

Life on the Edge:
Living Near Poverty in the United States, 1966-2010¹

Misty L. Heggeness
U.S. Census Bureau

Charles Hokayem
U.S. Census Bureau

October 19, 2012

This paper is prepared for the 2012 Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management Fall Research Conference in Baltimore, Maryland, November 8 – 10. Please do not cite without approval from the authors.

Abstract

Researchers interested in economically vulnerable populations in the United States generally study populations living below the official poverty thresholds used by the U.S. Census Bureau. We know less about those living just above the poverty thresholds. This paper takes a deeper look at those living just above the official poverty thresholds. Using Mollie Orshansky's (1966) definition of near poor, those living between 100 and less than 133 percent of the poverty thresholds, it compares rates by demographic and socioeconomic characteristics. In addition, it examines how these rates change under alternative poverty measures.

¹ Misty Heggeness (misty.l.heggeness@census.gov) and Charles Hokayem (charles.hokayem@census.gov) are Research Economists in the Poverty Statistics Branch of the U.S. Census Bureau, 4600 Silver Hill Road, Washington, DC 20233. We would like to thank Trudi Renwick, Chuck Nelson, Kathy Short, Kayla Fontenot, and Stephen Clark for helpful comments. This paper presents results of research and analysis undertaken by Census Bureau staff. Any views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the U.S. Census Bureau. It has undergone a more limited review than official publications.

Introduction

Individuals living in households with low incomes are more vulnerable to the stress of economic instability caused by job loss, ill health, and fluctuations in housing, food, and transportation costs. The official U.S. poverty thresholds create an explicit boundary that defines who lives in poverty. Numerous reports and studies have examined this vulnerable population using official poverty thresholds to distinguish those living in poverty (DeNavas-Walt, Proctor, and Smith 2012; Hoynes, Page, and Stevens 2006). We know less about the dynamics of low-income individuals living just above official poverty thresholds. This paper uses data from the Current Population Survey (CPS) Annual Social and Economic Supplements (ASEC) from 1967 to 2011 to study demographic and socioeconomic trends of individuals and families whose incomes are just above the poverty thresholds.

Mollie Orshansky, architect of the modern day poverty measure, worked as an economist in the Social Security Administration and authored a 1966 Social Security Bulletin in which she defined the “near poor” as those individuals living between 100 and 133 percent of official poverty thresholds. Our paper uses Orshansky’s definition of the near poor as those living 100 to 133 percent of poverty, and we report the proportion of individuals living close to poverty by demographic and socioeconomic characteristics.²

This paper provides a better understanding of the composition of this group over the past four decades and answers three broad questions: How have rates changed over the past four decades for those living 100 to 133 percent of poverty thresholds? How do the rates change under alternative poverty measures?

² Tables and figures in this paper report rates for those between 100 to 133 percent, 100 to 150 percent, and 100 to 200 percent of the official poverty thresholds.

The paper proceeds as follows. We provide a brief background into both the literature and data used in this paper, followed by an overview highlighting trends in the demographic and socioeconomic composition of the near poor. This includes a discussion on age, gender, race, educational attainment, labor force participation, and safety-net program participation over the past four decades. We then present trends using alternative poverty measures and examine differences between groups under alternative poverty measures. The alternative poverty measures used in this paper are one of the twelve National Academy of Sciences (NAS) measures and the Supplemental Poverty Measure (SPM) used by the U.S. Census Bureau.

Background

Since the development of the modern official poverty definition in the 1960s, there has been interest in understanding the dynamics of those individuals living just above poverty (Orshansky 1966; Eckholm 2006; Ben-Shalom, Moffitt, and Scholz 2011; Short and Smeeding 2012). Mollie Orshansky in a 1966 Social Security Bulletin states:

In 1965 the Social Security Administration developed two criteria of poverty to assay the relative economic position of different types of households in the United States...Because the lower of these criteria is being used as the current working definition of poverty, the somewhat less stringent measure has now been designated as the “near poor” level. Persons rated poor or near poor by these measures can be said to be in the ‘low income’ category. (20)

She continues to describe that the near-poor level averages about one-third higher dollar cost. Her report shows that as early as 1959, 9.0 percent of the population was near poor under this measure. That percent shrunk to 8.3 by 1964, but the absolute number of the near poor remained relatively flat between these years (Orshansky 1966, Table 2, page 24). Orshansky states:

What is perhaps more striking than the steady reduction in the number of the very poor is the failure to reduce the number just above the minimum poverty line: There are today, just as there were in 1959, about 15-3/4 million persons in households with income that is above the poverty level but still below what might be considered a reasonable minimum. It will be noticed that from 1959 to 1960, as the count of the poor rose, the number just above the poverty line did drop, only to climb again the following year as the poverty rolls started down. This reciprocal trend suggests that there may be a sizable group in the population living always on the margin – wavering between dire poverty and a level only slightly higher but never really free from the threat of [de]privation (tables 2 and 3). (25)

This concern for and interest in this group is repeated today in the media and other public venues (DeParle, Gebeloff, and Tavernise 2011; Dvorak 2012; Editorial: The Poor, the Near Poor, and You 2011; Short and Smeeding 2012; Tavernise, DeParle, and Gebeloff 2011;). However, to date, only a handful of research exists examining the long-term trends in demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of this group (Ben-Shalom, Moffitt, and Scholz 2011; Smeeding 2006). Moreover, research available does not define the near poor consistently

(Ben-Shalom, Moffitt, and Scholz 2011; Neumark, Schweitzer, and Wascher 2005; Short and Smeeding 2012). For example, Short and Smeeding consider the near poor as those living between 100 to 200 percent of poverty, whereas Ben-Shalom, Moffitt, and Scholz define the near poor as those living between 100 and 150 percent of poverty. In some cases, the near poor are intertwined with the working poor or working class, when in fact over half of all poor individuals aged 25 to 54 were in the labor force in 2010, along with approximately 70 percent of the near poor (authors' calculations in Table 2, Bansak and Raphael 2008). While research on this group exists, to our knowledge, this is the first comprehensive examination of overall and subgroup rates spanning more than four decades.

Data and Methodology

We use the U.S. Census Bureau's Current Population Survey (CPS) Annual Social and Economic Supplements (ASEC) micro data from 1967 to 2011.³ The CPS ASEC is a nationally representative sample of the American population. While the CPS is a monthly survey, the CPS ASEC, also known as the March supplement, collects extensive employment, earnings, income, and program participation questions once a year. It interviews approximately 100,000 households annually. The CPS ASEC's primary function is to collect information on labor force participation, income, and program participation to inform policymakers and the public of labor, unemployment, and economic wellbeing trends of individuals, families, and households.

Structural changes to CPS data have occurred since 1967. While most variables remain consistent, a handful of variables used in this analysis have diverse structures or coding schemes over time. We harmonize these variables for consistent coding and structure, allowing us to

³ Data are subject to error arising from a variety of sources. For more information on sampling and non-sampling error, see www.census.gov/apsd/techdoc/cps/cpsmar11.pdf (accessed October 12, 2012).

create a single personalized dataset with multiple years of data. In addition, we replicate the official poverty measure, accounting for changes in the poverty universe over time since 1967.

As previously described, the focus of our discussion in this paper is on the Orshansky definition of near poor, which includes individuals with incomes between 100 and 133 percent of their official poverty threshold. In the tables and figures provided, however, we also provide results for the near poor defined as 100 to 150 percent of the poverty threshold and 100 to 200 percent of the poverty threshold.⁴

Who is included in the Orshansky near poor definition? For a family of four including two adults and two children, the poverty threshold was \$22,113 in 2010. Therefore, the Orshansky measure of near poor in 2010 for a family of four including two adults and two children includes all two adult, two child families with incomes from \$22,113 to less than \$29,410. Similarly, all two parents, four children families with incomes between \$29,137 and \$38,752 live near poverty based on the Orshansky measure in 2010. Additional information on poverty thresholds for calculating the ranges of income under near poor measures for different family types is available on the Census Bureau website (<http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/poverty/threshld/index.html>).

Demographic and Socioeconomic Trends of the Near Poor from 1966 to 2010

Table 1 shows poverty rates and near-poor rates for 1967 and 2010, as well as the percentage-point change over the time period. The overall poverty rate increased between 1967 and 2010 while the near poverty rate went down. Compared to 1967, a higher proportion of the

⁴ Those interested in rates for those 100 to less than 150 percent of poverty thresholds and those 100 to less than 200 percent of poverty thresholds can see the tables and figures in the end of the paper.

population is living in poverty and a lower proportion of the population is living near poverty. Using Orshansky's definition, the near-poverty rate decreased from 8.0 percent to 6.2 percent.

Rates differ by demographic subpopulations, including gender. While near-poverty rates decreased for both men and women, the decrease was greater for men than women. Additionally, while the poverty rate for women has not changed significantly since 1967, men's poverty rates have gone up by 1.4 percentage points.

Rates for those living near poverty have decreased for all races; they have decreased more for blacks and other races than for whites. Under the Orshansky measure, rates have decreased by 1.3 percentage points for whites, 5.3 percentage points for blacks, and 6.7 percentage points for other races. Rates are highest for blacks in 2010 (8.4 percent).

Separated, divorced, or widowed individuals have higher rates than do married individuals.⁵ In 2010, separated or divorced adults were twice as likely to live near poverty as their married counterparts were. While near-poverty rates decreased significantly for most, widows are the exception. Between 1967 and 2010, the poverty rate for widows decreased by more than half as widows moved out of poverty and into the near poverty category. The near-poverty rate for widows increased by 1.4 percentage points.

As overall educational attainment increased over the decades, those left with low levels of education are more vulnerable to living in or near poverty. Rates increased for those with less than a high school diploma and those with a high school diploma. Under the Orshansky measure, the near poverty rate for those with high school completed was 4.8 percent in 1967 and increased to 6.9 by 2010. Poverty and near-poor rates have not changed significantly for those with some college education.

⁵ In 1967, differences between separated or divorced versus widowed are not statistically significant.

Those individuals aged 15 and older not in the labor force have higher poverty and near poverty rates than their counterparts in the labor force. While the poverty rate of those in the labor force did not change between 1967 and 2010, it increased by 2.7 percentage points for those not in the labor force. Near-poverty rates decreased for both those in the labor force and those not in the labor force over the time period.

Regional differences exist. The south has the highest rates of poverty in both years, although its poverty rate decreased from 22.1 percent in 1967 to 16.8 percent in 2010. Near-poverty rates decreased for all regions over the time period, except for the near poor in the west. The south, with the highest rates in 1967, also experienced the highest percentage point decline in rates from 1967 to 2010 under all measures, which is not statistically different from 1967.

Table 2 shows average age, labor force participation rates, and program participation rates for individuals by poverty and near poverty status. There is no significant difference in average age over time by any measure. Young and elder adults living near poverty have lower labor force participation rates today than in 1967. For example, under the Orshansky measure of the near poor, 62.9 percent of those aged 15 to 24 participated in the labor market, compared to 48.6 in 2010. The rate for those aged 55 plus went from 27.7 percent in 1967 to 17.1 percent in 2010.

Those living near poverty are less likely to live in a household receiving public assistance today than in 1981. In 1981, 11.7 percent of individuals living 100 to less than 133 percent of poverty thresholds lived in a household receiving public assistance. In 2010, that rate decreased to 4.9 percent. However, the near poor are more likely to receive food stamps (currently known as SNAP), free or reduced school lunch, and are more likely to take advantage of the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) program than in 1981. The SNAP program participation rate for those

living near poverty is higher in 2010 than 1981, 31.5 percent compared to 20.3 percent. Overall, more individuals living near poverty are participating in the social welfare programs for which they qualify.

The Near Poor and Alternative Poverty Measures

While the official poverty measure introduced by Mollie Orshansky serves as one way to identify and study the near poor, two other measures, the National Academy of Sciences Measure (NAS) and the Supplemental Poverty Measure (SPM), can also be used. The National Academy of Sciences measure is based on the recommendations of the Panel on Poverty and Family Assistance in 1995 (Citro and Michael 1995). The Supplemental Poverty Measure draws from the NAS measure and subsequent research. It is based on recommendations of an Interagency Technical Working Group on Developing a Supplemental Poverty Measure (2010). Both measures are intended to address concerns about the adequacy of the official poverty measure in how both resources and thresholds are defined. The U.S. Census Bureau publishes the NAS measure for 1999-2010 and SPM measure for 2009-2010 with updates to these series scheduled for Fall 2012.⁶

Table 3 compares the poverty measure concepts for the three measures along several dimensions. The official measure and the NAS measure use a resource unit that excludes unrelated individuals under the age of 15 while the SPM resource unit consists of all related individuals who live at the same address, including any coresident unrelated children who are cared for by the family. The official measure resources only consider gross before-tax income while NAS and SPM resources consider a wider range of resources such as cash income, in-kind

⁶ See <http://www.census.gov/hhes/povmeas/data/nas/tables/2010/index.html> for the NAS measure and Short (2011) for the SPM measure.

benefits, taxes paid, tax credits, work expenses, and out-of-pocket medical expenses. Unlike NAS resources, SPM resources exclude child support paid. Though the NAS and SPM measures consider a similar set of resources a key difference is how some of these resources are collected. The SPM measure uses responses to direct questions about child care expenses and out-of-pocket medical expenses added to the CPS ASEC 2010. The NAS measure uses modeling techniques to determine these expenses. Thresholds for the official measure are calculated using the minimum food diet in 1963. Thresholds for the NAS and SPM measures are calculated using expenditures on food, clothing, shelter, utilities (FCSU), plus ‘a little more’ for additional expenses. Each alternative measure uses a different method of calculating the threshold. The NAS measure takes 80 percent of median FCSU expenditures for a 2 adult, 2 child family; the SPM measure takes the 33rd percentile of FCSU expenditure for a family with exactly 2 children. Both alternative measures incorporate geographic adjustments for differences in housing costs and utilize a three parameter equivalence scale for family size and composition. Only the SPM measure distinguishes thresholds by housing tenure (owner with a mortgage, owner without a mortgage, and renter). Both measures are updated differently. The NAS measure is updated with 3 years of expenditure data while the SPM measure is updated with 5 years of expenditure data. In contrast, the threshold for the official measure is only updated using the Consumer Price Index.

There are several versions of the NAS measure that differ in the treatment of medical out-of-pocket expenses, geographic adjustments, and threshold updating.⁷ Since there are several versions of the NAS measure, we choose the version that is most similar to the SPM, the NAS

⁷ More details about the NAS measures can be found in Dalaker (2005).

MSI-GA-CE (Medical out-of-pocket expenses Subtracted from Income-Geographic Adjustment of poverty threshold-Threshold adjusted using Consumer Expenditure Survey).

This section provides a sense of how the near poor differ along demographic and socioeconomic characteristics using alternative poverty measures. We would expect differences in how each measure identifies the near poor given the differences in resource and threshold definitions outlined above. We use a pooled sample of households in the Current Population Survey Annual Social and Economic Supplement (CPS ASEC) whose data refer to calendar years 2000-2010 but are collected 2001-2011. We merge the public-use research data files to the CPS ASEC sample to replicate the NAS and SPM measures for the years 2000-2010 and 2009-2010, respectively.⁸ For comparison across all measures, we use the SPM poverty universe for all estimates in this section, which includes unrelated individuals under 15 years of age. We calculate the poverty rate under the official measure and the two alternative measures. For comparison to previous SPM research, we categorize these unrelated individuals under 15 years of age as “in poverty.” Similar to the previous section, we define the near poor population as those with income-to-threshold ratio levels of 100% - <133%. We also show those from 100% - <150% and 100% - <200% in the appendix.

Figure 11 displays the time series of national poverty rates under the official measure and the two alternative measures for 2000-2010 and highlights the recessions during this decade. Figures 12-20 display the time series of rates for the near poor population using the Orshansky measure (defined as the percentage of people whose income-to-threshold ratio is 100%-<133%) with the alternative poverty measures. The figures show near poverty rates by various

⁸ The NAS public-use research data files can be found at < <http://www.census.gov/hhes/povmeas/data/public-use.html>>, and the SPM public-use research data files can be found at <<http://www.census.gov/hhes/povmeas/data/supplemental/public-use.html>>

demographic characteristics such as age, gender, race, marital status, education, labor force status, region, and housing tenure. The figures also show participation rates by assistance programs: public assistance (AFDC/TANF), SNAP/Food Stamps, housing subsidy (section 8), energy assistance, Earned Income Tax Credit, WIC, and the school lunch program.

Table 4 shows the change in near poverty rates between 2000 and 2010 using the official and NAS measures along with a statistical test for this change.⁹ The SPM measure is only available 2009-2010 so is not included. The table shows near poverty rates by demographic characteristic. Both measures show the overall near poverty rate in 2010 is higher than the near poverty rate in 2000. The change in the NAS measure is 1.3 percentage points while the change in the official measure is 0.5 percentage points.

Examining the change by demographic group shows both men and women experienced an increase in near poverty rates over this time period. Men experienced an increase of 0.6 and 1.2 percentage points in the official and NAS measures, respectively. Women experienced an increase of 0.4 and 1.4 percentage points in the official and NAS measures, respectively.

Divorced and Single, Never-Married individuals also experienced a positive change under both measures. The NAS measure shows all education groups are more likely to be near poor in 2010 than 2000. This also holds true using the official measure with the exception of individuals with less than a high school education.

The NAS measure reveals children are more likely to be near poor in 2010 than in 2000; however, the official measure shows no change. Both measures show non-elderly adults are

⁹ All comparative statements in this section have undergone statistical testing, and, unless otherwise noted, all comparisons are statistically significant at the 10 percent significance level.

more likely to be near poor in 2010 than in 2000. The opposite holds for seniors. The official measure shows a decline in near poverty while the NAS measure shows no change.

Table 5 shows participation rates by assistance program in 2000 and 2010. Both official and NAS measures display statistically different changes from 2000 to 2010 in participation rates for a few assistance programs: (1) a decrease for public assistance (AFDC/TANF) and housing subsidy (section 8) and; (2) an increase for SNAP/Food Stamps and energy assistance.

Table 6 presents near poverty rates using the official, NAS, and SPM measures for 2010. Like Table 4, Table 6 defines the near poor population using the Orshansky measure (the percentage of people whose income-to-threshold ratio is 100%–<133%). Table 6 illustrates the prevalence of near poverty under varying measures and highlights the change in near poverty rates relative to the official measure. The final columns in the table show a statistical test of the equality of the NAS and SPM measures to the official measure. The NAS and SPM measures show higher overall near poverty rates than the official measure by at least 4.5 percentage points in 2010. This observation holds true for all demographic categories. Using the NAS measure, the largest difference compared to the official measure occurs for Blacks (difference of 7.9 percentage points) followed by individuals with less than a high school education and renters (difference of 7.5 percentage points). Using the SPM measure, the largest difference compared to the official measure occurs for renters (difference of 8.3 percentage points) followed by individuals with less than a high school education (difference of 7.9 percentage points).

Table 7 shows program participation rates by assistance program in 2010 for the official, NAS, and SPM measures. Program participation rates under the NAS and SPM measures for

SNAP/Food Stamps, energy assistance, Earned Income Tax Credit, and the School Lunch Program are lower than the official measure.

Appendix Figures A1-A18 show trends in the near poor by demographic and socioeconomic characteristics using the alternative poverty measures for income-to-threshold ratios, 100%-150% (Figures A1-A9) and 100%-200% (Figures A10-A18). Appendix Tables A1 and A5 present near poverty rates in 2000 along with near poverty rates in 2010 also using the alternative poverty measures for income-to-threshold ratios, 100%-150% (Table A1) and 100%-200% (Table A5). Appendix Tables A3 and A7 show near poverty rates using the official, NAS, and SPM measures for 2010 by income-to-threshold ratio (100%-150%, Table A3; 100%-200%, Table A7). These Appendix Figures and Tables illustrate the sensitivity of the results to the near poor definition.

Conclusion

This paper advances our knowledge of the demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of the near poor and provides an overview of those living near poverty from 1966 to 2010. We define the near poor as Orshansky (1966) did during the War on Poverty and consider additional definitions as well. This paper highlights general characteristics and compares them to individuals living in poverty in terms of demographic and socioeconomic characteristics. Overall, we show that the proportion of near poor decreased from 1967 to 2010. Those who are single, separated, divorced, or widowed have higher near poverty rates than those who are married. Those with less education and those not in the labor force experience higher rates of both poverty and near poverty. Overall, the near poor make up less of the total population than in 1967. Those considered near poverty in 2010 have lower levels of education,

less employment, and increased program participation in qualifying programs than their 1967 counterparts. Additionally, the near poor have higher participation rates of food stamps/SNAP, free or reduced school lunch, and Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) in 2010 than in 1981.

In addition to presenting near poor trends using the official poverty measure, this paper also presents trends using two alternative poverty definitions, the National Academy of Sciences measure (NAS) and the Supplemental Poverty Measure (SPM) for 2000-2010. Both alternative measures under the Orshanky definition (100%-133%) of near poor show near poor rates exceeding the official poverty measure in 2010. This observation holds true when examining alternative measures under other near poor definitions (100%-150% and 100%-200%).

While this paper only presents a trend analysis of the near poor, future work will address how demographic and socioeconomic characteristics influence the near poor classification using a regression framework. In this way, we can assess the impact of one characteristic on the likelihood of being near poor while holding the other characteristics constant.

References

Bansak, Cynthia, and Steven Raphael. "The State Children's Health Insurance Program and Job Mobility: Identifying Job Lock among Working Parents in Near-Poor Households." *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* 61 (2008): 564-579

Ben-Shalom, Yonatan, Robert Moffitt, and John Karl Scholz. "An Assessment of the Effectiveness of Anti-Poverty Programs in the United States." Paper prepared for the Oxford Handbook of the Economics of Poverty, May 2011.

Citro, Constance F., and Robert T. Michaels (eds.). "Measuring Poverty: A New Approach." Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press, 1995.

Dalaker, Joe. "Alternative Poverty Estimates in the United States: 2003." U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Reports, P60-227. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 2005.

DeNavas-Walt, Carmen, Bernadette D. Proctor, and Jessica C. Smith. "Income, Poverty, and Health Insurance Coverage in the United States: 2011." U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Reports, P60-243. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 2012.

DeParle, Jason, Robert Gebeloff, and Sabrina Tavernise. "Older, Suburban and Struggling, 'Near Poor' Startle the Census." *New York Times* (November 18, 2011).

Dvorak, Petula. "A Dizzying Fall from Middle-Class Grace." *The Washington Post*, September 24, 2012.

Eckholm, Erik. "America's 'Near Poor' Are Increasingly at Economic Risk." *New York Times*, May 8, 2006.

Hoynes, Hilary W., Marianne E. Page, and Ann Huff Stevens. "Poverty in America: Trends and Explanations." *The Journal of Economic Perspectives* 20 (2006): 47-68.

Neumark, David, Mark Schweitzer, and William Wascher. "The Effects of Minimum Wages on the Distribution of Family Incentives: A Nonparametric Analysis." *The Journal of Human Resources* 40 (Autumn 2005): 867-894.

Orshansky, Mollie. "Recounting the Poor – A Five-Year Review." *Social Security Bulletin* 20 (1966): 20-37.

Observations from the Interagency Technical Working Group on Developing a Supplemental Poverty Measure (Interagency), March 2010, available at http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/poverty/SPM_TWGObservations.pdf.

Short, Kathleen. "The Research Supplemental Poverty Measure: 2010." U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Reports, P60-241. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Short, Kathleen, and Timothy Smeeding. "Understanding Income-to-Threshold Ratios Using the Supplemental Poverty Measure." U.S. Census Bureau Social, Economic, and Housing Statistics Division Working Paper No. 2012-18 (August 21, 2012).

Smeeding, Timothy. "Poor People in Rich Nations: The United States in Comparative Perspective." *The Journal of Economic Perspectives* 20 (2006): 69-90.

Tavernise, Sabrina, Jason DeParle, and Robert Gebeloff. "Voices of the Near Poor." *New York Times*, November 19, 2011.

Editorial Board. "The Poor, The Near Poor, and You." *New York Times*, November 23, 2011.

Table 1. Poverty and Near Poverty Rates, United States, 1967 and 2010

	1967								2010								Change			
	<100%		100 - <133%		100 - <150%		100 - <200%		<100%		100 - <133%		100 - <150%		100 - <200%		<100%	100 - <133%	100 - <150%	100 - <200%
	(%)	s.e.	(%)	s.e.	(%)	s.e.	(%)	s.e.	(%)	s.e.	(%)	s.e.	(%)	s.e.	(%)	s.e.				
Overall Poverty Rate	14.2	(0.09)	8.0	(0.07)	12.8	(0.09)	26.9	(0.12)	15.1	(0.17)	6.2	(0.11)	9.5	(0.13)	18.9	(0.18)	0.9 *	-1.8 *	-3.2 *	-8.1 *
Gender																				
Men	12.5	(0.13)	7.8	(0.10)	12.5	(0.13)	26.7	(0.17)	14.0	(0.19)	5.8	(0.12)	9.0	(0.14)	18.0	(0.19)	1.4 *	-2.0 *	-3.5 *	-8.7 *
Women	15.8	(0.13)	8.2	(0.10)	13.1	(0.12)	27.1	(0.16)	16.3	(0.18)	6.6	(0.12)	10.1	(0.16)	19.7	(0.20)	0.4	-1.6 *	-3.0 *	-7.5 *
Race																				
White	11.1	(0.09)	7.2	(0.07)	11.8	(0.09)	26.1	(0.12)	13.2	(0.17)	5.8	(0.12)	9.1	(0.14)	18.1	(0.19)	2.1 *	-1.3 *	-2.7 *	-8.0 *
Black	39.4	(0.39)	13.8	(0.27)	20.5	(0.32)	33.3	(0.38)	27.4	(0.61)	8.4	(0.33)	12.9	(0.41)	23.9	(0.52)	-12.0 *	-5.3 *	-7.6 *	-9.4 *
Other	14.4	(1.03)	12.6	(0.94)	19.1	(1.13)	33.6	(1.36)	14.9	(0.74)	5.9	(0.40)	8.7	(0.46)	17.9	(0.73)	0.4	-6.7 *	-10.4 *	-15.7 *
Marital Status (Aged 18+)																				
Married	8.8	(0.11)	6.6	(0.10)	10.9	(0.12)	24.0	(0.17)	6.9	(0.15)	4.0	(0.11)	6.4	(0.14)	13.8	(0.21)	-1.9 *	-2.7 *	-4.5 *	-10.2 *
Separated or Divorced	27.8	(0.67)	9.4	(0.43)	13.7	(0.51)	25.8	(0.66)	20.5	(0.39)	8.3	(0.25)	12.1	(0.30)	23.1	(0.34)	-7.2 *	-1.1 *	-1.7 *	-2.7 *
Widowed	35.6	(0.54)	10.1	(0.35)	14.4	(0.40)	25.1	(0.49)	15.4	(0.49)	11.5	(0.45)	18.3	(0.54)	34.7	(0.61)	-20.2 *	1.4 *	3.9 *	9.6 *
Single, Never-Married	16.1	(0.14)	8.9	(0.11)	14.5	(0.14)	30.2	(0.18)	21.5	(0.25)	7.2	(0.15)	11.0	(0.18)	20.9	(0.22)	5.4 *	-1.8 *	-3.5 *	-9.3 *
Educational Attainment (Aged 25+)																				
Less Than High School	21.3	(0.22)	10.3	(0.16)	15.5	(0.19)	29.9	(0.24)	29.3	(0.51)	12.4	(0.34)	18.6	(0.44)	32.9	(0.50)	8.0 *	2.1 *	3.1 *	3.1 *
High School Completed	6.6	(0.16)	4.8	(0.13)	8.4	(0.17)	20.7	(0.26)	13.5	(0.26)	6.9	(0.19)	10.9	(0.24)	22.3	(0.30)	6.9 *	2.1 *	2.5 *	1.5 *
Some College/Associate's Degree	5.7	(0.27)	4.0	(0.24)	6.8	(0.30)	16.1	(0.43)	9.4	(0.20)	4.9	(0.15)	7.7	(0.19)	16.5	(0.25)	3.7 *	0.9 *	0.9 *	0.4
College Completed or More	4.1	(0.22)	2.2	(0.17)	3.6	(0.21)	9.2	(0.32)	4.3	(0.14)	2.1	(0.10)	3.3	(0.13)	7.6	(0.19)	0.2	0.0	-0.2	-1.6 *
Labor Force (Aged 15+)																				
In Labor Force	8.6	(0.11)	5.6	(0.09)	9.1	(0.11)	20.9	(0.16)	8.6	(0.13)	4.4	(0.10)	6.9	(0.12)	14.5	(0.17)	-0.1	-1.1 *	-2.3 *	-6.4 *
Not in Labor Force	19.1	(0.14)	10.0	(0.11)	16.0	(0.13)	32.1	(0.17)	21.7	(0.24)	7.9	(0.16)	12.2	(0.19)	23.2	(0.25)	2.7 *	-2.1 *	-3.7 *	-8.9 *
Region																				
Northeast	10.0	(0.16)	6.9	(0.13)	11.3	(0.17)	25.4	(0.23)	12.9	(0.36)	5.2	(0.26)	8.3	(0.32)	16.2	(0.43)	2.9 *	-1.7 *	-3.1 *	-9.1 *
West	10.9	(0.21)	6.7	(0.16)	11.5	(0.21)	25.1	(0.29)	15.3	(0.38)	6.5	(0.21)	9.9	(0.27)	19.5	(0.38)	4.4 *	-0.2	-1.6 *	-5.6 *
Midwest	11.7	(0.18)	7.5	(0.15)	12.1	(0.18)	26.7	(0.24)	14.0	(0.37)	5.8	(0.23)	8.9	(0.25)	18.3	(0.40)	2.2 *	-1.7 *	-3.2 *	-8.5 *
South	22.1	(0.20)	10.1	(0.14)	15.3	(0.17)	29.5	(0.22)	16.8	(0.31)	6.7	(0.20)	10.3	(0.27)	20.1	(0.35)	-5.3 *	-3.5 *	-5.0 *	-9.5 *

Note: * Statistically different from zero at the 90 percent confidence level.

Source: Authors' calculations, U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 1967-2011 Annual Social and Economic Supplements. For information on sampling and nonsampling error, see www.census.gov/apds/techdoc/cps/cpsmar11.pdf.

Table 2. Other Measures by Poverty and Near Poverty Status, United States, 1967, 1981, 2000, and 2010

	1967/1981/2000 ⁺								2010				Change			
	<100%		100-133%		100-150%		100-200%		<100%		100-133%		<100%		100-133%	
	s.e.		s.e.		s.e.		s.e.		s.e.		s.e.					
Average Age	33.1	(18.6)	29.9	(23.1)	29.1	(17.8)	28.2	(11.7)	29.6	(16.7)	35.8	(32.2)	36.0	(25.5)	36.6	(17.2)
Labor Force Participation Rate																
Aged 15 to 24	57.4	(0.92)	62.9	(1.21)	61.9	(0.95)	63.4	(0.64)	40.9	(0.79)	48.6	(1.31)	48.3	(1.05)	48.7	(0.83)
Aged 25 to 54	61.9	(0.74)	67.5	(0.86)	68.3	(0.67)	69.6	(0.44)	51.4	(0.61)	69.1	(0.78)	69.8	(0.63)	73.8	(0.44)
Aged 55+	22.5	(0.54)	27.7	(0.90)	29.7	(0.75)	35.4	(0.59)	15.7	(0.67)	17.1	(0.86)	16.5	(0.63)	18.7	(0.46)
Program Participation (comparing 1981 to 2010)																
Public Assistance	31.5	(0.34)	11.7	(0.34)	11.3	(0.27)	8.0	(0.16)	9.2	(0.37)	4.9	(0.48)	4.1	(0.34)	3.0	(0.19)
Food Stamps/SNAP	48.0	(0.37)	20.3	(0.41)	18.2	(0.32)	12.6	(0.20)	45.9	(0.59)	31.5	(0.82)	28.5	(0.67)	21.8	(0.46)
Housing Subsidies	8.3	(0.30)	5.4	(0.42)	5.1	(0.32)	4.0	(0.21)	8.4	(0.47)	5.2	(0.52)	5.1	(0.44)	4.3	(0.32)
Energy Assistance	17.5	(0.28)	9.8	(0.30)	8.9	(0.24)	6.0	(0.14)	12.4	(0.36)	9.9	(0.49)	9.4	(0.37)	7.1	(0.24)
Earned Income Tax Credit	7.8	(0.20)	7.7	(0.28)	6.7	(0.21)	4.7	(0.13)	16.1	(0.22)	18.9	(0.30)	17.9	(0.23)	15.6	(0.18)
School Lunch Program	79.9	(0.42)	67.2	(0.77)	63.3	(0.64)	51.7	(0.47)	84.3	(0.63)	79.1	(1.28)	75.4	(1.06)	64.9	(0.86)
WIC (only since 2000)	26.8	(0.39)	21.9	(0.54)	20.3	(0.42)	17.7	(0.28)	26.1	(0.67)	21.0	(1.11)	19.4	(0.83)	16.9	(0.57)

Notes: ⁺ Comparison year is 1967 unless otherwise indicated. * Statistically different from zero at the 90 percent confidence level.

Source: Authors' calculations, U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 1967-2011 Annual Social and Economic Supplements. For information on sampling and nonsampling error, see www.census.gov/aprd/techdoc/cps/cpsmar11.pdf.

Table 3. Comparison of Official, National Academy of Sciences, and Supplemental Poverty Measures

Dimension	Official Poverty Measure	National Academy of Sciences Measure (MSI-GA-CE)	Supplemental Poverty Measure
Resource Unit	All individuals who are related by birth, marriage, or adoption; excludes unrelated individuals over 15	All individuals who are related by birth, marriage, or adoption; excludes unrelated individuals over 15	All related individuals who live at the same address, including any coresident unrelated children who are cared for by the family (such as foster children) and any cohabitators and their relatives
Resource Measure	Gross before-tax income	Sum of cash income, plus in-kind benefits that families can use to meet their food, clothing, shelter, and utilities needs, minus taxes (or plus tax credits), minus work expenses, minus out-of-pocket medical expenses	Sum of cash income, plus in-kind benefits that families can use to meet their food, clothing, shelter, and utilities needs, minus taxes (or plus tax credits), minus work expenses, minus out-of-pocket medical expenses, minus child support paid
Threshold Measure	Three times the cost of minimum food diet in 1963	80 percent of the median of expenditures on food, clothing, shelter, and utilities for a 2 adult, 2 child family multiplied by 1.2	The 33 rd percentile of expenditures on food, clothing, shelter, and utilities for a family with exactly two children multiplied by 1.2
Threshold Adjustment	Vary by family size, composition, and age of householder	Geographic adjustments for differences in housing costs and a three parameter equivalence scale for family size and composition	Geographic adjustments for differences in housing costs and a three parameter equivalence scale for family size and composition; Thresholds vary by housing tenure
Threshold Updating	Consumer Price Index: All items	Three year moving average of expenditures on food, clothing, shelter, and utilities	Five year moving average of expenditures on food, clothing, shelter, and utilities

Table 4. Near Poverty Rates Using Official and NAS Measures, 100%-<133%, 2000 and 2010

	2000				2010				Change (2000 to 2010)			
	Official	s.e.	NAS	s.e.	Official	s.e.	NAS	s.e.	Official	Equality Test	NAS	Equality Test
Overall Near Poverty Rate	5.7	(0.14)	9.4	(0.18)	6.2	(0.11)	10.7	(0.14)	0.5	*	1.3	*
Gender												
Men	5.2	(0.19)	8.8	(0.25)	5.8	(0.12)	10.0	(0.15)	0.6	*	1.2	*
Women	6.2	(0.21)	10.0	(0.26)	6.6	(0.13)	11.4	(0.16)	0.4	*	1.4	*
Race												
White	5.3	(0.15)	8.6	(0.19)	5.8	(0.12)	9.7	(0.15)	0.5	*	1.1	*
Black	8.2	(0.47)	14.1	(0.59)	8.4	(0.34)	16.3	(0.46)	0.2		2.2	*
Other	5.4	(0.58)	10.4	(0.78)	5.9	(0.40)	11.8	(0.58)	0.5		1.4	
Marital Status (Aged 18+)												
Married, Spouse Present	3.6	(0.13)	6.5	(0.17)	3.8	(0.11)	7.6	(0.16)	0.2		1.1	*
Married, Spouse Absent	7.5	(1.09)	11.8	(1.33)	9.0	(0.72)	13.8	(0.95)	1.5		2.0	
Separated	8.4	(0.96)	15.3	(1.24)	9.7	(0.64)	16.3	(0.81)	1.3		1.0	
Widowed	12.8	(0.64)	15.5	(0.70)	11.5	(0.46)	15.0	(0.48)	-1.3	*	-0.5	
Divorced	6.8	(0.40)	9.9	(0.47)	7.9	(0.26)	11.9	(0.34)	1.1	*	2.0	*
Single, Never-Married	6.6	(0.16)	11.1	(0.21)	7.2	(0.15)	12.6	(0.19)	0.6	*	1.5	*
Educational Attainment (Aged 25+)												
Less Than High School	12.2	(0.30)	17.7	(0.35)	12.4	(0.34)	19.9	(0.40)	0.2		2.2	*
High School Completed	5.4	(0.14)	9.4	(0.19)	6.9	(0.19)	11.8	(0.21)	1.5	*	2.4	*
Some College/Associate's Degree	3.7	(0.14)	6.3	(0.17)	4.9	(0.15)	8.6	(0.19)	1.2	*	2.3	*
College Completed or More	1.6	(0.09)	2.8	(0.12)	2.1	(0.10)	4.0	(0.14)	0.5	*	1.2	*
Labor Force												
In Labor Force	3.7	(0.09)	6.6	(0.11)	4.4	(0.10)	8.1	(0.13)	0.7	*	1.5	*
Not in Labor Force	7.9	(0.13)	12.4	(0.15)	7.9	(0.16)	13.3	(0.19)	0.0		0.9	*
Region												
Northeast	5.0	(0.26)	10.2	(0.37)	5.2	(0.26)	11.0	(0.33)	0.2	*	0.8	
Midwest	4.4	(0.23)	6.8	(0.28)	5.8	(0.23)	8.5	(0.26)	1.4	*	1.7	*
South	6.5	(0.22)	9.2	(0.26)	6.7	(0.20)	10.8	(0.24)	0.2	*	1.6	*
West	6.4	(0.27)	11.7	(0.36)	6.5	(0.22)	12.5	(0.31)	0.1	*	0.8	*
Age												
Child (<18)	7.0	(0.27)	11.8	(0.34)	7.3	(0.21)	13.1	(0.25)	0.3		1.3	*
Adult (18-64)	4.5	(0.10)	7.8	(0.13)	5.4	(0.10)	9.5	(0.13)	0.9	*	1.7	*
Senior (65+)	9.3	(0.27)	12.5	(0.31)	7.9	(0.27)	12.2	(0.32)	-1.4	*	-0.3	

Note: * Statistically different from zero at the 90 percent confidence level.

Source: Authors' calculations, U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2001-2011 Annual Social and Economic Supplements. For information on sampling and nonsampling error, see www.census.gov/apsd/techdoc/cps/cpsmar11.pdf.

Table 5. Program Participation Rates Using Official and NAS Measures, 100%-<133%, 2000 and 2010

	2000				2010				Change (2000 to 2010)			
	Official	s.e.	NAS	s.e.	Official	s.e.	NAS	s.e.	Official	Equality Test	NAS	Equality Test
Program Participation Rate												
Public Assistance	6.2	(0.62)	7.0	(0.51)	4.9	(0.48)	5.2	(0.37)	-1.3	*	-1.8	*
Food Stamps/SNAP	15.5	(0.92)	17.2	(0.75)	31.5	(0.82)	28.3	(0.63)	16.0	*	11.1	*
Housing Subsidy	7.7	(1.02)	10.8	(0.94)	5.2	(0.52)	7.6	(0.56)	-2.5	*	-3.2	*
Energy Assistance	6.7	(0.64)	6.4	(0.49)	9.9	(0.49)	8.8	(0.35)	3.2	*	2.4	*
Earned Income Tax Credit	18.4	(0.99)	14.9	(0.71)	18.9	(0.30)	15.0	(0.23)	0.5		0.1	
School Lunch Program	78.9	(1.63)	74.0	(1.36)	79.1	(1.29)	71.1	(1.05)	0.2		-2.9	*
WIC	21.9	(1.34)	19.8	(0.99)	21.0	(1.12)	19.9	(0.71)	-0.9		0.1	

Note: * Statistically different from zero at the 90 percent confidence level.

Source: Authors' calculations, U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2001-2011 Annual Social and Economic Supplements. For information on sampling and nonsampling error, see www.census.gov/aprd/techdoc/cps/cpsmar11.pdf.

Table 6. Near Poverty Rates Using Official, NAS, and SPM Measures, 100% - <133%, 2010

	2010						Difference from Official			
	Official	s.e.	NAS	s.e.	SPM	s.e.	NAS	Equality Test	SPM	Equality Test
Overall Near Poverty Rate	6.2	(0.11)	10.7	(0.14)	11.1	(0.13)	4.5	*	4.9	*
Gender										
Men	5.8	(0.12)	10.0	(0.15)	10.5	(0.14)	4.2	*	4.7	*
Women	6.6	(0.13)	11.4	(0.16)	11.6	(0.14)	4.8	*	5.0	*
Race										
White	5.8	(0.12)	9.7	(0.15)	10.1	(0.14)	3.9	*	4.3	*
Black	8.4	(0.34)	16.3	(0.46)	16.2	(0.46)	7.9	*	7.8	*
Other	5.9	(0.40)	11.8	(0.58)	12.7	(0.55)	5.9	*	6.8	*
Marital Status (Aged 18+)										
Married, Spouse Present	3.8	(0.11)	7.6	(0.16)	7.9	(0.15)	3.8	*	4.1	*
Married, Spouse Absent	9.0	(0.72)	13.8	(0.95)	13.5	(0.95)	4.8	*	4.5	*
Separated	9.7	(0.64)	16.3	(0.81)	17.0	(0.81)	6.6	*	7.3	*
Widowed	11.5	(0.46)	15.0	(0.48)	16.0	(0.42)	3.5	*	4.5	*
Divorced	7.9	(0.26)	11.9	(0.34)	11.5	(0.32)	4.0	*	3.6	*
Single, Never-Married	7.2	(0.15)	12.6	(0.19)	13.0	(0.18)	5.4	*	5.8	*
Educational Attainment (Aged 25+)										
Less Than High School	12.4	(0.34)	19.9	(0.40)	20.3	(0.41)	7.5	*	7.9	*
High School Completed	6.9	(0.19)	11.8	(0.21)	12.2	(0.24)	4.9	*	5.3	*
Some College/Associate's Degree	4.9	(0.15)	8.6	(0.19)	8.9	(0.19)	3.7	*	4.0	*
College Completed or More	2.1	(0.10)	4.0	(0.14)	4.0	(0.13)	1.9	*	1.9	*
Labor Force										
In Labor Force	4.4	(0.10)	8.1	(0.13)	8.4	(0.12)	3.7	*	4.0	*
Not in Labor Force	7.9	(0.16)	13.3	(0.19)	13.8	(0.18)	5.4	*	5.9	*
Region										
Northeast	5.2	(0.26)	11.0	(0.33)	11.2	(0.34)	5.8	*	6.0	*
Midwest	5.8	(0.23)	8.5	(0.26)	9.8	(0.29)	2.7	*	4.0	*
South	6.7	(0.20)	10.8	(0.24)	11.0	(0.24)	4.1	*	4.3	*
West	6.5	(0.22)	12.5	(0.31)	12.3	(0.31)	6.0	*	5.8	*
Age										
Child (<18)	7.3	(0.21)	13.1	(0.25)	13.9	(0.22)	5.8	*	6.6	*
Adult (18-64)	5.4	(0.10)	9.5	(0.13)	9.8	(0.13)	4.1	*	4.4	*
Senior (65+)	7.9	(0.27)	12.2	(0.32)	12.3	(0.30)	4.3	*	4.4	*
Housing Tenure										
Owner with Mortgage	3.1	(0.12)	6.1	(0.18)	7.3	(0.19)	3.0	*	4.2	*
Owner without Mortgage	6.5	(0.24)	10.0	(0.30)	8.3	(0.25)	3.5	*	1.8	*
Renter	10.4	(0.22)	17.9	(0.33)	18.7	(0.33)	7.5	*	8.3	*

Note: * Statistically different from zero at the 90 percent confidence level.

Source: Authors' calculations, U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2001-2011 Annual Social and Economic Supplements. For information on sampling and nonsampling error, see www.census.gov/aprd/techdoc/cps/cpsmar11.pdf.


Table 7. Program Participation Rates Using Official, NAS, and SPM Measures, 100%-<133%, 2010

	2010						Difference from Official			
	Official	s.e.	NAS	s.e.	SPM	s.e.	NAS	Equality Test	SPM	Equality Test
Program Participation Rate										
Public Assistance	4.9	(0.48)	5.2	(0.37)	5.0	(0.36)	0.3		0.1	
Food Stamps/SNAP	31.5	(0.82)	28.3	(0.63)	28.8	(0.65)	-3.2	*	-2.7	*
Housing Subsidy	5.2	(0.52)	7.6	(0.56)	8.4	(0.55)	2.4	*	3.2	*
Energy Assistance	9.9	(0.49)	8.8	(0.35)	9.1	(0.38)	-1.1	*	-0.8	*
Earned Income Tax Credit	18.9	(0.30)	15.0	(0.23)	14.4	(0.21)	-3.9	*	-4.5	*
School Lunch Program	79.1	(1.29)	71.1	(1.05)	68.3	(1.07)	-8.0	*	-10.8	*
WIC	21.0	(1.12)	19.9	(0.71)	20.3	(0.84)	-1.1	*	-0.7	

Note: * Statistically different from zero at the 90 percent confidence level.


Source: Authors' calculations, U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2001-2011 Annual Social and Economic Supplements. For information on sampling and nonsampling error, see www.census.gov/aprd/techdoc/cps/cpsmar11.pdf.

Figure 1. Poverty and Near Poverty Rates by Year, United States, 1966 to 2010




Source: Authors' calculations, U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 1967-2011 Annual Social and Economic Supplements. For information on sampling and nonsampling error, see www.census.gov/apsd/techdoc/cps/cpsmar11.pdf.

Figure 2. Poverty and Near Poverty Rates by Gender and Year, United States, 1966 to 2010



Source: Authors' calculations, U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 1967-2011 Annual Social and Economic Supplements. For information on sampling and nonsampling error, see www.census.gov/apso/techdoc/cps/cpsmar11.pdf.


Figure 3. Poverty and Near Poverty Rates by Race and Year, United States, 1966 to 2010



Note: Those with Hispanic or Latino ethnicity are identified by their race.

Source: Authors' calculations, U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 1967-2011 Annual Social and Economic Supplements. For information on sampling and nonsampling error, see www.census.gov/apsd/techdoc/cps/cpsmar11.pdf.


Figure 4. Poverty and Near Poverty Rates for Individuals Aged 18 and Older by Marital Status and Year, United States, 1966 to 2010



Note: All estimates based on poverty universe for those aged 18+.

Source: Authors' calculations, U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 1967-2011 Annual Social and Economic Supplements. For information on sampling and nonsampling error, see www.census.gov/apsd/techdoc/cps/cpsmar11.pdf.

Figure 5. Poverty and Near Poverty Rates for Individuals Aged 15 and Older by Educational Attainment and Year, United States, 1966 to 2010



Note: Estimates based on poverty universe for those aged 15+.

Source: Authors' calculations, U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 1967-2011 Annual Social and Economic Supplements. For information on sampling and nonsampling error, see www.census.gov/apsd/techdoc/cps/cpsmar11.pdf.


Figure 6. Poverty and Near Poverty Rates for Individuals Aged 15 and Older by Labor Force Status and Year, United States, 1966 to 2010



Notes: Estimates based on poverty universe for those aged 15+. Data discrepancies in 1987 and 1994 are presented with missing data for those years.


Source: Authors' calculations, U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 1967-2011 Annual Social and Economic Supplements. For information on sampling and nonsampling error, see www.census.gov/apsd/techdoc/cps/cpsmar11.pdf.

Figure 7. Poverty and Near Poverty Rates by Region and Year, United States, 1966 to 2010




Source: Authors' calculations, U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 1967-2011 Annual Social and Economic Supplements. For information on sampling and nonsampling error, see www.census.gov/apsd/techdoc/cps/cpsmar11.pdf.

Figure 8. Average Age of Individuals in Poverty and Near Poverty by Year, United States, 1966 to 2010



Source: Authors' calculations, U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 1967-2011 Annual Social and Economic Supplements. For information on sampling and nonsampling error, see www.census.gov/aprd/techdoc/cps/cpsmar11.pdf.

Figure 9. Labor Force Participation Rates by Age Group, Poverty/Near Poverty Measure, and Year, United States, 1966 to 2010




Notes: Estimates based on poverty universe. Alternative ranges on y-axes. Data discrepancies in 1987 and 1994 are presented with missing data for those years.

Source: Authors' calculations, U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 1967-2011

Annual Social and Economic Supplements. For information on sampling and nonsampling error, see www.census.gov/apsd/techdoc/cps/cpsmar11.pdf.


Figure 10(A). Program Participation by Type of Program, Year, and Poverty Status, United States, various years



Notes: Estimates based on poverty universe. Years based on data availability. Alternative ranges on y-axes. Participation based on someone in the household receiving program assistance.

Source: Authors' calculations, U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 1967-2011 Annual Social and Economic Supplements. For information on sampling and nonsampling error, see www.census.gov/apsd/techdoc/cps/cpsmar11.pdf.


Figure 10(B). Program Participation by Type of Program, Year, and Poverty Status, United States, various years



Notes: Estimates based on poverty universe. Years based on data availability. Alternative ranges on y-axes. Participation based on someone in the household receiving program assistance.


Source: Authors' calculations, U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 1967-2011 Annual Social and Economic Supplements. For information on sampling and nonsampling error, see www.census.gov/aprd/techdoc/cps/cpsmar11.pdf.

Figure 11. Percent of Individuals in Poverty by Year and Poverty Alternative Poverty Measure, United States, 2000 to 2010




Source: Authors' calculations, U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2001-2011 Annual Social and Economic Supplements. For information on sampling and nonsampling error, see www.census.gov/apsd/techdoc/cps/cpsmar11.pdf.

Figure 12. Percent of Individuals with Income-to-Threshold Ratio 100% - <133% by Year and Alternative Poverty Measure, United States, 2000 to 2010




Source: Authors' calculations, U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2001-2011 Annual Social and Economic Supplements. For information on sampling and nonsampling error, see www.census.gov/aprd/techdoc/cps/cpsmar11.pdf.

Figure 13. Percent of Individuals with Income-to-Threshold Ratio 100% - <133% by Age, Year, and Alternative Poverty Measure, United States, 2000 to 2010




Source: Authors' calculations, U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2001-2011 Annual Social and Economic Supplements. For information on sampling and nonsampling error, see www.census.gov/apsd/techdoc/cps/cpsmar11.pdf.

Figure 14. Percent of Individuals with Income-to-Threshold Ratio 100% - <133% by Gender, Year, and Alternative Poverty Measure, United States, 2000 to 2010




Source: Authors' calculations, U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2001-2011 Annual Social and Economic Supplements. For information on sampling and nonsampling error, see www.census.gov/aprd/techdoc/cps/cpsmar11.pdf.

Figure 15. Percent of Individuals with Income-to-Threshold Ratio 100% - <133% by Race, Year, and Alternative Poverty Measure, United States, 2000-2010




Source: Author's calculations, U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2001-2011 Annual Social and Economic Supplements. For information on sampling and nonsampling error, see www.census.gov/apsd/techdoc/cps/cpsmar11.pdf.

Figure 16. Percent of Individuals with Income-to-Threshold Ratio 100% - <133% by Marital Status, Year, and Alternative Poverty Measure, United States, 2000 to 2010




Source: Authors' calculations, U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2001-2011 Annual Social and Economic Supplements. For information on sampling and nonsampling error, see www.census.gov/apsd/techdoc/cps/cpsmar11.pdf.

Figure 17. Percent of Individuals with Income-to-Threshold Ratio 100% - <133% by Educational Attainment, Year, and Alternative Poverty Measure, United States, 2000 to 2010




Source: Authors' calculations, U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2001-2011 Annual Social and Economic Supplements. For information on sampling and nonsampling error, see www.census.gov/apsd/techdoc/cps/cpsmar11.pdf.

Figure 18. Percent of Individuals with Income-to-Threshold Ratio 100% - <133% by Labor Force Participation, Year, and Alternative Poverty Measure, United States, 2000 to 2010




Source: Authors' calculations, U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2001-2011 Annual Social and Economic Supplements. For information on sampling and nonsampling error, see www.census.gov/apsd/techdoc/cps/cpsmar11.pdf.

Figure 19. Percent of Individuals with Income-to-Threshold Ratio 100% - <133% by Region, Year, and Alternative Poverty Measure, United States, 2000 to 2010




Source: Authors' calculations, U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2001-2011 Annual Social and Economic Supplements. For information on sampling and nonsampling error, see www.census.gov/aprd/techdoc/cps/cpsmar11.pdf.

Figure 20(A). Percent of Individuals with Income-to-Threshold Ratio 100% - <133% by Program Participation, Year, and Alternative Poverty Measure, 2000 to 2010



Source: Authors' calculations, U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2001-2011 Annual Social and Economic Supplements. For information on sampling and nonsampling error, see www.census.gov/apsd/techdoc/cps/cpsmar11.pdf.

Figure 20(B). Percent of Individuals with Income-to-Threshold Ratio 100% - <133% by Program Participation, Year, and Alternative Poverty Measure, United States, 2000 to 2010



Source: Authors' calculations, U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2001-2011 Annual Social and Economic Supplements. For information on sampling and nonsampling error, see www.census.gov/aprd/techdoc/cps/cpsmar11.pdf.

Appendix Tables and Figures

Table A1. Near Poverty Rates Using Official and NAS Measures, 100%-<150%, 2000 and 2010

	2000				2010				Change (2000 to 2010)			
	Official	s.e.	NAS	s.e.	Official	s.e.	NAS	s.e.	Official	Equality Test	NAS	Equality Test
Overall Near Poverty Rate	8.8	(0.17)	14.5	(0.21)	9.5	(0.13)	16.4	(0.16)	0.7	*	1.9	*
Gender												
Men	8.2	(0.24)	13.7	(0.30)	8.9	(0.14)	15.4	(0.17)	0.7	*	1.7	*
Women	9.5	(0.25)	15.3	(0.31)	10.1	(0.16)	17.3	(0.18)	0.6	*	2.0	*
Race												
White	8.3	(0.19)	13.3	(0.23)	9.1	(0.14)	15.1	(0.17)	0.8	*	1.8	*
Black	12.4	(0.56)	21.6	(0.70)	12.9	(0.41)	23.7	(0.50)	0.5		2.1	*
Other	8.0	(0.70)	15.8	(0.94)	8.7	(0.46)	17.2	(0.65)	0.7		1.4	
Marital Status (Aged 18+)												
Married, Spouse Present	5.8	(0.20)	10.5	(0.26)	6.2	(0.14)	11.9	(0.18)	0.4		1.4	*
Married, Spouse Absent	12.6	(1.37)	16.9	(1.55)	12.5	(0.81)	19.2	(1.09)	-0.1		2.3	
Separated	12.5	(1.14)	22.2	(1.43)	14.0	(0.73)	23.1	(0.90)	1.5		0.9	
Widowed	19.1	(0.76)	22.4	(0.80)	18.3	(0.54)	23.0	(0.57)	-0.8		0.6	
Divorced	10.6	(0.49)	15.7	(0.58)	11.6	(0.29)	18.0	(0.38)	1.0	*	2.3	*
Single, Never-Married	10.1	(0.20)	16.9	(0.25)	10.9	(0.18)	19.0	(0.21)	0.8	*	2.1	*
Educational Attainment (Aged 25+)												
Less Than High School	18.2	(0.35)	25.6	(0.40)	18.6	(0.44)	28.6	(0.48)	0.4		3.0	*
High School Completed	8.8	(0.18)	14.9	(0.23)	10.9	(0.24)	18.4	(0.25)	2.1	*	3.5	*
Some College/Associate's Degree	6.0	(0.17)	10.3	(0.22)	7.7	(0.19)	13.7	(0.24)	1.7	*	3.4	*
College Completed or More	2.5	(0.11)	4.6	(0.15)	3.3	(0.13)	6.3	(0.17)	0.8	*	1.7	*
Labor Force												
In Labor Force	5.9	(0.11)	10.6	(0.14)	6.9	(0.12)	12.9	(0.14)	1.0	*	2.3	*
Not in Labor Force	11.9	(0.15)	18.7	(0.18)	12.2	(0.19)	19.8	(0.23)	0.3		1.1	*
Region												
Northeast	7.8	(0.32)	15.5	(0.44)	8.2	(0.32)	16.7	(0.40)	0.4		1.2	*
Midwest	7.4	(0.29)	11.4	(0.35)	8.9	(0.25)	13.6	(0.34)	1.5	*	2.2	*
South	9.7	(0.26)	14.6	(0.31)	10.3	(0.27)	16.5	(0.28)	0.6		1.9	*
West	9.8	(0.33)	16.8	(0.41)	9.9	(0.27)	18.4	(0.39)	0.1		1.6	*
Age												
Child (<18)	10.4	(0.32)	18.1	(0.41)	11.3	(0.25)	20.0	(0.29)	0.9	*	1.9	*
Adult (18-64)	7.1	(0.12)	12.3	(0.16)	8.2	(0.12)	14.6	(0.15)	1.1	*	2.3	*
Senior (65+)	14.2	(0.33)	18.4	(0.36)	12.6	(0.33)	18.3	(0.36)	-1.6	*	-0.1	

Note: * Statistically different from zero at the 90 percent confidence level.

Source: Authors' calculations, U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2001-2011 Annual Social and Economic Supplements. For information on sampling and nonsampling error, see www.census.gov/apds/techdoc/cps/cpsmar11.pdf.

Table A2. Program Participation Rates Using Official and NAS Measures, 100%-<150%, 2000 and 2010

	2000				2010				Change (2000 to 2010)			
	Official	s.e.	NAS	s.e.	Official	s.e.	NAS	s.e.	Official	Equality Test	NAS	Equality Test
Program Participation Rate												
Public Assistance	5.6	(0.47)	6.0	(0.38)	4.1	(0.34)	4.3	(0.26)	-1.5	*	-1.7	*
Food Stamps/SNAP	13.3	(0.70)	15.3	(0.58)	28.5	(0.67)	26.4	(0.51)	15.2	*	11.1	*
Housing Subsidy	7.1	(0.80)	10.4	(0.76)	5.1	(0.44)	7.4	(0.47)	-2.0	*	-3.0	*
Energy Assistance	6.1	(0.49)	6.2	(0.39)	9.4	(0.37)	8.0	(0.28)	3.3	*	1.8	*
Earned Income Tax Credit	17.1	(0.77)	14.0	(0.55)	17.9	(0.23)	14.5	(0.18)	0.8		0.5	
School Lunch Program	75.2	(1.41)	70.4	(1.15)	75.4	(1.06)	67.5	(0.92)	0.2		-2.9	*
WIC	20.3	(1.05)	18.2	(0.77)	19.4	(0.84)	18.8	(0.57)	-0.9		0.6	

Note: * Statistically different from zero at the 90 percent confidence level.

Source: Authors' calculations, U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2001-2011 Annual Social and Economic Supplements. For information on sampling and nonsampling error, see www.census.gov/apsd/techdoc/cps/cpsmar11.pdf.

Table A3. Near Poverty Rates Using Official, NAS, and SPM Measures, 100%-<150%, 2010

	2010						Difference from Official			
	Official	s.e.	NAS	s.e.	SPM	s.e.	NAS	Equality Test	SPM	Equality Test
Overall Near Poverty Rate	9.5	(0.13)	16.4	(0.16)	16.8	(0.16)	6.9	*	7.3	*
Gender										
Men	8.9	(0.14)	15.4	(0.17)	16.1	(0.18)	6.5	*	7.2	*
Women	10.1	(0.16)	17.3	(0.18)	17.5	(0.18)	7.2	*	7.4	*
Race		(0.00)		(0.00)		(0.00)				
White	9.1	(0.14)	15.1	(0.17)	15.6	(0.17)	6.0	*	6.5	*
Black	12.9	(0.41)	23.7	(0.50)	23.6	(0.55)	10.8	*	10.7	*
Other	8.7	(0.46)	17.2	(0.65)	18.6	(0.70)	8.5	*	9.9	*
Marital Status (Aged 18+)										
Married, Spouse Present	6.2	(0.14)	11.9	(0.18)	12.4	(0.19)	5.7	*	6.2	*
Married, Spouse Absent	12.5	(0.81)	19.2	(1.09)	19.9	(1.10)	6.7	*	7.4	*
Separated	14.0	(0.73)	23.1	(0.90)	23.2	(0.94)	9.1	*	9.2	*
Widowed	18.3	(0.54)	23.0	(0.57)	23.1	(0.51)	4.7	*	4.8	*
Divorced	11.6	(0.29)	18.0	(0.38)	17.7	(0.40)	6.4	*	6.1	*
Single, Never-Married	10.9	(0.18)	19.0	(0.21)	19.7	(0.23)	8.1	*	8.8	*
Educational Attainment (Aged 25+)										
Less Than High School	18.6	(0.44)	28.6	(0.48)	28.1	(0.47)	10.0	*	9.5	*
High School Completed	10.9	(0.24)	18.4	(0.25)	18.5	(0.29)	7.5	*	7.6	*
Some College/Associate's Degree	7.7	(0.19)	13.7	(0.24)	14.3	(0.24)	6.0	*	6.6	*
College Completed or More	3.3	(0.13)	6.3	(0.17)	6.7	(0.17)	3.0	*	3.4	*
Labor Force										
In Labor Force	6.9	(0.12)	12.9	(0.14)	13.2	(0.16)	6.0	*	6.3	*
Not in Labor Force	12.2	(0.19)	19.8	(0.23)	20.5	(0.23)	7.6	*	8.3	*
Region										
Northeast	8.2	(0.32)	16.7	(0.40)	16.3	(0.43)	8.5	*	8.1	*
Midwest	8.9	(0.25)	13.6	(0.34)	15.1	(0.35)	4.7	*	6.2	*
South	10.3	(0.27)	16.5	(0.28)	17.0	(0.29)	6.2	*	6.7	*
West	9.9	(0.27)	18.4	(0.39)	18.5	(0.40)	8.5	*	8.6	*
Age										
Child (<18)	11.3	(0.25)	20.0	(0.29)	21.2	(0.29)	8.7	*	9.9	*
Adult (18-64)	8.2	(0.12)	14.6	(0.15)	14.9	(0.17)	6.4	*	6.7	*
Senior (65+)	12.6	(0.33)	18.3	(0.36)	18.2	(0.36)	5.7	*	5.6	*
Housing Tenure										
Owner with Mortgage	5.2	(0.15)	10.0	(0.23)	11.8	(0.23)	4.8	*	6.6	*
Owner without Mortgage	10.1	(0.28)	15.7	(0.34)	13.1	(0.33)	5.6	*	3.0	*
Renter	15.4	(0.28)	26.1	(0.37)	27.0	(0.41)	10.7	*	11.6	*

Note: * Statistically different from zero at the 90 percent confidence level.

Source: Authors' calculations, U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2001-2011 Annual Social and Economic Supplements. For information on sampling and nonsampling error, see www.census.gov/apcd/techdoc/cps/cpsmar11.pdf.


Table A4. Program Participation Rates Using Official, NAS, and SPM Measures, 100%-<150%, 2010

	2010						Difference from Official			
	Official	s.e.	NAS	s.e.	SPM	s.e.	NAS	Equality Test	SPM	Equality Test
Program Participation Rate										
Public Assistance	4.1	(0.34)	4.3	(0.26)	4.2	(0.25)	0.2		0.1	
Food Stamps/SNAP	28.5	(0.67)	26.4	(0.51)	26.6	(0.57)	-2.1	*	-1.9	*
Housing Subsidy	5.1	(0.44)	7.4	(0.47)	7.9	(0.46)	2.3	*	2.8	*
Energy Assistance	9.4	(0.37)	8.0	(0.28)	8.2	(0.31)	-1.4	*	-1.2	*
Earned Income Tax Credit	17.9	(0.23)	14.5	(0.18)	13.9	(0.16)	-3.4	*	-4.0	*
School Lunch Program	75.4	(1.06)	67.5	(0.92)	64.9	(0.88)	-7.9	*	-10.5	*
WIC	19.4	(0.84)	18.8	(0.57)	18.5	(0.66)	-0.6		-0.9	*

Note: * Statistically different from zero at the 90 percent confidence level.


Source: Authors' calculations, U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2001-2011 Annual Social and Economic Supplements. For information on sampling and nonsampling error, see www.census.gov/aprd/techdoc/cps/cpsmar11.pdf.

Figure A1. Percent of Individuals with Income-to-Threshold Ratio 100% - <150% by Year and Alternative Poverty Measure, United States, 2000 to 2010




Source: Authors' calculations, U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2001-2011 Annual Social and Economic Supplements. For information on sampling and nonsampling error, see www.census.gov/aprd/techdoc/cps/cpsmar11.pdf.

Figure A2. Percent of Individuals with Income-to-Threshold Ratio 100% - <150% by Age, Year, and Alternative Poverty Measure, United States, 2000 to 2010




Source: Authors' calculations, U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2001-2011 Annual Social and Economic Supplements. For information on sampling and nonsampling error, see www.census.gov/apds/techdoc/cps/cpsmar11.pdf.

Figure A3. Percent of Individuals with Income-to-Threshold Ratio 100% - <150% by Gender, Year, and Alternative Poverty Measure, United States, 2000 to 2010




Source: Authors' calculations, U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2001-2011 Annual Social and Economic Supplements. For information on sampling and nonsampling error, see www.census.gov/aprd/techdoc/cps/cpsmar11.pdf.

Figure A4. Percent of Individuals with Income-to-Threshold Ratio 100% - <150% by Race, Year, and Alternative Poverty Measure, United States, 2000-2010




Source: Authors' calculations, U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2001-2011 Annual Social and Economic Supplements. For information on sampling and nonsampling error, see www.census.gov/aprd/techdoc/cps/cpsmar11.pdf.

Figure A5. Percent of Individuals with Income-to-Threshold Ratio 100% - <150% by Marital Status, Year, and Alternative Poverty Measure, United States, 2000 to 2010




Source: Authors' calculations, U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2001-2011 Annual Social and Economic Supplements. For information on sampling and nonsampling error, see www.census.gov/apsd/techdoc/cps/cpsmar11.pdf.

Figure A6. Percent of Individuals with Income-to-Threshold Ratio 100% - <150% by Educational Attainment, Year, and Alternative Poverty Measure, United States, 2000 to 2010



Source: Authors' calculations, U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2001-2011 Annual Social and Economic Supplements. For information on sampling and nonsampling error, see www.census.gov/apso/techdoc/cps/cpsmar11.pdf.


Figure A7. Percent of Individuals with Income-to-Threshold Ratio 100% - <150% by Labor Force Participation, Year, and Alternative Poverty Measure, United States, 2000 to 2010



Recessions Official NAS SPM

Source: Authors' calculations, U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2001-2011 Annual Social and Economic Supplements. For information on sampling and nonsampling error, see www.census.gov/aprd/techdoc/cps/cpsmar11.pdf.


Figure A8. Percent of Individuals with Income-to-Threshold Ratio 100% - <150% by Region, Year, and Alternative Poverty Measure, United States, 2000 to 2010



Recessions Official NAS SPM


Source: Authors' calculations, U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2001-2011 Annual Social and Economic Supplements. For information on sampling and nonsampling error, see www.census.gov/apsd/techdoc/cps/cpsmar11.pdf.

Figure A9(A). Percent of Individuals with Income-to-Threshold Ratio 100% - <150% by Program Participation, Year, and Alternative Poverty Measure, 2000 to 2010



Source: Authors' calculations, U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2001-2011 Annual Social and Economic Supplements. For information on sampling and nonsampling error, see www.census.gov/aprd/techdoc/cps/cpsmar11.pdf.

Figure A9(B). Percent of Individuals with Income-to-Threshold Ratio 100% - <150% by Program Participation, Year, and Alternative Poverty Measure, 2000 to 2010



Source: Authors' calculations, U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2001-2011 Annual Social and Economic Supplements. For information on sampling and nonsampling error, see www.census.gov/apcd/techdoc/cps/cpsmar11.pdf.

Table A5. Near Poverty Rates Using Official and NAS Measures, 100%-<200%, 2000 and 2010

	2000				2010				Change (2000 to 2010)			
	Official	s.e.	NAS	s.e.	Official	s.e.	NAS	s.e.	Official	Equality Test	NAS	Equality Test
Overall Near Poverty Rate	18.0	(0.23)	28.0	(0.27)	18.8	(0.18)	31.4	(0.20)	0.8	*	3.4	*
Gender												
Men	16.9	(0.33)	27.0	(0.39)	18.0	(0.19)	30.3	(0.22)	1.1	*	3.3	*
Women	19.0	(0.33)	28.9	(0.39)	19.6	(0.20)	32.5	(0.22)	0.6		3.6	*
Race												
White	17.2	(0.25)	26.3	(0.30)	18.1	(0.19)	29.7	(0.22)	0.9	*	3.4	*
Black	24.2	(0.73)	37.9	(0.83)	23.9	(0.52)	41.2	(0.58)	-0.3		3.3	*
Other	15.9	(0.94)	29.0	(1.17)	17.9	(0.73)	32.7	(0.86)	2.0	*	3.7	*
Marital Status (Aged 18+)												
Married, Spouse Present	13.2	(0.29)	22.2	(0.35)	13.6	(0.21)	25.0	(0.25)	0.4		2.8	*
Married, Spouse Absent	23.0	(1.74)	33.0	(1.94)	22.1	(0.97)	34.3	(1.31)	-0.9		1.3	
Separated	24.3	(1.48)	38.3	(1.68)	25.3	(0.82)	38.7	(0.95)	1.0		0.4	
Widowed	33.7	(0.91)	37.4	(0.93)	34.7	(0.61)	40.7	(0.63)	1.0		3.3	*
Divorced	20.2	(0.64)	30.1	(0.73)	22.6	(0.36)	33.4	(0.48)	2.4	*	3.3	*
Single, Never-Married	20.0	(0.26)	31.5	(0.30)	20.8	(0.22)	35.4	(0.26)	0.8	*	3.9	*
Educational Attainment (Aged 25+)												
Less Than High School	32.7	(0.43)	43.2	(0.45)	32.9	(0.51)	45.2	(0.53)	0.2		2.0	*
High School Completed	19.0	(0.25)	30.0	(0.29)	22.3	(0.30)	35.5	(0.34)	3.3	*	5.5	*
Some College/Associate's Degree	13.6	(0.25)	23.0	(0.30)	16.5	(0.25)	29.4	(0.32)	2.9	*	6.4	*
College Completed or More	5.8	(0.17)	10.5	(0.22)	7.6	(0.19)	14.8	(0.24)	1.8	*	4.3	*
Labor Force												
In Labor Force	13.0	(0.15)	22.7	(0.19)	14.5	(0.17)	26.7	(0.21)	1.5	*	4.0	*
Not in Labor Force	23.2	(0.20)	33.6	(0.22)	23.2	(0.25)	36.1	(0.26)	0.0		2.5	*
Region												
Northeast	16.2	(0.45)	28.8	(0.55)	16.2	(0.43)	30.8	(0.52)	0.0		2.0	*
Midwest	15.5	(0.40)	22.9	(0.46)	18.2	(0.40)	28.5	(0.44)	2.7	*	5.6	*
South	19.7	(0.35)	28.7	(0.40)	20.0	(0.35)	32.0	(0.38)	0.3		3.3	*
West	19.3	(0.44)	31.2	(0.51)	19.5	(0.38)	33.5	(0.51)	0.2		2.3	*
Age												
Child (<18)	21.2	(0.43)	33.3	(0.50)	21.5	(0.32)	37.4	(0.34)	0.3		4.1	*
Adult (18-64)	14.8	(0.17)	24.8	(0.21)	16.4	(0.16)	28.6	(0.22)	1.6	*	3.8	*
Senior (65+)	27.5	(0.42)	32.8	(0.44)	25.6	(0.46)	33.8	(0.49)	-1.9	*	1.0	

Source: Authors' calculations, U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2001-2011 Annual Social and Economic Supplements. For information on sampling and nonsampling error, see www.census.gov/apsd/techdoc/cps/cpsmar11.pdf.

Table A6. Program Participation Rates Using Official and NAS Measures, 100%-<200%, 2000 and 2010

	2000				2010				Change (2000 to 2010)			
	Official	s.e.	NAS	s.e.	Official	s.e.	NAS	s.e.	Official	Equality Test	NAS	Equality Test
Program Participation Rate												
Public Assistance	4.3	(0.29)	4.5	(0.24)	3.0	(2.97)	3.1	(0.17)	-1.3		-1.4	*
Food Stamps/SNAP	9.8	(0.43)	10.8	(0.36)	21.8	(0.46)	20.6	(0.38)	12.0	*	9.8	*
Housing Subsidy	5.7	(0.53)	7.9	(0.51)	4.3	(0.32)	6.4	(0.34)	-1.4	*	-1.5	*
Energy Assistance	4.4	(0.29)	4.3	(0.23)	7.1	(0.24)	6.2	(0.19)	2.7	*	1.9	*
Earned Income Tax Credit	14.5	(0.51)	10.6	(0.35)	15.6	(0.19)	11.9	(0.12)	1.1	*	1.3	*
School Lunch Program	66.0	(1.09)	58.7	(0.91)	64.9	(0.87)	56.5	(0.72)	-1.1		-2.2	*
WIC	17.7	(0.70)	14.6	(0.52)	16.9	(0.58)	15.9	(0.42)	-0.8		1.3	*

Source: Authors' calculations, U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2001-2011 Annual Social and Economic Supplements. For information on sampling and nonsampling error, see www.census.gov/apds/techdoc/cps/cpsmar11.pdf.

Table A7. Near Poverty Rates Using Official, NAS , and SPM Measures, 100%-<200%, 2010

	2010						Difference from Official			
	Official	s.e.	NAS	s.e.	SPM	s.e.	NAS	Equality Test	SPM	Equality Test
Overall Near Poverty Rate	18.8	(0.18)	31.4	(0.20)	31.9	(0.21)	12.6	*	13.1	*
Gender										
Men	18.0	(0.19)	30.3	(0.22)	31.0	(0.23)	12.3	*	13.0	*
Women	19.6	(0.20)	32.5	(0.22)	32.7	(0.22)	12.9	*	13.1	*
Race										
White	18.1	(0.19)	29.7	(0.22)	30.3	(0.22)	11.6	*	12.2	*
Black	23.9	(0.52)	41.2	(0.58)	40.8	(0.68)	17.3	*	16.9	*
Other	17.9	(0.73)	32.7	(0.86)	33.4	(0.90)	14.8	*	15.5	*
Marital Status (Aged 18+)										
Married, Spouse Present	13.6	(0.21)	25.0	(0.25)	25.7	(0.27)	11.4	*	12.1	*
Married, Spouse Absent	22.1	(0.97)	34.3	(1.31)	34.0	(1.34)	12.2	*	11.9	*
Separated	25.3	(0.82)	38.7	(0.95)	37.9	(0.98)	13.4	*	12.6	*
Widowed	34.7	(0.61)	40.7	(0.63)	40.0	(0.62)	6.0	*	5.3	*
Divorced	22.6	(0.36)	33.4	(0.48)	33.1	(0.48)	10.8	*	10.5	*
Single, Never-Married	20.8	(0.22)	35.4	(0.26)	36.0	(0.28)	14.6	*	15.2	*
Educational Attainment (Aged 25+)										
Less Than High School	32.9	(0.51)	45.2	(0.53)	44.8	(0.47)	12.3	*	11.9	*
High School Completed	22.3	(0.30)	35.5	(0.34)	35.4	(0.34)	13.2	*	13.1	*
Some College/Associate's Degree	16.5	(0.25)	29.4	(0.32)	29.5	(0.31)	12.9	*	13.0	*
College Completed or More	7.6	(0.19)	14.8	(0.24)	15.6	(0.26)	7.2	*	8.0	*
Labor Force										
In Labor Force	14.5	(0.17)	26.7	(0.21)	27.2	(0.20)	12.2	*	12.7	*
Not in Labor Force	23.2	(0.25)	36.1	(0.26)	36.6	(0.28)	12.9	*	13.4	*
Region										
Northeast	16.2	(0.43)	30.8	(0.52)	31.1	(0.55)	14.6	*	14.9	*
Midwest	18.2	(0.40)	28.5	(0.44)	29.8	(0.45)	10.3	*	11.6	*
South	20.0	(0.35)	32.0	(0.38)	32.1	(0.40)	12.0	*	12.1	*
West	19.5	(0.38)	33.5	(0.51)	34.0	(0.49)	14.0	*	14.5	*
Age										
Child (<18)	21.5	(0.32)	37.4	(0.34)	38.6	(0.36)	15.9	*	17.1	*
Adult (18-64)	16.4	(0.16)	28.6	(0.22)	29.0	(0.21)	12.2	*	12.6	*
Senior (65+)	25.6	(0.46)	33.8	(0.49)	33.1	(0.44)	8.2	*	7.5	*
Housing Tenure										
Owner with Mortgage	12.0	(0.22)	23.3	(0.29)	26.1	(0.28)	11.3	*	14.1	*
Owner without Mortgage	20.4	(0.40)	30.5	(0.45)	27.5	(0.45)	10.1	*	7.1	*
Renter	27.5	(0.33)	43.8	(0.45)	43.6	(0.44)	16.3	*	16.1	*


Source: Authors' calculations, U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2001-2011 Annual Social and Economic Supplements. For information on sampling and nonsampling error, see www.census.gov/apds/techdoc/cps/cpsmar11.pdf.

Table A8. Program Participation Rates Using Official, NAS, and SPM Measures, 100%-<200%, 2010

	2010						Difference from Official			
	Official	s.e.	NAS	s.e.	SPM	s.e.	NAS	Equality Test	SPM	Equality Test
Program Participation Rate										
Public Assistance	3.0	(2.97)	3.1	(0.17)	3.2	(0.18)	0.1		0.2	
Food Stamps/SNAP	21.8	(0.46)	20.6	(0.38)	20.3	(0.37)	-1.2	*	-1.5	*
Housing Subsidy	4.3	(0.32)	6.4	(0.34)	6.1	(0.32)	2.1	*	1.8	*
Energy Assistance	7.1	(0.24)	6.2	(0.19)	6.1	(0.20)	-0.9	*	-1.0	*
Earned Income Tax Credit	15.6	(0.19)	11.9	(0.12)	11.3	(0.12)	-3.7	*	-4.3	*
School Lunch Program	64.9	(0.87)	56.5	(0.72)	53.7	(0.71)	-8.4	*	-11.2	*
WIC	16.9	(0.58)	15.9	(0.42)	16.3	(0.46)	-1.0	*	-0.6	*


Source: Authors' calculations, U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2001-2011 Annual Social and Economic Supplements. For information on sampling and nonsampling error, see www.census.gov/aprd/techdoc/cps/cpsmar11.pdf.

Figure A10. Percent of Individuals with Income-to-Threshold Ratio 100% - <200% by Year and Alternative Poverty Measure, United States, 2000 to 2010




Source: Authors' calculations, U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2001-2011 Annual Social and Economic Supplements. For information on sampling and nonsampling error, see www.census.gov/aprd/techdoc/cps/cpsmar11.pdf.

Figure A11. Percent of Individuals with Income-to-Threshold Ratio 100% - <200% by Age, Year, and Alternative Poverty Measure, United States, 2000 to 2010




Source: Authors' calculations, U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2001-2011 Annual Social and Economic Supplements. For information on sampling and nonsampling error, see www.census.gov/apsd/techdoc/cps/cpsmar11.pdf.

Figure A12. Percent of Individuals with Income-to-Threshold Ratio 100% - <200% by Gender, Year, and Alternative Poverty Measure, United States, 2000 to 2010




Source: Authors' calculations, U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2001-2011 Annual Social and Economic Supplements. For information on sampling and nonsampling error, see www.census.gov/apsd/techdoc/cps/cpsmar11.pdf.

Figure A13. Percent of Individuals with Income-to-Threshold Ratio 100% - <200% by Race, Year, and Alternative Poverty Measure, United States, 2000-2010




Source: Authors' calculations, U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2001-2011 Annual Social and Economic Supplements. For information on sampling and nonsampling error, see www.census.gov/apso/techdoc/cps/cpsmar11.pdf.

Figure A14. Percent of Individuals with Income-to-Threshold Ratio 100% - <200% by Marital Status, Year, and Alternative Poverty Measure, United States, 2000 to 2010




Source: Authors' calculations, U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2001-2011 Annual Social and Economic Supplements. For information on sampling and nonsampling error, see www.census.gov/aprd/techdoc/cps/cpsmar11.pdf.

Figure A15. Percent of Individuals with Income-to-Threshold Ratio 100% - <200% by Educational Attainment, Year, and Alternative Poverty Measure, United States, 2000 to 2010



Source: Authors' calculations, U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2001-2011 Annual Social and Economic Supplements. For information on sampling and nonsampling error, see www.census.gov/apso/techdoc/cps/cpsmar11.pdf.


Figure A16. Percent of Individuals with Income-to-Threshold Ratio 100% - <200% by Labor Force Participation, Year, and Alternative Poverty Measure, United States, 2000 to 2010



Recessions
 Official
 NAS
 SPM


Source: Authors' calculations, U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2001-2011 Annual Social and Economic Supplements. For information on sampling and nonsampling error, see www.census.gov/aprd/techdoc/cps/cpsmar11.pdf.

Figure A17. Percent of Individuals with Income-to-Threshold Ratio 100% - <200% by Region, Year, and Alternative Poverty Measure, United States, 2000 to 2010




Source: Authors' calculations, U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2001-2011 Annual Social and Economic Supplements. For information on sampling and nonsampling error, see www.census.gov/apsd/techdoc/cps/cpsmar11.pdf.

Figure A18(A). Percent of Individuals with Income-to-Threshold Ratio 100% - <200% by Program Participation, Year, and Alternative Poverty Measure, 2000 to 2010



Source: Authors' calculations, U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2001-2011 Annual Social and Economic Supplements. For information on sampling and nonsampling error, see www.census.gov/aprd/techdoc/cps/cpsmar11.pdf.

Figure A18(B). Percent of Individuals with Income-to-Threshold Ratio 100% - <200% by Program Participation, Year, and Alternative Poverty Measure, 2000 to 2010



Source: Authors' calculations, U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2001-2011 Annual Social and Economic Supplements. For information on sampling and nonsampling error, see www.census.gov/apsd/techdoc/cps/cpsmar11.pdf.