

POST-STRATIFICATION APPROACHES IN THE CORPORATION STATISTICS OF INCOME PROGRAM

James M. Harte, Internal Revenue Service

This paper is an early interim report on the research being conducted to improve estimation procedures in the Corporate Statistics of Income (SOI) program. This report provides just a brief sketch of the background for the application issues we expect to experience in more detail at next year's meetings.

The motivation for the present work is quite simple. Budget cuts have increased concerns that the corporation return sample size is inadequate. Raking ratio estimation and other post-stratification techniques are among the procedures being considered to improve the efficiency of the corporate sample for the primary statistics of interest. [1]

BACKGROUND

Annual statistics have been available from corporate tax returns since the 1916 income tax year. Figure 1 lists the major uses and publications of these data. The corporation source book is the most detailed SOI report featuring complete income statement and balance sheet information classified by industry. The three levels of classes are: industry division (12 classes), major industry (58 classes), and minor industry (160 classes). Figure 2 provides a specimen page from the source book for minor industry 2096. The names of the industry division, major industry, and minor industry are given at the bottom of the Figure.

A pilot study of the corporate SOI data was conducted some years ago where estimation was based upon post-stratification by industry [2] (see Figure 3). The study indicated that post-stratification by major industry could achieve large reductions in variance for some items and little, if any, increase in variance for others. The comparison was with a scheme in which tax returns were stratified by the joint size of their income and assets (essentially the same way as is done at present).

The full scale study we are now conducting involves all 1979 corporation tax returns filed on Form 1120 or Form 1120-S which were fractionally sampled. These are the two return types filed by the overwhelming majority of corporations (over 98%). Excluded from the study are the other corporation tax returns tabulated in SOI namely Forms 1120F, 1120L, 1120M and 1120 DISC. Excluded as well are those Forms 1120 and 1120S cases selected with certainty because of high income or high assets (or because they were needed for special studies).

Figure 4 shows how we classify the returns into sample strata. [3] In effect, we assign each return in our study a numerical code of 1 through 9 based upon its size of net income or deficit. We also assign each return a code of 1 through 9 based upon the size of its assets. The larger of the two codes labels the stratum in which the return is sampled at a given rate. Figure 5 shows the resultant dis-

tribution of the population and the sample by stratum. In our post-stratification studies these sample classes are further divided into 58 industry groups, producing $58 \times 9 = 522$ post-strata.

POST-STRATIFICATION

Figure 6 compares and contrasts the present stratification scheme with the post-stratification classification scheme used in our study. Four steps are listed for stratification with three of the four having a parallel step in post-stratification. The missing step is step 2, sample selection, because post-stratification is an estimation method and does not involve the selection of the sample. Item 3 under post-stratification actually describes the method of estimation used in the pilot study by Westat [2]. The known counts for the major industries are from the revenue processing of the returns and are based on the Principal Business Activity (PBA) Code. Unfortunately, industry post-stratification in its simplest version is unwieldy and can actually do more harm than good because the sample sizes in the 522 post-strata can be very small. Grouping of the sample into large enough categories to avoid this problem, as was done by Westat, is a very difficult procedure to do well and contains many arbitrary elements; hence we rejected it in favor of a "raking" approach.

Figure 1

CORPORATION INCOME TAX RETURN DATA MAJOR USES AND SOURCES

USES

Revenue estimation and tax policy by Treasury Department and the Congress.

Estimates needed to produce the National Income and Product Accounts by the Commerce Department.

Information for business and industry analysts and economists (in both the private and public sector).

SOURCES

Statistics of Income Corporation Income Tax Returns, Internal Revenue Service, Publication 16 (annual publication available from the Government Printing Office).

Corporation Source Book of Statistics of Income (unpublished tables by industry group including minor industry; available by special order on a reimbursable basis from the Statistics of Income Division, Internal Revenue Service, Washington, DC).

Raking ratio estimation is a method which adjusts the estimated totals of the returns for each post-stratum, namely income-asset major industry class, so that agreement is achieved between the 58 known totals of the major industries and the 9 known totals for the income-asset classes (but not for each of the 522 cells separately). Figure 7 outlines the motivation and the effects of the raking estimation. The last item in that figure indicates that the primary motive is not the appearance of consistency but the expectation that sampling error will be reduced by making the sample estimates agree with known outside information.

Research Plan

Essentially the current method of stratification will be compared to three variations of raking ratio estimation. One method, the usual method, will involve all the post-strata. The other two methods will be limited to post-strata whose sample yield is less than 400 returns or in the other case, the post-strata whose sample yield is less than 200 returns. Post-stratification is thought to be a robust procedure by some in the sense that it gives some insurance against bad samples. [4] The limited versions of raking we will study will shed light on this question since the gains from post-stratification should be greater when the sample size is moderately

Figure 3

GAINS FROM POST-STRATIFICATION BY INDUSTRY
(Pilot Study)

Item	Reduction in Variance Percent
Inventories	36.7
Business Receipts	26.3
Total Receipts	25.4
Base for Investment Credit	18.9
Depreciation	11.4
Taxable Income	7.9
Capital Gains	- .1
Stockholder's Distribution	- 1.9

NOTE: The items from the corporation tax returns are listed in rank order according to the reduction in variance comparing income-asset stratification with income-asset-industry post-stratification.

small. The criterion for comparison will be the relative sampling error (coefficient of variation) which will be estimated from half sample replicates.

We expect that the application of post-stratification methods will give the user and the government better statistics for the dollar spent.

Figure 4

DETERMINATION OF SAMPLE STRATA

Size of Total Assets	Asset Code
Under \$50,000	1
\$50,000 under \$100,000	2
\$100,000 under \$250,000	3
\$250,000 under \$500,000	4
\$500,000 under \$1,000,000	5
\$1,000,000 under \$2,500,000	6
\$2,500,000 under \$5,000,000	7
\$5,000,000 under \$10,000,000	8
\$10,000,000 under \$25,000,000 financial	9

Size of Net Income or Deficit	Income Code
Under \$25,000	1
\$25,000 under \$50,000	2
\$50,000 under \$100,000	3
\$100,000 under \$250,000	4
\$250,000 under \$500,000	5
\$500,000 under \$1,000,000	6
\$1,000,000 under \$1,500,000	7
\$1,500,000 under \$2,500,000	8
\$2,500,000 under \$5,000,000 financial	9

NOTE: Each sample stratum is labelled 1 through 9. Each return receives an income code and an asset code. The return is assigned to a sample stratum based on the higher of the two codes. For example, sample stratum 2 consist of all returns with asset code 2 and either income code 1 or 2, as well as all returns with asset code 1 and income code 2. Sample stratum 9 is limited to returns in the following financial industries: banks including mutual savings banks and bank holding companies, personal and business credit institutions, other insurance companies, and regulated investment companies.

Figure 5

POPULATION AND SAMPLE COUNTS
BY SAMPLE STRATUM, 1979-1980

Sample Stratum	Population	Sample Count
Part 1. -- 1979		
1	1,064,373	3,583
2	402,114	1,833
3	489,879	3,637
4	283,670	4,734
5	177,821	5,496
6	117,979	9,057
7	39,471	3,837
8	19,653	3,976
9	4,347	2,207
Other Returns	49,839	41,708
TOTAL	2,649,146	80,068
Part 2. -- 1980		
1	1,159,761	4,232
2	432,588	2,349
3	522,736	4,276
4	304,495	5,252
5	192,148	6,253
6	129,074	10,451
7	43,198	4,955
8	23,930	5,406
9	4,739	2,326
Other Returns	54,550	39,965
TOTAL	2,867,219	85,465

Figure 6

COMPARISON OF STRATIFICATION
AND POST-STRATIFICATION

Stratification	Post-Stratification
1. Classify all returns into Income-Asset strata	1. Classify sample returns into Income-Asset-Industry post-strata
2. Select a sample from each stratum	2. _____
3. Estimate totals for each stratum by weighting up to known counts for the stratum	3. Estimate totals for each post-stratum by weighting up to known counts of major industry
4. Add stratum estimates	4. Add post-stratum estimates

Figure 7

POST-STRATIFICATION BY RAKING
RATIO ESTIMATION

- Raking ratio estimation adjusts estimates to agree with known counts within a tolerance.
- The raked estimate for each post-stratum is divided by the sample count for the post-stratum to produce a weight. This weight is used in producing all other estimates, for instance, money totals.
- Reduction in sampling error is expected for many estimates using raking ratio estimation.
- Stratified estimates of industry groups do not agree with known counts.
- Post-stratified estimates of Income-Asset strata do not agree with known counts.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Technical advice and support by H. Lock Oh and Homer Jones are gratefully acknowledged. Gerald Reiser helped develop the figures and prepare copy which was typed by Sandra Heaney. The research evaluation team for the project consists of Jim Bahnke, Mike Leszcz, Jenny Newport and Dan Rosa.

REFERENCES

- [1] Deming, W.E. and Stephan, F.F. On a Least Squares Adjustment of a Sampled Frequency Table When the Expected Marginal Tables Are Known, Annals Math. Stat., 1940, Vol. 11, 427-444.
- [2] Results of a Study to Improve Sampling Efficiency of Statistics of Corporation Income Westat, Inc., Bethesda, Md. January 1974. (Unpublished)
- [3] Internal Revenue Service, Statistics of Income 1978-1979 Corporation Income Tax Returns, Publication 16, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 1982.
- [4] Holt, D. and Smith, T.M.F. Post Stratification. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, 1979, A, 142, Part 1, 33-46.