (1.9%) and non-citizens (1.8%)

Modify Equivalence Scales – Two Options

- Current 3 parameter equivalence scale:
 - One and two adults: scale = (adults)^{0.5}
 - Single parents: scale = (adults + 0.8 * first child + 0.5 * other children)^{0.7}
 - All other families: scale = (adults + 0.5 * children)^{0.7}
- Option 1: Use 0.7 for economies of scale for all
 - Only changes scale for 2A/0C units from 1.41 → 1.62
- Option 2: Change equivalence scale to \sqrt{n} for all

Modify Equivalence Scales—Option 1: 2A/0C Δ

- Current 3 parameter equivalence scale:
 - One and two adults: scale = (adults)^{0.5} → (adults)^{0.7}
 - Only changes equivalence scale for 2A/0C units from 1.41 → 1.62
- Results in higher thresholds for 2A/0C units than 1A/1C units
 - Conceptual question as to which types of units should have higher thresholds
- Overall, increases poverty (0.6%). Among largest increases: less than high school education (2.2%) and individuals age 65 and older (1.5%)

Modify Equivalence Scales—Option 2: \sqrt{n}

- Replace 3-parameter scale with \sqrt{n}
- Treat adults and children the same
- More consistent with international measures
- Simple and straightforward

- Overall, decreases poverty (1.8%). Among largest declines: non-citizens (4.8%), Hispanics (4.5%) and less than high school education (4.2%)

Summary/Recommendations

- Make WIC modification
- Cap nutritional assistance program
- Need feedback on move to household analysis
- Need feedback on equivalence scale changes

Contact

Liana E. Fox
Social, Economic & Housing Division
U.S. Census Bureau
liana.e.fox@census.gov

Summary of Potential Resource Changes

	HH Unit of Analysis	Equiv Scale-2A/0C	Equiv Scale- \sqrt{n}
Overall	↓ 0.7 %	↑ 0.6 %	↓ 1.8 %
Under 18	↓ 0.2 %	No change	↓ 2.6 %
18 to 64 years	↓ 1.0 %	↑ 0.6 %	↓ 1.8 %
65 years and older	↓ 0.2 %	↑ 1.5 %	↓ 0.8 %

Note: All estimates with an up or down arrow indicate difference is statistically different from zero at the 90 percent confidence interval.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2019 Annual Social and Economic Supplement.