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Overview

• The Great Recession led to massive increases in unemployment, and the recovery has been slow and weak

• The social safety net responded with Unemployment Benefit extensions to 99 weeks and 1 in 7 receiving Food Stamps

• Here I examine the performance of the social safety net in protecting the disadvantaged population in the Great Recession

• I use this “stress test” identify the holes in the safety net moving forward
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Employment (seasonally adjusted) since peak

Unemployment (seasonally adjusted) since peak

Source: Hoynes, Miller and Schaller “Who Suffers in Recessions”, *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 2012 (updated with data through 2013)
Who was impacted by the Great Recession

• Examining labor market fluctuations between 1980-2013, we find that recessions are more likely to impact:
  – Young persons
  – Men
  – Racial and ethnic minorities
  – Those with lower education levels

• While the Great Recession led to larger overall job losses (compared to earlier recessions), the pattern across groups was little changed
A 1 percentage point increase in the overall unemployment rate leads to an almost 3 percentage point increase for 16 year olds.

Source: Hoynes, Miller and Schaller “Who Suffers in Recessions”, *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 2012 (updated with data through 2013)
Source: Hoynes, Miller and Schaller “Who Suffers in Recessions”, *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 2012 (updated with data through 2013)
Effect of Area Unemployment Rate Across Education Levels

Source: Hoynes, Miller and Schaller “Who Suffers in Recessions”, *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 2012 (updated with data through 2013)
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Evolution of Antipoverty programs in the U.S.

- **1930s**
  - Social Security
  - AFDC
  - Unemployment Insurance

- **Great Society**
  - 1960s-1970s
  - Food Stamps
  - Medicare
  - Medicaid
  - Disability
  - Civil Rights Act

- **1990s**
  - Welfare Reform
  - Rise of the EITC

- **2010**
  - Obamacare
The safety net for nonelderly families

- Cash welfare AFDC/TANF [means tested]
- Food Stamps [means tested]
- The EITC [means tested, requires employment]
- Unemployment Compensation [social insurance]
- Disability benefits: DI [social insurance], SSI [means tested]

We identify these programs as the “safety net” – in that they may provide some protection in response to reductions in income/earnings.

Ignores public health insurance programs
Reforms in the safety net, prior to Great Recession

• The decline of welfare
  – Up until the early 1990s the U.S. relied primarily on traditional cash welfare, Aid to Families with Dependent Children
  – AFDC had a guaranteed income (never very high) and a high benefit reduction rate (~100%). Eligibility was limited to single mothers.
  – This led to a (longstanding) concern that AFDC discourages work and marriage, and causes long term dependence.
  – Welfare reform in 1996 → time limits, work requirements, lower tax rates → caseloads at historic low [Now TANF]

• The rise of the EITC
  – Transition from out-of-work assistance to in-work assistance
  – Refundable tax credit for low income families
  – Benefits focused on families with children
  – Requires earnings: strong incentives for employment
The decline of welfare...

Figure TANF 1. AFDC/TANF Families Receiving Income Assistance

Source: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services *Indicators of Welfare Dependence*. 2013
The rise of the EITC...

Source: Tax Policy Center.
Persons Kept Above Poverty (2012, In Millions)

The response to the Great Recession: The Stimulus and the Safety Net

- **Unemployment Benefits**: Emergency program raised UI benefit durations to as long as 99 weeks (usual maximum is 26 weeks); shifts costs from states to federal government
- Increase in **unemployment benefits** ($25/week)
- Increase in **Food Stamp** benefits (13.6%, e.g. $80/month for family of 4)
- Increase in **EITC** (for families with 3+ children)
- New tax credit (Making Work Pay), up to $400 per worker/yr
UI benefit availability over the Great Recession

Total Funds Allocated: $840 BILLION

Estimated American Recovery and Reinvestment Act tax, entitlement, and contract, grant, and loan expenditures have been increased from $787B to $840B to be consistent with the President's 2012 budget and with scoring changes made by the Congressional Budget Office® since the enactment of the Recovery Act in February 2009.

Breakdown Of Funds Paid Out By Category

- **Total Tax Benefits**: $290.7B
- **Contracts, Grants and Loans**: $261.2B
- **Entitlements**: $264.4B
Roadmap

1. The Great Recession in the U.S.
2. U.S. safety net programs and the stimulus
3. How did the safety net respond?
4. Effects of the GR on poverty and the most vulnerable
5. Lessons moving forward given the “stress test” of the Great Recession
6. Conclusion
How did the safety net respond to the Great Recession?

- *Compared to what?* We take a historical perspective
- We compare the experience in the Great Recession to the experience in earlier recessions (in particular the early 1980s recession)
- Test if the response of the safety net is different in the GR
How did the safety net respond to the Great Recession?

**Modeling approach**

- We take advantage of the variation across U.S. states in the timing and severity of cycles.
- Estimate a state-year panel data model with participants/population as a function of the unemployment rate, allowing for different effects in the 1980s and the GR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States with lowest incr in UR</th>
<th>States with highest incr in UR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota +0.2pp</td>
<td>Nevada +8.3pp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska +1.0pp</td>
<td>Florida +6.4pp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska +1.1pp</td>
<td>California +6.3pp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What do we expect given policy landscape?

- Decline of welfare and rise of EITC $\rightarrow$ major transformation of safety net from *out-of-work* aid to *in-work* aid $\rightarrow$ less protection in GR
- Long UI benefit durations $\rightarrow$ more protection in GR
- Food stamp benefits expanded leading up to and during the GR $\rightarrow$ more protection in GR

We investigate this by estimating the effect of state-year unemployment rates on state-year safety net participants (per capita).
Responsiveness of Safety Net to Unemployment Rate
Comparison of GR to Early 1980s Recession

A 1 percentage point increase in unemployment rate leads to an 18 percent increase in UI participation in the Great Recession.

Source: Bitler and Hoynes “The More Things Change, the More They Stay the Same? The Safety Net and Poverty in the Great Recession,”
Note coefficient on “rest of period” omitted here.
Findings:

- Less protection in GR for cash welfare (TANF)
- More protection in GR for UI and (not significantly) food stamps
- EITC not responsive to cycles (more on this below)
Illustration of these results for TANF
State Scatterplot of $\Delta UR$ against $\%\Delta TANF$ caseload/pop

2007-2009

Cash Welfare (TANF) and Unemployment Rate
Change between 2007 and 2009

1979-1982

Cash Welfare (AFDC) and Unemployment Rate
Change between 1979 and 1982

Little relationship between changes in state labor market conditions and TANF in GR

Comparison of Food Stamps and TANF in GR
State Scatterplot of ΔUR against %Δcaseload/pop

2007-2009 TANF

2007-2009 Food Stamps

Cash Welfare (TANF) and Unemployment Rate Change between 2007 and 2009

Food Stamps and Unemployment Rate Change between 2007 and 2009

Safety nets and the Great Recession: Bottom Line

- Cash welfare (TANF) provided no protection in the Great Recession
- Unemployment Insurance and Food Stamps provided more protection in the Great Recession (compared to a similar shock to UR in earlier recessions)
- But how does this translate to family wellbeing?

We can use similar models to explore the effects of the Great Recession on poverty.
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Poverty measurement in the U.S.

- U.S. defines poverty as an absolute measure
- A family is poor if their resources are less than the federal poverty threshold
  - Poverty lines vary by family size and are adjusted for changes in prices each year
- We measure family resources comprehensively as after tax and transfer income, including the value of in-kind transfers (e.g. food stamps, housing benefits) [*U.S. official poverty uses only cash resources.*]

### Poverty Thresholds by Family Type, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Type</th>
<th>Threshold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 parent, 1 child</td>
<td>$16,057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 parent, 2 children</td>
<td>$18,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 parents, 2 children</td>
<td>$23,624</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By comparison, median family income in 2013 was $51,017.
Poverty rates rose with unemployment.

... but the social safety net provided tremendous protection.

Source: Bitler, Hoynes and Kuka “Child Poverty in the Great Recession.”
State Scatterplot of Change in UR against Change in Child Poverty, 2005-2007 to 2010-2012

Source: Bitler, Hoynes and Kuka “Child Poverty in the Great Recession.”
But how do we gauge the degree to which the most vulnerable were protected in the Great Recession?

- Again, we take a historical perspective
- We compare the experience of poverty in the Great Recession to the experience in earlier recessions (in particular the early 1980s recession)
- Test if the response of the safety net is different in the GR
- As before, we do this by estimating a state panel data model, using variation in the timing and severity of cycles across states.
Source: Bitler and Hoynes “The More Things Change, the More They Stay the Same? The Safety Net and Poverty in the Great Recession,”

Note coefficient on “rest of period” omitted here.
THE GOOD NEWS

• The share of families falling below 100% poverty is **less** affected than we would have expected from prior cycles
  – 1 one percentage point increase in the unemployment rate in the Great Recession led to a 4.7% increase in poverty, compared to a 6.2% increase in the early 1980s recession
THE BAD NEWS

• The share of families falling below 50% poverty (extreme poverty) is **more affected** than we would have expected from prior cycles
  
  – 1 one percentage point increase in the unemployment rate in the Great Recession led to a 7.4% increase in extreme poverty, compared to a 4.4% increase in the early 1980s recession
Extreme poverty: What is responsible for the decline in protection in the Great Recession? Welfare Reform

Poverty and the Great Recession: Bottom Line

• More families fell into extreme poverty than we would have expected from historical experience; this is directly tied to the dismantling of cash welfare

• Fewer families fell below (100%) poverty than we would have expected from historical experience; this is linked to the success of the food stamp program
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Lesson #1:
U.S. lacks a safety net for extreme poverty

- Welfare reform has removed the protection for the most vulnerable
- For some, disability benefits have filled this hole
Lesson #2:
A large and targeted stimulus can make a difference

• Extensions to unemployment benefits and accessibility of food stamps
Lesson #3: In-work benefits are not well suited to providing protection against job loss

• The Earned Income Tax Credit is the most important antipoverty program for families in the U.S.
Lesson #3: In-work benefits are not well suited to providing protection against job loss

- The Earned Income Tax Credit is the most important antipoverty program for families in the U.S.
In-work credits are being adopted across the OECD

Figure 2.7. Targeting of in-work credits in OECD countries (for single parent with two children), 2010

Targeted in-work credits

No phase-out or low phase-out

Source: OECD (2011), Taxation and Employment, OECD Tax Policy Studies, No. 21,
Lesson #3: In-work benefits are not well suited to providing protection against job loss

- The Earned Income Tax Credit is the most important antipoverty program for families in the U.S.
- Research shows that the EITC leads to large increases in employment, as well as improving health and child cognitive outcomes
- But, because it requires earned income, it does not work well in times of high unemployment. It is not designed to provide insurance against income losses.
Lesson #3: In-work benefits are not well suited to providing protection against job loss

- The Earned Income Tax Credit is the most important antipoverty program for families in the U.S.
- Research shows that the EITC leads to large increases in employment, as well as improving health and child cognitive outcomes.
- But, because it requires earned income, it does not work well in times of high unemployment. It is not designed to provide insurance against income losses.
For single parent families, the EITC is weakly pro-cyclical; it provides no additional assistance in times of “need.”

For married couples, the EITC has some countercyclical response, reflecting possibility that a earnings shock will move people in to eligibility range.

Source: Bitler, Hoynes and Kuka “Do In-Work Tax Credits Serve as a Safety Net?”
• With the decline of *out-of-work* assistance (e.g., welfare reform) accompanying the increase in *in-work* assistance, the net effect is less protection against job and income losses.
Lesson #4: The social safety net is essential to reducing the effect of economic shocks.
Conclusions

• The Great Recession led to the largest increase in unemployment in the post-war period

• One of the important roles for government is to design programs to effectively insure against losses to income; provide protection in times of need

• The evidence from the Great Recession, in terms of the response of the social safety net and the incidence of poverty, is of great importance for learning about what is working and what is not
Kernel Density Plot of HH program participation, by ratio of private income to pov., non-elderly, 1982