NBER WORKING PAPER SERIES

THE VALIDITY OF CONSUMPTION DATA: ARE THE CONSUMER EXPENDITURE INTERVIEW AND DIARY SURVEYS INFORMATIVE?

Adam Bee
Bruce D. Meyer
James X. Sullivan

Working Paper 18308
http://www.nber.org/papers/w18308

NATIONAL BUREAU OF ECONOMIC RESEARCH
1050 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge, MA 02138
August 2012

The views expressed herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Bureau of Economic Research or the U.S. Census Bureau. We would like to thank Tom Crossley, Thesia Garner, Steve Henderson, Clinton McCully, William Passero, and Laura Paszkiewicz for their help, and participants at the CRIW/NBER Conference on Improving the Measurement of Consumer Expenditures for their comments. We also thank Kevin Rinz for research assistance.

The Validity of Consumption Data: Are the Consumer Expenditure Interview and Diary Surveys Informative?

Adam Bee, Bruce D. Meyer, and James X. Sullivan

NBER Working Paper No. 18308
August 2012
JEL No. C81,C82,C83,D12,D31,I32

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the quality of data collected in the Consumer Expenditure (CE) Survey, which is the source for the Consumer Price Index weights and is the main source of U.S. consumption microdata. We compare reported spending on a large number of categories of goods and services to comparable national income account data. We do this separately for the two components of the CE—the Interview Survey and the Diary Survey—rather than a combination that has been used in past comparisons. We find that most of the largest categories of consumption are measured well in the Interview Survey as the ratio to the national account data is close to one and has not declined appreciably over time. Several other large categories are reported at a low rate or have seen the ratio to the national accounts decline over time. The results are less encouraging for the Diary Survey. There is no large Diary category that is both measured well and reported at a higher rate than in the Interview Survey. We also compare the ownership of and the value of durables, such as homes and cars, in the CE to other sources. This evidence suggests the CE performs fairly well. Based on observable characteristics, the CE Survey appears to be fairly representative, although there is strong evidence of under-representation at the top of the income distribution and under-reporting of income and expenditures at the top. We then examine the precision of the two surveys and the frequency of no spending overall or for a given spending category. In the Diary Survey, we find much greater dispersion in spending and the dispersion relative to the Interview Survey varies across goods and over time. Diary respondents are much more likely to report zero spending for a consumption category, and a high and increasing fraction of respondents reporting zero for all categories. These results suggest that using Diary data to assess inequality trends and other distributional outcomes is likely to lead to biased and misleading results. Our results have important implications for interpreting and properly using CE data and how best to redesign the CE.

Adam Bee
US Census Bureau
charles.a.bee@census.gov

Bruce D. Meyer
Harris School of Public Policy
University of Chicago
1155 E. 60th Street
Chicago, IL 60637
and NBER
bdmeyer@uchicago.edu

James X. Sullivan
Department of Economics
447 Flanner Hall
University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, IN 46556
James.X.Sullivan.197@nd.edu

1. Introduction

The Consumer Expenditure (CE) Survey is a vital data source. Assessing and improving the quality of the CE is a major policy and research issue for several reasons. The CE is the source of weights for the Consumer Price Index (CPI), which is used to index for inflation income tax brackets, government transfer payments such as Social Security benefits, private labor contracts and other economic variables. The CE is also the only comprehensive source of consumption information on the U.S. population.[1] The survey is used by government agencies for several purposes and has been extensively used by outside researchers. CE data have been used to address a long list of research issues that would be difficult or impossible to address with another source. The survey has been available in some form for almost a century, and in its current form for over 30 years. This long history allows researchers to examine changes over a long time period.

Many previous studies have compared the CE to other data sources. Some of these comparisons report alarming patterns. Several authors have pointed out that the weight on housing is much higher in the CPI than in the Personal Consumption Expenditure (PCE) deflator. Bosworth (2010) argues that the housing weight is about twice as large in the CPI as the PCE because of uneven under-reporting in the CE. Other authors have emphasized that the ratio of CE expenditures to PCE expenditures has declined from about 0.8 to just above 0.6 in recent decades (Attanasio et al. 2006). It is important to recognize that these earlier studies often compare expenditures that are noncomparable.

There are important gaps in our knowledge from these comparisons. A key gap is that comparisons of CE aggregates to national income account data are generally done with the integrated data that are a confusing amalgam of the two components of the CE: the Interview Survey and the Diary Survey. Researchers generally use one or the other of these components, so the benchmarking of the amalgam cannot be applied to the data that are typically used by researchers. A better understanding of the quality of spending data in each of these surveys will also inform efforts to redesign the CE, as the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) is in the midst of

[1] There are recent efforts to gather comprehensive, but less detailed expenditure data as part of other surveys (see Hurd and Rohwedder 2011 or Li, Schoeni, Danziger, and Charles 2010, for example). An interesting aspect of these papers given the focus of the current paper is that these efforts assess the quality of their data by comparing it to that of the CE.

a multi-year redesign of the surveys. The first reason given for the CE redesign in the BLS planning documents is under-reporting of expenditures (Bureau of Labor Statistics 2010). To evaluate the separate components of the survey it is necessary to compare them separately to outside sources.

In this paper we examine comparisons of CE data to micro and macro data from other sources. We examine the quality of reported expenditures, which can be roughly thought of as outlays, as well as parts of consumption, which can be thought of as a flow of resources used, including the flow of resources from the ownership of durables. The rental equivalent of owner-occupied housing, while not part of expenditures, is used to determine the CPI weights and is an appropriate measure of housing consumption. In the case of vehicles, an expenditures measure would include purchases, but consumption should be based on a flow of resources consumed, which depends on the number and value of vehicles. These durable measures are crucial in calculating consumption, but their reporting has not been extensively validated. Keeping in mind that mean squared error is equal to bias squared plus variance, we also examine the variance of the data and the frequency of reports of no spending. Last, we examine the representativeness of the Interview Survey along a number of dimensions including income.

We begin by examining ratios of CE aggregate data to national income account data, looking separately at the Interview Survey and Diary Survey. We rely on information from the BLS and the Bureau of Economic Analysis as to which expenditure categories are most comparable and we focus on these. We find that most of the largest categories of consumption are measured well in the Interview Survey as the ratio to PCE data is close to one and has not declined appreciably over time. These categories include new vehicles, food and beverages at home, rent and utilities, the rental equivalent of owner-occupied housing, gasoline and other energy goods, and communication. Several other large categories are reported at a low rate or have seen the ratio to the PCE decline over time. These categories include food away from home, furniture and furnishings, clothing, gambling, and alcohol. There are no large Diary Survey categories that are both measured well and reported at a higher rate than in the Interview Survey. Overall, the categories of expenditures that are not reported well tend to be those that involve many small and irregular purchases. These poorly reported categories also tend to be private goods (clothing), ones that one may not want to reveal that one buys (alcohol, tobacco), and certain luxuries (alcohol, food away from home). Large salient purchases like automobiles,

and regular purchases like rent, utilities, and groceries, seem to be well reported. We find that the number and value of cars compare closely to outside sources, and the time pattern of home values closely follows other data.

We also present evidence on the precision of Interview and Diary Survey data. Coefficients of variation are noticeably higher in the Diary than in the Interview Survey. Diary respondents are much more likely to report zero spending for a consumption category, and a high and increasing fraction of respondents report zero for all categories. 11.9 percent of 2010 Diary Survey respondents report zero spending for an entire week, up from 4.5 percent in 1991.

We then compare the demographic characteristics and the income distribution reported in the CE and the Current Population Survey (CPS). The results suggest that the CE Interview sample is fairly representative along many dimensions. However, Sabelhaus et al. (2012) provides strong evidence of under-representation at the top of the income distribution and under-reporting of income and expenditures at the top. They find that low-income households are well represented. The under-representation of high income households and their disproportionate under-reporting of expenditures means that the aggregate reporting rates relative to the PCE emphasized in the paper likely understate the under-reporting problem for high income households, but overstate the problem for low income households.

These results have implications for the use of existing CE data and for the redesign of the CE Survey. The importance of the under-reporting of expenditures in the CE will depend on the purpose for which the data are used. Uses of the data that rely on aggregates are likely biased. Our results suggest the CPI is biased because the differential under-reporting means that the weights do not accurately reflect consumers' purchases. However, a simple comparison of PCE and CPI weights overstates the potential bias in consumer prices because much of the PCE is not intended to be captured by the CPI. Given evidence that the CE may be more likely to miss spending near the top of the distribution, under-reporting is less of a concern for analyses that do not rely on spending at the top, such as measures of consumption poverty or median consumption. And, the high and fairly constant reporting rates for large categories of consumption in the Interview Survey suggest that, for some purposes, researchers can rely on these categories to address some of the concerns about under-reporting.

The outline of the remainder of the paper is as follows. In Section 2 we describe the Interview and Diary components of the CE. Section 3 summarizes past work comparing the CE

to other sources. In Section 4 we provide our comparisons of the separate Interview and Diary Surveys to national income account personal consumption expenditure data. In Section 5 we provide comparisons of CE data on the ownership and value of durable goods to those from other sources. In Section 6 we examine the precision of the data and the frequency of no reported expenditures in the Interview and Diary Surveys. In Section 7 we consider the representativeness of the CE Survey. We discuss the implications of our results for uses of the CE Survey and for survey redesign in Section 8, and conclude in Section 9.

2. The Consumer Expenditure Survey

The Consumer Expenditure survey is a national survey designed to represent the noninstitutionalized population of the U.S. The survey has two parts: the Interview Survey and the Diary Survey. Both components are based on the same sampling frame, but they have different questionnaires that are administered to different samples. We examine the data from both of these surveys.

The Interview Survey took its current form in 1980, though it began much earlier. It includes about 5,000 families each quarter between 1980 and 1998 and about 7,500 families thereafter. It is a recall survey that collects information from families (or consumer units) about their expenditures for the previous three months. The survey is a rotating panel—about 20 percent of the sample is replaced each quarter. Consumer units remain in the sample for up to five interviews—an initial bounding interview, followed by four quarterly interviews. The bounding interview collects information on demographic characteristics and ownership of major durables. Data from the bounding interview are not publicly available. The next four interviews collect detailed expenditure information in addition to demographic, employment and income data. The interviews are generally done in person though phone interviews have become more common in recent years. Starting in 2003, interviewers used a Computer Assisted Personal Interview (CAPI) instrument. The interview lasts 60 minutes on average.

The Diary Survey collects consumer unit spending through direct recordkeeping. On a daily expense record consumer units are asked to self-report spending for up to two consecutive one-week periods. This recordkeeping format is designed to capture spending on small, infrequent purchases that may be missed in a recall survey. The Diary also includes a

questionnaire that collects information on household characteristics. This questionnaire is administered by an interviewer. Since 2004, a CAPI instrument has been used for this interview. The Diary Survey includes about 5,000 households annually. See U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (2012) for more details.

Not all types of spending are collected in both surveys (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics 2012). For example, the Interview Survey does not collect spending on housekeeping supplies, personal care products, and nonprescription drugs, while the Diary Survey does not capture overnight trips expenses or credit and installment plan payments. The Diary also does not collect information on the rental equivalent value of owned homes, which is a major component of any total consumption measure, is one of the largest PCE categories, and is weighted very heavily in calculations of the CPI. While the Diary is designed to capture other types of spending, in practice many important categories, such as new vehicle purchases, are rarely reported.

The Diary and Interview Surveys are also designed for different purposes (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics 2012). The Interview Survey is designed to capture relatively large expenditures and those that occur regularly such as rent or mortgage payments. The Diary Survey, on the other hand, is designed to capture smaller spending categories and those purchased more frequently. Often the level of detail is much greater in the Diary. For example, in the 2010 survey, the Diary has more than one hundred detailed subcategories that fall under the classification of food at home, while the Interview Survey has only one spending classification for food at home.

3. Earlier Consumer Expenditure Survey Comparisons

CE data have been compared to data from many sources, but the most extensive and heavily cited comparisons are to the Personal Consumption Expenditure (PCE) data from the National Income and Product Accounts (NIPA). Past research (Gieseman 1987, Slesnick 1992, Branch 1994, Garner et al. 2006 and 2009, Attanasio et al. 2006, Meyer and Sullivan 2011a) has emphasized a discrepancy between CE and PCE data. In comparing the CE to the PCE data, it is important to recognize conceptual incompatibilities between these data sources.[2] Slesnick

[2] See Deaton and Kozel (2005) for discussion of non-comparabilities between survey and national income account data for expenditures.

(1992), when comparing CE data from 1960-61 through 1989, concluded that "approximately one-half of the difference between aggregate expenditures reported in the CEX surveys and the NIPA can be accounted for through definitional differences." Similarly, the General Accounting Office in their summary of a Bureau of Economic Analysis comparison of the differences in 1992 reported that "more than half was traceable to definitional differences." A key conceptual difference between PCE and CE spending is that the CE measures out-of-pocket spending by households, while the PCE definition is wider, including purchases made on behalf of households by institutions such as employer-paid insurance or free financial services, and purchases made by nonprofits. The magnitude of this difference in how spending is defined has increased over time. McCully (2011) reported that in 2009 nearly thirty percent of the PCE was not intended to be captured by the CE, up from just over seven percent in 1959. In 2009, these differences include imputations such as those for owner-occupied housing and financial services (but excluding purchases by non-profit institutions serving households and employer contributions for group health insurance) that account for over ten percent of the PCE. In-kind social benefits account for nearly another ten percent. Employer contributions for group health insurance and workers' compensation account for over six percent, while life insurance and pension fund expenses and final consumption expenditures of nonprofits represent almost four percent. Another important difference between the PCE and CE is that the CE is not intended to capture purchases by those abroad, on military bases and in institutions.

It is also important to note that the PCE aggregates do not necessarily reflect true total spending. The PCE numbers are the product of a great deal of estimation and imputation that is subject to error.[3] One indicator of the potential error in the PCE is the magnitude of the revisions that are made from time to time (Gieseman 1987; Slesnick 1992). An indication of this is the 2009 revisions to the PCE which substantially revised past estimates of several categories. Notably, food at home, one of the largest categories, decreased by over five percent after the 2009 revision.[4]

[3] The PCE estimates come from business records reported on the economic censuses and other Census Bureau Surveys. These business surveys are subject to a number of sources of error and are adjusted using input-output tables to add imports and subtract sales that do not go to domestic households. These totals are then balanced to control totals for incomes earned, retail sales, and other benchmark data.

[4] The 2008 value for food at home was 741,189 (in millions of $2008) prior to revision and 669,441 after, but the new definition excludes pet food. A comparable pre-revision number excluding pet food is 707,553. The drop from 707,553 to 669,441 is 5.4 percent. Thank you to Clinton McCully for clarifying this revision.

One of the first evaluations of the current CE is Gieseman (1987) who reports CE comparisons to the PCE for 1980-1984.[5] He reports separate comparisons of Interview Survey and Diary Survey estimates, though the Diary estimates are only for food. In these early years, published tabulations separate Interview and Diary data, while published data for later years are integrated. Consequently, subsequent comparisons of CE to PCE almost exclusively rely on the integrated data that combine Interview Survey and Diary Survey data.[6,7] Gieseman found that the CE reports were close to the PCE for rent, fuel and utilities, telephone services, furniture, transportation, and personal care services. On the other hand, substantially lower reporting of food, household furnishings, alcohol, tobacco, clothing and entertainment were apparent back in 1980-1984. In separate Interview Survey and Diary Survey comparisons for food at home, he found that the CE/PCE ratios for the Interview Survey exceeded that for the Diary Survey by ten to twenty percentage points, but were still below one. For the much smaller category, food away from home, the Diary Survey ratios exceeded the Interview Survey ratios by about twenty percentage points, but again were considerably below one. The current patterns have strong similarities to these from 30 years ago.

Garner et al. (2006) report a long historical series of comparisons for the integrated data that begins in 1984 and goes up through 2002. Some categories are reported well. Rent, utilities, etc. and utilities, fuels and related are reported at a high and stable rate relative to the PCE. Telephone services, vehicle purchases, and gasoline and motor oil are reported at a high rate that has declined somewhat over time. Food at home relative to the PCE is about 0.70, but has remained stable over time. The many remaining categories of expenditures have low and generally falling rates of reporting relative to the PCE, though some small categories such as footwear and vehicle rentals show increases.

The authors ultimately argue that this historical series can be replaced by a better series that focuses on categories that are the most comparable. "A more detailed description of the categories of items from the CE and the PCE is utilized than was used when the historical comparison methodology was developed. Consequently, more comparable product categories

[5] Comparisons of expenditure survey data to national income account data go back at least to Houthakker and Taylor (1970).
[6] Exceptions include Meyer and Sullivan (2010 and 2011a).
[7] In cases where the expenditure category is available in both surveys, the BLS selects the source for the integrated data that is viewed as most reliable. See Steinberg et al. (2010) and Creech and Steinberg (2011).

are constructed and are included in the final aggregates and ratios used in the new comparison of the two sets of estimates." The authors note that aggregates from the two sources tend to be more different for noncomparable categories. The new series is reported for every five years 1992 to 2002 in Garner et al. (2006), and updated and extended annually through 2007 in Garner et al. (2009).

When this new BLS methodology on categories that are comparable between the CE and the PCE is used, and when the PCE aggregates are adjusted to reflect differences in population coverage between the two sources, the ratio of CE to PCE is fairly high, but still has tended to fall over time. The ratio for 1992 and 1997 is 0.88, while in 2002 it is 0.84 and has fallen to 0.81 by 2007 (Garner et al. 2009). The share of the PCE that is comparable to the CE has also tended to fall somewhat over time, dropping from 0.57 in 1992 to 0.52 in 2007. A much larger share of the CE is comparable to the PCE, slightly over 70 percent in all years.

For nine of the larger expenditure categories, Meyer and Sullivan (2010, 2011a) report limited comparisons over time for the Interview Survey only. They find that for most of these major categories reporting rates are high and stable.

Some research has sharply overstated the discrepancy by comparing noncomparable categories of CE and NIPA consumption and ignoring definitional differences. In addition, almost all comparisons are based on the integrated data that combine CE Diary and CE Interview data, so the results are not applicable to either the CE Interview data or Diary data alone, as they are typically used in research. Some authors have argued that despite the incompatibilities between the CE and PCE, in the absence of definitional changes one would expect the differences between the series to be relatively constant (Attanasio et al. 2006). This conclusion is not at all obvious; one might still expect a gradual widening of the difference between the sources given their rapidly growing incompatibility as reported in McCully (2011).

There have been comparisons of the CE to many other sources. Most are summarized on the BLS Comparisons web page.[8] These comparisons include utilities compared to the Residential Energy Consumption Survey (RECS), rent and utilities compared to that reported in the American Housing Survey (AHS), food at home compared to trade publications *Supermarket Business* and *Progressive Grocer*, health expenditures compared to the National Health

[8] http://www.bls.gov/cex/cecomparison.htm.

Expenditure Accounts (NHEA) and the Medical Expenditure Panel Survey (MEPS). With the exception of health expenditures, the comparisons generally suggest that the CE does a fairly good job of reporting these types of expenditures. However, except for health expenditures, these comparisons are to categories for which the comparisons to the PCE have indicated high and roughly stable reporting, though the reporting of food at home is at a lower rate, especially in the Diary Survey. See Garner et al. (2009) or Branch (1994) for summaries.

4. Separate Interview and Diary Survey Comparisons to National Income Accounts

For the purposes of assessing CE Survey quality, it is important to examine the Interview and Diary Surveys separately. Differences in spending across these two data sources provide evidence on how best to collect spending data. For some important categories there are large differences between the mean reported values in the Interview and Diary Surveys. For example, between 1998 and 2003, average spending on food at home in the CE Interview Survey exceeded the average from the CE Diary Survey by more than 20 percent.[9]

Recognizing that not all non-comparabilities can be removed, we examine the ratio of CE Interview and Diary Survey values weighted by population to corresponding categories of PCE data for select PCE categories.[10] We have followed the approach of Garner et al. (2006, 2009) and Passero (2011) who select categories in the PCE and CE that are most comparable based on "concepts and comprehensiveness". These comparable categories are 56 percent of the PCE in 2010. To align each CE spending subcategory with the comparable PCE category, we have heavily relied on a concordance supplied to us by the BLS. The data appendix notes the cases where expenditure subcategories are not available in either the Interview or Diary Survey, and Appendix Table 1 provides our concordance of Universal Classification Codes (UCCs) in the Diary and Interview Survey for each of these comparable PCE categories. In Tables 1 and 2, we

[9] The fact that food at home from the Interview Survey compares more favorably to PCE numbers than does food at home from the CE Diary Survey does not necessarily imply that the former is reported more accurately. For example, the CE Interview Survey numbers may include non-food items purchased at a grocery store. Battistin (2003) argues that the higher reporting of food at home for the recall questions in the Interview component is due to over-reporting, but as Browning et al. (2003) state, this is open to question. We stick to the presumption that more is better as the CE is almost always below the PCE and this criteria is largely used by the BLS in selecting which source, Interview or Diary, is preferred for a particular expenditure category (see Creech and Steinberg 2011).

[10] We do not correct for differences in population coverage. Such corrections have averaged two to three percentage points in past analyses (Garner et al. 2006, 2009).

report CE/PCE ratios for categories of expenditures for which we can define reasonably comparable CE and PCE categories for either the Interview or the Diary Survey alone.[11] Table 1 summarizes the findings for the largest categories in 2010. Table 2 reports the results for 46 comparable categories for 1986 and 2010. Additional years are available in Appendix Table 2.

Among the ten largest categories in Table 1 (combining the BLS subcategories of clothing into one so that it is large enough to be in the top ten) six are reported at a high rate in the Interview Survey and that rate has been roughly constant over time. These well-measured categories are the imputed rent on owner-occupied nonfarm housing, rent and utilities, food and nonalcoholic beverages purchased for off-premises consumption (food at home), gasoline and other energy goods, communication, and new motor vehicles. These six categories are all among the eight largest. In 2010, the ratio of Interview Survey to PCE exceeds 0.94 for imputed rent, rent and utilities, and new motor vehicles. It exceeds 0.80 for food at home and communication and is just below 0.80 for gasoline and other energy goods. The 2010 ratios for both the Interview and Diary Surveys are just over 0.50 for purchased meals and beverages (food away from home) and close to 0.43 for furniture and furnishings. For clothing and alcohol, the Interview Survey ratios are both low and below the Diary Survey ratios, which are below half themselves.

While the Diary is designed to capture most types of spending, in practice many categories are missed, including some of the largest categories. For example, no spending on new trucks, pick-ups, vans, or jeeps is captured in the Diary Survey between 2007 and 2010. For this reason, we do not report a Diary/PCE ratio for new motor vehicles in Table 1. The Diary/PCE ratio for imputed rental of owner-occupied nonfarm housing (the largest PCE category we examine) is also missing because the Diary does not collect information on the rental equivalent of owned homes.

Looking at the full 46 categories reported in Table 2, among the remaining categories outside the top ten in size, only six in the Interview and five in the Diary have a ratio of at least 0.80 in 2010. The largest of these categories reported well in the Interview Survey are motor vehicle accessories and parts, household maintenance, and cable and satellite television and radio services. In the Diary Survey household cleaning products and cable and satellite television and

[11] A larger set of categories can be examined of course with the union of the Interview and Diary data.

radio services are reported well in 2010, though the historical pattern for both exhibits substantial variation (also see Appendix Table 2). The remaining categories that are reported poorly in both surveys with ratios below one half include glassware, tableware, and household utensils, and sporting equipment. Gambling and alcohol are especially badly reported with ratios below 0.20 and 0.33, respectively, in both surveys in most years.

While the ratios for selected years are shown in Table 2, the patterns for the ten largest categories of expenditures can be more easily seen in a series of figures. We discuss the categories in order of their size beginning with the largest. Figure 1a reports the ratio of CE to PCE imputed rent from 1984 onward and new motor vehicles from 1980 onward.[12],[13] These two large categories are available for the Interview Survey, but not the Diary Survey.[14] Both categories compare favorably to the PCE—they have ratios near one that have not declined appreciably over time. The imputed rental of owner-occupied nonfarm housing in the Interview Survey typically exceeds the PCE equivalent by about ten percent, slightly more so in the most recent years. While some analyses of CE to PCE aggregates omit housing because the ratio exceeds one (Sabelhaus et al. 2012), we include it because selecting only those categories with low ratios would necessarily bias the overall picture. The CE/PCE ratio for new motor vehicles is overall very close to one, approximately 1.05 in the 1980s, approximately 0.97 in the 1990s, and right around one in the 2000s.

Figure 1b reports Diary and Interview comparisons for rent and utilities. In the Interview Survey the CE/PCE ratio is just below one, averaging around 0.95, while the Diary Survey ratio is about ten percentage points lower. Food at home in the Interview and Diary Surveys is reported in Figure 1c. Interview food at home has a ratio just under 0.90 in nearly all years except the period from 1981 to 1987 when a different wording of the food at home question was employed.[15] The Diary Survey ratio is about twenty percentage points lower at 0.70. Food away

[12] Information on the rental equivalent of the home is not available in the Interview Survey in 1980 and 1981.
[13] For the surveys administered in the fourth quarter of 1981 through the fourth quarter of 1983, the CE sampling frame only covered urban areas. For this reason, we exclude data from the 1982 and 1983 surveys. In addition, the 1981 estimates we report are not entirely nationally representative, because part of this spending comes from the fourth quarter of 1981 survey and the first quarter of 1982 survey.
[14] The Diary does collect data on new vehicle purchases, but we do not report ratios for this category for the Diary because these data appear to capture a small share of purchases. See the discussion in the Data Appendix for more details.
[15] The effect of this change in wording has been known for a long time (see Gieseman 1987). During 1980-1981 the Interview Survey asked usual weekly expenditure on food over the past three months, while from 1982-1987 spending on food over the previous month was asked. In 1988, the survey returned to the earlier question. Because

from home is reported in Figure 1d. This category has a low ratio in both surveys and one that has declined since the 1980s. The Diary Survey ratio is also about ten percentage points higher than the Interview Survey ratio, although the two surveys give similar numbers following a change in the wording of the food away question in the Interview Survey in 2007.[16] The ratio for the Diary Survey is biased downward somewhat because the Diary does not collect data on food away from home spending that occurs during out-of-town trips. The Interview Survey does collect these data; in 2010 spending on food during out-of-town trips was about 6 percent of the PCE aggregate for food away. Ratios for spending on gasoline and other energy goods are displayed in Figure 1e. The ratio is nearly always above 0.80 in the Interview Survey and about five to ten percentage points lower in the Diary Survey. The Interview Survey ratio did fall over the 1980s. Clothing is shown in Figure 1f, combining the categories of women's and girl's clothing, men's and boy's clothing, and shoes and footwear. This category is the first one that is reported poorly. The reporting ratio has declined from about 0.60 to less than one-half, for the Diary Survey, with the Interview Survey consistently lower. The ratio for communication is shown in Figure 1g. The Interview Survey shows a ratio of about 0.80 for most years, though there is a dip to nearly 0.70 for much of the 1990s and early 2000s. The Diary ratio has been 5 to 10 percentage points lower since about 1996. Furniture and furnishings in Figure 1h is badly reported with a ratio in the Interview Survey that falls over time from about 0.75 to 0.45. The ratio for this category is more variable in the Diary Survey, at about 0.50 in the early years, high in the middle years and then near the Interview Survey numbers in the most recent years. Alcoholic beverages purchased for off-premises consumption in Figure 1i is a very badly reported category, with both Interview and Diary ratios that drop from 0.33 to just over 0.20.

The overall pattern indicates much better reporting in the Interview Survey than the Diary Survey. Household cleaning products is the only category among the 46 we report where the Diary Survey reports expenditures at a higher rate than the Interview Survey and reports them well, i.e. at a high absolute rate that has not declined appreciably over time. This fairly small category has a ratio of 1.15 in 2010 in the Diary Survey and has not declined appreciably in the

---

the January to March 1982 surveys collected data for part of 1981, the change in questionnaire is partly reflected in the 1981 totals.

[16] Starting with the second quarter of 2007, the question on food away from home changed from a query about usual monthly spending to usual weekly spending. This change resulted in a noticeable increase in reported food away spending.

past 20 years. On the other hand, there are many categories of expenditures, in particular most of the largest ones, that are reported at a higher rate in the Interview Survey and which have maintained high and roughly stable rates.

This finding of higher reporting in an interview survey is consistent with other evidence. There is a long history of papers that have noted the presence of "diary fatigue" meaning that respondents tire of completing the diary and omit purchases. Evidence of this pattern in the CE Diary Survey that is frequently cited is the fact that reported expenditures fall noticeably in the second diary week (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics 1983; Silberstein and Scott 1991; Stephens 2003). See Crossley and Winter (2012) for a nice discussion of diary fatigue and other problems with collecting expenditure data with a diary.

This pattern of lower reporting in diary surveys than interview surveys is also evident in other North American data. Statistics Canada conducted in parallel two versions of the Canadian Survey of Household Spending in 2009. One version was a 12-month recall interview survey, while the second was the redesigned survey that gathers spending on many items through two week diaries. The interview spending on average exceeds the diary spending for comparable categories by 9 percent for frequent expenses and 14 percent for less frequent expenses (Dubreuil et al. 2011). The authors believe the difference between the modes is not due to other features of the survey that changed, such as the elimination of balance editing. For example, balance editing tends to affect income and savings rather than expenditures. Possible reasons that this difference might arise are that insufficient motivation may lead diary respondents to omit many items to reduce the burden of the process. Consistent with this hypothesis, the Canadian Food Expenditure Survey (Ahmed et al. 2010) finds that the second diary week tends to have lower reported expenditures (by 11 percent) than the first, as respondents tire of the process. A recall measure from this same survey has food expenditures 14 percent higher than the two-week diary average.

In principle an attentive, motivated respondent could report better data in a diary than in a recall survey, but the evidence shows that the typical respondent does not fit this profile. The diary task also requires respondent effort at many distinct times during the two weeks, whereas an interview survey requires a single short (albeit taxing) interview. These results suggest that the presence of an interviewer may be helpful in coaxing greater compliance with the survey.

The categories of expenditures that are not reported well tend to be those that involve many small and irregular purchases. These poorly reported categories also tend to be private goods (clothing), ones that one may not want to reveal that one buys (alcohol, tobacco), and certain luxuries (alcohol, food away from home). Large salient purchases (like automobiles), and regular purchases like rent, utilities, and groceries, seem to be well reported. These patterns have been largely evident since the 1980s or even earlier. However, over the past three decades there has been a slow decline in the quality of reporting of many of the mostly smaller categories of expenditures in both the Interview Survey and the Diary Survey.

5. Durables in the CE

Reporting ownership of houses and vehicles is very different from reporting the small, discretionary purchases that seem to be badly reported in the CE. We begin by examining how the reported stock of cars matches that from other sources. This information does not enter expenditures, but enters consumption when we calculate a value of the services of owned cars. In Table 3, we compare reported car and truck ownership in the Interview Survey to administrative data on motor vehicle registrations.

These comparisons are complicated by a number of issues. First, the CE is intended to capture only vehicles owned by households, but the registration data include commercial and publicly owned vehicles including farm trucks. We were able to obtain an estimate of the number of two types of commercial vehicles, taxis and rental cars, for four states. The taxi share ranged from 0.04 percent (Arizona in 2003) to 0.68 percent (New York in 1998). The rental car share ranged from 0.30 percent (Mississippi in 2004) to 1.54 percent (Arizona in 1998). We do not have an easy way to estimate the prevalence of corporate cars and other commercial vehicles. Second, the registration data include leased vehicles and motor homes which are not included in the CE Survey numbers. We were able to obtain estimates of the motor home shares for seven states. The share of motor homes ranged from 0.3 percent (Maine in 2007) to 1.8 percent (Oregon in 2000). The total number of leased cars and trucks in the CE Survey for 2002 was 6.96 million, or about 3.75 percent of all cars and trucks. These first two complications imply that we understate the share of vehicles owned by households that are reported in the CE. Third, our survey count of vehicles will not include those that have been disposed of by the household,

but have not been reported as disposed to the state or have not had their registrations expire. Conversely, registrations will not include vehicles that have not been registered. This issue, which is likely less important, could bias the measure of reporting either up or down. Fourth, prior to 1985, personal passenger vans, minivans and utility vehicles were included in automobile registrations, while subsequently they were included in trucks. For this reason, we generally report comparisons for cars and trucks combined so that we have a consistent concept over time.

Bearing these caveats in mind, ratios of cars and trucks in the CE to those in the administrative records are reported in the bottom line of Table 3. The ratios are consistently well above 0.80. Given that a large share of cars and trucks are commercially owned as the numbers in the previous paragraph suggest, these numbers indicate a very high reporting rate. In similar comparisons (Appendix Table 3), we find that the total number of reported trucks owned in the CE lines up closely with data from the Vehicle Inventory and Use Survey (VIUS)—all of the ratios of CE counts to VIUS counts are slightly over one.

We have also verified that the purchase price of vehicles in the CE Interview Survey is reported fairly well. Purchase prices are directly part of expenditures and also are used to determine the rental value of car ownership which enters flow consumption. We validate the reported purchase price of new and used vehicles in the Interview Survey by comparing the reported values to published values in National Automobile Dealers Association (NADA) bluebook guides. For a sample of 100 cars with a reported purchase price in each of the years 1990 and 2000, we compare the reported vehicle values in the Interview Survey to bluebook data. We match these cars from the Interview Survey to a bluebook price based on the reported make, model, year and number of doors for each car. We report the correlations in Table 4. The comparisons are probably most relevant for cars that have been recently purchased. For those that have been owned six months or less the correlations are very high, 0.956 and 0.912 in 1990 and 2000, respectively. This is especially impressive given that there are many characteristics of cars that are not reported in the CE or cannot be matched to bluebook features.

Some past work has found that respondents seem to report home values fairly accurately in household surveys (Kiel and Zabel 1999; Bucks and Pence 2006). We have compared the reported rental equivalent of homes to the reported house values. The rental equivalent and home value are highly correlated, at around 0.6 in a typical year. The ratio of the rental

equivalent to home value has been fairly stable, though it declined appreciably in the mid-2000s, as one might expect during a period of rising home prices. To see whether the general pattern over time in reported home values in the CE is sensible, we plotted in Figure 2 the average home value reported in the CE Interview Survey compared to the Case-Shiller house price index. The average CE rental equivalent has the same qualitative time pattern as the Case-Shiller index, but it rises faster over time. The Case-Shiller index holds housing characteristics fixed, while the CE average does not. Because many characteristics of houses are improving over time such as square footage, presence of air conditioning, and other home amenities (see Meyer and Sullivan 2011b), the CE rise should be more pronounced, which is what is evident in Figure 2.

6. Precision and the Frequency of Reported Purchases in the Interview and Diary Data

We next examine the precision of expenditure reports from the Interview and Diary Surveys. The precision of these estimates is of interest for several reasons. First, the precision of the consumer unit reports determines the precision of statistics calculated from the data. Second, by comparing the precision of the Interview and Diary components of the survey, one can determine how many diary responses are needed to obtain the same precision as one interview response. This point is important in choosing between interview and diary forms of survey administration and the appropriate sample sizes. Third, the dispersion of the various components of expenditures is informative if either of the CE Survey components is going to be used to estimate distributional characteristics of expenditures, as when one is using the CE to assess inequality or poverty or in calculating percentiles for use in setting poverty thresholds as is done with the new Supplemental Poverty Measure.

To assess the precision of the CE, we examine the same 46 categories of expenditures from Table 2 that align closely with the PCE. We use these categories because we have verified their consistency over time. For 35 of these categories we have comparable data for both the Interview and Diary Surveys. In Table 5 we report the coefficient of variation (CV) of the quarterly interview reports and the weekly diary reports for these categories of expenditures.[17], [18]

[17] We calculate the CV as the square root of the sample size times the standard error of the mean divided by the mean. The standard error is calculated following the Balanced Repeated Replications (BRR) procedure used by the BLS to calculated standard errors for official CE tables. This BRR procedure is used to account for the CE Survey's

CVs for additional years are reported in Appendix Table 4. We focus on comparisons of quarters to weeks since a substantial share of respondents to both surveys do not complete the entire four quarters or two weeks. For example, typically about ten percent of consumer units only respond for one of the Diary weeks. For a given year Table 5 reports the Diary CV, the Interview CV, and the ratio of Diary to Interview. Several patterns are apparent. First, the Diary CVs tend to be much larger than those for the Interview Survey. In 2010, the weighted average of the CVs across comparable categories is 1.58 times as large in the Dairy Survey as in the Interview Survey. We expect the Interview Survey to be more precise because it captures 13 weeks of expenditures, as compared to just one week for the Diary Survey. If we make the extreme and implausible assumptions of no error in either survey, that weekly observations are independent, and simple random sampling, we would expect a ratio of CVs equal to the square root of 13 or 3.6.

Second, the Diary/Interview ratios vary sharply across expenditure categories. For 2010, the Diary CV is over three times that of the Interview CV for accounting and other business services, but the Diary CV is slightly lower than the Interview CV in the case of glassware, tableware, and household utensils. The ratios vary considerably, even for some of the largest categories of expenditures. For food and nonalcoholic beverages purchased for off-premises consumption (food at home) the Diary CV is nearly twice as large as the Interview CV, but it is smaller than the Interview CV for purchased meals and beverages (food away from home).

Third, there are also noticeable changes in the CVs over time. For the Diary, the weighted average for comparable categories falls slightly throughout the period. For the Interview Survey, the weighted average falls between 1987 and 1991 and then rises between 1991 and 2010. The CVs for the largest categories—food at home, purchased meals and beverages, gasoline and other energy products, rent and utilities, and imputed rent—in the Interview Survey tend to rise between 1987 and 1991 and then fall between 1991 and 2010, although the CV for rent and utilities rises throughout this period and the CV for purchased meals and beverages falls between 1987 and 1991. All of these categories except food away

---

multi-stage sample selection process. See http://www.census.gov/srd/papers/pdf/rr93-6.pdf for details on this procedure. The CVs that we report are about 10 percent larger than those estimated assuming simple random sampling design for the Diary Survey, and about 40 percent larger for the Interview Survey.

[18] We report CVs for 1987 instead of 1986 (the first year that data are available for most spending categories) because a complete set of replicate weights is not available in the public use version of the 1986 Interview Survey.

were reported at a high rate in the Interview Survey relative to the PCE and, and these rates did not decline much over time. Looking at these same categories for the Diary Survey (except for imputed rent, which is not available) the CVs tend to fall between 1987 and 1991, and then rise between 1991 and 2010, except for gasoline and other energy products which falls throughout this period.

To understand what is behind these differences in the coefficients of variation across expenditure categories, surveys and time, we look at the share of respondents who report no expenditures in a given category. It is first important to note that a substantial share of Diary respondents indicate that they had no expenditures at all in a given week, and this share has been sharply increasing over time. As recently as 1991 the share of valid respondents for whom at least one of the week's expenditures was zero was 4.5 percent, but it reached 11.9 percent in 2010 (Appendix Table 5). In 2010, 9.4 percent of diary weeks have zero reported expenditures for the entire week. There are three reasons why a family in the Diary Survey would have zero expenditures for an entire week. First, the family may be on a trip for the entire week and the Diary Survey explicitly does not capture spending on trips. About three-quarters of the families with zero spending for an entire week in the 2010 Diary Survey fall into this group. Second, the family may truly have zero spending for that week, and third, the family may fail to report actual spending that occurred during the interview week. As we explain in Section 8, regardless of the reason, the prevalence of zero expenditures, and more generally the greater dispersion of spending in the Diary, has important implications for certain uses of the Diary data.

In Table 6, we report the share of reports that are zero for the 46 categories of expenditures that we have previously considered. For each year, we report the share of zeros in the Diary Survey, the Interview Survey and the difference between the surveys. See Appendix Table 6 for additional years. Looking at the 35 categories of expenditures available for both Interview and Diary Surveys, 24 of the Diary Survey categories are zero more than 90 percent of the time, while 14 of these same categories in the Interview Survey are zero for 90 percent or more of the consumer units. In 2010, 72 percent of Diary Survey respondents reported no spending on rent and utilities, as compared to 2 percent of Interview Survey respondents. Clearly these higher rates of zero reports are one reason for the higher CVs for the Diary Survey. The rate of reports of zero has also been rising for both surveys. Between 1986 and 2010 the

majority of Diary categories saw increases in the share of zeros. While not as pronounced, the rise in zeros is also apparent in the Interview Survey.

These results on CVs and frequency of period without any purchases have several implications for distributional analyses. In particular, the greater dispersion of weekly expenditures than quarterly expenditures, the extent to which this varies across expenditure categories and time, and the changing frequency of purchases suggest that the use of Diary data to examine poverty or inequality is problematic. We discuss these implications in more detail in Section 8.

7. Representativeness of the CE

There are concerns that the CE misses certain types of households. The main method used in past studies that have assessed the bias due to unit nonresponse in the CE is comparisons of respondents contacted through more intensive methods to the remainder of respondents (Chapova et al. 2008; King et al. 2009). These studies suggest little bias. However, these analyses are not without their drawbacks, as those contacted through more intensive efforts may not be representative of those who are never contacted at all or are unwilling to respond.

To directly examine the representativeness of the CE we compare the distribution of household characteristics in the CE to those in the Current Population Survey (CPS).[19] While the distribution of characteristics in the CPS does not necessarily reflect the true distribution in the U.S. population, the CPS is a large survey (about 100,000 households annually in recent years) that is relied upon for many official statistics. Our results indicate that the characteristics of those in the CE line up quite closely with those of CPS respondents. These results do not necessarily confirm that the CE is representative of the U.S. population. Rather, they indicate that any concerns about representativeness in the CE are shared with the CPS.

In addition to a base weight to account for sampling probabilities, the CE has two stages of post-stratification adjustment to weights. The first stage is a "non-interview" adjustment based on region of country, household tenure (owner or renter), consumer unit size, and race of the reference person. The second stage is a "calibration factor" that accounts for frame under-

[19] For these comparisons we use the Annual Social and Economic Supplement, formerly called the Annual Demographic File or the March CPS.

coverage by adjusting the weights to 24 "known" population counts for region, race, tenure, age, and urban/rural status. Thus, we do not focus on these characteristics of households.

In Appendix Table 7, we report a number of demographic characteristics of the Interview Survey respondents for the years 1980-2010, as well as corresponding CPS values. We examine characteristics at the individual level, rather than at the level of the family or household to facilitate comparability. The educational attainment distributions match quite closely, though the CE has slightly greater representation of those without a high school degree and this tendency has increased slightly over time. Marital status, weeks and hours worked, and age match very closely, though the CE has somewhat fewer young children. The share that owns a home matches very closely, but that should not be surprising given that housing tenure is used to weight the CE data.

One of the principal concerns about unit nonresponse is that the CE may disproportionately miss households with either high or low income. Sabelhaus et al. (2012) examine the representativeness of the CE Interview Survey by income. They match CE respondent and non-respondent households to income at the zipcode level. They find that there is a small under-representation of those from the top four or five percentiles of zipcode level income and no under-representation (maybe a slight over-representation) at the bottom of the zipcode level income percentiles. Much more important quantitatively they find that the income reported in the survey, either because high income people are missing or because income is under-reported at the top, is much lower than that from other sources such as the Survey of Consumer Finances and tax records. Furthermore, reported spending relative to income is very low at the top.

This evidence suggests that much of the under-reporting of expenditures occurs at the very top of the income distribution, implying that the aggregate under-reporting statistics emphasized in this paper likely overstate the weakness of the CE for a typical household. If much of the under-reporting is due to high income households understating spending, then spending by the vast majority of consumers is better than the averages that the aggregate numbers indicate. These results combined with those in the current paper have several implications for various uses of the data that we discuss below.

8. Implications for Uses of the Current CE and for Redesign of the Survey

The results in this paper have implications for the uses of existing CE data. Under-reporting of expenditures is a first order problem, particularly because it differs substantially across spending categories. In addition to the level of under-reporting, the changes in the extent of under-reporting over time have also varied across type of good. The result of these patterns is that uses of the data that rely on aggregates are likely biased. In particular, the CPI is biased since the differential under-reporting means that the weights do not accurately reflect consumers' purchases. For example, as mentioned earlier, one of the principal concerns about the CE is that it causes too much weight is be put on housing in the CPI. The changes in the relative reporting of different types of good means that changes in the CPI are likely biased as well.

Fortunately, the quantitative importance of this problem may not be as severe as it first seems. A simple comparison of PCE and CPI weights overstates the potential bias in consumer prices because, as noted above, much of the PCE is not intended to be captured by the CPI. There is also research that has directly examined using PCE weights in a consumer price index (Blair 2012), finding only a modest bias that goes in different directions depending on how the index is constructed. It should also be noted that much of the bias may come from the plutocratic (dollar weighted as opposed to person weighted) nature of the CPI. While dollar weighting is appropriate when deflating national accounts, for many purposes of the CPI, such as indexing tax parameters and government benefits, person weighting may be more appropriate. Much of the aggregate under-reporting in the CE appears to come from under-reporting by high income households who are under-represented in the survey to begin with. While overall, the sample appears fairly representative, the dollar weighted nature of the CPI weights means that potentially missing a small share of households that account for a large share of expenditures could significantly bias the total expenditure based weights.

The results also indicate that certain categories of expenditures are well-measured on average, especially in the Interview Survey, and have not seen their reporting deteriorate. For researchers, emphasizing well-measured components may be a successful strategy to reduce bias when relying on the CE. For example, Meyer and Sullivan (2012) examine consumption poverty using "core consumption" which is based on well-measured spending categories from the Interview Survey: food at home, rent plus utilities, transportation, gasoline, the value of owner-

occupied housing, rental assistance, and the value of owned vehicles. An important advantage of the Interview Survey relative to the Diary Survey is that the former has many more large, well-measured categories of expenditures.

One could reasonably estimate total expenditures or consumption from these well-measured categories, relying on the constancy of the relationship between these categories and total spending as measured in the 1980s, when these categories in the CE were more comparable to the PCE. For example, see Meyer and Sullivan (2010). Such a procedure will give a consistent series over time, but is unlikely to deliver an unbiased measure of the level of consumption because of under-reporting that was present in the 1980s. Alternatively, scaling up total expenditures using CE/PCE ratios for all categories would be suspect given that so much of the CE is not comparable to the PCE. Methods that use CE data recognizing the nature of under-reporting need to be further developed and validated.

Some uses of the CE Survey rely on the distribution of expenditures. Examples include the construction of poverty thresholds for the new Supplemental Poverty Measure, and the calculation of poverty rates and inequality measures. For most of these uses, the representativeness of the CE through most of the income distribution and the concentration of under-reporting among the highest income households is largely favorable for the use of the CE Interview Survey. Conversely, the data are ill-suited for examining the highest income households. As a corollary, analyses of inequality using CE data should focus on statistics that are not heavily dependent on spending by the top few percentiles of the distribution such as 90/10 ratios, rather than variances, Gini coefficients, or spending shares at top percentiles.

The Interview Survey is the more appropriate data source for studies of consumption inequality or other distributional analyses. The goal of distributional analyses is typically to measure consumption rather than expenditures. Consumption differs from expenditures because one pays infrequently for goods and services that one is continuously consuming like rent and utilities. Durable goods like cars are purchased very infrequently, but their services are received over a long period of time. Even much of food is in cans or boxes that may be purchased at a very different time from when it is consumed. To closely approximate consumption, average spending over a long period of time is needed. The much higher variability of weekly expenditures than quarterly expenditures is an indication of the greater deviation of weekly expenditures from consumption. The higher observed variability of weekly expenditures than

quarterly expenditures could be the result of greater true variance or greater variance. Neither higher true variability nor measurement error is helpful in approximating longer-term consumption.

One might think even though one or two weeks of expenditures are not ideal for measuring the longer-term distribution of expenditures or consumption, they have a simple, maybe even time-constant, relationship to longer-term distributions. However, such a relationship is unlikely for several reasons. Because distributional measures such as percentiles, poverty measures, and variances inherently depend on dispersion, the differing dispersion in the Diary Survey spending relative to longer-term spending, the differing relative dispersion across expenditure categories, and the changes in the relative dispersion over time mean that both levels and changes in distributional measures based on weekly Diary data are biased. Previous studies have assumed a constant relationship between the weekly and quarterly data in order to infer longer-term distributional patterns or have not addressed the issue of the relationship between two weeks of expenditures and longer-term measures of consumption (Attanasio et al. 2007, 2012). The changing dispersion of the weekly data relative to the quarterly data for many categories indicates that this assumption is not valid. Furthermore, because aggregate spending is the sum of spending in different categories, the relationship between a given percentile in the weekly data and that of longer-term expenditures will change as spending shifts between categories with different degrees of dispersion. That the distribution of weekly expenditures differs in complicated and changing ways from the distribution of longer-term expenditures, suggests there is no simple, time-invariant way to convert one to the other.

That nearly ten percent of Diary respondents report no spending at all in a week is also problematic. As discussed above, a family might report zero expenditures for an entire week because they are on a trip for the entire week, they have zero spending for that week, or they fail to report actual spending. However, even if these zero reports of spending are accurate, such spending is unlikely to reflect consumption accurately. The large fraction of families with zero total spending suggests that any inequality measure that depends heavily on spending at low percentiles will be misleading.

The results also have implications for the redesign of the CE Survey. In deciding which type of survey, Interview or Diary, to emphasize in the future it is important to recognize how the current versions perform. The Interview Survey does well at recording many large categories

of expenditures, but does poorly at others. The Diary Survey does better than the Interview Survey for some categories, particularly some small categories that the Interview captures poorly, but rarely does the Diary do well on both an absolute basis and compared to the Interview Survey. These results are also consistent with the evidence on diary and interview reporting from the Canadian Survey of Household Spending as well as the Canadian Food Expenditure Survey. Diary reporting seems to capture less spending than is obtained through an interview.

The greater dispersion in the Diary Survey means that larger samples sizes are required to obtain the same level of precision as in the Interview Survey. For categories of expenditures that can be compared across the two surveys, the weighted average of the coefficients of variation in the Diary Survey is 58 percent greater than that of the Interview Survey in 2010. In terms of precision, this result indicates that about 2.5 independent weekly Diary Survey observations approximately equal one quarterly Interview Survey observation.

9. Conclusions

In this paper we examine the quality of consumption data in the CE Interview and Diary Surveys. While some categories of spending are significantly under-reported, our results indicate that the Interview Survey, in particular, does quite well in terms of a high and roughly constant share of expenditures relative to the national accounts for some of the largest components of consumption. These components include imputed rent on owner-occupied housing, rent and utilities, food at home, gasoline and other energy goods, new motor vehicles, and to a lesser extent, communication. The Interview Survey does poorly for food away from home, clothing, furniture and furnishings and alcoholic beverages. Our results are less encouraging for the Diary Survey which does poorly overall. There is no major category for which the Diary Survey both has a higher ratio to the PCE than the Interview Survey and the ratio is high and stable. We also find that the number and value of cars in the Interview Survey compares closely to outside sources, and the time pattern of home values closely follows other data.

Overall, the categories of expenditures that are not reported well tend to be those that involve many small and irregular purchases. These poorly reported categories also tend to be

private goods (clothing), ones that one may not want to reveal that one buys (alcohol, tobacco), and certain luxuries (alcohol, food away from home). Large salient purchases like automobiles, and regular purchases like rent, utilities, and groceries, seem to be well reported.

While the evidence on the relative bias of the Interview and Diary data is compelling, the evidence on precision of the data also favors the Interview Survey. Coefficients of variation are noticeably higher in the Diary Survey than in the Interview Survey. We also find that Diary respondents are much more likely to report zero spending for a consumption category. In 2010, 72 percent of Diary Survey respondents reported no spending on rent and utilities, as compared to 2 percent of Interview Survey respondents. The rate of reports of zero has been rising for both surveys. For the Diary Survey, we also find a high and increasing fraction of respondents reporting zero for all categories. 11.9 percent of 2010 Diary Survey respondents report zero spending for an entire week, up from 4.5 percent in 1991.

The CE Interview sample appears to be representative along many dimensions. However, Sabelhaus et al. (2012) provides strong evidence of under-representation at the top of the income distribution and under-reporting of income and expenditures at the top. They find that low-income households are well represented. The under-representation of high income households and their disproportionate under-reporting of expenditures means that the aggregate reporting rates relative to the PCE emphasized in the paper likely understate the under-reporting problem for high income households, but overstate the problem for low income households.

These results have implications for the use of existing CE data and for the redesign of the CE Survey. The importance of the under-reporting of expenditures in the CE will depend on the purpose for which the data are used. Uses of the data that rely on aggregates are likely biased. Our results suggest the CPI is biased because the differential under-reporting means that the weights do not accurately reflect consumers' purchases. However, we discuss several reasons why this problem might not be as worrisome as it first appears.

The evidence that the CE appears to miss spending near the top of the distribution implies that under-reporting is less of a concern for analyses that do not rely on spending at the top, such as measures of consumption poverty or median consumption. And, the high and fairly constant reporting rates for large categories of consumption in the Interview Survey suggest that, for some purposes, researchers can rely on these categories to address some of the concerns about under-reporting.

The greater dispersion of spending in the Diary data has important implication for distributional analyses. The high and increasing fraction of zero reported spending suggests that the use of Diary Survey data to assess inequality trends and other distributional outcomes is likely to lead to biased and misleading results. Also, the larger coefficients of variation in the Diary suggest that larger sample sizes are required for the Diary to obtain the same information as in the Interview Survey. Furthermore, diary data may not be appropriate to capture the longer term distribution of expenditures needed to measure consumption for distributional analyses.

References

Ahmed, Naeem, Mathew Brzozowski and Thomas F. Crossley. 2010. "Measurement Errors in Recall Food Consumption Data." Working Paper, University of Cambridge.

Attanasio, Orazio P., Erich Battistin, and Andrew Leicester. 2006. "From Micro to Macro, from Poor to Rich: Consumption and Income in the UK and the US," working paper, University College London.

Attanasio, Orazio P., Erich Battistin and Mario Padula, 2010. *Inequality in Living Standards since 1980: Evidence from Expenditure Data*. American Enterprise Institute.

Battistin, E. (2003). "Errors in survey reports of consumption expenditures", Institute for Fiscal Studies, Working Paper 0307.

Bosworth, Barry (2010). "Price Deflators, the Trust Fund Forecast, and Social Security Solvency", WP 2010-12, Center for Retirement Research at Boston College.

Branch, E. Raphael (1994). "The Consumer Expenditure Survey: a comparative analysis," *Monthly Labor Review*, 47-55.

Browning, Martin, Thomas Crossley, and Guglielmo Weber, 2003. "Asking Consumption Questions in General Purpose Surveys," *Economic Journal*, Royal Economic Society, vol. 113(491), pages F540-F567, November.

Bucks, Brian and Karen Pence. 2006. "Do Homeowners Know Their House Values and Mortgage Terms?" Working Paper, Federal Reserve Board of Governors.

Chopova, Boriana, Jennifer Edgar, Jeffrey M. Gonzales, Susan King, Dave McGrath, and Lucilla Tan. 2008. "Assessing nonresponse bias in the CE Interview Survey: A summary of four studies." U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Citro, Constance F. and Robert T. Michael. 1995. *Measuring Poverty: A New Approach*, eds. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

Creech, Brett J. and Barry P. Steinberg. 2011. "CE Source Selection for Publication Tables." Consumer Expenditure Survey Anthology, 2011. U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Crossley, Thomas F. and Joachim K. Winter. 2012. "Asking Households about Expenditures: What Have We Learned?" in Improving the Measurement of Consumer Expenditures, Christopher Carroll, Thomas Crossley, and John Sabelhaus, editors. Forthcoming from University of Chicago Press.

Cutler, David M. and Lawrence F. Katz. 1991. "Macroeconomic Performance and the Disadvantaged." *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity* 2: 1-74.

Dalaker, Joe. 2005. *Alternative Poverty Estimates in the United States: 2003.* U.S. Census Bureau. Current Population Reports P60-227.

Deaton, Angus and Valerie Kozel (2005), "Data and Dogma: The Great Indian Poverty Debate," *The World Bank Research Observer*, vol. 20:2, 177-199.

Dubreuil, Guylaine, Johanne Tremblay, Jenny Lynch, and Martin Lemire. 2011. "Redesign of the Canadian Survey of Household Spending." Slide Presentation at the Household Survey Producers Workshop, June 2011.

Garner, Thesia I., George Janini, William Passero, Laura Paszkiewicz, and Mark Vendemia. 2006. "The CE and the PCE: A Comparison." Monthly Labor Review 66 (September), 20-46.

Garner, Thesia I., Robert McClelland, and William Passero. 2009. "Strengths and Weaknesses of the Consumer Expenditure Survey from a BLS Perspective." Paper Presented at the NBER Summer Institute, July 2009.

General Accounting Office. 1996. "Alternative Poverty Measures," GAO/GGD-96-183R. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Gieseman, Raymond. 1987. "The Consumer Expenditure Survey: quality control by comparative analysis," *Monthly Labor Review*, 8-14.

Houthakker, Hendrik S. and Lester D. Taylor. 1970. *Consumer Demand in the United States: Analysis and Projections*, 2nd Edition. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.

Hurd, Michael and Susann Rohwedder. 2011. "High-Frequency Data on Total Household Spending: Evidence from the Monthly ALP Surveys. Working paper.

Interagency Technical Working Group (2010). "Observations from the Interagency Technical Working Group on Developing a Supplemental Poverty Measure." March.

Johnson**,** David S., Jonathan A. Parker**,** and Nicholas S. Souleles **(**2006): "Household expenditure and the income tax rebates of 2001," *American Economic Review*, 96(5), 1589–1610.

Johnson, David S. 2004. "Measuring Consumption and Consumption Poverty: Possibilities and Issues" Paper prepared for "Reconsidering the Federal Poverty Measure."

Kiel, Katherine A. and Jeffrey E. Zabel. 1999. "The Accuracy of Owner-Provided House Values: the 1978-1991 American Housing Survey" *Real Estate Economics* 27(2): 263-298.

King, Susan L., Boriana Chopova, Jennifer Edgar, Jeffrey M. Gonzales, Dave E. McGrath, and Lucilla Tan. 2009. "Assessing Nonresponse Bias in the Consumer Expenditure Interview Survey." Paper presented in Section on Survey Research Methods- JMS 2009.

Li, Geng, Robert F. Schoeni, Sheldon Danziger, and Kerwin Kofi Charles (2010). "New Expenditure Data in the PSID: Comparisons with the CE," *Monthly Labor Review*, vol. 133, no. 2, pp. 29-39.

McCully, Clinton. 2011. "Trends in Consumer Spending and Personal Saving, 1959-2009." *Survey of Current Business,* June.

McCarthy, Mary E., Thesia I. Garner, William D. Passero, David S. Johnson and Geoffrey D. Paulin. 1998. "Construction and Research Use of the Consumer Expenditure Survey." Slides for Presentation, U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Meyer, Bruce D., Wallace K. C. Mok and James X. Sullivan. 2009. "The Under-Reporting of Transfers in Household Surveys: Its Nature and Consequences" NBER working paper 15181, July.

Meyer, Bruce D., and James X. Sullivan. 2012. "Five Decades of Consumption and Income Poverty." NBER Working Paper 14827. Revised February 2012.

Meyer, Bruce D. and James X. Sullivan. 2011a. Viewpoint: Further Results on Measuring the Well-Being of the Poor Using Income and Consumption, *Canadian Journal of Economics*, 44(1), 52-87.

_____. 2011b. "The Material Well-Being of the Poor and the Middle Class Since 1980," American Enterprise Institute Working Paper.

_____. 2010. "Consumption and Income Inequality in the U.S. Since the 1960s." Working Paper, University of Notre Dame.

_____. 2008. "Changes in the Consumption, Income, and Well-Being of Single Mother Headed Families," *American Economic Review*, 98(5), December, 2221-2241.

_____. 2003. "Measuring the Well-Being of the Poor Using Income and Consumption." *Journal of Human Resources*, 38:S, 1180-1220.

Moran, Larry R. and Clinton P. McCully. 2001. "Trends in Consumer Spending, 1959-2000" *Survey of Current Business*, March.

Parker, Jonathan A., Nicholas S. Souleles, David S. Johnson, and Robert McClelland (2011) Consumer Spending and the Economic Stimulus Payments of 2008," Working Paper.

Passero, William (2011). "Table 1. Summary comparison of aggregate Consumer Expenditures (CE) and Personal Consumption Expenditures (PCE), based on 2002 Benchmark and restricted to the most comparable categories on the basis of concepts involved and comprehensiveness, 2003 – 2009." Revised 11/28/2011. Accessed at http://www.bls.gov/cex/cecomparison.htm.

Poterba, James M. 1991. "Is the Gasoline Tax Regressive?" In Tax Policy and the Economy 5, ed. David Bradford, 145-164. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Sabelhaus, John, David Johnson, Stephn Ash, David Swanson, Thesis Garner, John Greenlees and Steve Henderson. 2012. "Is the Consumer Expenditure Survey Representative by Income?" in Improving the Measurement of Consumer Expenditures, Christopher Carroll, Thomas Crossley, and John Sabelhaus, editors. Forthcoming from University of Chicago Press.

Short, Kathleen, Thesia Garner , David Johnson, and Patricia Doyle, "Experimental Poverty Measures: 1990 to 1997," U. S. Census Bureau, Current Population Reports, Series P60-205, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1999.

Silberstein, A.R., and S.Scott (1991): Expenditure Diary Surveys and their Asssociated Errors, in Biermer, P.P., R.M. Groves, L.E. Lyberg, N.A. Mathiowetz and S. Sudman, Editors, *Measurement Errors in Surveys*, Wiley, Hoboken NJ: 1991.

Slesnick, Daniel T. 1992. "Aggregate Consumption and Savings in the Postwar United States." *Review of Economics and Statistics* 74(4): 585-597.

Slesnick, Daniel T. 1993. "Gaining Ground: Poverty in the Postwar United States." *Journal of Political Economy* 101(1): 1-38.

Slesnick, Daniel T. 2001. *Consumption and Social Welfare*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Steinberg, Barry, Brett J. Creech, Mary Lynn Schmidt, and Patrick Falwell. 2010. "Source Selection: Selecting and Evaluating America's Expenditures." Paper presented at the Joint Statistical Meetings 2010, Section on Government Statistics.

Stephens, Melvin, Jr. 2003. "3rd of tha Month: Do Social Security Recipients Smooth Consumption Between Checks?" *American Economic Review* 93(1): 406-422.

Triest, Robert. 1998. "Has Poverty Gotten Worse?" *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 12: 1, pp. 97-114.

U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS). 2010. "Gemini Planning Document," unpublished manuscript.

U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS). 2012. "Consumer Expenditures and Income," in BLS Handbook of Methods, U.S. Department of Labor, U.S. Department of Labor.

U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS). 1983. "Consumer Expenditure Survey: Diary Survey, 1980-81, Bulletin 2173, U.S. Department of Labor, September 1983.

Venti, Steven F. and David A. Wise. 2004. "Aging and Housing Equity: Another Look" in *Perspectives on the Economics of Aging*, edited by David A. Wise. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 127-175.

Data Appendix

Below is a list of expenditure categories for which we have compared Interview Survey (IS) and/or Diary Survey (DS) data to PCE aggregates. These categories were selected following Garner et al. (2006, 2009) and Passero (2011) who identified categories in the PCE and CE that are most comparable based on "concepts and comprehensiveness". These comparable categories are 56 percent of the PCE in 2010. The concordance between PCE categories and the CE assembled in this previous work is based on integrated data—the combination of data from both the IS and DS. Our analyses compare the IS and DS to the PCE separately. Consequently, some additional non-comparabilities will arise when a spending category is only available in one of the surveys.

For each of the PCE spending categories below, we summarize the compatibility between the IS and DS (note, we do not comment on the comparability between these surveys and the PCE) by labeling them as "compatible", "mostly compatible", or "not compatible". A category is labeled as "compatible" if the same spending subcategories (or Universal Classification Codes, UCCs) are designed to be captured in both surveys. A category is labeled as "mostly compatible" if as least one subcategory is missing from either the IS or DS, and the missing UCCs are not a substantial fraction of PCE spending for that category. Finally, a category is labeled as "not compatible" if a substantial fraction of spending for that category is not designed to be captured by either the IS or DS. Except for a few noted categories, data from the DS are not available prior to 1986, because only a small subset of UCCs are publicly available for the 1980-1985 surveys. Appendix Table 1 provides our concordance of UCCs in the IS and DS for each of the comparable PCE categories.

Durable Goods

New motor vehicles: Not compatible. The IS reports spending separately for net outlays on new purchases and the trade-in allowance. The DS does not report these separately, and it is not clear whether the spending reported in the DS is net of trade-ins. In addition, the value of the "New trucks, pick-ups, vans, or jeeps" UCC in the DS is zero for 2007-2010, and it is not clear whether spending on these types of vehicles is reported in another UCC. For this reason, we do not report DS results for this category.

Motor vehicle accessories and parts: Mostly compatible. The Interview Survey (IS) does not contain "Global positioning devices," which totaled $628 million in the 2010 DS, or about 2 percent of the PCE aggregate for this category. The DS does not contain "Vehicle accessories including labor," which totaled $392 million in the 2010 IS or about 1 percent of the PCE aggregate for this category. "Vehicle products and services" is only available in the IS beginning in 2005. Although the IS and DS are mostly compatible for this PCE category, the ratio in in the DS varies considerably over time. Because we are not able to resolve these sharp changes, we do not report the ratios for the DS for this category.

Furniture and furnishings: Mostly compatible. "Rental of party supplies for catered affairs" is included in the IS but not the DS. This UCC is about 1 percent of the PCE aggregate for this category. The IS's "Replacement wall-to-wall carpet in owned homes" is represented by "Installed wall-to-wall carpet" in the DS. "Floor coverings, nonpermanent" in the IS is represented by "Room-size rugs and other non-permanent floor coverings" in the DS. "Wall-to-wall carpet" in the IS is included in "Capital improvements--service" in the DS, but the latter category is too broad, so it is excluded from the DS aggregate. This UCC is less than 1 percent of the PCE aggregate for this category. In the years 1980 to 1985, only one UCC in this category is available in the DS, so we do not report DS ratios for those years.

Household appliances: Mostly compatible. "Dishwashers (built-in), garbage disposals, and range hoods" in both rented and owned homes do not have a unique subcategory in the DS, but presumably they are included in the "Miscellaneous household appliances" subcategory in the DS. All other appliances are divided between renter and owned homes in the IS but combined in the DS.

Glassware, tableware, and household utensils: Mostly compatible. Some UCC titles in the DS are not listed in IS. For example, "Tableware, nonelectric kitchenware" and "Miscellaneous household equipment and parts" are not recorded in the IS, but these subcategories may be captured in "Flatware," "Glassware," and "Nonelectric cookware," which are available in the IS. In the years 1980 to 1985, only two UCCs in this category are available in the DS, so we do not report DS ratios for those years.

Outdoor equipment and supplies: Compatible. Although the IS and DS are compatible for this PCE category, the ratios in both surveys vary considerably over time. Because we are not able to resolve these sharp changes, we do not report the ratios for this category.

Televisions: Compatible.

Audio equipment: Mostly compatible. Beginning in 1999:2 phonographs were replaced by "Accessories and other sound equipment" in the IS. "Digital audio players" were added in 2005. Both surveys include "vehicle audio equipment, excluding labor." Until 2005:2 the IS also included "vehicle audio equipment including labor," but it is not clear that this is captured in the DS. In 2005, this UCC represented about 0.1 percent of the PCE aggregate for this category. In 1994:1 "Battery replacement, audio equipment, floor mats, seat covers, other accessories, batteries, and other equipment installed by CU" in the IS was split into two new UCCs: "Parts, equipment, and accessories," which is in the Motor vehicle accessories and parts category, and "Vehicle audio equipment excluding labor," which is in the audio equipment category. The latter seems larger, so we assign the pre-1994, combined UCC to the audio equipment category. Likewise, in 1994:1 "Purchase and installation of vehicle accessories, including audio equipment, customizing, and items such as luggage racks, fog lamps, and trailer hitches" was split into "Vehicle accessories including labor" and "Vehicle audio equipment including labor." As above, the pre-1994 combined UCC was assigned to the audio equipment category, which contains the latter UCC. In the years 1980 to 1985, only one UCC in this category is available in the DS, so we do not report DS ratios for those years.

Recording media: Compatible. In the IS mail-order club purchases were merged into all audio media purchases beginning in 2005.

Photographic equipment: Mostly compatible. "Photographic equipment" is contained in both surveys, but "Visual goods" is only contained in the DS. In 2010 "Visual goods" was about 5 percent of the PCE aggregate for this category. In the years 1980 to 1985, "Visual goods" is the only UCC available in the DS for this category, so we do not report DS ratios for those years.

Sporting equipment, supplies, guns, and ammunition: Mostly compatible. Only the DS contains "Fireworks," but this UCC is very small relative to the PCE aggregate for this category. There is no DS equivalent to "All other vehicles, trade-in" in the IS. This UCC represents about 0.4 percent of the PCE aggregate for this category. There is also no DS equivalent to "Recreation expenses, out-of-town trips," in the IS. This UCC represents about 5 percent of the PCE aggregate for this category. In 1994:1 in the IS "Motorized camper-coach or other vehicles (net outlay)" was split into "Purchase of motorized vehicle," which is in the other recreational vehicles category described below, and "Purchase of other vehicle" which is in this Sporting

equipment category. Because the former UCC is larger in the late 1990s, the pre-1994 UCC was assigned to the other recreational vehicles category. The same was done for trade-ins, which were similarly split in 1994:1. In the years 1980 to 1985, "Fireworks" is the only UCC available in the DS for this category, so we do not report DS ratios for those years.

Bicycles and accessories: Compatible. This category consists of one UCC "Bicycles" that is consistent across time and recorded in both surveys.

Pleasure boats: Not compatible. "Purchase of boat with motor" in the IS does not have an analogous category in the DS. These boats might be included in "Powered sports vehicles" in the DS, but this is a broader subcategory that is included in Sporting equipment above. The IS contains trade-ins for boats but the DS does not.

Other recreational vehicles: Not compatible. Three UCCs in this category, "Purchase of motorized camper," "Trailers, attached campers, trade-in," and "Motorized campers, trade-in" are available in the IS but not the DS. Also, the DS does not have a UCC that is analogous to the IS subcategory "Trailer/other attachable campers". The DS does have "Unpowered boats, trailers," but this is a better match with the "Pleasure boats" category above.

Recreational books: Compatible.

Musical instruments: Compatible.

Jewelry and watches: Compatible.

Telephone and facsimile equipment: Compatible.

<u>Nondurable Goods</u>

Food purchased for off-premises consumption and **Nonalcoholic beverages purchased for off-premises consumption**: Mostly compatible when these two categories are combined. A large set of UCCs in the DS align with a single IS UCC, "Average food and non-alcoholic beverage expenses." There were several minor content changes in the DS in 1995 and 1996. In 1994 several DS categories were split and recombined, and a few minor categories (e.g., dried fruit, vegetable juices) were added. These categories are also available in the DS for years 1980 to 1985.

Alcoholic beverages purchased for off-premises consumption: Compatible. Several UCCs in the DS for this category match up with a single UCC in the IS, "Beer, wine, and other alcohol for

home use." Note that spending on non-alcoholic beer and wine is included in this category. This category is also available in the DS for years 1980 to 1985.

Women's and girls' clothing: Mostly compatible. The DS does not record spending on "Women's costumes" or "Girls' costumes," but these UCCs are very small.

Men's and boys' clothing: Mostly compatible. The DS does not record spending on "Men's costumes" or "Boys' costumes," but these UCCs are very small.

Clothing materials: Compatible.

Shoes and other footwear: Compatible.

Gasoline and other energy goods: Mostly compatible. Only the DS contains "Gasohol," but this UCC is extremely small. The DS does not contain "Gasoline bought on out-of-town trips" or "Motor oil bought on out-of-town trips." Together these UCCs represent about 4 percent of the PCE aggregate for this category. This category is missing in the 1984 and 1985 DS files, but is available in the DS across 1980, 1981, and years 1986 and later.

Pets and related products: **Not** compatible. This category consists of two UCCs: "Pet food" and "Pet purchases, supplies, and medicine." The former UCC is missing from the IS; in 2010 it comprised 70.3 percent of the category in the DS. The latter UCC is also missing from the DS files in years 1980-1985, so we do not report DS ratios for those years.

Film and photographic supplies: Not compatible. This category consists of two UCCs, "Film" and "Other photographic supplies." The latter UCC is not recorded in the IS. In the DS, the latter UCC is the larger of the two.

Household cleaning products: Not compatible. Out of five UCCs in this category, including "Soaps and detergents" and "Lawn and garden supplies," the only UCC contained in the IS is "Termite/pest control products," which may differ substantially from its most similar UCC in the DS, "Miscellaneous household products."

Household paper products: Not compatible. This category consists of one UCC, "Cleansing and toilet tissue, paper towels and napkins," which is only available in the DS.

Household linens: Compatible.

Sewing items: Compatible.

Personal care products: Not compatible. Out of nine UCCs, only three relatively minor UCCs are available in both surveys.

Tobacco: Mostly compatible. "Cigarettes" and "Other tobacco products" are available in both surveys, but "Smoking accessories" and "Marijuana" are only recorded in the DS. These latter UCCs in the DS are only about 0.5 percent of the PCE aggregate for this category. This category is also available in the DS for years 1980 to 1985.

Newspapers and periodicals: Mostly compatible. Only the DS contains "Newsletters," but this UCC is extremely small.

Services

Rent and utilities: Mostly compatible. "Rent" is contained in both surveys, but the IS also has home improvement materials for renters, while the DS does not distinguish between owners and renters for home improvement materials. "Wall-to-wall carpet (replacement) (renter)" and "Other repair and maintenance services, renter" are unavailable in the DS, but these UCCs are very small relative to the PCE aggregate for this category. Only two UCCs in this category, "Electricity" and "Natural gas" are available in the DS in 1980 and 1981, and no UCC is available in 1984 or 1985, so we do not report DS ratios in any year before 1986.

Imputed rental of owner-occupied nonfarm housing: Not compatible. Information on the rental equivalence of owned homes is not available in the DS. For the IS this category includes the rental equivalence of primary residences and vacation homes, but does not include the rental equivalence of time shares. The data are reported as a monthly value. For owned homes we multiply the monthly value by 12, while for vacation homes, we multiply the monthly value by 6, which follows Passero (2011).

Other motor vehicle services: Not compatible. Of the 24 UCCs in this category, only eight are available in both surveys. We report ratios for this category for the IS only.

Cable and satellite television and radio services: Compatible.

Photo processing: Compatible.

Photo studios: Compatible. This category is only available in the IS beginning in 1999, and it is also available in the DS in all years including 1980 to 1985.

Gambling: Compatible. Lottery tickets were first mapped to this category in 1996:2. In 2001:1, this category was split up in the DS from "Miscellaneous fees, lotteries, and pari-mutuel losses" to just "Lotteries and pari-mutuel losses." Gambling expenses were not collected in the IS before

2001:2. This category is also available in the DS in years 1984 and 1985 but not in 1980 and 1981.

Veterinary and other services for pets: Compatible.

Purchased meals and beverages: Mostly compatible. This category includes spending by the family on food and beverages (both alcoholic and non-alcoholic) purchased at restaurants, school or employer cafeterias, and other eating establishments, as well as food or board at school. The IS also includes food and beverages purchased on out of town trips, but the DS does not collect these expenses. In 2010, this spending on out of town trips in the IS was about 6 percent of the PCE aggregate for this category. This category is also available in the DS for years 1980 to 1985.

Food supplied to civilians: Compatible. This category includes meals provided by employers. Respondents are asked to report spending on "free meals at work as part of your pay".

Communication: Mostly compatible. "Postage" and "Delivery services" are provided in the DS, but unavailable in the IS. In 2010 "Postage" is about 3 percent of the PCE aggregate for this category while "Delivery services" is less than 0.2 percent.

Legal services: Compatible.

Accounting and other business services: Mostly compatible. In the DS, there are three UCCs that match up with this category: "Accounting fees," "Miscellaneous personal services," and "Employment counseling and fees." The last of these is unavailable in the IS, but this subcategory is very small, and it may be captured in the IS by the miscellaneous subcategory.

Funeral and burial services: Compatible.

Personal care services: Mostly compatible. "Shopping club membership fees" is not recorded in the DS, but this UCC represents only about 1 percent of the PCE aggregate for this category. "Repair of personal care appliances" was removed from the IS in 1999:2 and not replaced, although it remained in the DS. In recent years, this UCC in the DS has contained no spending. In both surveys, "Dating services" was first collected in 2005. This category is mostly available in the DS for years 1980 to 1985, with the exception that "Watches and jewelry repair" is not available in these years.

Repair and hire of footwear: Compatible.

Child care: Compatible.

Household maintenance: Mostly compatible. "Other home services" (340903) is available in both surveys; we assume that in each survey this residual UCC corresponds with several UCCs

that are available in one survey but not the other. Two minor UCCs are not available in the DS: "Rental and installation of dishwashers, range hoods, and garbage disposals" and "Management fees for management, security, and parking—other properties," but these categories are small relative to the PCE aggregate for this category.

Table 1: CE PCE Comparisons for 10 Large Categories, 2010 [In millions of dollars]

PCE category	PCE	DS/ PCE	IS/ PCE
Imputed rental of owner-occupied nonfarm housing	1,203,053		1.065
Rent and utilities	668,759	0.797	0.946
Food and nonalc. beverages purchased for off-premises consumption (food at home)	659,382	0.656	0.862
Purchased meals and beverages (food away from home)	533,078	0.508	0.528
Gasoline and other energy goods	354,117	0.725	0.779
Clothing	256,672	0.487	0.317
Communication	223,385	0.686	0.800
New motor vehicles	178,464		0.961
Furniture and furnishings	140,960	0.433	0.439
Alcoholic beverages purchased for off-premises consumption	106,649	0.253	0.220

Notes: The PCE category name for food at home is "Food and nonalcoholic beverages purchased for off-premises consumption." The PCE category name for food away from home is "Purchased meals and beverages."

Table 2: Aggregate Consumer Expenditure (CE) Interview and Diary Survey and Personal Consumption Expenditures (PCE), 1986 and 2010 [In millions of dollars]

	2010					1986				
PCE category	**PCE**	**CE DS**	**CE IS**	**DS/ PCE**	**IS/ PCE**	**PCE**	**CE DS**	**CE IS**	**DS/ PCE**	**IS/ PCE**
Total durables, nondurables, and services										
Total	$9,965,306					$2,841,379				
Comparable items (# of categories differ for Interview and Diary)		2,315,529	3,998,836	0.57	0.74		900,434	1,502,609	0.66	0.85
Durable goods										
Total durable goods	1,085,484					421,440				
Comparable durable goods (# of categories differ for IS and DS)		184,531	376,802	.38	.53		83,907	293,296	.47	.88
New motor vehicles	178,464		171,450		.96	134,047		154,574		1.15
Motor vehicle accessories and parts	26,558		23,474		.88	11,446		7,065		.62
Furniture and furnishings	140,960	61,010	61,859	.43	.44	59,392	26,928	45,494	.45	.77
Household appliances	40,536	27,323	30,034	.67	.74	21,243	10,689	17,644	.50	.83
Glassware, tableware, and household utensils	41,545	11,822	3,402	.28	.08	15,142	5,653	2,983	.37	.20
Televisions	37,407	11,730	14,379	.31	.38	11,635	3,772	6,741	.32	.58
Audio equipment	19,019	5,703	3,086	.30	.16	7,247	2,480	10,290	.34	1.42
Recording media	33,077	6,892	4,985	.21	.15	10,429	2,923	3,246	.28	.31
Photographic equipment	2,844	3,860	2,937	1.36	1.03	2,997	1,488	1,812	.50	.60
Sporting equipment, supplies, guns, and ammunition	53,258	12,733	16,422	.24	.31	13,147	6,329	7,420	.48	.56
Bicycles and accessories	4,257	2,338	1,868	.55	.44	2,114	978	1,195	.46	.57
Pleasure boats	9,779		6,960		.71	4,828		4,909		1.02
Other recreational vehicles	9,580		5,245		.55	5,446		7,235		1.33
Recreational books	30,412	4,079	5,582	.13	.18	7,771	3,104	4,127	.40	.53
Musical instruments	4,939	1,845	1,848	.37	.37	1,606	271	2,586	.17	1.61
Jewelry and watches	61,485	26,774	14,320	.44	.23	24,333	13,354	11,329	.55	.47
Telephone and facsimile equipment	13,991	3,941	4,126	.28	.29	1,256	1,286	1,089	1.02	.87
Nondurable goods										
Total nondurable goods	2,301,517					774,189				
Comparable nondurable goods (# of categories differ for IS and DS)		1,008,380	1,018,800	.60	.70		424,127	437,329	.66	.77
Food and nonalc. beverages purchased for off-premises consumption	659,382	432,541	568,134	.66	.86	273,849	184,751	217,242	.67	.79
Alcoholic beverages purchased for off-premises consumption	106,649	27,016	23,452	.25	.22	41,670	13,899	14,252	.33	.34
Women's and girls' clothing	161,192	80,450	49,737	.50	.31	77,933	49,664	43,353	.64	.56
Men's and boys' clothing	95,480	44,532	31,585	.47	.33	44,884	30,115	26,207	.67	.58
Clothing materials	4,203	1,227	687	.29	.16	3,057	652	1,059	.21	.35
Shoes and other footwear	59,334	36,679	17,896	.62	.30	24,464	15,689	11,896	.64	.49
Gasoline and other energy goods	354,117	256,573	275,691	.72	.78	91,191	76,406	96,671	.84	1.06
Pets and related products	50,068	28,401		.57		10,021	6,914		.69	
Household cleaning products	41,287	47,597		1.15		18,156	16,993		.94	
Household paper products	40,325	12,502		.31		11,295	4,087		.36	
Household linens	24,288	10,767	7,070	.44	.29	11,020	6,102	4,077	.55	.37
Sewing items	1,213	1,038	1,154	.86	.95	574	1,224	1,030	2.13	1.79
Tobacco	94,357	29,057	43,395	.31	.46	32,157	17,631	21,543	.55	.67
Services - household consumption expenditures										
Total services	6,578,305					1,645,750				
Comparable services (# of categories differ for IS and DS)		1,122,618	2,603,234	.60	.83		392,400	771,984	.72	.92
Rent and utilities	668,759	533,202	632,560	.80	.95	225,758	187,547	217,782	.83	.96
Imputed rental of owner-occupied nonfarm housing	1,203,053		1,281,521		1.07	304,497		340,934		
Other motor vehicle services	58,612		33,654		.57	9,552		7,701		.81
Cable and satellite television and radio services	79,524	64,014	77,063	.80	.97	10,533	4,966	10,032	.47	.95
Photo processing	2,388	1,456	1,383		.58	4,110	1,558	2,265	.38	.55
Photo studios	7,089	2,009	2,527	.28	.36	3,381	709		.21	
Gambling	99,578	9,517	6,288	.10	.06	15,516	3,458		.22	
Veterinary and other services for pets	25,669	19,101	17,401	.74	.68	3,660	2,909	3,578	.79	.98
Purchased meals and beverages	533,078	270,810	281,323	.51	.53	161,472	116,882	104,439	.72	.65
Communication	223,385	153,300	178,771	.69	.80	55,600	41,837	44,260	.75	.80
Legal services	96,788	6,573	15,590	.07	.16	27,348	2,858	7,155	.10	.26
Accounting and other business services	27,745	15,921	7,934	.57	.29	3,729	11,137	3,192	2.99	.86
Funeral and burial services	19,048	1,365	11,442	.07	.60	7,091	1,270	5,824	.18	.82
Repair and hire of footwear	457	416	187		.41	449	296	351	.66	.78
Child care	30,309	9,270	9,629	.31	.32	7,983	8,081	7,126	1.01	.89
Household maintenance	55,216	35,664	45,961	.65	.83	20,539	8,892	17,347	.43	.84

Notes: Data are from the Interview and Diary Consumer Expenditure Surveys and the U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis. Reported categories are only those where the CE and PCE are most comparable. Comparable categories follows Passero (2011). PCE numbers are from Table 2.4.5U. Personal Consumption Expenditures by Type of Product, accessed on November 21, 2011.

Table 3: Comparison of Vehicle Ownership in the CE Interview Survey to Motor Vehicle Registrations (in millions), 1972-2010

	1972	1973	1980	1987	1990	1992	1995	1997	2000	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Automobiles																	
CE Survey	89.6	80.6	105.8	120.7	121.6	120.7	121.2	116.6	113.7	116.2	118.3	114.4	106.8	106.6	107.7	108.3	108.3
State Motor Vehicle Registrations	96.6	101.4	120.7	130.0	132.2	125.1	126.9	128.4	132.2	134.6	134.3	135.0	135.2	134.0	134.5	135.6	133.4
Ratio	0.928	0.795	0.876	0.928	0.920	0.965	0.955	0.908	0.860	0.863	0.881	0.848	0.790	0.795	0.801	0.798	0.812
Trucks																	
CE Survey	10.1	9.9	25.8	33.2	39.3	42.5	52.1	56.1	63.5	69.6	74.1	86.2	87.6	89.0	90.4	91.8	92.4
State Motor Vehicle Registrations	20.3	22.2	32.3	45.7	53.1	61.6	70.8	75.3	85.0	90.8	92.8	97.9	101.6	105.7	108.2	108.0	108.3
Ratio of CES to SMVR	0.498	0.447	0.801	0.727	0.740	0.690	0.736	0.744	0.747	0.766	0.798	0.881	0.862	0.842	0.835	0.850	0.853
Automobiles & Trucks																	
CE Survey	99.7	90.5	131.7	153.9	160.9	163.2	173.2	172.7	177.1	185.7	192.4	200.7	194.4	195.6	198.1	200.1	200.7
State Motor Vehicle Registrations	116.8	123.6	153.0	175.7	185.3	186.7	197.7	203.8	217.3	225.5	227.2	232.9	236.8	239.7	242.7	243.6	241.7
Ratio	0.854	0.732	0.860	0.876	0.869	0.874	0.876	0.847	0.815	0.824	0.847	0.862	0.821	0.816	0.816	0.821	0.830

Notes: Motor vehicle registrations are from the U.S. Federal Highway Administration, Highway Statistics. Registration numbers include all commercial cars and trucks. In 1980, personal passenger vans, passenger minivans, and utility-type vehicles are included in automobile registrations. Starting in 1990 these vehicles are no longer included in automobiles but are included in trucks. Vehicle Inventory Use Survey data, which are only available through 2002, are from the Census Bureau. "Major Use" denotes the business survey respondents said for which their truck is used. "Primary Operator Classification" denotes the type of owner. "Personal Transportation" describes a vehicle that is operated for or owned by someone who operates it for personal use, such as pleasure driving, travel to work, carpool, etc. "Owner/operator" describes an independent trucker driving for his or her own business, or is on lease to a company.

Table 4: Correlation of Reported Vehicle Purchase Price in the CE Interview Survey to NADA values

Survey Year	1990	2000
Cars owned 6 months or less	0.956	0.912
Cars owned 12 months or less	0.937	0.790
Cars owned 24 months or less	0.879	0.779

Notes: For each of the survey years reported, we compute the correlation between the reported purchase price of a random sample of vehicles from the CE Interview Survey and the value of these vehicles reported in the NADA guides. Values from NADA guides were identified based on make, model, year, number of cylinders and number of doors for each vehicle. For each survey year, we select a random sample of 100 new and used vehicles with a reported purchase price from the CE Interview Survey.

Table 5: Coefficient of Variation by Spending Category, Consumer Expenditure (CE) Interview and Diary Survey, 1987-2010

	2010			1991			1987		
PCE category	**CE DS**	**CE IS**	**DS/ IS**	**CE DS**	**CE IS**	**DS/ IS**	**CE DS**	**CE IS**	**DS/ IS**
Durable goods									
New motor vehicles		12.34			9.01			9.93	
Motor vehicle accessories and parts		4.68			4.71			5.60	
Furniture and furnishings	14.67	10.37	1.42	14.25	5.61	2.54	15.39	5.42	2.84
Household appliances	19.05	8.58	2.22	18.62	4.82	3.86	19.03	4.55	4.18
Glassware, tableware, and household utensils	6.32	8.59	0.74	20.61	5.60	3.68	9.10	7.25	1.26
Televisions	17.32	8.84	1.96	33.39	8.15	4.10	30.89	8.55	3.61
Audio equipment	16.32	10.06	1.62	22.91	6.16	3.72	18.98	5.52	3.44
Recording media	9.40	5.99	1.57	7.78	3.80	2.05	8.59	4.85	1.77
Photographic equipment	26.27	11.81	2.22	29.77	16.00	1.86	34.23	16.82	2.04
Sporting equipment, supplies, guns, and ammunition	14.03	8.84	1.59	13.33	7.64	1.75	13.86	6.26	2.21
Bicycles and accessories	29.65	17.68	1.68	35.49	14.19	2.50	33.73	10.79	3.13
Pleasure boats		80.78			51.70			30.23	
Other recreational vehicles		55.97			47.25			26.92	
Recreational books	8.91	6.20	1.44	6.89	4.52	1.52	9.41	7.21	1.31
Musical instruments	47.55	23.02	2.07	45.03	22.51	2.00	36.32	27.38	1.33
Jewelry and watches	35.99	12.43	2.90	17.01	8.22	2.07	18.41	8.81	2.09
Telephone and facsimile equipment	19.26	8.57	2.25	18.11	6.51	2.78	14.63	7.63	1.92
Nondurable goods									
Food and nonalc. bev. purchased for off-premises consumption	1.81	0.93	1.93	1.72	1.62	1.06	1.92	1.48	1.30
Alcoholic beverages purchased for off-premises consumption	4.46	4.45	1.00	4.51	4.51	1.00	3.97	3.59	1.10
Women's and girls' clothing	4.79	3.69	1.30	5.26	2.52	2.08	3.74	3.50	1.07
Men's and boys' clothing	5.31	4.78	1.11	4.34	2.84	1.53	5.06	3.27	1.54
Clothing materials	12.39	17.96	0.69	17.92	10.66	1.68	11.60	7.41	1.57
Shoes and other footwear	5.06	3.10	1.63	3.62	3.15	1.15	5.85	2.84	2.06
Gasoline and other energy goods	2.19	1.73	1.27	2.37	1.98	1.20	2.84	1.83	1.55
Pets and related products	6.56			5.68			5.22		
Household cleaning products	3.60			2.86			3.75		
Household paper products	3.37			2.96			2.85		
Household linens	6.18	4.93	1.26	7.66	5.57	1.37	7.08	4.62	1.53
Sewing items	30.73	15.88	1.93	28.75	9.10	3.16	13.69	12.21	1.12
Tobacco	6.04	5.48	1.10	3.75	3.10	1.21	3.23	3.34	0.97
Services - household consumption expenditures									
Rent and utilities	3.80	2.20	1.72	3.44	1.67	2.05	4.07	1.46	2.78
Imputed rental of owner-occupied nonfarm housing		2.08			2.86			2.76	
Other motor vehicle services		7.52			9.98			8.09	
Cable and satellite television and radio services	4.14	1.63	2.54	5.82	3.36	1.73	6.48	3.29	1.97
Photo processing	13.81	9.22	1.50	11.62	5.30	2.19	14.18	4.54	3.12
Photo studios	23.57	14.34	1.64	20.98			18.01		
Gambling	43.18	17.33	2.49	10.69			12.69		
Veterinary and other services for pets	10.70	6.75	1.59	9.43	8.52	1.11	13.67	5.79	2.36
Purchased meals and beverages	2.12	2.45	0.87	1.97	2.45	0.81	3.53	2.75	1.28
Communication	2.63	1.52	1.73	2.72	1.90	1.43	4.67	1.91	2.45
Legal services	27.21	16.41	1.66	34.45	18.46	1.87	33.79	25.15	1.34
Accounting and other business services	31.94	9.99	3.20	22.34	9.16	2.44	17.46	15.04	1.16
Funeral and burial services	38.27	17.24	2.22	77.21	15.64	4.94	60.41	16.71	3.61
Repair and hire of footwear	29.79	21.05	1.42	19.89	9.66	2.06	17.92	7.18	2.49
Child care	16.46	19.28	0.85	8.34	9.64	0.87	9.94	9.25	1.07
Household maintenance	12.13	5.52	2.20	9.13	5.94	1.54	13.35	6.82	1.96
Weighted Mean (all categories)	7.07	4.32	1.63	6.30	3.67	1.72	6.71	3.75	1.79
Weighted Mean (comparable categories only)	6.18	3.92	1.58	6.24	3.44	1.82	6.62	3.67	1.80
Median ratio			1.63			1.86			1.92

Notes: Data are from the Interview and Diary Consumer Expenditure Surveys. Spending categories are the same as those reported in Table 2. The unit of observation is a consumer unit-quarter for the Interview Survey and a consumer unit-week for the Diary Survey. The coefficient of variation is the ratio of the standard error of the mean to the mean times the square root of the sample size, where the standard error is calculated using the Balanced Repeated Replication procedure recommend by the BLS for variance estimation in the CE Survey.

Table 6: Fraction of Consumer Units with Zero Spending by Spending Category, Consumer Expenditure (CE) Interview and Diary Survey, 1986-2010

	2010			1991			1986		
PCE category	**CE DS**	**CE IS**	**DS - IS**	**CE DS**	**CE IS**	**DS - IS**	**CE DS**	**CE IS**	**DS - IS**
Durable goods									
New motor vehicles		0.988			0.980			0.970	
Motor vehicle accessories and parts		0.806			0.875			0.874	
Furniture and furnishings	0.902	0.777	0.126	0.880	0.688	0.192	0.901	0.667	0.233
Household appliances	0.961	0.816	0.146	0.968	0.799	0.169	0.971	0.783	0.189
Glassware, tableware, and household utensils	0.889	0.895	-0.007	0.892	0.867	0.025	0.901	0.846	0.055
Televisions	0.997	0.957	0.040	0.998	0.959	0.039	0.997	0.950	0.046
Audio equipment	0.987	0.968	0.019	0.991	0.777	0.213	0.989	0.750	0.239
Recording media	0.954	0.811	0.142	0.942	0.703	0.239	0.963	0.768	0.194
Photographic equipment	0.994	0.976	0.018	0.995	0.976	0.019	0.996	0.969	0.026
Sporting equipment, supplies, guns, and ammunition	0.961	0.827	0.134	0.948	0.767	0.181	0.955	0.773	0.183
Bicycles and accessories	0.995	0.983	0.013	0.995	0.974	0.021	0.995	0.975	0.020
Pleasure boats		0.998			0.996			0.996	
Other recreational vehicles		0.999			0.997			0.996	
Recreational books	0.964	0.817	0.148	0.944	0.715	0.229	0.944	0.716	0.228
Musical instruments	0.996	0.987	0.010	0.995	0.977	0.018	0.996	0.975	0.021
Jewelry and watches	0.958	0.894	0.065	0.940	0.799	0.140	0.947	0.779	0.168
Telephone and facsimile equipment	0.989	0.934	0.055	0.981	0.938	0.042	0.993	0.951	0.042
Nondurable goods									
Food and nonalc. bev. purchased for off-premises consumption	0.189	0.012	0.177	0.090	0.008	0.082	0.117	0.009	0.108
Alcoholic beverages purchased for off-premises consumption	0.854	0.674	0.181	0.810	0.635	0.175	0.763	0.572	0.191
Women's and girls' clothing	0.795	0.531	0.264	0.722	0.377	0.345	0.734	0.347	0.387
Men's and boys' clothing	0.862	0.623	0.239	0.827	0.502	0.325	0.836	0.479	0.357
Clothing materials	0.983	0.972	0.011	0.963	0.916	0.047	0.966	0.901	0.065
Shoes and other footwear	0.890	0.674	0.216	0.887	0.538	0.349	0.891	0.503	0.388
Gasoline and other energy goods	0.362	0.095	0.267	0.319	0.109	0.210	0.300	0.113	0.187
Pets and related products	0.812			0.784			0.810		
Household cleaning products	0.591			0.495			0.517		
Household paper products	0.765			0.624			0.658		
Household linens	0.927	0.823	0.104	0.928	0.818	0.110	0.937	0.795	0.141
Sewing items	0.990	0.965	0.024	0.976	0.929	0.046	0.978	0.916	0.062
Tobacco	0.858	0.792	0.067	0.735	0.661	0.074	0.662	0.588	0.074
Services - household consumption expenditures									
Rent and utilities	0.720	0.024	0.696	0.629	0.028	0.601	0.708	0.034	0.673
Imputed rental of owner-occupied nonfarm housing		0.341			0.368			0.381	
Other motor vehicle services		0.750			0.748			0.737	
Cable and satellite television and radio services	0.895	0.253	0.641	0.916	0.474	0.442	0.956	0.579	0.377
Photo processing	0.985	0.931	0.054	0.973	0.745	0.229	0.974	0.747	0.227
Photo studios	0.994	0.977	0.018	0.991			0.993		
Gambling	0.955	0.898	0.057	0.935			0.948		
Veterinary and other services for pets	0.978	0.859	0.119	0.980	0.865	0.115	0.987	0.867	0.120
Purchased meals and beverages	0.304	0.194	0.110	0.254	0.166	0.088	0.246	0.162	0.084
Communication	0.729	0.055	0.674	0.701	0.050	0.652	0.676	0.061	0.615
Legal services	0.997	0.974	0.023	0.997	0.962	0.035	0.997	0.957	0.041
Accounting and other business services	0.980	0.944	0.036	0.971	0.932	0.040	0.978	0.933	0.045
Funeral and burial services	0.999	0.987	0.012	0.998	0.944	0.054	0.998	0.960	0.039
Repair and hire of footwear	0.997	0.990	0.007	0.994	0.947	0.047	0.993	0.937	0.056
Child care	0.990	0.974	0.016	0.966	0.942	0.024	0.953	0.931	0.022
Household maintenance	0.955	0.714	0.240	0.939	0.725	0.214	0.951	0.720	0.230
Mean difference			0.133			0.161			0.169
Median difference			0.065			0.110			0.120

Notes: Data are from the Interview and Diary Consumer Expenditure Surveys. Spending categories are the same as those reported in Table 2. The unit of observation is a consumer unit-quarter for the Interview Survey and a consumer unit-week for the Diary Survey.

Figure 1a: Comparisons of CE Diary and CE Interview Aggregates to PCE Aggregates, New Motor Vehicles and Imputed Rent (Interview Only)



Figure 1b: Comparisons of CE Diary and CE Interview Aggregates to PCE Aggregates, Rent and Utilities



Figure 1c: Comparisons of CE Diary and CE Interview Aggregates to PCE Aggregates, Food at Home



Figure 1d: Comparisons of CE Diary and CE Interview Aggregates to PCE Aggregates, Food Away from Home



Figure 1e: Comparisons of CE Diary and CE Interview Aggregates to PCE Aggregates, Gasoline and Other Energy Goods



Figure 1f: Comparisons of CE Diary and CE Interview Aggregates to PCE Aggregates, Clothing and Shoes



Figure 1g: Comparisons of CE Diary and CE Interview Aggregates to PCE Aggregates, Communication



Figure 1h: Comparisons of CE Diary and CE Interview Aggregates to PCE Aggregates, Furniture and Furnishings



Figure 1i: Comparisons of CE Diary and CE Interview Aggregates to PCE Aggregates, Alcoholic Beverages



Figure 2: Reported Value of the Home (CE Interview) Compared to Case-Shiller Annual Housing Price Indices (Base Year = 1987)



Note: CE data exlcudes the following states because they are not included in the Case-Shiller Index: AL, AK, ID, IN, ME, MS, MT, SC, SD, WV, and WI. In addition, the following states are exlcuded because of limited state information in the CE data: DE, GA, MD, and MN.

Appendix Table 1: Concordance of Interview and Diary Survey UCCs for Each PCE Category

PCE Category	Interview Survey UCCs	Diary Survey UCCs
Durable goods		
New motor vehicles	*1980-2010*: 450110 450116 450210 450216	*1986-2010*: 450110 *1986-2006*: 450210
Motor vehicle accessories and parts	*1980-2010*: 480110 480213 490501 *2005-2010*: 480212	*1986-2010*: 480110 480212 480213 600903
Furniture and furnishings	*1980-2010*: 290110 290120 290210 290310 290320 290410 290420 290440 320901 290430 340904 680320 320220 690242 690241 690243 320120 280210 *1980-2006*: 320210 320231 *2007-2010*: 320233 *1980-1998*: 220511 220614 230132 320110 320162 *1999-2010*: 220616 230133 320111	*1986-2010*: 290110 290120 290210 290310 290320 290410 290420 290440 320901 290430 340904 320220 690242 690241 690243 230130 320110 320120 280210 *1986-2006*: 320210 320231 *2007-2010*: 320233
Household appliances	*1980-2010*: 230117 230118 300111 300112 300211 300212 300221 300222 300311 300312 300321 300322 320150 300331 300332 300411 300412 320511 320512 320522 690245 690244 320521	*1986-2010*: 230117 230118 300110 300210 300220 300310 300320 320150 300330 300410 320511 320512 300900 320522 320521
Glassware, tableware, and household utensils	*1980-2010*: 320310 320320 320330 320340 320350 320370 320360	*1986-2010*: 320320 320340 320350 320905 320370 320380 320310 320330 320360
Outdoor equipment and supplies	*1980-2010*: 320410	*1986-2010*: 320410
Televisions	*1980-2004*: 310110 310120 310130 *2005-2010*: 310140	*1986-2004*: 310110 310120 310130 *2005-2010*: 310140
Audio equipment	*1980-2010*: 480214 310311 310313 310315 310320 490502 *2005-2010*: 310314 *1980-1998*: 310312 *1996-2010*: 310333 *1980-1995*: 310330 *1980-1993*: 480211 490500	*1986-2010*: 480214 310311 310312 310313 310315 310320 310331 310332 *2005-2010*: 310314
Recording media	*1980-2010*: 310220 *1980-2004*: 310341 310342 *2005-2010*: 310340	*1986-2010*: 310340 310220
Photographic equipment	*1980-2010*: 610230	*1986-2010*: 610230 610903
Sporting equipment, supplies, guns, and ammunition	*1980-2010*: 600142 600144 600210 600410 600420 600430 610120 *1980-1993*: 610900 *1994-2010*: 600901 600902	*1986-2010*: 600130 600210 600410 600420 600430 600901 610120 610901
Bicycles and accessories	*1980-2010*: 600310	*1986-2010*: 600310
Pleasure boats	*1980-2010*: 600121 600132 600110 600138 600127	*1986-2010*: 600120 600130 600110
Other recreational vehicles	*1980-2010*: 600122 600128 *1980-1993*: 600131 600137 *1994-2010*: 600141 600143	(none)
Recreational books	*1980-2010*: 590220 590230 660310	*1986-2010*: 590220 590230 660310
Musical instruments	*1980-2010*: 610130	*1986-2010*: 610130
Jewelry and watches	*1980-2010*: 430110 430120	*1986-2010*: 430110 430120
Telephone and facsimile equipment	*1980-2010*: 320232 690210	*1986-2010*: 320232 690210

PCE Category	Interview Survey UCCs	Diary Survey UCCs
Nondurable goods		
Food purchased for off-premises consumption	*1980-2006*: 790220 790230 *2007-2010*: 790240	*1980-2010*: 010110 010120 010210 010310 010320 020110 020210 020510 020610 020810 020310 020410 020620 020710 020820 030110 030210 030310 030410 030510 030610 030710 030810 040110 040210 040310 040510 040410 040610 050110 050210 050310 050410 050900 060110 060210 060310 070110 070230 070240 090110 090210 100210 100410 100510 160310 080110 160320 160211 160212 100110 160110 110110 110210 110310 110410 110510 120110 120210 120310 120410 130310 140110 140210 140220 140230 140320 140330 140340 140310 130320 150110 150211 150212 150310 180210 180220 180110 180310 180320 180410 180420 180510 180520 180620 180710 180611 180612 *1994-2010*: 070210 070220 130120 130210 160210 180610
Nonalcoholic beverages purchased for off-premises consumption		*1980-2010*: 170520 170310 170410 130121 140410 140420 130122 130110 170110 170210 170510 170531 170532 130211 130212 *2007-2010*: 170533 *2006-2010*: 170530 *1980-1994*: 480211 *1995-2010*: 480213
Alcoholic beverages purchased for off-premises consumption	*1980-2006*: 790310 790320 *2007-2010*: 790330	*1980-2010*: 200210 200410 200533 200310 200523 200111 200513 200112
Women's and girls' clothing	*1980-2010*: 380110 380210 380311 380312 380313 380320 380331 380332 380340 380410 380420 380430 380510 380901 380902 380903 390110 390120 390210 390221 390222 390230 390310 390321 390322 390901 390902 *1980-2006*: 380331 380332 390221 390222 *2007-2010*: 380333 390223	*1986-2010*: 380110 380210 380311 380312 380313 380320 380331 380332 380340 380410 380420 380430 380510 380901 380902 390110 390120 390210 390221 390222 390230 390310 390321 390322 390901 *1980-2006*: 380331 380332 390221 390222 *2007-2010*: 380333 390223

PCE Category	Interview Survey UCCs	Diary Survey UCCs
Men's and boys' clothing	*1980-2010*: 360110 360120 360210 360311 360312 360320 360330 360340 360350 360410 360511 360512 360901 360902 370110 370120 370130 370211 370212 370213 370220 370311 370312 370313 370902 *1980-2006*: 360511 360512 370312 370313 *2007-2010*: 360513 370314 *1980-1994*: 370901 *1995-2010*: 370903 370904	*1986-2010*: 360110 360120 360210 360311 360312 360320 360330 360340 360350 360410 360511 360512 360901 370110 370120 370130 370211 370212 370213 370220 370311 370312 370313 370901 370904 *1986-2006*: 360511 360512 370312 370313 *2007-2010*: 360513 370314
Clothing materials	*1980-2010*: 420110 420120	*1986-2010*: 420110 420120
Shoes and other footwear	*1980-2010*: 400110 400210 400310 400220	*1986-2010*: 400110 400210 400310 400220
Gasoline and other energy goods	*1980-2010*: 470111 470112 470113 470211 470212 470220 250111 250112 250113 250114 250211 250212 250213 250214 250901 250902 250903 250904 250911 250912 250913 250914 250221 250222 250223 250224	*1980-1981, 1986-2010*: 470111 470112 470114 470211 470220 250110 250210 250900 250220
Pets and related products	*1980-2010*: 610320	*1986-2010*: 610310 610320
Film and photographic supplies	*1980-2010*: 610210	*1986-2010*: 610210 610220
Household cleaning products	*1980-2010*: 330511 *1980-1998*: 990910	*1980-2010*: 320140 330110 330210 330610 330510
Household paper products	(none)	*1980-2010*: 330310
Household linens	*1980-2010*: 280110 280120 280130 280220 280900 320904	*1986-2010*: 280110 280120 280130 280220 280900 320904
Sewing items	*1980-2010*: 280230	*1986-2010*: 280230
Personal care products	*1980-2010*: 320130 640130 640420	*1985-2010*: 640110 640120 640130 640210 640220 640410 640310 640420 *1986-2010*: 320130
Tobacco	*1980-2010*: 630110 630210	*1980-2010*: 630110 630210 630900 630220
Newspapers and periodicals	*1980-2010*: 590310 590410 *1980-1993*: 590110 590210 *1994-2010*: 590111 590112 590211 590212	*1986-2010*: 590110 590210 590900
Services		
Rent and utilities	*1980-2010*: 800710 210110 230121 230141 230150 240111 240121 240211 240221 240311 240321 320611 320621 270211 270212 270213 270214 270411 270412 270413 270414 260111 260112 260113 260114 260211 260212 260213 260214 *1980-1998*: 230131 *1999-2010*: 230134 320163 *1980-1993*: 230111	*1986-2010*: 800710 210110 270210 270410 260110 260210 270905
Imputed rental of owner-occupied nonfarm housing	*1980-2010*: 910060 910070 *1980-2006*: 910100 *2007-2010*: 910101 910102 910103 *1993-2010*: 910050	(none)

PCE Category	Interview Survey UCCs	Diary Survey UCCs
Other motor vehicle services	*1980-2010*: 450312 450412 520511 520512 520521 520522 520902 520905 520904 620907 520541 520542 *1980-1993*: 620907 *1994-2010*: 620921 620922 *1980-1990*: 520530 620902 *1991-2010*: 520531 520532 620909 620919 450310 450313 450314 450410 450413 450414	*1986-2010*: 450310 450410 520511 520521 520902 520904 520531 520541
Cable and satellite television and radio services	*1980-2010*: 270310 270311	*1986-2010*: 270310 270311
Photo processing	*1980-2010*: 620330	*1986-2010*: 620330
Photo studios	*1999-2010*: 620320	*1980-2010*: 620320
Gambling	*2001-2010*: 620926	*2001-2010*: 620926 *1984-2000*: 620911 *1980-1981*: 620901
Veterinary and other services for pets	*1980-2010*: 620410 620420	*1986-2010*: 620410 620420
Purchased meals and beverages	*1980-2010*: 190901 190902 190903 790410 790420 790430 200900	*1998-2010*: 190111 190211 190311 190321 190911 190921 190112 190212 190312 190322 190912 190922 190113 190213 190313 190323 190913 190923 190114 190214 190314 190324 190914 190924 190115 190215 190315 190325 190915 190925 190116 190216 19031 190326 190916 190926 200511 200512 200516 200521 200522 200526 200531 200532 200536 *1980-1997*: 190110 190210 190310 190320 190901 190902 200510 200520 200530
Food supplied to civilians	*1980-2010*: 800700	*1986-2010*: 800700
Communication	*1980-2010*: 270104 620930 310350 690116 270105 690114 *1980-2005*: 270103 *2005-2010*: 310240 *1980-1997*: 270510 270610 *1980-1990*: 270000 *1991-2010*: 270101 270102	*1986-2010*: 270000 340110 340120 310241 310242 620930 310351 310352 690116 690114
Legal services	*1980-2010*: 680110	*1986-2010*: 680110
Accounting and other business services	*1980-2010*: 680902 001400 680903	*1986-2010*: 680902 680903
Funeral and burial services	*1980-2010*: 680140 680901	*1986-2010*: 680140 680901
Personal care services	*1980-2010*: 440150 620115 *1980-1998*: 650110 650210 650900 *2005-2010*: 680904 *1999-2010*: 650310	*1980-2010*: 650900 650110 650210 *1986-2010*: 440150 *2005-2010*: 680904
Repair and hire of footwear	*1980-2010*: 440110	*1986-2010*: 440110
Child care	*1980-1992*: 340210 *1993-2010*: 340211 340212	*1986-2010*: 340210

PCE Category	Interview Survey UCCs	Diary Survey UCCs
Household maintenance	*1980-2010*: 340310 340510 440900 340630 340620 230142 340901 340907 990900 270901 270902 270903 270904 340420 340903 340914 340911 340912 790640 340915 340410	*1986-2010*: 340310 340510 440900 340630 340620 230140 340901 340907 340913 270900 340903 340410

Notes: UCC refers to Universal Classification Code, which denotes a detailed expenditure category in the Interview or Diary Survey. Many of these spending categories contain only a few UCCs in the Diary in years before 1986. For those categories, we do not list the pre-1986 UCCs. See the Data Appendix for details.

Appendix Table 2: Aggregate Consumer Expenditure (CE) Interview and Diary Survey and Personal Consumption Expenditures (PCE), 1986-2010 [In millions of dollars]

	2010					2006					2001				
PCE category	**PCE**	**CE DS**	**CE IS**	**DS/ PCE**	**IS/ PCE**	**PCE**	**CE DS**	**CE IS**	**DS/ PCE**	**IS/ PCE**	**PCE**	**CE DS**	**CE IS**	**DS/ PCE**	**IS/ PCE**
Total durables, nondurables, and services															
Total	$9,965,306					$9,061,022					$6,962,603				
Comparable items (# of categories differ for Interview and Diary)		2,315,529	3,998,836	0.57	0.74		2,305,155	3,919,463	0.62	0.78		1,786,178	2,986,027	0.62	0.75
Durable goods															
Total durable goods	1,085,484					1,154,973					946,347				
Comparable durable goods (# of categories differ for IS and DS)		184,531	376,802	.38	.53		225,679	497,289	.43	.61		195,895	405,552	.49	.60
New motor vehicles	178,464		171,450		.96	233,047		248,551		1.07	230,018		214,367		.93
Motor vehicle accessories and parts	26,558		23,474		.88	27,316		18,729		.69	25,281		15,091		.60
Furniture and furnishings	140,960	61,010	61,859	.43	.44	160,233	75,975	80,770	.47	.50	124,482	70,966	62,428	.57	.50
Household appliances	40,536	27,323	30,034	.67	.74	44,601	31,840	31,439	.71	.70	35,739	28,145	22,261	.79	.62
Glassware, tableware, and household utensils	41,545	11,822	3,402	.28	.08	43,295	14,617	4,071	.34	.09	37,115	12,075	3,359	.33	.09
Televisions	37,407	11,730	14,379	.31	.38	34,515	18,759	15,496	.54	.45	16,669	5,708	8,511	.34	.51
Audio equipment	19,019	5,703	3,086	.30	.16	22,414	5,566	4,554	.25	.20	17,944	9,419	3,796	.52	.21
Recording media	33,077	6,892	4,985	.21	.15	37,331	11,881	8,940	.32	.24	36,179	11,171	7,722	.31	.21
Photographic equipment	2,844	3,860	2,937	1.36	1.03	5,501	3,318	3,870	.60	.70	3,638	3,363	2,379	.92	.65
Sporting equipment, supplies, guns, and ammunition	53,258	12,733	16,422	.24	.31	54,416	15,923	19,590	.29	.36	41,266	15,959	14,862	.39	.36
Bicycles and accessories	4,257	2,338	1,868	.55	.44	3,734	1,330	1,551	.36	.42	3,030	2,244	1,167	.74	.39
Pleasure boats	9,779		6,960		.71	14,248		13,670		.96	10,687		7,530		.70
Other recreational vehicles	9,580		5,245		.55	15,055		11,946		.79	11,471		12,963		1.13
Recreational books	30,412	4,079	5,582	.13	.18	28,854	6,086	6,364	.21	.22	24,749	3,914	6,242	.16	.25
Musical instruments	4,939	1,845	1,848	.37	.37	5,641	3,126	1,862	.55	.33	4,932	2,050	2,795	.42	.57
Jewelry and watches	61,485	26,774	14,320	.44	.23	62,334	24,431	17,404	.39	.28	47,577	16,776	13,687	.35	.29
Telephone and facsimile equipment	13,991	3,941	4,126	.28	.29	11,606	4,069	2,577	.35	.22	5,839	4,120	1,750	.71	.30
Nondurable goods															
Total nondurable goods	2,301,517					2,069,760					1,587,659				
Comparable nondurable goods (# of categories differ for IS and DS)		1,008,380	1,018,800	.60	.70		1,012,313	980,841	.66	.73		748,694	741,935	.63	.72
Food and nonalc. beverages purchased for off-premises consumption	659,382	432,541	568,134	.66	.86	582,168	400,248	514,347	.69	.88	482,228	335,712	416,927	.70	.86
Alcoholic beverages purchased for off-premises consumption	106,649	27,016	23,452	.25	.22	91,609	31,324	24,134	.34	.26	77,193	22,782	18,697	.30	.24
Women's and girls' clothing	161,192	80,450	49,737	.50	.31	158,903	90,353	56,748	.57	.36	132,134	72,636	57,615	.55	.44
Men's and boys' clothing	95,480	44,532	31,585	.47	.33	93,907	53,735	36,126	.57	.38	83,203	43,697	39,438	.53	.47
Clothing materials	4,203	1,227	687	.29	.16	4,303	2,196	644	.51	.15	4,218	1,102	504	.26	.12
Shoes and other footwear	59,334	36,679	17,896	.62	.30	56,606	36,058	18,573	.64	.33	46,092	33,311	13,791	.72	.30
Gasoline and other energy goods	354,117	256,573	275,691	.72	.78	335,246	269,741	281,553	.80	.84	183,583	143,247	153,922	.78	.84
Pets and related products	50,068	28,401		.57		39,084	22,332		.57		27,309	14,259		.52	
Household cleaning products	41,287	47,597		1.15		38,426	47,043		1.22		30,764	35,533		1.16	
Household paper products	40,325	12,502		.31		35,449	11,848		.33		26,353	8,317		.32	
Household linens	24,288	10,767	7,070	.44	.29	25,553	15,872	8,695	.62	.34	23,882	10,903	6,205	.46	.26
Sewing items	1,213	1,038	1,154	.86	.95	1,229	726	1,432	.59	1.16	1,285	833	1,061	.65	.83
Tobacco	94,357	29,057	43,395	.31	.46	72,281	30,837	38,589	.43	.53	69,705	26,362	33,776	.38	.48
Services - household consumption expenditures															
Total services	6,578,305					5,836,289					4,428,597				
Comparable services (# of categories differ for IS and DS)		1,122,618	2,603,234	.60	.83		1,067,163	2,441,333	.65	.87		841,589	1,838,540	.66	.85
Rent and utilities	668,759	533,202	632,560	.80	.95	553,313	466,860	558,834	.84	1.01	443,912	399,549	425,357	.90	.96
Imputed rental of owner-occupied nonfarm housing	1,203,053		1,281,521		1.07	1,111,028		1,292,026		1.16	829,759		960,176		1.16
Other motor vehicle services	58,612		33,654		.57	60,112		46,253		.77	60,943		48,036		.79
Cable and satellite television and radio services	79,524	64,014	77,063	.80	.97	63,722	56,165	64,038	.88	1.00	44,540	35,923	39,013	.81	.88
Photo processing	2,388	1,456	1,383		.58	2,912	1,896	2,125	.65	.73	6,060	2,524	3,115	.42	.51
Photo studios	7,089	2,009	2,527	.28	.36	7,050	4,044	2,667	.57	.38	6,635	1,732	2,139	.26	.32
Gambling	99,578	9,517	6,288	.10	.06	101,052	8,422	6,414	.08	.06	69,990	5,155	6,362	.07	.09
Veterinary and other services for pets	25,669	19,101	17,401	.74	.68	21,490	20,601	15,185	.96	.71	14,541	8,474	9,451	.58	.65
Purchased meals and beverages	533,078	270,810	281,323	.51	.53	477,001	294,234	211,876	.62	.44	359,567	226,785	167,551	.63	.47
Communication	223,385	153,300	178,771	.69	.80	195,215	144,195	151,125	.74	.77	165,481	101,759	110,862	.61	.67
Legal services	96,788	6,573	15,590	.07	.16	91,705	5,152	18,893	.06	.21	70,075	10,274	12,094	.15	.17
Accounting and other business services	27,745	15,921	7,934	.57	.29	26,604	10,264	7,410	.39	.28	18,569	6,953	6,158	.37	.33
Funeral and burial services	19,048	1,365	11,442	.07	.60	18,580	7,770	9,133	.42	.49	17,132	418	8,850	.02	.52
Repair and hire of footwear	457	416	187		.41	441	279	163	.63	.37	461	449	169	.97	.37
Child care	30,309	9,270	9,629	.31	.32	25,592	10,499	9,576	.41	.37	19,924	7,365	7,145	.37	.36
Household maintenance	55,216	35,664	45,961	.65	.83	57,656	36,782	45,617	.64	.79	47,202	34,229	32,062	.73	.68

Notes: Data are from the Interview and Diary Consumer Expenditure Surveys and the U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis. Reported categories are only those where the CE and PCE are most comparable. Comparable categories follows Passero (2011).

Appendix Table 2 (Continued): Aggregate Consumer Expenditure (CE) Interview and Diary Survey and Personal Consumption Expenditures (PCE), 1986-2010 [In millions of dollars]

	1996					1991					1986				
PCE category	**PCE**	**CE DS**	**CE IS**	**DS/ PCE**	**IS/ PCE**	**PCE**	**CE DS**	**CE IS**	**DS/ PCE**	**IS/ PCE**	**PCE**	**CE DS**	**CE IS**	**DS/ PCE**	**IS/ PCE**
Total durables, nondurables, and services															
Total	$5,157,893					$3,895,828					$2,841,379				
Comparable items (# of categories differ for Interview and Diary)		1,513,763	2,298,763	0.68	0.78		1,239,830	1,864,751	0.69	0.81		900,434	1,502,609	0.66	0.85
Durable goods															
Total durable goods	676,297					477,185					421,440				
Comparable durable goods (# of categories differ for IS and DS)		175,664	331,171	.61	.69		150,334	276,680	.69	.78		83,907	293,296	.47	.88
New motor vehicles	152,971		149,602		.98	112,903		126,430		1.12	134,047		154,574		1.15
Motor vehicle accessories and parts	21,608		15,145		.70	13,757		8,262		.60	11,446		7,065		.62
Furniture and furnishings	88,322	66,124	51,246	.75	.58	67,120	61,505	44,812	.92	.67	59,392	26,928	45,494	.45	.77
Household appliances	26,798	20,714	20,125	.77	.75	23,262	14,074	15,875	.61	.68	21,243	10,689	17,644	.50	.83
Glassware, tableware, and household utensils	24,772	8,966	3,222	.36	.13	18,537	9,233	3,077	.50	.17	15,142	5,653	2,983	.37	.20
Televisions	12,211	5,689	7,365	.47	.60	10,894	4,456	6,275	.41	.58	11,635	3,772	6,741	.32	.58
Audio equipment	13,750	8,963	5,387	.65	.39	9,184	3,722	10,466	.41	1.14	7,247	2,480	10,290	.34	1.42
Recording media	21,785	11,280	7,222	.52	.33	15,057	5,242	5,198	.35	.35	10,429	2,923	3,246	.28	.31
Photographic equipment	3,018	2,172	1,483	.72	.49	2,582	1,512	1,306	.59	.51	2,997	1,488	1,812	.50	.60
Sporting equipment, supplies, guns, and ammunition	28,529	16,658	14,329	.58	.50	20,452	11,645	10,418	.57	.51	13,147	6,329	7,420	.48	.56
Bicycles and accessories	3,029	2,212	1,458	.73	.48	2,531	2,279	1,799	.90	.71	2,114	978	1,195	.46	.57
Pleasure boats	7,096		10,532		1.48	4,428		8,410		1.90	4,828		4,909		1.02
Other recreational vehicles	8,728		15,282		1.75	6,051		8,626		1.43	5,446		7,235		1.33
Recreational books	18,116	3,837	5,884	.21	.32	11,041	3,763	5,400	.34	.49	7,771	3,104	4,127	.40	.53
Musical instruments	3,090	1,255	2,088	.41	.68	2,175	926	1,501	.43	.69	1,606	271	2,586	.17	1.61
Jewelry and watches	39,892	15,497	14,531	.39	.36	30,192	18,406	13,449	.61	.45	24,333	13,354	11,329	.55	.47
Telephone and facsimile equipment	3,389	2,505	1,924	.74	.57	1,874	5,892	1,742	3.14	.93	1,256	1,286	1,089	1.02	.87
Nondurable goods															
Total nondurable goods	1,241,376					1,020,250					774,189				
Comparable nondurable goods (# of categories differ for IS and DS)		662,452	626,730	.68	.73		567,248	567,088	.69	.78		424,127	437,329	.66	.77
Food and nonalc. beverages purchased for off-premises consumption	402,756	293,747	352,599	.73	.88	351,488	254,569	315,644	.72	.90	273,849	184,751	217,242	.67	.79
Alcoholic beverages purchased for off-premises consumption	58,676	18,864	14,735	.32	.25	50,858	15,524	12,861	.31	.25	41,670	13,899	14,252	.33	.34
Women's and girls' clothing	111,410	74,803	51,325	.67	.46	96,473	68,356	51,308	.71	.53	77,933	49,664	43,353	.64	.56
Men's and boys' clothing	75,838	45,019	36,018	.59	.47	59,392	39,859	31,409	.67	.53	44,884	30,115	26,207	.67	.58
Clothing materials	3,379	1,297	799	.38	.24	3,634	2,190	1,130	.60	.31	3,057	652	1,059	.21	.35
Shoes and other footwear	39,496	31,027	14,469	.79	.37	31,328	23,592	14,194	.75	.45	24,464	15,689	11,896	.64	.49
Gasoline and other energy goods	144,745	115,860	123,743	.80	.85	121,129	92,737	108,113	.77	.89	91,191	76,406	96,671	.84	1.06
Pets and related products	20,209	15,019		.74		14,070	9,760		.69		10,021	6,914		.69	
Household cleaning products	26,344	28,057		1.07		20,505	24,446		1.19		18,156	16,993		.94	
Household paper products	19,723	7,003		.36		15,376	5,741		.37		11,295	4,087		.36	
Household linens	21,161	9,321	5,434	.44	.26	14,582	7,232	4,591	.50	.31	11,020	6,102	4,077	.55	.37
Sewing items	1,040	825	1,398	.79	1.34	699	1,555	1,040	2.22	1.49	574	1,224	1,030	2.13	1.79
Tobacco	51,419	21,610	26,209	.42	.51	42,409	21,687	26,798	.51	.63	32,157	17,631	21,543	.55	.67
Services - household consumption expenditures															
Total services	3,240,220					2,398,393					1,645,750				
Comparable services (# of categories differ for IS and DS)		675,647	1,340,862	.70	.87		522,248	1,020,983	.69	.87		392,400	771,984	.72	.92
Rent and utilities	358,225	320,550	345,125	.89	.96	291,385	260,557	276,771	.89	.95	225,758	187,547	217,782	.83	.96
Imputed rental of owner-occupied nonfarm housing	592,467		639,125		1.08	436,687		474,196			304,497		340,934		
Other motor vehicle services	42,622		36,376		.85	15,010		12,946		.86	9,552		7,701		.81
Cable and satellite television and radio services	27,400	23,108	24,677	.84	.90	19,269	13,415	17,633	.70	.92	10,533	4,966	10,032	.47	.95
Photo processing	6,377	2,590	2,993	.41	.47	5,466	1,862	2,750	.34	.50	4,110	1,558	2,265	.38	.55
Photo studios	6,455	2,431		.38		4,867	1,350		.28		3,381	709		.21	
Gambling	50,291	6,279		.12		24,664	4,298		.17		15,516	3,458		.22	
Veterinary and other services for pets	9,816	7,411	6,843	.75	.70	5,554	5,203	5,675	.94	1.02	3,660	2,909	3,578	.79	.98
Purchased meals and beverages	279,515	163,818	143,572	.59	.51	237,257	137,351	119,041	.58	.50	161,472	116,882	104,439	.72	.65
Communication	104,928	84,820	81,545	.81	.78	71,996	59,018	60,507	.82	.84	55,600	41,837	44,260	.75	.80
Legal services	50,608	11,179	11,074	.22	.22	41,751	3,339	8,484	.08	.20	27,348	2,858	7,155	.10	.26
Accounting and other business services	10,995	9,190	4,787	.84	.44	7,089	6,253	4,561	.88	.64	3,729	11,137	3,192	2.99	.86
Funeral and burial services	12,721	13,369	11,311	1.05	.89	10,114	2,229	7,268	.22	.72	7,091	1,270	5,824	.18	.82
Repair and hire of footwear	482	434	270	.90	.56	622	445	407	.72	.65	449	296	351	.66	.78
Child care	14,412	7,462	7,696	.52	.53	10,948	7,874	7,528	.72	.69	7,983	8,081	7,126	1.01	.89
Household maintenance	35,817	23,006	25,465	.64	.71	24,732	19,054	23,215	.77	.94	20,539	8,892	17,347	.43	.84

Notes: Data are from the Interview and Diary Consumer Expenditure Surveys and the U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis. Reported categories are only those where the CE and PCE are most comparable. Comparable categories follows Passero (2011).

Appendix Table 3: Comparison of Vehicle Ownership in the CE Interview Survey to Motor Vehicle Registrations (in millions), 1972-2010

	1972	1987	1992	1997	2002
Trucks					
CE Survey	10.1	33.2	42.5	56.1	69.6
Vehicle Inventory and Use Survey					
Personal Transportation as Major Use	8.1	29.3	40.4	50.9	65.3
Personal Transportation as Primary Operator Classification	NA	29.3	41.1	51.8	65.3
Mixed Personal Transportation and Business as Primary Operator Classification	NA	0.5	1.2	1.4	NA
Owner/Operator as Primary Operator Classification	NA	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.5
All Three as Primary Operator Classification	NA	30.0	42.5	53.3	65.9
Ratio of CES to PT as Major Use	1.244	1.135	1.051	1.101	1.065
Ratio of CES to PT as POC	NA	1.133	1.035	1.083	1.065
Ratio of CES to All Three as POC	NA	1.107	1.002	1.051	1.056

Notes: See notes to 2a.

Appendix Table 4: Coefficient of Variation by Spending Category, Consumer Expenditure (CE) Interview and Diary Survey, 1987-2010

	2010			2006			2001		
PCE category	**CE DS**	**CE IS**	**DS/ IS**	**CE DS**	**CE IS**	**DS/ IS**	**CE DS**	**CE IS**	**DS/ IS**
Durable goods									
New motor vehicles		12.34			8.39			8.48	
Motor vehicle accessories and parts		4.68			5.34			5.41	
Furniture and furnishings	14.67	10.37	1.42	13.54	10.32	1.31	12.01	11.24	1.07
Household appliances	19.05	8.58	2.22	16.27	6.11	2.66	14.09	7.11	1.98
Glassware, tableware, and household utensils	6.32	8.59	0.74	7.42	7.80	0.95	12.83	8.52	1.51
Televisions	17.32	8.84	1.96	28.29	9.49	2.98	30.58	11.31	2.70
Audio equipment	16.32	10.06	1.62	14.15	10.64	1.33	27.92	11.36	2.46
Recording media	9.40	5.99	1.57	5.70	5.14	1.11	6.23	5.15	1.21
Photographic equipment	26.27	11.81	2.22	24.83	9.64	2.58	24.59	11.52	2.14
Sporting equipment, supplies, guns, and ammunition	14.03	8.84	1.59	17.16	13.98	1.23	24.61	11.04	2.23
Bicycles and accessories	29.65	17.68	1.68	30.51	18.03	1.69	33.54	15.97	2.10
Pleasure boats		80.78			47.90			41.06	
Other recreational vehicles		55.97			84.70			52.60	
Recreational books	8.91	6.20	1.44	7.19	5.28	1.36	9.35	5.74	1.63
Musical instruments	47.55	23.02	2.07	56.66	18.82	3.01	72.70	24.30	2.99
Jewelry and watches	35.99	12.43	2.90	20.80	12.30	1.69	14.55	12.70	1.15
Telephone and facsimile equipment	19.26	8.57	2.25	15.50	7.27	2.13	14.12	8.21	1.72
Nondurable goods									
Food and nonalc. beverages purchased for off-premises consumption	1.81	0.93	1.93	1.41	1.20	1.18	1.70	1.04	1.64
Alcoholic beverages purchased for off-premises consumption	4.46	4.45	1.00	5.12	5.54	0.92	4.08	4.49	0.91
Women's and girls' clothing	4.79	3.69	1.30	3.22	3.93	0.82	4.20	4.14	1.01
Men's and boys' clothing	5.31	4.78	1.11	5.10	3.51	1.46	5.73	4.43	1.29
Clothing materials	12.39	17.96	0.69	22.00	21.25	1.04	14.99	15.64	0.96
Shoes and other footwear	5.06	3.10	1.63	4.70	3.00	1.57	5.18	4.64	1.12
Gasoline and other energy goods	2.19	1.73	1.27	1.80	1.56	1.15	2.06	1.73	1.19
Pets and related products	6.56			4.62			5.24		
Household cleaning products	3.60			3.36			5.00		
Household paper products	3.37			2.54			2.99		
Household linens	6.18	4.93	1.26	6.91	6.74	1.03	6.95	7.04	0.99
Sewing items	30.73	15.88	1.93	14.54	13.50	1.08	18.55	12.35	1.50
Tobacco	6.04	5.48	1.10	4.90	4.05	1.21	3.69	5.51	0.67
Services - household consumption expenditures									
Rent and utilities	3.80	2.20	1.72	3.49	1.94	1.80	3.29	2.28	1.44
Imputed rental of owner-occupied nonfarm housing		2.08			2.14			3.02	
Other motor vehicle services		7.52			7.61			8.40	
Cable and satellite television and radio services	4.14	1.63	2.54	3.77	2.47	1.53	3.91	2.24	1.75
Photo processing	13.81	9.22	1.50	10.01	7.68	1.30	11.74	5.11	2.30
Photo studios	23.57	14.34	1.64	27.39	20.42	1.34	19.14	16.45	1.16
Gambling	43.18	17.33	2.49	17.37	9.39	1.85	15.81	14.79	1.07
Veterinary and other services for pets	10.70	6.75	1.59	13.38	8.35	1.60	12.37	7.80	1.59
Purchased meals and beverages	2.12	2.45	0.87	2.21	3.06	0.72	2.64	2.83	0.93
Communication	2.63	1.52	1.73	2.81	1.37	2.05	3.54	1.74	2.03
Legal services	27.21	16.41	1.66	40.36	20.02	2.02	36.79	12.92	2.85
Accounting and other business services	31.94	9.99	3.20	14.25	11.45	1.25	17.33	12.97	1.34
Funeral and burial services	38.27	17.24	2.22	88.08	18.01	4.89	64.78	14.10	4.59
Repair and hire of footwear	29.79	21.05	1.42	36.57	15.96	2.29	26.49	14.82	1.79
Child care	16.46	19.28	0.85	13.06	12.49	1.05	15.51	18.21	0.85
Household maintenance	12.13	5.52	2.20	10.70	5.02	2.13	15.35	14.71	1.04
Weighted Mean (all categories)	7.07	4.32	1.63	6.40	4.16	1.54	6.53	4.49	1.46
Weighted Mean (comparable categories only)	6.18	3.92	1.58	6.18	4.05	1.52	6.34	4.19	1.51
Median ratio			1.63			1.35			1.49

Notes: Data are from the Interview and Diary Consumer Expenditure Surveys. Spending categories are the same as those reported in Table 2. The unit of observation is a consumer unit-quarter for the Interview Survey and a consumer unit-week for the Diary Survey. The coefficient of variation is the ratio of the standard error of the mean to the mean times the square root of the sample size, where the standard error is calculated using the Balanced Repeated Replication procedure recommend by the BLS for variance estimation in the CE Survey. The weighted means are calculated using as the weights the PCE values for each category for 2010 reported in Table 2.

Appendix Table 4 (Continued): Coefficient of Variation by Spending Category, Consumer Expenditure (CE) Interview and Diary Survey, 1987-2010

		1996			1991			1987	
PCE category	**CE DS**	**CE IS**	**DS/ IS**	**CE DS**	**CE IS**	**DS/ IS**	**CE DS**	**CE IS**	**DS/ IS**
Durable goods									
New motor vehicles		8.82			9.01			9.93	
Motor vehicle accessories and parts		3.85			4.71			5.60	
Furniture and furnishings	9.34	7.66	1.22	14.25	5.61	2.54	15.39	5.42	2.84
Household appliances	15.19	5.33	2.85	18.62	4.82	3.86	19.03	4.55	4.18
Glassware, tableware, and household utensils	7.89	9.27	0.85	20.61	5.60	3.68	9.10	7.25	1.26
Televisions	26.64	8.28	3.22	33.39	8.15	4.10	30.89	8.55	3.61
Audio equipment	21.58	9.55	2.26	22.91	6.16	3.72	18.98	5.52	3.44
Recording media	7.20	4.18	1.73	7.78	3.80	2.05	8.59	4.85	1.77
Photographic equipment	36.30	14.60	2.49	29.77	16.00	1.86	34.23	16.82	2.04
Sporting equipment, supplies, guns, and ammunition	25.13	7.38	3.41	13.33	7.64	1.75	13.86	6.26	2.21
Bicycles and accessories	23.74	16.03	1.48	35.49	14.19	2.50	33.73	10.79	3.13
Pleasure boats		60.25			51.70			30.23	
Other recreational vehicles		86.73			47.25			26.92	
Recreational books	8.24	4.33	1.90	6.89	4.52	1.52	9.41	7.21	1.31
Musical instruments	59.89	22.09	2.71	45.03	22.51	2.00	36.32	27.38	1.33
Jewelry and watches	11.31	9.15	1.24	17.01	8.22	2.07	18.41	8.81	2.09
Telephone and facsimile equipment	15.28	5.19	2.94	18.11	6.51	2.78	14.63	7.63	1.92
Nondurable goods									
Food and nonalc. beverages purchased for off-premises consumption	1.35	0.99	1.36	1.72	1.62	1.06	1.92	1.48	1.30
Alcoholic beverages purchased for off-premises consumption	4.47	4.45	1.00	4.51	4.51	1.00	3.97	3.59	1.10
Women's and girls' clothing	6.20	2.83	2.19	5.26	2.52	2.08	3.74	3.50	1.07
Men's and boys' clothing	6.41	2.42	2.65	4.34	2.84	1.53	5.06	3.27	1.54
Clothing materials	11.97	8.55	1.40	17.92	10.66	1.68	11.60	7.41	1.57
Shoes and other footwear	6.07	2.43	2.50	3.62	3.15	1.15	5.85	2.84	2.06
Gasoline and other energy goods	2.60	1.85	1.41	2.37	1.98	1.20	2.84	1.83	1.55
Pets and related products	13.49			5.68			5.22		
Household cleaning products	2.74			2.86			3.75		
Household paper products	3.51			2.96			2.85		
Household linens	8.39	4.80	1.75	7.66	5.57	1.37	7.08	4.62	1.53
Sewing items	19.37	14.06	1.38	28.75	9.10	3.16	13.69	12.21	1.12
Tobacco	4.55	4.35	1.05	3.75	3.10	1.21	3.23	3.34	0.97
Services - household consumption expenditures									
Rent and utilities	3.37	2.16	1.56	3.44	1.67	2.05	4.07	1.46	2.78
Imputed rental of owner-occupied nonfarm housing		1.76			2.86			2.76	
Other motor vehicle services		7.99			9.98			8.09	
Cable and satellite television and radio services	4.53	2.18	2.07	5.82	3.36	1.73	6.48	3.29	1.97
Photo processing	12.63	3.82	3.31	11.62	5.30	2.19	14.18	4.54	3.12
Photo studios	43.80			20.98			18.01		
Gambling	14.88			10.69			12.69		
Veterinary and other services for pets	9.19	5.62	1.63	9.43	8.52	1.11	13.67	5.79	2.36
Purchased meals and beverages	2.00	2.71	0.74	1.97	2.45	0.81	3.53	2.75	1.28
Communication	3.38	2.17	1.56	2.72	1.90	1.43	4.67	1.91	2.45
Legal services	47.12	12.36	3.81	34.45	18.46	1.87	33.79	25.15	1.34
Accounting and other business services	32.15	7.61	4.23	22.34	9.16	2.44	17.46	15.04	1.16
Funeral and burial services	75.48	15.95	4.73	77.21	15.64	4.94	60.41	16.71	3.61
Repair and hire of footwear	33.98	8.80	3.86	19.89	9.66	2.06	17.92	7.18	2.49
Child care	8.52	13.07	0.65	8.34	9.64	0.87	9.94	9.25	1.07
Household maintenance	8.64	4.82	1.79	9.13	5.94	1.54	13.35	6.82	1.96
Weighted Mean (all categories)	6.69	3.46	1.93	6.30	3.67	1.72	6.71	3.75	1.79
Weighted Mean (comparable categories only)	6.40	3.42	1.87	6.24	3.44	1.82	6.62	3.67	1.80
Median ratio			1.85			1.86			1.92

Notes: Data are from the Interview and Diary Consumer Expenditure Surveys. Spending categories are the same as those reported in Table 2. The unit of observation is a consumer unit-quarter for the Interview Survey and a consumer unit-week for the Diary Survey. The coefficient of variation is the ratio of the standard error of the mean to the mean times the square root of the sample size, where the standard error is calculated using the Balanced Repeated Replication procedure recommend by the BLS for variance estimation in the CE Survey. The weighted means are calculated using as the weights the PCE values for each category for 2010 reported in Table 2.

Appendix Table 5: Diary Response Statistics, Select Years 1986-2010

		2010	2006	2001	1996	1991	1986
(1)	Number of CUs with at least one valid week	7,457	7,557	7,931	5,761	6,319	6,897
(2)	Number of valid week one diaries	7,063	7,101	7,722	5,522	6,001	6,439
(3)	Number of valid week two diaries	7,233	7,354	7,682	5,254	5,918	6,378
(4)	Number of CUs completing diaries for both weeks	6,839	6,898	7,473	5,015	5,600	5,920
(5)	Fraction of all CUs: (4)/(1)	91.7%	91.3%	94.2%	87.1%	88.6%	85.8%
(6)	Number of CUs reporting at least one week of no spending	885	766	572	431	285	472
(7)	Fraction of all CUs: (6)/(1)	11.9%	10.1%	7.2%	7.5%	4.5%	6.8%
(8)	Number of CUs reporting no spending for both weeks	445	343	253	175	106	165
(9)	Fraction of all CUs: (8)/(1)	6.0%	4.5%	3.2%	3.0%	1.7%	2.4%
(10)	Fraction of those completing diaries for both weeks: (8)/(4)	6.5%	5.0%	3.4%	3.5%	1.9%	2.8%
(11)	Number of CUs completing a week one diary that has no spending	689	572	398	298	187	284
(12)	Fraction of week one diaries: (11)/(2)	9.8%	8.1%	5.2%	5.4%	3.1%	4.4%
(13)	Number of CUs completing a week two diary that has no spending	641	537	427	308	204	353
(14)	Fraction of week two diaries: (13)/(3)	8.9%	7.3%	5.6%	5.9%	3.4%	5.5%

Note: A completed diary may have no spending.

Appendix Table 6: Fraction of Consumer Units with Zero Spending by Spending Category, Consumer Expenditure (CE) Interview andDiary Survey, 1986-2010

	2010			2006			2001		
PCE category	**CE DS**	**CE IS**	**DS - IS**	**CE DS**	**CE IS**	**DS - IS**	**CE DS**	**CE IS**	**DS - IS**
Durable goods									
New motor vehicles		0.988			0.982			0.981	
Motor vehicle accessories and parts		0.806			0.814			0.810	
Furniture and furnishings	0.902	0.777	0.126	0.861	0.747	0.114	0.875	0.736	0.138
Household appliances	0.961	0.816	0.146	0.957	0.818	0.139	0.959	0.821	0.138
Glassware, tableware, and household utensils	0.889	0.895	-0.007	0.872	0.889	-0.016	0.902	0.902	0.000
Televisions	0.997	0.957	0.040	0.996	0.956	0.040	0.998	0.960	0.038
Audio equipment	0.987	0.968	0.019	0.984	0.955	0.029	0.986	0.954	0.032
Recording media	0.954	0.811	0.142	0.920	0.727	0.193	0.921	0.723	0.199
Photographic equipment	0.994	0.976	0.018	0.992	0.970	0.022	0.993	0.976	0.017
Sporting equipment, supplies, guns, and ammunition	0.961	0.827	0.134	0.952	0.820	0.132	0.960	0.804	0.156
Bicycles and accessories	0.995	0.983	0.013	0.996	0.985	0.011	0.995	0.985	0.010
Pleasure boats		0.998			0.997			0.998	
Other recreational vehicles		0.999			0.999			0.999	
Recreational books	0.964	0.817	0.148	0.948	0.795	0.153	0.960	0.769	0.191
Musical instruments	0.996	0.987	0.010	0.995	0.986	0.009	0.997	0.980	0.017
Jewelry and watches	0.958	0.894	0.065	0.950	0.880	0.070	0.958	0.877	0.081
Telephone and facsimile equipment	0.989	0.934	0.055	0.987	0.941	0.046	0.987	0.942	0.045
Nondurable goods									
Food and nonalc. beverages purchased for off-premises consumption	0.189	0.012	0.177	0.158	0.012	0.146	0.149	0.012	0.136
Alcoholic beverages purchased for off-premises consumption	0.854	0.674	0.181	0.820	0.673	0.147	0.812	0.672	0.140
Women's and girls' clothing	0.795	0.531	0.264	0.759	0.498	0.260	0.795	0.471	0.324
Men's and boys' clothing	0.862	0.623	0.239	0.835	0.597	0.238	0.863	0.569	0.293
Clothing materials	0.983	0.972	0.011	0.976	0.971	0.004	0.977	0.965	0.012
Shoes and other footwear	0.890	0.674	0.216	0.884	0.646	0.238	0.888	0.671	0.217
Gasoline and other energy goods	0.362	0.095	0.267	0.310	0.098	0.213	0.308	0.107	0.201
Pets and related products	0.812			0.794			0.830		
Household cleaning products	0.591			0.546			0.581		
Household paper products	0.765			0.732			0.747		
Household linens	0.927	0.823	0.104	0.904	0.814	0.090	0.922	0.840	0.082
Sewing items	0.990	0.965	0.024	0.986	0.961	0.025	0.990	0.957	0.032
Tobacco	0.858	0.792	0.067	0.808	0.774	0.034	0.803	0.755	0.048
Services - household consumption expenditures									
Rent and utilities	0.720	0.024	0.696	0.721	0.020	0.701	0.712	0.031	0.681
Imputed rental of owner-occupied nonfarm housing		0.341			0.325			0.333	
Other motor vehicle services		0.750			0.737			0.764	
Cable and satellite television and radio services	0.895	0.253	0.641	0.880	0.268	0.612	0.873	0.323	0.550
Photo processing	0.985	0.931	0.054	0.976	0.884	0.092	0.971	0.784	0.187
Photo studios	0.994	0.977	0.018	0.991	0.974	0.017	0.992	0.963	0.029
Gambling	0.955	0.898	0.057	0.942	0.873	0.069	0.961	0.847	0.114
Veterinary and other services for pets	0.978	0.859	0.119	0.975	0.873	0.102	0.981	0.874	0.107
Purchased meals and beverages	0.304	0.194	0.110	0.247	0.185	0.062	0.276	0.171	0.104
Communication	0.729	0.055	0.674	0.695	0.048	0.648	0.707	0.043	0.664
Legal services	0.997	0.974	0.023	0.997	0.974	0.023	0.997	0.967	0.029
Accounting and other business services	0.980	0.944	0.036	0.977	0.944	0.033	0.972	0.939	0.033
Funeral and burial services	0.999	0.987	0.012	0.999	0.983	0.015	0.999	0.974	0.026
Repair and hire of footwear	0.997	0.990	0.007	0.998	0.990	0.009	0.996	0.986	0.010
Child care	0.990	0.974	0.016	0.988	0.969	0.019	0.984	0.967	0.017
Household maintenance	0.955	0.714	0.240	0.951	0.716	0.235	0.940	0.736	0.204
Mean difference			0.133			0.128			0.138
Median difference			0.065			0.069			0.082

Notes: Data are from the Interview and Diary Consumer Expenditure Surveys. Spending categories are the same as those reported in Table 2. The unit of observation is a consumer unit-quarter for the Interview Survey and a consumer unit-week for the Diary Survey.

Appendix Table 6 (Continued): Fraction of Consumer Units with Zero Spending by Spending Category, Consumer Expenditure (CE) Interview and Diary Survey, 1986-2010

	1996			1991			1986		
PCE category	**CE DS**	**CE IS**	**DS - IS**	**CE DS**	**CE IS**	**DS - IS**	**CE DS**	**CE IS**	**DS - IS**
Durable goods									
New motor vehicles		0.983			0.980			0.970	
Motor vehicle accessories and parts		0.768			0.875			0.874	
Furniture and furnishings	0.874	0.707	0.167	0.880	0.688	0.192	0.901	0.667	0.233
Household appliances	0.965	0.800	0.165	0.968	0.799	0.169	0.971	0.783	0.189
Glassware, tableware, and household utensils	0.901	0.882	0.019	0.892	0.867	0.025	0.901	0.846	0.055
Televisions	0.997	0.957	0.040	0.998	0.959	0.039	0.997	0.950	0.046
Audio equipment	0.988	0.939	0.049	0.991	0.777	0.213	0.989	0.750	0.239
Recording media	0.917	0.677	0.240	0.942	0.703	0.239	0.963	0.768	0.194
Photographic equipment	0.995	0.979	0.016	0.995	0.976	0.019	0.996	0.969	0.026
Sporting equipment, supplies, guns, and ammunition	0.953	0.759	0.194	0.948	0.767	0.181	0.955	0.773	0.183
Bicycles and accessories	0.994	0.980	0.014	0.995	0.974	0.021	0.995	0.975	0.020
Pleasure boats		0.998			0.996			0.996	
Other recreational vehicles		0.998			0.997			0.996	
Recreational books	0.949	0.726	0.223	0.944	0.715	0.229	0.944	0.716	0.228
Musical instruments	0.998	0.978	0.020	0.995	0.977	0.018	0.996	0.975	0.021
Jewelry and watches	0.953	0.833	0.120	0.940	0.799	0.140	0.947	0.779	0.168
Telephone and facsimile equipment	0.991	0.930	0.061	0.981	0.938	0.042	0.993	0.951	0.042
Nondurable goods									
Food and nonalc. beverages purchased for off-premises consumption	0.121	0.007	0.115	0.090	0.008	0.082	0.117	0.009	0.108
Alcoholic beverages purchased for off-premises consumption	0.804	0.644	0.160	0.810	0.635	0.175	0.763	0.572	0.191
Women's and girls' clothing	0.769	0.399	0.370	0.722	0.377	0.345	0.734	0.347	0.387
Men's and boys' clothing	0.852	0.513	0.339	0.827	0.502	0.325	0.836	0.479	0.357
Clothing materials	0.976	0.944	0.032	0.963	0.916	0.047	0.966	0.901	0.065
Shoes and other footwear	0.880	0.594	0.286	0.887	0.538	0.349	0.891	0.503	0.388
Gasoline and other energy goods	0.314	0.106	0.209	0.319	0.109	0.210	0.300	0.113	0.187
Pets and related products	0.804			0.784			0.810		
Household cleaning products	0.555			0.495			0.517		
Household paper products	0.697			0.624			0.658		
Household linens	0.930	0.829	0.101	0.928	0.818	0.110	0.937	0.795	0.141
Sewing items	0.985	0.942	0.043	0.976	0.929	0.046	0.978	0.916	0.062
Tobacco	0.769	0.702	0.067	0.735	0.661	0.074	0.662	0.588	0.074
Services - household consumption expenditures									
Rent and utilities	0.714	0.025	0.689	0.629	0.028	0.601	0.708	0.034	0.673
Imputed rental of owner-occupied nonfarm housing		0.361			0.368			0.381	
Other motor vehicle services		0.735			0.748			0.737	
Cable and satellite television and radio services	0.884	0.401	0.483	0.916	0.474	0.442	0.956	0.579	0.377
Photo processing	0.970	0.752	0.218	0.973	0.745	0.229	0.974	0.747	0.227
Photo studios	0.993			0.991			0.993		
Gambling	0.949			0.935			0.948		
Veterinary and other services for pets	0.979	0.866	0.113	0.980	0.865	0.115	0.987	0.867	0.120
Purchased meals and beverages	0.285	0.158	0.127	0.254	0.166	0.088	0.246	0.162	0.084
Communication	0.716	0.040	0.676	0.701	0.050	0.652	0.676	0.061	0.615
Legal services	0.996	0.965	0.031	0.997	0.962	0.035	0.997	0.957	0.041
Accounting and other business services	0.976	0.935	0.040	0.971	0.932	0.040	0.978	0.933	0.045
Funeral and burial services	1.000	0.965	0.034	0.998	0.944	0.054	0.998	0.960	0.039
Repair and hire of footwear	0.996	0.972	0.024	0.994	0.947	0.047	0.993	0.937	0.056
Child care	0.979	0.958	0.021	0.966	0.942	0.024	0.953	0.931	0.022
Household maintenance	0.944	0.737	0.208	0.939	0.725	0.214	0.951	0.720	0.230
Mean difference			0.158			0.161			0.169
Median difference			0.113			0.110			0.120

Notes: Data are from the Interview and Diary Consumer Expenditure Surveys. Spending categories are the same as those reported in Table 2. The unit of observation is a consumer unit-quarter for the Interview Survey and a consumer unit-week for the Diary Survey.

Appendix Table 7: Comparison of Demographic Characteristics, CE Interview Survey and CPS, 1980-2010

	No High School Degree			High School Degree			Some College			College Graduate			Married			Weeks Worked			Hours Worked per Week			Under 18			Under 5			Hispanic Origin			Live in Owned Home		
	CE	CPS	Diff	CE	CPS	Diff	CE	CPS	Diff	CE	CPS	Diff	CE	CPS	Diff	CE	CPS	Diff	CE	CPS	Diff	CE	CPS	Diff	CE	CPS	Diff	CE	CPS	Diff	CE	CPS	Diff
1980	0.319	0.298	0.021	0.333	0.349	-0.016	0.200	0.202	-0.002	0.148	0.151	-0.003	0.643	0.632	0.011	35.345	35.713	-0.368	31.408	31.185	0.223	0.288	0.283	0.005	0.075	0.086	-0.011	.	.	.	0.705	0.725	-0.020
1981	0.293	0.289	0.004	0.340	0.355	-0.015	0.209	0.204	0.004	0.159	0.151	0.007	0.640	0.623	0.017	35.559	35.459	0.100	31.509	30.859	0.651	0.282	0.280	0.002	0.077	0.088	-0.012	.	.	.	0.705	0.720	-0.015
1984	0.263	0.258	0.005	0.342	0.359	-0.017	0.211	0.213	-0.002	0.184	0.170	0.014	0.621	0.607	0.014	35.670	35.300	0.371	31.873	30.526	1.347	0.273	0.268	0.004	0.078	0.092	-0.014	.	.	.	0.689	0.685	0.004
1985	0.264	0.254	0.009	0.328	0.356	-0.028	0.217	0.216	0.000	0.192	0.174	0.018	0.617	0.604	0.013	36.820	36.136	0.684	32.436	31.258	1.178	0.265	0.267	-0.002	0.074	0.091	-0.017	.	.	.	0.688	0.680	0.008
1986	0.261	0.246	0.015	0.339	0.358	-0.019	0.219	0.221	-0.002	0.181	0.175	0.006	0.608	0.603	0.005	37.186	36.348	0.838	32.666	31.525	1.141	0.271	0.266	0.005	0.075	0.091	-0.017	.	.	.	0.679	0.675	0.004
1987	0.248	0.240	0.007	0.351	0.358	-0.007	0.218	0.221	-0.004	0.184	0.180	0.004	0.618	0.604	0.014	37.192	36.867	0.325	32.937	31.988	0.949	0.274	0.264	0.010	0.077	0.091	-0.014	.	.	.	0.675	0.676	-0.001
1988	0.253	0.235	0.018	0.344	0.360	-0.015	0.218	0.221	-0.003	0.185	0.185	0.001	0.614	0.598	0.015	37.350	37.284	0.066	33.174	32.258	0.916	0.269	0.263	0.005	0.075	0.091	-0.016	.	.	.	0.665	0.675	-0.010
1989	0.241	0.230	0.011	0.339	0.355	-0.015	0.226	0.224	0.002	0.194	0.192	0.002	0.612	0.596	0.016	38.129	37.829	0.300	33.855	32.561	1.294	0.269	0.262	0.008	0.078	0.091	-0.013	.	.	.	0.672	0.674	-0.001
1990	0.238	0.224	0.014	0.332	0.351	-0.019	0.231	0.230	0.001	0.199	0.194	0.004	0.609	0.593	0.016	38.326	38.319	0.006	33.707	33.091	0.615	0.271	0.261	0.010	0.080	0.091	-0.011	.	.	.	0.669	0.670	-0.001
1991	0.231	0.216	0.015	0.336	0.354	-0.018	0.232	0.234	-0.002	0.201	0.195	0.006	0.616	0.588	0.027	38.120	38.241	-0.121	33.590	33.098	0.492	0.269	0.262	0.007	0.076	0.092	-0.016	.	.	.	0.678	0.668	0.010
1992	0.235	0.208	0.027	0.326	0.355	-0.028	0.234	0.243	-0.009	0.206	0.195	0.011	0.608	0.585	0.023	37.708	37.991	-0.282	33.384	32.893	0.490	0.278	0.262	0.016	0.081	0.092	-0.012	.	.	.	0.653	0.667	-0.014
1993	0.217	0.202	0.015	0.337	0.347	-0.010	0.238	0.253	-0.015	0.208	0.199	0.010	0.597	0.584	0.013	37.916	37.929	-0.013	33.378	32.830	0.548	0.271	0.267	0.005	0.078	0.094	-0.015	.	.	.	0.661	0.667	-0.006
1994	0.207	0.194	0.013	0.340	0.339	0.001	0.239	0.264	-0.025	0.213	0.203	0.011	0.602	0.581	0.021	37.910	37.897	0.013	33.521	32.914	0.607	0.276	0.267	0.009	0.079	0.093	-0.014	.	.	.	0.671	0.667	0.003
1995	0.207	0.189	0.018	0.339	0.335	0.004	0.235	0.266	-0.031	0.218	0.210	0.009	0.594	0.584	0.011	38.221	38.400	-0.179	33.545	33.235	0.309	0.272	0.268	0.004	0.075	0.093	-0.018	.	.	.	0.675	0.674	0.001
1996	0.192	0.189	0.003	0.334	0.332	0.002	0.258	0.264	-0.006	0.216	0.215	0.001	0.594	0.576	0.017	38.151	38.677	-0.526	33.398	33.390	0.008	0.273	0.268	0.005	0.075	0.092	-0.017	.	.	.	0.670	0.677	-0.007
1997	0.190	0.186	0.004	0.316	0.334	-0.018	0.270	0.263	0.008	0.224	0.217	0.006	0.598	0.571	0.027	38.572	38.989	-0.417	33.625	33.566	0.059	0.275	0.265	0.009	0.072	0.089	-0.018	.	.	.	0.677	0.682	-0.006
1998	0.177	0.179	-0.002	0.315	0.335	-0.020	0.281	0.265	0.017	0.227	0.222	0.005	0.602	0.572	0.029	38.833	39.295	-0.463	34.145	33.726	0.419	0.271	0.265	0.007	0.073	0.088	-0.015	.	.	.	0.686	0.689	-0.003
1999	0.168	0.174	-0.006	0.316	0.331	-0.014	0.282	0.266	0.016	0.234	0.229	0.005	0.595	0.572	0.023	39.224	39.510	-0.286	34.167	33.861	0.306	0.266	0.263	0.003	0.068	0.086	-0.018	.	.	.	0.684	0.694	-0.010
2000	0.171	0.169	0.002	0.319	0.328	-0.009	0.280	0.271	0.009	0.230	0.232	-0.002	0.587	0.573	0.014	39.462	39.822	-0.360	34.193	34.163	0.030	0.265	0.262	0.003	0.069	0.085	-0.017	.	.	.	0.690	0.699	-0.010
2001	0.166	0.169	-0.003	0.310	0.320	-0.010	0.289	0.272	0.017	0.235	0.239	-0.004	0.581	0.573	0.008	39.451	39.750	-0.299	34.220	33.908	0.312	0.264	0.257	0.006	0.068	0.083	-0.014	.	.	.	0.697	0.702	-0.005
2002	0.165	0.169	-0.004	0.305	0.318	-0.014	0.289	0.270	0.019	0.242	0.243	-0.001	0.579	0.567	0.012	39.161	39.335	-0.173	33.854	33.499	0.355	0.262	0.256	0.007	0.070	0.082	-0.013	.	.	.	0.697	0.705	-0.008
2003	0.168	0.164	0.004	0.295	0.318	-0.022	0.293	0.271	0.021	0.244	0.247	-0.004	0.579	0.566	0.013	38.414	38.879	-0.465	33.423	33.049	0.374	0.258	0.255	0.003	0.069	0.082	-0.013	.	.	.	0.708	0.709	-0.001
2004	0.162	0.158	0.004	0.289	0.317	-0.029	0.295	0.273	0.022	0.255	0.252	0.003	0.585	0.565	0.020	38.450	38.537	-0.087	33.628	32.699	0.929	0.257	0.254	0.003	0.068	0.082	-0.014	.	.	.	0.715	0.713	0.002
2005	0.173	0.157	0.016	0.282	0.319	-0.036	0.293	0.273	0.020	0.252	0.251	0.000	0.579	0.564	0.015	38.191	38.613	-0.422	33.558	32.627	0.931	0.255	0.252	0.002	0.066	0.082	-0.016	.	.	.	0.708	0.720	-0.012
2006	0.173	0.154	0.020	0.284	0.316	-0.032	0.291	0.275	0.016	0.251	0.255	-0.004	0.575	0.559	0.016	38.550	38.737	-0.186	34.068	32.794	1.273	0.254	0.250	0.004	0.067	0.082	-0.015	0.145	0.140	0.005	0.708	0.709	-0.002
2007	0.171	0.151	0.019	0.282	0.315	-0.033	0.284	0.272	0.012	0.263	0.262	0.001	0.578	0.560	0.018	38.840	38.945	-0.106	34.140	32.881	1.259	0.252	0.249	0.004	0.069	0.082	-0.013	0.153	0.143	0.010	0.705	0.708	-0.003
2008	0.165	0.142	0.022	0.279	0.309	-0.031	0.292	0.279	0.013	0.265	0.269	-0.005	0.579	0.550	0.028	38.478	38.969	-0.492	33.530	32.804	0.726	0.251	0.248	0.003	0.066	0.083	-0.017	0.155	0.147	0.008	0.706	0.704	0.002
2009	0.158	0.141	0.017	0.281	0.309	-0.028	0.294	0.280	0.014	0.267	0.271	-0.003	0.572	0.551	0.022	37.664	38.314	-0.651	32.854	32.288	0.567	0.247	0.246	0.001	0.066	0.083	-0.017	0.156	0.151	0.005	0.696	0.694	0.002
2010	0.167	0.137	0.030	0.279	0.310	-0.032	0.284	0.280	0.004	0.271	0.273	-0.002	0.563	0.541	0.021	36.394	37.061	-0.667	31.853	31.289	0.564	0.249	0.245	0.003	0.068	0.084	-0.015	0.158	0.154	0.004	0.687	0.685	0.001

Notes: All means are reported at the individual level and weighted using population weights. Education and marital status are reported for all individuals 18-64. Work hours and weeks worked are reported for all individuals 18-64. The remaining variables are reported for all individuals. For both surveys, the years refer to the year of the interview. The reference period for work hours and weeks worked are for the previous 12 months for the CE survey and for the previous calendar year for the CPS. For all other variables, the information is reported as of the interview date. Interviews for the CE occur throughout the year. Interviews for the CPS are conducted in primarily in March, although since 2003 interviews are also conducted in February and April.

Appendix Table 8: Comparison of Before-Tax Money Income, CE Interview Survey and CPS, 2004-2010

	Share below $15,001			Share $15,001 - $30,000			Share $30,001 - $50,000			Share $50,001 - $75,000			Share $75,001 - $100,000			Share above $100,000		
	CE	CPS	Diff	CE	CPS	Diff	CE	CPS	Diff	CE	CPS	Diff	CE	CPS	Diff	CE	CPS	Diff
2004	0.076	0.082	-0.006	0.139	0.13	0.009	0.190	0.188	0.002	0.202	0.198	0.004	0.143	0.143	0.000	0.249	0.2588	-0.009
2005	0.072	0.081	-0.008	0.135	0.128	0.007	0.194	0.188	0.006	0.204	0.197	0.006	0.145	0.141	0.003	0.251	0.2655	-0.015
2006	0.073	0.078	-0.005	0.127	0.126	0.001	0.189	0.19	-0.001	0.203	0.193	0.010	0.151	0.14	0.011	0.257	0.2724	-0.016
2007	0.067	0.079	-0.011	0.133	0.131	0.003	0.193	0.18	0.013	0.205	0.193	0.012	0.146	0.144	0.002	0.256	0.2734	-0.018
2008	0.080	0.085	-0.006	0.142	0.135	0.007	0.201	0.185	0.016	0.194	0.195	-0.001	0.139	0.14	-0.001	0.245	0.2602	-0.015
2009	0.083	0.093	-0.010	0.147	0.138	0.009	0.200	0.187	0.014	0.191	0.19	0.000	0.136	0.138	-0.001	0.243	0.2546	-0.012
2010	0.091	0.098	-0.007	0.150	0.141	0.010	0.205	0.188	0.017	0.191	0.188	0.003	0.135	0.134	0.001	0.228	0.2514	-0.024

Notes: Dollar cutoffs are in 2010 dollars.