

IV. PARTICIPATION BY SUBGROUP

To the extent that the demonstrations are successful, they may be attracting to the FSP elderly households that are different from the typical elderly FSP household. We examined the demonstration impacts by subgroups in two key categories: the age of the oldest member of the household and the benefit received.

Our ability to identify impacts on subgroups is affected by the availability of key data. In Maine, Connecticut and North Carolina, we currently are able to identify demonstration participants in the administrative database. To identify subgroup trends for these states, we compare the characteristics of demonstration participants and non-demonstration participants in the most recent month for which there is data. The results show key differences between demonstration and non-demonstration participants.

Direct comparisons of demonstration participants and non-demonstration participants are not possible yet in the other three states. In Florida, all new entrants are demonstration participants, and in Arizona and Michigan, where we are still awaiting the necessary data to identify which households are demonstration participants. For these states, we examine how the distribution of households in these subgroups changed from the month immediately prior to implementation until the last month of the demonstration. We then compared any changes in the distribution with similarly-measured changes for the comparison sites. If there are major differences between demonstration and non-demonstration participants, they may appear in the demonstration site-comparison site differences. Unfortunately, this methodology proves less illuminating than comparing demonstration participants with non-participants in the same county. Because the demonstration participants make up only a small share of all participants in the demonstration counties, they have only a minor impact on the characteristics of the participants as a whole.

The results of the subgroup analysis for each state are discussed below.

- **Florida.** Changes in the age and benefit distribution in Florida demonstration sites do not differ substantially from changes in the comparison sites (Table 13). In terms of the age distribution, the demonstration and comparison counties shared similar distributions in January 2002. About one-quarter of elderly participants were age 60 to 65, and another fifth age 66-70. Both groups experienced slight changes in the age distribution, with the demonstration sites becoming slightly older and the comparison sites slightly younger. In terms of benefits, prior to the demonstration, elderly clients in the demonstration counties were more likely than elderly clients in the comparison counties to have receive \$10 benefit. However, there were no dramatic shifts in the distribution of benefits after almost two years of the demonstration.

TABLE 13
 DISTRIBUTION OF ELDERLY FSP HOUSEHOLDS BY SUBGROUP,
 FLORIDA

	Demonstration Sites		Comparison Sites	
	Percent Distribution of January 2002 Households	Percentage Point Change in Distribution in October 2003	Percent Distribution of January 2002 Households	Percentage Point Change in Distribution in October 2003
Age of Oldest Household Member				
60-65	25.8	-1.1	24.7	1.6
66-70	21.3	-0.3	20.8	1.1
71-80	35.0	0.3	36.6	-1.5
80+	17.9	1.1	17.9	-1.2
Benefit Amount				
\$10	41.1	-5.0	30.2	-3.7
\$11 to \$25	12.6	0.2	11.2	-2.1
\$26 to \$50	18.9	-0.2	20.1	-2.3
\$51 to \$100	18.8	0.8	25.0	-0.5
\$101 to \$150	7.7	3.8	12.4	7.1
\$150+	0.9	0.5	1.2	1.6

- **Arizona.** As in Florida, changes in the age and benefit distribution in Arizona demonstration sites do not differ substantially from changes in the comparison sites (Table 14). In terms of the age distribution, over one-third of clients in both the demonstration and comparison counties were in the age 60 to 65 range prior to the demonstration. This group increased slightly by November 2003. In terms of benefits, a relatively small share of elderly clients were receiving a \$10 benefit in August 2002. This group increased slightly in the demonstration counties by November 2003, and decreased slightly in the comparison counties during the same period. This could suggest that the demonstration is attracting some lower-than-average benefit households.

TABLE 14

DISTRIBUTION OF ELDERLY FSP HOUSEHOLDS BY SUBGROUP, ARIZONA

	Demonstration Sites		Comparison Sites	
	Percent Distribution of August 2002 Households	Percentage Point Change in Distribution in November 2003	Percent Distribution of August 2002 Households	Percentage Point Change in Distribution in November 2003
Age of Oldest Household Member				
60-65	36.8	1.9	37.1	1.9
66-70	21.7	0.2	21.7	-0.5
71-80	30.0	-1.5	31.4	-0.6
80+	11.2	-0.2	9.7	-0.8
Benefit Amount				
\$10	18.0	1.7	16.4	-2.8
\$11 to \$25	8.0	-2.1	9.0	-3.0
\$26 to \$50	20.3	-5.2	21.7	-7.1
\$51 to \$100	30.9	-0.5	27.8	3.4
\$101 to \$150	19.5	6.7	22.1	9.2
\$150+	1.8	-0.1	2.0	0.8

- **Maine.** In Maine, we are able to compare the characteristics of demonstration participants with non-demonstration participants (Table 15). Demonstration participants tend to be older (almost half are in the 71 to 80 years old range) and more likely to receive a \$10 FSP benefit (35.2 percent of demonstration participants compared with only 17.5 percent of non-demonstration participants).

TABLE 15
DISTRIBUTION OF ELDERLY FSP HOUSEHOLDS BY SUBGROUP,
MAINE

	October 2003	
	Demonstration Households ^a	Non-Demonstration Households
Number of Households	71	469
	<i>Percent Distribution By Subgroup</i>	
Age of Oldest Household Member		
60-65	9.9	23.9
66-70	19.7	24.7
71-80	47.9	36.9
80+	22.5	14.5
Benefit Amount		
\$10	35.2	17.5
\$11 to \$25	5.6	4.3
\$26 to \$50	16.9	10.9
\$51 to \$100	22.5	37.7
\$101 to \$150	19.7	27.5
\$150+	0.0	1.7

^a“Demonstration households” refers to all elderly FSP households participating in the month and that received application assistance at some point in the past.

- Michigan.** In both the demonstration and comparison counties in Michigan, about one-third of clients are in the 60 to 65 age range, and the age distribution does not change substantially after 1 year (Table 16). However, the distribution of benefits paid in the demonstration county does shift slightly to lower benefits, a shift not observed in the comparison county. The percentage of demonstration county clients with a \$10 benefit increased by 2.9 percentage points—from 16.8 to 19.7—after one year of the demonstration.

TABLE 16
DISTRIBUTION OF ELDERLY FSP HOUSEHOLDS BY SUBGROUP,
MICHIGAN

	Demonstration Sites		Comparison Sites	
	Percent Distribution of October 2002 Households	Percentage Point Change in Distribution in October 2003	Percent Distribution of October 2002 Households	Percentage Point Change in Distribution in October 2003
Age of Oldest Household Member				
60-65	34.6	0.2	32.7	1.1
66-70	23.4	-1.4	21.3	-0.1
71-80	31.0	-0.1	33.1	-1.5
80+	11.0	1.3	12.9	0.5
Benefit Amount				
\$10	16.8	2.9	25.3	-0.1
\$11 to \$25	6.3	-1.2	6.4	-0.8
\$26 to \$50	11.2	-1.7	9.9	-1.4
\$51 to \$100	33.0	-3.4	31.8	-0.7
\$101 to \$150	31.6	3.3	25.6	2.7
\$150+	1.1	0.1	1.1	0.2

- Connecticut.** In Connecticut, we are able to compare the characteristics of demonstration participants with non-demonstration participants (Table 17). Demonstration participants tend to be younger than non-demonstration participants in the demonstration towns. Over half of the demonstration participants are in the 60 to 70 age range, while 65 percent of non-demonstration participants are over age 70. Because the current administrative databases obtained from Connecticut do not contain eligible benefit amounts for demonstration participants, we do not compare the benefit distributions for Connecticut.

TABLE 17
DISTRIBUTION OF ELDERLY FSP HOUSEHOLDS BY SUBGROUP,
CONNECTICUT

	October 2003	
	Demonstration Households	Non-Demonstration Households
Number of Households	174	3,793
	<i>Percent Distribution By Subgroup</i>	
Age of Oldest Household Member		
60-65	24.7	14.8
66-70	29.3	19.5
71-80	33.3	45.0
80+	12.6	20.7

- North Carolina.** In North Carolina, we are able to compare the characteristics of demonstration participants with non-demonstration participants (Table 18). Demonstration participants tend to be older than non-demonstration participants. Almost two-thirds of demonstration participants are over age 70, compared with 54.1 percent among non-demonstration participants. Demonstration participants are far more likely to be eligible for a \$10 benefit than non-demonstration participants (60.5 percent of demonstration participants compared with 17.6 percent of non-demonstration participants). Only five percent of demonstration participants are eligible for an FSP benefit over \$50.

TABLE 18
DISTRIBUTION OF ELDERLY FSP HOUSEHOLDS BY SUBGROUP,
NORTH CAROLINA

	October 2003	
	Demonstration Households	Non-Demonstration Households
Number of Households	281	318
	<i>Percent Distribution By Subgroup</i>	
Age of Oldest Household Member		
60-65	17.4	28.3
66-70	19.6	17.6
71-80	43.8	39.0
80+	19.2	15.1
Benefit Amount		
\$10	60.5	17.6
\$11 to \$25	15.7	10.1
\$26 to \$50	18.9	34.3
\$51 to \$100	4.6	24.8
\$101 to \$150	0.4	12.9
\$150+	0.0	0.3