



**SACOSS**

*South Australian Council  
of Social Service*

# SACOSS

**Cost of Living Update**

**No.45**

**December Quarter  
2020**

2020



**Cost of Living Update No. 45**

**December Quarter, 2020**

ISSN 1836-5248 (Print)  
ISSN 1836-5256 (Online)

First published in February 2021 by the South Australian Council of Social Service  
Email: [sacoss@sacoss.org.au](mailto:sacoss@sacoss.org.au)  
Website: [www.sacoss.org.au](http://www.sacoss.org.au)

© South Australian Council of Social Service, 2021

# Introduction

This report is the latest in a series tracking changes in the cost of living, particularly for vulnerable and disadvantaged South Australians.

The first part uses the Australian Bureau of Statistics' Selected Living Cost Indexes (ABS, 2021a) and Consumer Price Index (ABS, 2021b) to show key changes in the cost of living in the last quarter and over the last 12 months.

As a summary measure, the Selected Living Cost Indexes are preferred over the better-known Consumer Price Index (CPI) because the CPI is technically not a cost of living measure. The CPI tracks changes in the price of a specific basket of goods, but this basket includes goods and services that are not part of the expenditure of all households, and low-income households in particular. This is important when considering the cost of living because if expenditure on bare essentials makes up the vast bulk (or entirety) of expenditure for low-income households, then price increases in those areas are crucial whilst price increases or decreases on other discretionary goods are less relevant. However, increases in the prices of bare essentials may be masked in the generic CPI by rises or falls in other goods and services in the CPI basket.

The Selected Living Cost Indexes also use a different methodology to CPI (see Appendix: Explanatory Note 1) and they disaggregate expenditure into a number of different household types, although this *Cost of Living Update* focuses only on the figure for "Age Pension" and "Other government transfer recipients" (hereafter "other social security recipients") as these are likely to represent the more disadvantaged households. While the Selected Living Cost Indexes also have limitations in tracking cost of living changes for these groups (see Appendix: Explanatory Note 2), they do provide a robust statistical base, a long time series, and quarterly tracking of changes – all of which is useful data for analysis. This report also adds to the Selected Living Cost Indexes by putting a dollar value on the changes, and by using disaggregated CPI data to summarise changes in prices of key items.

SACOSS *Cost of Living Updates* sometimes also contain a second section with a more in-depth analysis of cost of living trends in one key area of concern in relation to cost of living pressures on vulnerable and disadvantaged South Australians. There is no second section in this *Cost of Living Update*.

# SECTION 1: December Quarter 2020 Cost of Living Changes


## Prices

In the December 2020 quarter, the cost of living (as measured by the ABS Selected Living Cost Indexes) for age pensioners rose by 0.1%, while for other social security recipients the cost of living rose by 0.9% (ABS, 2021b). CPI in the same period rose by 0.7% in Adelaide, and 0.9% nationally (ABS, 2021a).

The living cost index increase for age pensioners was small and well below the inflation rate because on average they have no expenditure on childcare (which increased by 15% in Adelaide in the quarter), and because other price rises were offset by falls in electricity and a fall in pharmaceutical expenditure due to the PBS funding cycle. By contrast, the living cost index increased more for other social security recipients than any other group – mainly because of the higher weighting in the index of childcare and tobacco – both of which increased. However, while living cost index rise was no more than the general inflation rate, it should be noted that one of the key drivers of the living cost index for other social security recipients in the quarter and over the last year was a fall in mortgage interest. This was not matched by a fall in rents (at least in Adelaide – see Table 1 below), so the cost of living for renters on social security would have been higher than the index shows.

Over the last year (December Qtr 2019 – December Qtr 2020), the living cost index for age pensioners rose by 0.4% and for other social security recipients by 0.9% (ABS, 2021a), by comparison to the generic CPI rise of 0.9% nationally and 1% in Adelaide (ABS, 2021b).

**Figure 1: Increases in Living Costs December Qtr 2020**



These overall figures can be disaggregated to track changes in the price of key basic goods and services in the last quarter both in Adelaide and nationally. These are shown in Table 1.

**Table 1: Cost of Living Changes December Qtr 2020 by Expenditure Type**

	December Quarter CPI Increase		Annual CPI Increase (Dec 2019 – Dec 2020)	
	Adelaide	Australia	Adelaide	Australia
	%	%	%	%
Food	-0.2	0.2	2.9	2.3
Fruit and Vegetables	-2.7	-1.8	3.6	3.3
Housing	-0.1	-0.6	-1.6	-0.9
Rent	0.7	0.1	1.2	-1.3
Utilities	-0.4	-4.6	-7.2	-6.6
• Electricity	-0.8	-7.5	-6.5	-9.2
• Water	0.0	0.0	-16.7	-3.3
• Gas	1.1	-1.4	1.6	-2.6
Health	2.6	1.3	3.9	2.6
Transport	-1.0	0.9	-7.3	-4.6
CPI All Groups	<b>0.7</b>	<b>0.9</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>0.9</b>

Source: (ABS, 2021b)

## Incomes

Given that social security recipients have very low incomes, it is unlikely that any (or any significant) amount of the weekly benefit can be saved – at least for those not able to supplement their government payments with other incomes. For someone on the base level of benefits (with no rent assistance), and assuming that they spend all their income, SACOSS calculates that the dollar value changes in cost of living is as shown in Table 2.

**Table 2: Cost of Living Changes December Qtr 2019 – December Qtr 2020**

	Base Allowance + Supplements (31 Dec 19)	Selected Living Cost Index Change	Living Cost Change per week	Base Allowance + Supplements (31 Dec 20)	Change in Rates of Same Benefits	Net Result \$pw
Age Pensioner (Single)	\$466.70	0.4%	\$1.87	\$472.15	\$5.45	\$3.58
JobSeeker with two FTB children	\$579.70	0.8%	\$4.64	\$588.18	\$8.48	\$3.84

(Source: Calculated from (Centrelink, 2019, 2020), (ABS, 2021a). See Explanatory Note 3 in the Appendix here)

The JobSeeker figures do not include the Coronavirus supplement which throughout the quarter was paid at \$250 per fortnight. Without the Coronavirus supplement, the figures show that the cost of living for a single person on Jobseeker with two children went up by \$4.64 per week, while their base income increased by \$8.48 so that without the supplement they would have been \$3.84 a week better off than a year ago. Again though, living costs for renters probably increased by more and given the historic low levels of JobSeeker payments, it is only really the Coronavirus Supplement that makes the payment liveable. Age pensioners were better off than a year ago by \$3.58 per week, although living costs actually decreased for employee households, so that provided they maintained their income, they did best of all the household types in the ABS index.

# APPENDIX: Explanatory Notes

## 1. CPI and Living Cost Indexes

The ABS Selected Living Cost Indexes uses a different methodology to the CPI in that the CPI is based on acquisition (i.e. the price at the time of acquisition of a product), while the living cost index is based on actual expenditure. This is particularly relevant in relation to housing costs where CPI traces changes in house prices, while the Selected Living Cost Indexes traces changes in the amount expended each week on housing (e.g. mortgage repayments). Further information is available in the Explanatory Notes to the Selected Living Cost Indexes (ABS, 2021a).

In that sense, the Selected Living Cost Indexes are not a simple disaggregation of CPI and the two are not strictly comparable. However, both indexes are used to measure changes in the cost of living over time (although that is not what CPI was designed for), and given the general usage of the CPI measure and its powerful political and economic status, it is useful to compare the two and highlight the differences for different household types.

## 2. Limitations of the Selected Living Cost Indexes

The Selected Living Cost Indexes are more nuanced than the generic CPI in that they measure changes for different household types, but there are still a number of problems with using those indexes to show cost of living changes faced by the most vulnerable and disadvantaged in South Australia. While it is safe to assume that social security recipients are among the most vulnerable and disadvantaged, any household-based data for multi-person households says nothing about distribution of power, money and expenditure within a household and may therefore hide particular (and often gendered) structures of vulnerability and disadvantage. Further, the living cost indexes are not state-based, so particular South Australian trends or circumstances may not show up.

At the more technical level, the Selected Living Cost Indexes are for households whose *predominant income* is from the described source (e.g. aged pension or government transfers). However, the expenditures that formed the base data and weighting (from the 2015-16 *Household Expenditure Survey*) add up to well over the actual social security payments available (even including other government payments like rent assistance, utilities allowance and family tax benefits). Clearly many households in these categories have other sources of income, or more than one social security recipient in the same household. Like the CPI, the Selected Living Cost Index figures reflect broad averages (even if more nuanced), but do not reflect the experience of the poorest in those categories.

Another example of this “averaging problem” is that expenditures on some items, like housing, are too low to reflect the real expenditures and changes for the most vulnerable in the housing market – again, because the worst-case scenarios are “averaged out” by those in the category with other resources. For instance, if one pensioner owned their own home outright they would generally be in a better financial position than a pensioner who has to pay market rents – but if the market rent were \$300 per week, the average expenditure on rent between the two would be \$150 per week, much less than what the renting pensioner was actually paying.

The weightings in the Selected Living Cost Indexes are also based on a set point in time (from the *Household Expenditure Survey*), but over time the price of some necessities may increase rapidly,

forcing people to change expenditure patterns to cover the increased cost. There is some adjustment of weightings for this, but these can't be checked without a new survey. Alternatively, or additionally, expenditure patterns may change for a variety of other reasons. However, the weighting in the indexes does not change and so does not track the expenditure substitutions and the impact that has on cost of living and lifestyle.

Finally, the Selected Living Cost Indexes' household income figures are based on households that are the average size for that household type: 1.51 people for aged pensioners, and 2.46 for other social security recipients (ABS, 2021b). This makes comparison with allowances difficult. This *Update* focuses on single person households for age pensioners, and a single person with two children (to align to the other social security recipient household average of 2.46 persons). However, this is a proxy rather than statistical correlation.

It is inevitable that any summary measure will have limitations, and as noted in the main text, the Selected Living Cost Indexes provide a robust statistical base, a long time series, and quarterly tracking of changes in the cost of living which is somewhat sensitive to low income earners.

### 3. Income Support Payment Calculations – December 2020

Even using the base rate of benefits, the calculation of the relevant weekly incomes is difficult because of the complexity of the income support system which means that payment eligibility and rates change depending on the exact circumstances of the household (e.g. age of children, assets). The calculation is also complex because of changes over time in eligibility and available benefits. However, based on an assumption of a single Aged Pensioner and a single Newstart recipient with two children (aged 10 and 14) – with neither receiving Commonwealth Rent Assistance, the basic income supports payments are as follows:

#### ***Rates at 31 December 2019***

	Base Rate	Pension Supplement	Energy Supplement	FTB A Child u13	FTB A Child 13-15	FTB B	Pharmac Benefit	TOTAL PAYMENT
Aged Pension	\$425.20	34.45	7.05					\$466.70
Newstart - 2 children	\$302.35		4.75	93.1	121.1	55.30	3.1	\$579.70

#### ***Rates at 31 December 2020***

	Base Rate	Pension Supplement	Energy Supplement	FTB A Child u13	FTB A Child 13-15	FTB B	Pharmac Benefit	TOTAL PAYMENT
Aged Pension	\$430.30	34.80	7.05					\$472.15
Newstart - 2 children	\$306.00		4.75	94.78	123.27	56.28	3.1	\$588.18

# Sources

ABS, 2021a. 6467.0 Selected Living Cost Indexes, Australia, December 2019. Australian Bureau of Statistics, Canberra.

ABS, 2021b. 6401.0 Consumer Price Index, Australia, December 2019. Australian Bureau of Statistics, Canberra.

ABS, 2017. 6530.0 - *Household Expenditure Survey, Australia: 2015-16*. Australian Bureau of Statistics.

Centrelink, 2019. A guide to Australian Government payments: 20 Sept –31 December 2019.

Centrelink, 2020. *A guide to Australian Government payments*, Australian Government, Canberra..