#### Moving to the Median and Expanding the Estimation Sample: The Case for Changing the Expenditures Underlying SPM Thresholds

Liana E. Fox U.S. Census Bureau

Thesia I. Garner Bureau of Labor Statistics

FCSM 2018 Research and Policy Conference March 7-9, 2018

Census Bureau U.S. Department of Commerce Economics and Statistics Administration U.S. CENSUS BUREAU *Census.gov* 

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.



#### Poverty: The History of a Measure

An Interagency Technical Working



Press, 1995.

census.gov

### **How to Determine Poverty Status**

#### Resources

**Needs** 





- All resource unit members have the same poverty status.
- For individuals who do not live with family members, their individual resources are compared with the appropriate threshold.



# Which Goods and Services? Food, Clothing, Shelter, Utilities (FCSU)





U.S. Department of Commerce Economics and Statistics Administration U.S. CENSUS BUREAU *CENSUS BUREAU*  + multiplier for other basic goods and services

#### **Based on Whom?**



# **Current SPM Threshold Construction**

- Produced by Bureau of Labor Statistics-Division of Price and Index Number Research (BLS-DPINR) using 5 years of Consumer Expenditure Survey Interview (CE) data
- 30<sup>th</sup>-36<sup>th</sup> percentile of expenditures of food, clothing, shelter, and utilities (FCSU) plus additional 20%
- Based on estimation sample of resource units with *exactly* 2 kids
- Separate thresholds by housing tenure: Owners with mortgage, owners without mortgage and renters
- Adjust for unit size/composition and geography



## **Changes Under Consideration**

#### Expand estimation sample from CU's with exactly 2 children

- Increase sample size
- Reflect spending patterns of a larger share of the population

#### Move base from 30-36<sup>th</sup> percentile to median of FCSU dist.

- Reduce impact of imputed benefits
- Allow for future incorporation of medical expenses



## **Expand Estimation Sample**



- Increase sample size
- Reflect spending patterns of a larger share of the population



## **Sample Size for Estimation Samples**

	CU's with 2 kids	CU's with 1+ kids	All CU's
Total Estimation Sample (unweighted)	n = 14,668	n = 40,620	n = 129,604
30-36th ptile FCSU	n=860	n=2,396	n= 7,632
Owners with mortgage	305	773	1,730
Owners without mortgage	112	332	2,646
Renters	443	1,291	3,256

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics, Consumer Expenditure Survey Interview Data, 2012Q2-2017Q1.



### **Change Base of Thresholds**



Percentile of the FCSU Distribution

#### Move base to median

- Reduce impact of imputed benefits
- Allow for future incorporation of medical expenses



## **Share of CUs Receiving Benefits**

	<b>30-36<sup>th</sup> Ptile of FCSU</b>	47-53 <sup>rd</sup> Ptile of FCSU
Public Housing	2.4	1.4
Govt. Asst. with Rent	2.0	1.4
SNAP	21.9	12.5
Private Health Insurance	65.2	74.3

Note: Estimation sample is consumer units with exactly two children.

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics, Consumer Expenditure Survey Interview Data, 2012Q2-2017Q1.



## **Alternative Thresholds Examined**

- 80% of 47<sup>th</sup>-53<sup>rd</sup> percentile (Median)
- CU's with 1+ kids
- All CU's

	CU's with 2 kids	CU's with 1+ kid	All CU's
30 <sup>th</sup> -36 <sup>th</sup> ptile	33 <sup>rd</sup> /2 kids	33 <sup>rd</sup> /1+ kids	33 <sup>rd</sup> /All
80% of 47 <sup>th</sup> -53 <sup>rd</sup> ptile	50 <sup>th</sup> /2 kids	50 <sup>th</sup> /1+ kids	50 <sup>th</sup> /All



## Threshold Values Relative to 33<sup>rd</sup>/2 kids

		CU's with 2 kids	CU's with 1+ kid	All CU's
30 <sup>th</sup> - 36 <sup>th</sup>	Owners with mortgages Owners without mortgages Renters	\$26,336 \$22,298 \$26,104	\$25,530 \$21,807 \$25,412	\$27,463 \$24,441 \$27,235
80% of 47 <sup>th</sup> - 53 <sup>rd</sup>	Owners with mortgages Owners without mortgages Renters	\$26,103 \$21,859 \$25,439	\$25,111 \$21,225 \$24,901	\$27,664 \$24,408 \$27,542

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics, Consumer Expenditure Survey Interview Data, 2012Q2-2017Q1.



#### 2016 SPM Rates

• Rates follow same pattern as thresholds

	CU's with 2 kids	CU's with 1+ kid	All CU's
30 <sup>th</sup> -36 <sup>th</sup> ptile	13.97	13.28	15.37
80% of 47 <sup>th</sup> -53 <sup>rd</sup> ptile	13.45	12.79	15.58

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2017 Annual Social and Economic Supplement.



U.S. Department of Commerce Economics and Statistics Administration U.S. CENSUS BUREAU *CENSUS.GOV* 

# Change in SPM Rates from 2011-2016

• Only 33<sup>rd</sup>/1+ kid statistically different from 33<sup>rd</sup>/2 kids

	CU's with 2 kids	CU's with 1+ kid	All CU's
30 <sup>th</sup> -36 <sup>th</sup> ptile	-2.11	-1.54*	-1.81
80% of 47 <sup>th</sup> -53 <sup>rd</sup> ptile	-1.90	-1.58	-1.76

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2017 Annual Social and Economic Supplement.



### SPM Rates by Age: 2016

	33 <sup>rd</sup> /2 kids	50 <sup>th</sup> /All CU's	Difference
Overall	13.97 (0.25)	15.58 (0.25)	1.61*
Under 18	15.24 (0.47)	17.24 (0.48)	2.01*
18 to 64 years	13.35 (0.29)	14.74 (0.28)	1.39*
65 years and older	14.55 (0.47)	16.43 (0.50)	1.88*



U.S. Department of Commerce Economics and Statistics Administration U.S. CENSUS BUREAU *Census.gov*  \* An asterisk following an estimate indicates difference is statistically different from zero at the 90 percent confidence interval. Note: Margins of error in parentheses. Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2017 Annual Social and Economic Supplement.

# Summary/Recommendations

- We recommend expanding the estimation sample
  - 1+ kids would nearly triple sample size, and keep similar attributes.
  - All CU's would increase sample size 9-fold, but concern that families without children spend differently than families with children.
- We recommend moving the base of the threshold from 33<sup>rd</sup> to some percentage of median.
  - In 2016, 75.5% of median would match 33<sup>rd</sup>/2 kids overall SPM rate.
  - In 2011, 77% of median would match 33<sup>rd</sup>/2 kids overall SPM rate.



#### Contact

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

#### **Thesia I. Garner**

Division of Price and Index Number Research Bureau of Labor Statistics <u>Garner.Thesia@bls.gov</u>





#### **Extra Slides**



### **ITWG Guidance**

 According to the ITWG recommendations, SPM should be seen as a research measure, improving due to changes in data, methodology or research.

 Priority should be placed on "consistency between threshold and resource definitions, data availability, simplicity in estimation, stability of the measure over time, and ease in explaining methodology (ITWG, 2010)."



#### **Supplemental Poverty Measure (SPM)**





Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2017 Annual Social and Economic Supplement. www2.census.gov/library/publications/2017/demo/p60-261.html.



#### 2016 SPM Poverty Thresholds for Renters (Two Adults and Two Children)





Sources: Geographic adjustments based on housing costs from the American Community Survey 2011-2015. Base thresholds are from the Bureau of Labor Statistic <https://stats.bls.gov/pir/spmhome.htm>.



U.S. Department of Commerce Economics and Statistics Administration U.S. CENSUS BUREAU census.gov