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Appendix A: Source and Accuracy of the Data
For every year following a census, the U.S. Census Bureau publishes population estimates as of July 1, using information on births, deaths, and domestic and international migration. The results are used to determine federal funding allocations, to monitor population trends, and to provide control populations used for weighting purposes in surveys. The estimates in this report are for July 1, 2003, and cover the 50 states and the District of Columbia.

The Nation and Regions
Between Census Day (April 1, 2000) and July 1, 2003, the resident population of the United States grew from 281.4 million to 290.8 million, an increase of 3 percent. During this time period, 13.1 million U.S. residents were born and 7.9 million died, creating a “natural increase” of 5.2 million people. The net increase from international migration (in-migrants minus out-migrants) added another 4.2 million people.

Between Census Day and July 1, 2003, the West was the fastest growing region, increasing by 5 percent (Figure 1). The South had the second-fastest growth rate—4 percent. In contrast, the growth rates in the Midwest and the Northeast were about half the rate of the country as a whole, 1.6 percent and 1.5 percent, respectively.

Among the country’s four statistical regions, the South was the most populous in 2003, containing 104.5 million people, or 36 percent of the U.S. total. The West and Midwest followed with 66.5 million and 65.4 million people, respectively. The Northeast had the smallest population, totaling 54.2 million people.

Words That Count
Population estimates, as produced by the Census Bureau’s Population Estimates Program, are approximations of populations for past dates. The calculations begin with the last census numbers, which are updated using data on births, deaths, and migration. Estimates of international and internal population movement are developed from tax returns, Medicare enrollment, and immigration data. The population estimates in this report are based on Census 2000. The numbers in this report cover the 50 states and the District of Columbia, but do not include Puerto Rico or any of the U.S. island areas: the U.S. Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, or the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

Resident population includes all people living in the United States.

Civilian noninstitutionalized population is the basic population represented in the surveys used in this report: the Current Population Survey (CPS), the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP), and the American Housing Survey (AHS). It includes everyone living in the United States who is not in an institution (such as a prison or nursing home) or living on a military base.1 The 2003 civilian noninstitutionalized population (285.5 million) was smaller than the resident population (290.8) because it did not include people in the military or in institutions, such as nursing homes and prisons. The two population universes also differed from one another in age and sex distribution, but differences were generally small. The resident population contained a higher proportion of men than the civilian noninstitutionalized population, 49.1 percent compared with 48.8 percent. It also contained a higher proportion of older adults (those 65 and older), 12.4 percent compared with 12.0 percent.

The four statistical regions of the United States are groups of states for which data are presented. They include the Northeast, the Midwest, the South, and the West, as shown in Figure 1.

1 Members of the armed forces who live off post or who live with their families on post are included in the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP) and the Annual Social and Economic Supplement (ASEC) to the CPS, as long as one civilian adult lives in the same household. The “regular” CPS never includes people in the military, but it does include other household members living with someone in the military, as long as there is one civilian adult in the household. The AHS includes people in the military living off base in the United States.
The 50 States and the District of Columbia

July 1, 2003, marked the 17th consecutive year that Nevada was the fastest-growing state. With a 12-percent gain since Census 2000, Nevada’s total population stood at 2.2 million in 2003. With a 9-percent increase since Census Day, Arizona was the second-most rapidly growing state. Florida ranked third with an increase of 6 percent.

Between April 1, 2000, and July 1, 2003, North Dakota and the District of Columbia lost population. North Dakota’s population was 1.3 percent smaller than it was on Census Day and the District of Columbia’s population declined 1.5 percent.

Figure 1.
Percent Change in the Population of Regions and States: 2000 to 2003

Table 1.
Ten Fastest-Growing Counties With Populations of 10,000 or More: 2000 to 2003
(Population in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Loudoun, VA</td>
<td>169.6</td>
<td>221.7</td>
<td>52.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Chattahoochee, GA</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Douglas, CO</td>
<td>175.8</td>
<td>223.5</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rockwall, TX</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Forsyth, GA</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>123.8</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Henry, GA</td>
<td>119.3</td>
<td>150.0</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Flagler, FL</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Newton, GA</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Paulding, GA</td>
<td>81.6</td>
<td>94.2</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Kendall, IL</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

California remained the most populous state, with 35.5 million people in 2003. California’s population constituted 12 percent of the U.S. total. The second- and third-most populous states were Texas (22.1 million) and New York (19.2 million). The least-populated states in 2003 were Wyoming (501,000), Vermont (619,000), and North Dakota (634,000). The District of Columbia’s population was 563,000.

Counties

With population increases of about 30 percent between Census Day and July 2003, Loudoun County, Virginia, and Chattahoochee County, Georgia, were the fastest-growing counties with populations of 10,000 or more, as shown in Table 1. Two of the ten fastest-growing counties during this time period were outside the South—Douglas County, Colorado, in the West and Kendall County, Illinois, in the Midwest. Four of the fastest-growing counties were in Georgia (Forsyth, Henry, Newton, and Paulding), one was in Texas (Rockwall), and one was in Florida (Flagler). The majority of the 3,141 U.S. counties grew between April 1, 2000, and July 1, 2003.

The most populous county in 2003 was Los Angeles County, California—9.9 million. The second-most populous county in the country was Cook County, Illinois (which includes Chicago), with 5.4 million people. It was followed by Harris County, Texas (which includes Houston), with 3.6 million people, and Maricopa County, Arizona (which includes Phoenix), with 3.4 million people.

Places

While the country as a whole grew by 3 percent between Census Day (April 1, 2000) and July 1, 2003, the fastest-growing place with more than 100,000 people grew at nearly 10 times that rate. Gilbert, Arizona’s growth rate, 32 percent, brought that city’s population up to 145,000. North Las Vegas, Nevada, had the second-fastest growth rate (25 percent) and Henderson, Nevada, was third (23 percent). Among the remaining cities in the top ten fastest-growing, three were in California (Irvine, Rancho Cucamonga, and Fontana) and two were in Arizona (Chandler and Peoria). Two were outside the West, and both of these were in Florida (Port St. Lucie and Cape Coral).

Since Census 2000, the ten largest places in the United States have not changed (Table 2). New York City topped the list in 2003, with a population of 8.1 million. Los Angeles (3.8 million) and Chicago (2.9 million) ranked second and third. San Antonio, with a population of 1.2 million, was the fastest-growing city among the top ten largest cities. With an increase of 6 percent since Census Day, San Antonio passed Dallas to become the eighth-largest city in the country. Chicago, Philadelphia, and Detroit had population decreases: 1 percent, 3 percent, and 4 percent, respectively.

The Census Bureau Can Tell You More

For more detailed information, go to the U.S. Census Bureau’s Estimates Program Web site <www.census.gov/popest/estimates.php>.

Look for information on related topics on the Census Bureau’s Web site <www.census.gov>.

Contact the Census Bureau’s Customer Service Center at 301-763-INFO (4636) or e-mail <pop@census.gov>.
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Population Profile of the United States: Dynamic Version 3
Birthdays can take on different meanings as people grow older. To a young person, a birthday might mean an opportunity to get a driver's license or to vote for the first time. To an older person, it might mean a retirement party. Many health issues, including everything from childhood diseases to geriatric conditions, are associated with age. These and many other life experiences are somewhat different for the male population than for the female population. The U.S. Census Bureau's Population Estimates Program produces age and sex data for the United States, states, and counties.

**Words That Count**

An **age pyramid** is a horizontal bar graph, usually showing the size of the male population on the left and the female population on the right, with age groupings beginning with the youngest populations on the bottom and ending with the oldest ones at the top (Figure 1).

**Median age** is the age at which half the population is older and half is younger.

A **cohort** is a group of people born during the same time period.

The **Baby Boom Generation** is the large cohort of people born from 1946 to 1964.

**Men and Women**

Within the total resident population in 2003 (290.1 million), women and girls outnumbered men and boys by 4.7 million—147.8 million compared with 143.0 million. This difference was not spread evenly throughout the age groups, as illustrated in the age pyramid shown in Figure 1. Among those under 18, boys outnumbered girls in 2003. From about 40 on, women were the majority. Among people in their nineties, the ratio of men to women was 36 to 100, reflecting the longer life expectancy of women than men. The number of male residents per 100 female residents is called a sex ratio. To find out more about sex ratios, see chapters on men and women and older adults.

---

1 The number of male residents per 100 female residents is called a sex ratio. To find out more about sex ratios, see chapters on men and women and older adults.
Figure 1.  
Population by Single Year of Age and Sex: 2003

Age Groups

Between Census Day (April 1, 2000) and July 1, 2003, the population of most 5-year age groups grew. A few groups saw declines, as illustrated in Figure 2.

The largest decline (5.7 percent) was among the population aged 35 to 39, the age group that the Baby Boom Generation was leaving. The fastest-growing population under 85 was the population 55 to 59. This age group grew more than 17 percent because the oldest Baby Boomers were replacing the smaller cohort of people who were born in the 5-year period before them.

While the total population increased 3.3 percent between 2000 and 2003, the population 65 and older increased 2.6 percent. A “birth dearth” during the late 1920s and early 1930s was largely responsible for the slow growth of this group. The population 70 to 74 shrank 3.0 percent, reflecting the entry into this age group of the small birth cohorts of the early 1930s. Other 5-year age groups within this older age group saw increases. The population 85 and older grew by 11 percent.

On July 1, 2003, the median age of the population was 35.9 years—older than the highest median age ever recorded in a census (35.3 in Census 2000).

Figure 2.
Percent Change in Population by Age: 2000 to 2003

State Differences

While 12 percent of U.S. residents were 65 or older in 2003, the proportions in individual states differed. Florida had the highest proportion in this age range, 17 percent (Figure 3). West Virginia and Pennsylvania followed, with proportions above 15 percent. Alaska anchored the other end of the scale, with 6 percent of its population in this age range. The proportion of the population that was 65 and older was also below 10 percent in Utah, Georgia, Colorado, and Texas.

The Census Bureau Can Tell You More

For more detailed information, go to the U.S. Census Bureau’s Population Estimates Program Web site <www.census.gov/popest/estimates.php>.

Look for information on related topics on the Census Bureau's Web site <www.census.gov>.

Contact the Census Bureau’s Customer Service Center at 301-763-INFO (4636) or e-mail <pop@census.gov>.
**RACE AND HISPANIC ORIGIN IN 2003**

A school system might use information on race and Hispanic origin to meet the needs of its students or to design cultural activities that reflect diversity in the community. A business could use it to select the mix of merchandise it will stock. Governments need information on race and Hispanic origin to implement and evaluate programs, such as the Equal Employment Opportunity Act, the Civil Rights Act, the Voting Rights Act, the Public Health Act, the Healthcare Improvement Act, the Job Partnership Training Act, the Equal Credit Opportunity Act, the Fair Housing Act, and others.

**Five Single-Race Groups and the Two or More Races Population**

On July 1, 2003, 99 percent of all U.S. residents—or 286.5 million people—belonged to exactly 1 of 5 racial groups, according to the U.S. Census Bureau’s Estimates Program. People who were White and no other race

---

**Words That Count**

Racial and Hispanic-origin classifications used in this chapter adhere to revised standards adopted by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in October 1997 and implemented in 2003. While these standards ask individuals to report one or more racial groups, surveys conducted in 2002 or earlier asked individuals to identify only one race.

Race estimates in this chapter include six categories: White, Black or African American, American Indian and Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander, and Two or More Races. This report uses the term Black to refer to people who are Black or African American, and the term Pacific Islander to refer to people who are Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander.

The single-race population (called the “alone” population in tables) refers to people who identified only one race.

In contrast, racial categories from surveys conducted in 2002 or earlier shown in some of the following chapters include only three racial groups: White, Black or African American, and Asian and Pacific Islander. The sample of the American Indian and Alaska Native population was not large enough to yield reliable results in these surveys.

For the purpose of the Population Estimates Program, the Some Other Race alone population used in Census 2000 was redistributed to other race categories based on the characteristics of other people in the same household or neighborhood.

The “alone or in combination” population refers to a single-race population plus any people who are of the specified race in combination with any other race. For instance, the Black alone or in combination population includes all people who report Black plus people who report Black in combination with one or more races (White, American Indian and Alaska Native, Asian, or Pacific Islander). When all five alone or in combination racial groups are added together, the sum is greater than the total population.

Hispanic or Latino origin refers to people who are Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American, or some other Hispanic origin. This report uses the term Hispanic to refer to all people of Hispanic or Latino origin. People of Hispanic origin may be any race. Because race and Hispanic origin are separate concepts, the racial categories of White, Black, American Indian and Alaska Native, Asian, and Pacific Islander all contain some people of Hispanic origin.

Non-Hispanic refers to all people whose ethnicity is not Hispanic. In this chapter and throughout this report, the term non-Hispanic White is used to indicate people who are White and no other race and who are not of Hispanic origin.

---

1 In contrast, racial categories from surveys conducted in 2002 or earlier shown in some of the following chapters include only three racial groups: White, Black or African American, and Asian and Pacific Islander. The sample of the American Indian and Alaska Native population was not large enough to yield reliable results in these surveys.

2 For the purpose of the Population Estimates Program, the Some Other Race alone population used in Census 2000 was redistributed to other race categories based on the characteristics of other people in the same household or neighborhood.
made up the largest group and numbered 234.2 million in 2003, as shown in Table 1. The single-race Black population was 37.1 million, and the single-race Asian population was 11.9 million. The single-race American Indian and Alaska Native population accounted for 2.8 million people in the United States. The smallest single-race category was the Pacific Islander population, numbering 495,000 in 2003. Another 1 percent of the total population, or 4.3 million people, belonged to the Two or More Races population. The Two or More Races population plus the five single-race populations equal the total population.

**Race Alone or in Combination**

In 2003, 237.9 million people were either single-race White or White in combination with one or more races. These two groups accounted for 82 percent of the total U.S. resident population, while single-race Whites represented 81 percent.

The single-race Black population and Blacks in combination with one or more races equaled 38.7 million in 2003. While the percentage of people who were Black and no other race was 12.8 percent of U.S. residents, the percentage who were single-race Black and Black in combination with some other race was 13.3 percent.

Asians who were one race or in combination with other races numbered 13.5 million in 2003. Single-race Asians represented 4.1 percent of all Americans, while single-race Asians plus those in combination with one or more races represented 4.6 percent.

The population of American Indians and Alaska Natives alone or in combination with other races (4.4 million) was 57 percent higher than the population of single-race American Indians and Alaska Natives. While single-race American Indians and Alaska Natives represented 1.0 percent of the U.S. total, this group in combination with their counterparts of more than one race represented 1.5 percent.

The population of Pacific Islanders alone or in combination with other racial groups (960,000) was nearly twice as large as the single-race Pacific Islander population. The expanded group's share of the U.S. total was 0.3 percent, compared with 0.2 percent for single-race Pacific Islanders.

**Hispanic and Non-Hispanic**

With 39.9 million people, the Hispanic population accounted for 14 percent of the total U.S. population on July 1, 2003. While this ethnic group contained people of all races, nearly all Hispanics (99 percent)
belonged to only one racial group. Among Hispanics, 92 percent were White, 4 percent were Black, 2 percent were American Indian and Alaska Native, 0.6 percent were Asian, and 0.3 percent were Pacific Islander. About one-half million Hispanics, 1 percent of all Hispanics, were more than one race.

Most people in the United States in 2003 were not Hispanic—250.9 million. As with Hispanics, the vast majority of non-Hispanics (99 percent) belonged to a single-race group. Within the non-Hispanic population, the largest group was the single-race, non-Hispanic White population, which numbered 197.3 million in 2003 and accounted for 68 percent of all people living in the United States.

Rates of Change

Between Census Day (April 1, 2000) and July 1, 2003, the population of the United States increased 3 percent. Growth rates differed among the racial and Hispanic-origin groups. The slowest-growing group was also the largest: the non-Hispanic White population increased by less than 1 percent—less than one-third the national rate. As a result, the population of non-Hispanic Whites declined as a proportion of the population as a whole, falling from 69.5 percent in April 2000 to about 67.9 percent in July 2003.

The American Indian and Alaska Native population grew at about the same rate as the country as a whole, increasing 3 percent between 2000 and 2003. The Black population increase, 4 percent, was somewhat higher than the national rate, and the Pacific Islander population grew faster than the country as a whole, with a 6-percent gain. The growth rate for people who were Two or More Races was even higher, 11 percent. The fastest-growing racial group was the Asian population, increasing by almost 13 percent. The Hispanic population was also 13 percent larger in 2003 than in 2000.

From 2000 to 2003, non-Hispanic Whites were the only group with a declining share of the total population. The American Indian and Alaska Native population and the Pacific Islander population remained unchanged, at 1.5 percent and 0.3 percent, respectively. The Black population increased from 13.2 percent of the total to 13.3 percent and the Asian population increased from 4.3 percent to 4.6 percent. Hispanics experienced the greatest percentage-point increase in share, rising from 12.5 percent of the population in 2000 to 13.7 percent in 2003.

Age Distribution

In 2003, the median age for the country as a whole was 35.9 years. The non-Hispanic White population had the highest median age (39.6), as shown in Figure 1. The Asian population was the only other group with a median age above 30 (32.4). The median age was 29.9 for American Indians and Alaska Natives, 29.8 for Blacks, and 27.1 for Pacific Islanders. The youngest racial group was the Two or More Races population, with a median age of 20.3. The median age for Hispanics was 26.7 years.

In 2003, the portion of people 65 and older was highest among non-Hispanic Whites—15 percent compared with 12 percent of the total population. The next highest proportions were among the Black and Asian populations. About 8 percent of each of these groups were 65 and older, followed by 7 percent of American Indians and Alaska Natives and 6 percent of Pacific Islanders. The racial group with the smallest share 65 and older was the Two or More Races group, with 5 percent in this age range. Five percent of Hispanics were 65 and older.

The share of children among the racial and Hispanic-origin groups was almost the inverse of the share of older adults. The non-Hispanic White population had the smallest proportion of children—22 percent were under 18, compared with 25 percent nationally. Twenty-six percent of the Asian population was under 18, while the proportion was about 32 percent for both the American Indian and Alaska Native population and the Black population. Thirty-three percent of the Pacific Islander population was under 18. The Two or More Races population contained the largest proportion of children, 46 percent. Among the Hispanic population, 34 percent were this young.

The median age is the midpoint of the distribution at which half of the population is older and half younger.
The Black Population

While 13 percent of people living in the United States in 2003 were Black, percentages differed by state, as shown in Figure 2. Sixty percent of the population in the District of Columbia was Black in 2003. Among the states, Mississippi had the highest proportion of Blacks (37 percent), followed by Louisiana (33 percent), South Carolina (30 percent), Georgia (29 percent), and Maryland (29 percent.) Among states outside the South, New York had the highest percentage of Blacks (19 percent). The states with the lowest percentages of Blacks were more scattered. The share of Blacks was less than 1 percent in Montana, Idaho, Vermont, and Maine.

The American Indian and Alaska Native Population

Less than 2 percent of the total U.S. population were American Indians and Alaska Natives, and 19 percent of Alaskans were this race (Figure 3). In Oklahoma and New Mexico, American Indians and Alaska Natives made up about 11 percent of the population. The states with the next highest proportions were South Dakota (9 percent) and Montana (8 percent). Among the 50 states, Pennsylvania had the smallest proportion, 0.5 percent.

The Asian Population

In 2003, 58 percent of people living in Hawaii were Asian, compared with 5 percent for the country as a whole (Figure 4). California was a distant second with 13 percent. The next three states with the highest percentages of Asians were Washington, New Jersey, and New York—all with about 7 percent. On the other end of the scale, less than 1 percent of the populations in West Virginia, Montana, Wyoming, and Mississippi were Asian.

The Pacific Islander Population

Hawaii was the state where people were most likely to be Pacific Islander, 23 percent, as shown in Figure 5. Utah ranked second, with just 1 percent of its population belonging to this group. The percentage of Pacific Islanders was less than 1 percent in all other states and the District of Columbia.

The Two or More Races Population

Less than 2 percent of the country’s population was in the Two or More Races population in 2003 and 20 percent of the population in Hawaii belonged to this group (Figure 6). More than 4 percent of the populations in Alaska and Oklahoma were Two or More Races, as was
Figure 2.
Percent Black* in the Population for States: 2003
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*Alone or in-combination population.

Figure 5.
Percent Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander* in the Population for States: 2003

*Alone or in-combination population.
3 percent of the population in Washington. At least 2 percent of the population was Two or More Races in Nevada, California, and Oregon. Mississippi had the lowest proportion of its population in the Two or More Races category (0.6 percent).

The Hispanic or Latino Population

In 2003, the state with the highest percentage of Hispanics was New Mexico. More than 43 percent of its population was Hispanic, compared with the national rate of 14 percent (Figure 7). Texas, a southern state, and California, a western state, had the next highest percentages, both about 34 percent. Arizona (28 percent) and Nevada (22 percent) followed. In both Colorado and Florida, the percentage of Hispanics was about 19 percent. West Virginia had the lowest percentage of Hispanics, 0.7 percent, closely followed by Maine and Vermont (0.8 percent and 0.9 percent, respectively).

The Non-Hispanic White Population

The proportion of non-Hispanic Whites was higher than 96 percent in Maine and Vermont, as shown in Figure 8. New Hampshire and West Virginia followed with more than 94 percent non-Hispanic White. Iowa ranked fifth, with 92 percent. In 2003, the non-Hispanic White resident population was less than 50 percent in three states: Hawaii (23 percent), New Mexico (44 percent), and California (45 percent). In the District of Columbia, 28 percent of residents were non-Hispanic White.
Figure 7.
Percent Hispanic in the Population for States: 2003

Note: Hispanics may be any race.

Figure 8.

The Census Bureau Can Tell You More


Additional information on race and Hispanic origin can be found in the chapters that follow.

Look for information on related topics on the Census Bureau’s Web site <www.census.gov>. Select “Estimates” on the home page or click on “H” for “Hispanics” and “R” for “Race.”

Contact the Census Bureau’s Customer Service Center at 301-763-INFO (4636) or e-mail <pop@census.gov>.

1 The three reports shown here are based on data from the 2002 Current Population Survey (CPS). Because of their small sample size in the 2002 CPS, reports were not issued for American Indians and Alaska Natives.
THE FERTILITY OF
AMERICAN WOMEN IN 2002

Hospitals, care providers, insurance companies, and baby food manufacturers are among the many groups interested in the number of newborns. The U.S. Census Bureau uses information on changing childbearing patterns to help project the number of people who will be living in the United States in the future.

In the early 1900s, women averaged about four children during their childbearing years, while those living during the Great Depression averaged about two. After World War II, the total fertility rate for women climbed to 3.7 by 1957, then fell to 1.8 by the mid-1970s.1 During the past decade, the total fertility rate has fluctuated between 2.0 and 2.1—just below the level required for natural replacement of the population.

In June 2002, 61 million women aged 15 to 44 lived in the United States, according to the June Fertility Supplement to the Current Population Survey (CPS). During the preceding 12 months, 3.8 million of these women gave birth—resulting in a fertility rate of 61 births per 1,000 women. First-time mothers accounted for 1.4 million of these births—producing a first-birth rate of 23 births per 1,000 women.

In 2002, about 10 percent of women ended their childbearing years with four or more children, compared with 36 percent of women in 1976. Correspondingly, the proportion of women ending their childbearing years with one or two children grew from 31 percent to 53 percent, as shown in Figure 1.

Birth Rates by Race and Hispanic Origin

Among the racial and ethnic groups studied (Non-Hispanic White, Black, Asian and Pacific Islander, and Hispanic), Hispanic women (of any race) were the only

---

**Words That Count**

Fertility rate, in this report, is defined as the number of women who reported having a child in a 12-month period ending in June per 1,000 women aged 15 to 44. Nearly all women end their childbearing by age 45.

Total fertility rates are hypothetical estimates of lifetime childbearing based on age-specific birth rates for a calendar year.

Replacement level fertility is the number of births per woman (approximately 2.1) required to maintain the population in the long term, assuming no international migration.

Children ever born is the number of children a woman has ever had, excluding stillbirths.

---

1 The estimates in this report (which may be shown in text, figures, and tables) are based on responses from a sample of the population and may differ from actual values because of sampling variability or other factors. As a result, apparent differences between the estimates for two or more groups may not be statistically significant. All comparative statements have undergone statistical testing and are significant at the 90-percent confidence level unless otherwise noted. For more information on the accuracy of the data, see Appendix A.

---

Figure 1.

Women Aged 40 to 44 by Number of Children Ever Born: 1976 and 2002

(Percent distribution)
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ones reaching the end of their childbearing years with more births than the number required for natural replacement—2.4 births by age 40 to 44. Non-Hispanic White women were below the replacement level, averaging 1.8 births by that age.

Foreign-born women aged 15 to 44 represented about 15 percent of all women of childbearing age living in the United States in 2002. During the year prior to the 2002 survey, 637,000 foreign-born women gave birth, resulting in a fertility rate of 71 births per 1,000 women. The fertility rate for native women was lower, at 60 births per 1,000 women.

Out-of-Wedlock Births

One-third of all births during the year occurred to unmarried mothers. Out-of-wedlock childbearing occurred predominantly among younger women. Eighty-nine percent of teenagers giving birth were unmarried, compared with 50 percent of mothers 20 to 24 years old and 12 percent of those 30 and older.

Out-of-wedlock childbearing declined with higher educational attainment. During the 12 months prior to the 2002 survey, 63 percent of births to women who had not graduated from high school were out of wedlock, compared with 6 percent of births to mothers with at least a bachelor’s degree.

Employment for New Mothers

Almost 2 million new mothers (91 percent) were employed at the time of the survey and another 189,000 were unemployed and looking for work. Between 1976 and 1998, labor force participation among new mothers rose from 31 percent to 59 percent, as shown in Figure 2. The rate dropped to 55 percent in 2000 (the first statistically significant decline since 1976) and remained at 55 percent in 2002.

Changes in the labor force participation of women with infants could signal changes in the need for child care, in child-rearing practices, in future childbearing patterns, and in employer-sponsored maternity leave benefits, among other impacts.
People move for various reasons. For example, some seek better housing or have a new job; others may be entering a new phase of life, such as retirement. The U.S. Census Bureau studies patterns of relocation to find clues about future population distribution. Information in this chapter about geographical mobility among the civilian noninstitutionalized population comes from the 2003 Current Population Survey Annual Social and Economic Supplement (CPS ASEC).1

Forty Million Movers


Most moves between 2002 and 2003 were within the same county. Over the past 10 years, movers have become more likely to cross state lines. In 2003, 59 percent of all moves were within the same county, while 19 percent were to a different county within the same state, 19 percent were to a different state, and 3 percent were from abroad, as illustrated in Figure 1. In 1994, 62 percent of moves were within the same county, while 16 percent crossed state boundaries.

Housing tenure (whether a person owns or rents) was one of the strongest correlates of geographical mobility in 2003. Nearly 1 in 3 people living in renter-occupied housing moved between 2002 and 2003, compared with about 1 in 14 people living in owner-occupied housing.2 Housing tenure is closely related to age, income, and race and Hispanic origin—factors that are also related to moving rates.

1 The estimates in this report (which may be shown in text, figures, and tables) are based on responses from a sample of the population and may differ from actual values because of sampling variability or other factors. As a result, apparent differences between the estimates for two or more groups may not be statistically significant. All comparative statements have undergone statistical testing and are significant at the 90-percent confidence level unless otherwise noted. For further information about the sources and accuracy of the estimates, see Appendix A.

2 As is the case with all characteristics in the ASEC, housing tenure was measured at the time of the survey (March 2003); tenure before the survey was not ascertained.

Figure 1.
Percent Distribution of Movers by Type of Move: 2002 to 2003
(Population 1 year and older)

Movers are all people 1 and older who were living in a different residence than they were one year earlier at the time of the Annual Social and Economic Supplement (ASEC) to the Current Population Survey (CPS).

Migration is defined as moves that cross county boundaries. Movements into and out of the United States are called international migration.
**Mobility by Age**

Young adults have the highest moving rates. About one-third of 20- to 29-year-olds moved between 2002 and 2003, more than twice the moving rate of all people 1 and older, as shown in Figure 2. Mobility peaked among people in their twenties and then decreased with age. Movers 55 and older were more likely to have moved to a different state than younger people—28 percent of movers 55 to 64 crossed state lines, compared with 19 percent of those 25 to 29.

**Mobility by Income**

Those with incomes below the poverty level were more likely to have moved (24 percent) than those with higher incomes (13 percent). The proportion of within-county moves was larger for people in poverty than higher-income people (61 percent and 58 percent, respectively), while people in poverty were less likely to have made an interstate move than others (17 percent and 20 percent, respectively).

**Mobility by Race and Hispanic Origin**

Between 2002 and 2003, non-Hispanic Whites had the lowest overall moving rate, 12 percent. Hispanics and Blacks shared the highest overall moving rate of 18 percent. Asians followed closely with a 17-percent moving rate. Among people who moved, Blacks and Hispanics were most likely to have moved within the same county (about 65 percent each), while non-Hispanic Whites were the most likely to have crossed county or state lines (44 percent). Asians and Hispanics were more likely than Blacks or non-Hispanic Whites to have moved to the United States from abroad.

The picture changed when age, education, economic, household, nativity, residential, and tenure characteristics of the racial and ethnic groups were taken into account using multivariate analysis. When the data were analyzed this way, Blacks were 14 percent less likely to move than non-Hispanic Whites, and Hispanics and Asians were no longer different from non-Hispanic Whites.

**Reasons for Moving**

The highest percentage of movers moved for housing-related reasons (51 percent), followed by family-related reasons (26 percent) and work-related reasons 

---

1 Hispanics may be any race. Based on the 2003 Current Population Survey (CPS) Annual Social and Economic Supplement (ASEC), 4 percent of the single-race Black population and 2 percent of the single-race Asian population were also Hispanic. Data for the American Indian and Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander, and Two or More Races populations are not shown in this chapter because of their small sample size in the ASEC.
(16 percent). More specifically, the leading reasons were to find a new or better house or apartment (20 percent), for "other family reasons" (13 percent), or to move into their own home (10 percent).

The proportion moving for family-related reasons was different for within-county moves and moves across county lines. Six percent of movers within a county cited a work-related reason for their move, compared with 28 percent of those who crossed county lines. Movers from abroad were the most likely to give a work-related reason for moving (38 percent).

In 2003, the overall moving rates for the population 18 and older differed by educational attainment—ranging from 11 percent of those with a high school education and no more to 13 percent of those with a bachelor’s degree. More highly educated people were more likely to move longer distances and more likely to cite a work-related reason for moving. While 23 percent of movers with a bachelor’s degree crossed a state line, 15 percent of those with less than a high school education did. Thirteen percent of people with only a high school diploma moved for work-related reasons, compared with 23 percent of those with a bachelor’s degree and 25 percent of those with a master’s degree or higher.

The Census Bureau Can Tell You More

For more information, consult the following U.S. Census Bureau Current Population Report: Geographical Mobility: 2002 to 2003 (P20-549) by Jason Schachter.

Look for complete reports and detailed tables on the Census Bureau’s Web site <www.census.gov>. Click on “G” and select “Geographic Mobility.”

Contact the Census Bureau’s Customer Service Center at 301-763-INFO (4636) or e-mail <pop@census.gov>.

For information on publications and other resources, see Appendix A.
Having the facts on America’s growing cultural diversity is essential for good government and good business. In some parts of the country, the characteristics of the foreign-born population are taken into account when developing educational programs, designing street signs, and providing social services. This population defies generalization because it is both diverse and rapidly changing.

The Foreign-Born Population

In 2003, 33.5 million people—or 12 percent of the civilian noninstitutionalized population—were foreign born, according to the Annual Social and Economic Supplement (ASEC) to the Current Population Survey (CPS).1 Almost 14 percent entered the United States since 2000 and another 37 percent entered during the 1990s. Among those arriving since 1990, 15 percent were naturalized.2 Citizenship rates increased with length of residence. Among the foreign born who entered the United States before 1970, 81 percent were naturalized by 2003.

Countries of Birth

Among the foreign born in 2003, 53 percent were born in Latin America, 25 percent in Asia, 14 percent in Europe, and 8 percent in other regions of the world. More than two-thirds of those from Latin America were born in Central America, including Mexico, as shown in Figure 1.

Figure 1. Foreign Born by World Region of Birth: 2003

(In percent)

LATIN AMERICA 53.3
Caribbean 10.1
Central America 36.9
South America 6.3
EUROPE 13.7
ASIA 25.0
OTHER REGIONS 8.0


Words That Count

The foreign-born population refers to people who were not U.S. citizens at birth.

The native population refers to people who were born in the United States or a U.S. Island Area, such as Puerto Rico, or who were born abroad of at least one U.S.-citizen parent.

World regions used in this chapter—Europe, Asia, Latin America, and Other Regions—are based on United Nations definitions. Latin America can be subdivided into Central America (including Mexico), South America, and the Caribbean. The Other Regions category includes Northern America, Africa, and Oceania.

---

1 The estimates in this report (which may be shown in text, figures, and tables) are based on responses from a sample of the population and may differ from actual values because of sampling variability or other factors. As a result, apparent differences between the estimates for two or more groups may not be statistically significant. All comparative statements have undergone statistical testing and are significant at the 90-percent confidence level unless otherwise noted. For more information on the accuracy of the data, see Appendix A.

2 Generally, at least 5 years of residence is required for U.S. citizenship, so rates for the more recently arrived will always be lower than the rates for people who came to the United States earlier. Measures of citizenship status based on the ASEC data differ from naturalization rates. Naturalization rates represent the percentage of legal immigrants eligible for U.S. citizenship who have become U.S. citizens. Although most foreign-born people living in the United States are legal immigrants, and therefore are eligible for naturalization, at any given time several million foreign-born people with nonimmigrant status also live in the United States (such as students, diplomats, and unauthorized migrants) and many of them are included in the ASEC data. Because of this, ASEC citizenship proportions are lower than Office of Immigration Statistics’ naturalization rates for all length-of-residence categories. For more information, see Profile of the Foreign-Born Population in the United States: 2000 (P23-206), Section 7, “Citizenship Status.”
Regional Differences

The West was home to the largest share of the foreign-born population living in the United States (37 percent)—while 21 percent of the native population lived there. The South accounted for 29 percent of the foreign-born population and 37 percent of the native population. The Northeast was home to 22 percent of the foreign born and 19 percent of natives. Twenty-four percent of the native population and 11 percent of the foreign-born population lived in the Midwest. In 2003, 44 percent of the foreign born lived in the central cities of U.S. metropolitan areas, compared with 27 percent of natives.

Age Distribution

In 2003, 80 percent of the foreign born were aged 18 to 64, compared with 60 percent of natives. Among the group 25 to 44, 45 percent of the foreign born were this age, compared with 27 percent of natives (Figure 2).

The percentages of the foreign-born population and the native population 65 and older were very close (11 percent and 12 percent, respectively). Fewer foreign-born residents were under age 18: 9 percent, compared with 28 percent for natives. The small proportion of the foreign born in the youngest age group reflects the fact that most of the children of foreign-born parents were natives.

Foreign-born families were larger than families of natives.³ While 25 percent of families with a foreign-born householder had five or more members, 13 percent of families with a native householder were this large.

³ Families are households consisting of two or more individuals, at least one of whom is related to the householder. The Census Bureau defines the nativity of a household (native or foreign born) by the nativity of the householder, regardless of the nativity of the other household members.
In 2002, homeownership rates for natives (70 percent), naturalized citizens (68 percent), and noncitizens (35 percent) were among the highest levels since data were first collected on homeownership and nativity in the 1994 CPS.\(^4\) For both naturalized citizens and noncitizens, homeownership rates were generally higher for households who had lived in this country the longest. Among naturalized householders who entered the country before 1975, 77 percent owned their own home, compared with 60 percent of those who entered the country later. In a similar vein, 63 percent of noncitizen householders who lived in the country prior to 1975 were homeowners, compared with 32 percent of householders who entered the country more recently.

Homeownership rates varied by place of birth. The rate of homeownership was 75 percent for naturalized European householders, 70 percent for naturalized Asian householders, and 62 percent for naturalized Latin American householders, as shown in Figure 3. These rates may be related to the length of time these householders lived in the United States. For instance, 32 percent of European-born householders entered the United States in 1975 or later, compared with 74 percent of Asian-born householders.

For natives, naturalized citizens, and noncitizens, marital status was related to homeownership rates. Married-couple households, for example, had higher homeownership rates than nonfamily households with two or more members. For natives, 86 percent of married-couple households and 42 percent of nonfamily households with two or more members owned their own homes. For naturalized householders, the homeownership rates were 79 percent and 44 percent, respectively. Among noncitizens, the rates were 45 percent and 14 percent, respectively.

The likelihood of homeownership increased with age. For native householders, homeownership was highest among those aged 55 to 64 (83 percent) and lowest for those under 35 (44 percent). The same pattern held true for naturalized citizens, with 76 percent of householders 55 to 64 owning their homes, compared with 48 percent of those under 35. While homeownership rates were lower for noncitizens of all ages, they reflected the same pattern. For example, among those 55 and older, the homeownership rate was 52 percent, compared with 22 percent for those under 35.

Homeownership rates were higher for naturalized citizens than for natives in the Midwest, the South, and the West. The rates were 78 percent for naturalized householders and 74 percent for native householders in the Midwest; 73 percent and 71 percent, respectively, in the South; and 67 percent and 66 percent, respectively, in the West. In the Northeast, naturalized householders (59 percent) were less likely than native householders (68 percent) to be homeowners.

---

\(^4\) Information on homeownership and nativity comes from the Current Population Survey's Housing Vacancy Survey.
Educational and Economic Characteristics

Among the population 25 and older in 2003, 67 percent of the foreign born were high school graduates or had more education, compared with 88 percent of natives. The percentage with this much education was above 80 percent for people born in Asia, Europe, and Other Regions and 49 percent for those from Latin America. About 27 percent of both the foreign born and natives had a bachelor's degree or more education.

The 2002 median household income for foreign-born households was $37,500, compared with $44,300 for natives. Households maintained by a foreign-born householder who was not a citizen had a median of $32,800, compared with $46,000 for those maintained by a naturalized citizen.

Overall, 17 percent of foreign-born residents lived in poverty in 2002, compared with 12 percent of natives. Foreign-born noncitizens were twice as likely as those who were naturalized to be poor—22 percent and 10 percent, respectively.

---

The Census Bureau Can Tell You More


Look for complete reports and detailed tables on the Census Bureau's World Wide Web site <www.census.gov>. Click on "F" and select "Foreign-Born Population Data" or "H" for "Homeownership/Housing Vacancies and Homeownership Data."

Contact the Census Bureau's Customer Service Center at 301-763-INFO (4636)

For information on the foreign born, e-mail <pop@census.gov>.

See the chapter on housing for more information on housing or e-mail <hhes-info@census.gov>.

For information on the source and accuracy of the estimates, see Appendix A.

---

1 Data on income and poverty for 2002 are from the 2003 ASEC. See the chapters on money income and poverty for more information.
Many businesses are interested in information about living arrangements because household composition is associated with the consumption of goods and services. State and local governments pay attention to households when making decisions about issues such as traffic patterns and school lunch programs. A broad spectrum of decision makers want to understand how the characteristics of families and living arrangements have changed over the decades.

While many adults live alone, the majority still live with a spouse. Some live with grandparents, parents, aunts, uncles, sisters, brothers, and other relatives, and others live with people who are not related to them by birth or marriage. Living arrangements of children are also of interest to educators and service providers.

Families

Families represented 81 percent of households in 1970 and 68 percent of America’s 109.3 million households in 2002, according to the Annual Social and Economic Supplement (ASEC) to the Current Population Survey (CPS).1 See Figure 1. Between 1970 and 2002,

---

FAMILIES AND LIVING ARRANGEMENTS IN 2002

Word That Count

A household consists of all the people who occupy a housing unit, regardless of their relationship. In a family household, at least one member is related to the householder by birth, marriage, or adoption. A nonfamily household can either be a person living alone or a householder who shares the home with nonrelatives only—for example, boarders or roommates. A subfamily is a family living within another household unit. They may be part of a family household regardless of their relationship to the householder. They may also be part of a nonfamily household if they are not related to the householder. For instance, a mother and child living in the home of an unrelated single friend would be a subfamily within a nonfamily household. A subfamily may be a married couple or a parent and a child.

Householder refers to the person (or one of the people) in whose name a housing unit is owned, rented, or maintained. If the house is owned or rented jointly by a married couple, the householder may be either the husband or the wife.

Marital status includes the following categories: never married, married, separated, widowed, and divorced. For the purpose of this report, the term “unmarried” includes never married, widowed, and divorced.

---

1 The estimates in this report (which may be shown in text, figures, and tables) are based on responses from a sample of the population and may differ from actual values because of sampling variability or other factors. As a result, apparent differences between the estimates for two or more groups may not be statistically significant. All comparative statements have undergone statistical testing and are significant at the 90-percent confidence level unless otherwise noted. For more information on the accuracy of the data, see Appendix A.
married-couple families with children fell from 40 percent of all households to 24 percent. The share of married couples without children remained relatively stable, accounting for 30 percent of all households in 1970 and 28 percent in 2002. The percentage of other families, including those with no spouse present, rose from 11 percent to 16 percent over that same time period.

From 1970 to 2002, people living alone grew from 17 percent of all households to 26 percent. At the same time, women living alone decreased from 67 percent of one-person households to 58 percent.

Other nonfamily households, people who live with nonrelatives only, grew from less than 2 percent to nearly 6 percent of all households.

Households decreased in size between 1970 and 2002, as shown in Figure 2. The share of households with five or more people dropped from 21 percent to 10 percent of all households. Those with one or two members grew from 46 percent to 59 percent of all households. In 2002, the average number of people per household was 2.58, compared with 3.14 in 1970.

Unmarried-couple households composed of unmarried partners of the opposite sex represented 4 percent of all households in 2002.\(^2\) In 58 percent of these households, the householder had never been married. In another 32 percent, the householder was divorced. Forty-one percent of unmarried-couple households contained children under 18 years of age. Unmarried-partner households may be classified as family or nonfamily households, depending on whether or not someone in the household is related to the householder by blood or adoption.

**The Postponement of Marriage**

One reason that nonfamily households have increased is the postponement of marriage. In 1970, the median age at first marriage was 21 for women and 23 for men.\(^3\) By 2002, the median had risen to 25 for women and 27 for men.

Delayed marriage has contributed to increases in the percentages of young men and women who have never married. The proportion of never-married women aged 25 to 34 increased between 1970 and 2002, from 9 percent to 31 percent. Among men this age, the share rose from 15 percent to 43 percent. The majority of men and women do marry. Among those 35 to 44 in 2002, 81 percent of men and 87 percent of women had been married at least once.

**Marriage and Divorce Patterns**

In 2002, 55 percent of men aged 18 to 24 lived at home with one or both parents.\(^4\) Forty-six percent of women this age also lived at home with at least one parent. Marriage was the most common type of living arrangement for people 25 to 34. In 2002, 48 percent of men and 56 percent of women in this age group were married and living with their spouse.

Differences in living arrangements also occur among older adults and are frequently related to differences in life expectancy.\(^5\) Among people 75 and older in 2002, men were more likely than women to be living with a spouse—68 percent, compared with 29 percent.

---

\(^2\) This number may underrepresent the true number of cohabitating couples because only householders and their partners are tabulated, not all unmarried couples within the household. Same-sex unmarried partners are also excluded from these estimates. Further, respondents may be reluctant to classify themselves as cohabitating couples in a personal interview.

\(^3\) Median age at first marriage in this report is calculated indirectly by estimating the proportion of young people who will marry during their lifetime, calculating one-half of this proportion, and determining by interpolation the age (at the time of the survey) of people at this halfway mark. The figures do not represent the actual median age of the population who married during the year.

\(^4\) Excludes individuals who were also in related subfamilies.

\(^5\) For more information, see the chapter on older adults.
for women. Fifty percent of women in this age group were living alone, compared with 22 percent of men.

**Marital Status by Race and Hispanic Origin**

Among people 15 and older in 2002, non-Hispanic Whites and Asians and Pacific Islanders were the most likely to be married and living with a spouse, 56 percent and 53 percent, respectively (Figure 3). The proportion married and living with a spouse was 33 percent for Blacks and 46 percent for Hispanics.

The percentage of people 15 and older who were divorced was highest for Blacks (10.4 percent) and lowest for Asians and Pacific Islanders (5.0 percent). Seven percent of Hispanics were divorced. Twenty-five percent of non-Hispanic Whites had never been married, compared with 33 percent of Asians and Pacific Islanders and 43 percent of Blacks. Among Hispanics this age, 36 percent had never been married.

Family households made up 81 percent of Hispanic households, compared with 68 percent of all households in 2002. The corresponding proportions were 73 percent for Asian and Pacific Islander households and 66 percent for Black and non-Hispanic White households. Average family household size was 2.99 for non-Hispanic Whites, compared with 3.35 for Blacks, 3.44 for Asians and Pacific Islanders, and 3.86 for Hispanics.

---

*Age distribution influences marital status by race and Hispanic origin. For more information, see the chapter on race and Hispanic origin.*

*Because Hispanics may be any race, data for Hispanics overlap slightly with data for the Black and the Asian and Pacific Islander populations. Based on the total male and female populations surveyed in the 2002 CPS ASEC, 3.7 percent of the Black population and 4.3 percent of the Asian and Pacific Islander population were also Hispanic. Data are not shown for the American Indian and Alaska Native population because of the small sample size in the 2002 CPS ASEC.*

*The race or origin of the household is based on the race or origin of the household members. Data in this chapter describe households with a household who reported only one race.*
Data from the 1996 Panel of the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP) help explain marriage patterns today. The SIPP tracks marriages that were entered into decades ago. Comparing marriage and divorce rates among younger men (those born from 1955 to 1964) and older men (those born from 1925 to 1934) reveals some interesting contrasts. The data show that the proportion of men married by age 25 dropped from 68 percent for older men to 49 percent for younger men. Among women who first married in the late 1940s, 90 percent reached their 10th anniversary, 81 percent their 20th, and 70 percent their 30th anniversary. Among those first married from 1950 to 1964, 55 percent had a 30th wedding anniversary. Fifty-six percent of those first married in the early 1970s celebrated a 20th anniversary. Seventy-three percent of women first married in the early 1980s were still with their first husband 10 years later, as shown in Figure 4.

By age 40, about 15 percent of men and women born from 1925 to 1934 had been divorced, compared with 31 percent of those born from 1945 to 1954. The rise in divorce also means that a higher percentage of people were more likely to be married more than once during their lifetimes. Among men born from 1925 to 1934, 11 percent had been married two or more times by age 40. Among those born from 1945 to 1954, 22 percent had been married multiple times. Data for women born during the same time periods showed a similar pattern. While 12 percent of the older group had been married at least twice by age 40, the proportion for the younger group was 23 percent.

**Number, Timing, and Duration of Marriages and Divorces (1996)**

![Figure 4. Percentage of Women Whose First Marriage Reached Its Tenth Anniversary by Year of Marriage: Fall 1996](image)


**The Census Bureau Can Tell You More**

For more detailed information, consult the following U.S. Census Bureau Current Population Reports: *America’s Families and Living Arrangements: 2000 (P20-537)* by Jason Fields, and *Number, Timing, and Duration of Marriages and Divorces: 1996 (P70-80)* by Rose M. Kreider and Jason M. Fields.

Look for complete reports and detailed tables on the Census Bureau’s Web site <www.census.gov>.

Click on “H” and select “Households and Families Data” or “M” and select “Marital Status and Living Arrangements Data.”

Contact the Census Bureau’s Customer Service Center at 301-763-INFO (4636) or e-mail <pop@census.gov>.
LIVING ARRANGEMENTS OF CHILDREN IN 2002

Health care professionals, school planners, and child care providers look to U.S. Census Bureau numbers on children to decide if new facilities or services are needed. Census Bureau data on children’s living arrangements help researchers understand how different types of family situations contribute to a child’s well-being. Information on the living arrangements of children is collected in the Annual Social and Economic Supplement (ASEC) to the Current Population Survey (CPS).

In 2002, 72 million children under age 18 lived in the United States—representing 26 percent of the country’s civilian noninstitutionalized population. In recent decades, the percentage of children living with both parents has dropped, while the percentage living with a single parent increased (Figure 1). In 2002, 69 percent of children lived with two parents, while 23 percent lived with only their mother and 5 percent lived with only their father. Four percent of children lived without either parent.

Adults in the Household

In 2002, 11 percent of children under 15 living with their single mother and 33 percent of those living with their single father were in households that included the parent’s unmarried partner. When children lived without either parent, at least one grandparent was frequently in the household—44 percent of the time.

In 2002, 8 percent of all children under 18 lived in households where at least one grandparent was present. Among children under 6, 10 percent lived in a household with a grandparent, compared with 7 percent of those 6 to 11, and 6 percent of those 12 to 17. The majority of children living with grandparents were in households where the grandparent was the householder. Sixty-five percent of these children had the benefit of at least one parent in their home.

Figure 1.
(Percent distribution of children under age 18)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two parents</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>68.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother, no father</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father, no mother</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither parent in household</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Words That Count

Children are all people under age 18, excluding those who maintain households, families, or subfamilies as a householder or spouse.

Parents are not limited to biological parents but include stepparents and those who adopt their children. Foster parents are considered nonrelatives.

Single parents, for the purpose of this report, include people who may be married but not living with their spouse, as well as other divorced, widowed, or never-married people.

---

1 The estimates in this report (which may be shown in text, figures, and tables) are based on responses from a sample of the population and may differ from actual values because of sampling variability or other factors. As a result, apparent differences between the estimates for two or more groups may not be statistically significant. All comparative statements have undergone statistical testing and are significant at the 90-percent confidence level unless otherwise noted. For more information on the accuracy of the data, see Appendix A.
Parents in the Household

In 2002, more than half of Black children lived with a single parent—48 percent with a single mother and 5 percent with a single father. The percentages for non-Hispanic Whites were 16 percent and 4 percent, respectively, while those for Asians and Pacific Islanders were 13 percent and 2 percent, respectively. Among Hispanic children, 25 percent lived with a single mother and 5 percent with a single father.3

Black children were more likely than children in the other groups to live in a grandparent’s household. While 9 percent of Black children lived with a grandparent in 2002, the rate was 4 percent for non-Hispanic White children and 3 percent for Asian and Pacific Islander children. Six percent of Hispanic children lived in a grandparent’s home.

Fifteen percent of children in two-parent families lived in households where the 2001 household income was below $30,000.4 In contrast, 45 percent with a single father, 65 percent with a single mother, and 61 percent without either parent were in households with incomes this low.

2 Because Hispanics may be any race, data for Hispanics overlap slightly with data for Black and Asian and Pacific Islander populations. Based on the 2002 CPS ASEC, 4 percent of Black children and 3 percent of Asian and Pacific Islander children were also Hispanic. Data for American Indian and Alaska Native children are not shown in this section because of the small sample size in the 2002 CPS ASEC.

3 The percentage of Hispanic children living with their father only (5 percent) was not statistically different from the percentage of Black children (5 percent) or non-Hispanic White children (4 percent) living with their father only.

4 Income data are for the year prior to the survey. For information on household income by family type, see the chapter on money income, and for information on children and adults in poverty by household type, see the chapter on poverty.
Data from the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP) describe and contrast care arrangements for preschool- and grade-school-age children in 1997.5

Child Care for Preschoolers

In 1997, 63 percent of children under 5 years of age were in some form of regular child care during a typical week.6 These preschoolers were more likely to be cared for by a relative (41 percent) than a nonrelative (35 percent) and 12 percent received care from both. Twenty-one percent of preschoolers were cared for by their grandparents and 17 percent by their fathers.7 Four percent were cared for by other siblings or their mother while she worked. Other relatives cared for another 9 percent of children in this age group. About one-fifth of preschoolers were in organized facilities, 6 percent were in nursery or preschools, and 12 percent were in day care centers.

Child Care Arrangements (Spring 1997)

Child Care for Older Children

Relatives are important contributors to the care of children 5 to 14 years old. In 1997, 17 percent were cared for by siblings, 16 percent by their fathers, and 15 percent by grandparents. Four percent of children received care from nonrelatives in their own home and another 7 percent in the provider’s home. Six percent were in organized facilities. Most children in this age group were in school (84 percent) and some (17 percent) participated in enrichment activities such as sports, lessons, clubs, and before- or after-school programs. In addition, 19 percent of grade-school age children cared for themselves on a regular basis without any adult supervision.

The Cost of Child Care

Of the 32.6 million mothers who lived with at least one child under age 15 in 1997, 33 percent reported they made cash payments for child care—with payments averaging $71 per week. Mothers who were not employed were less likely than those who were employed to pay for child care, 14 percent compared with 43 percent. They also paid less for care than employed mothers, $49 per week compared with $75 per week. On average, mothers with one child paid $61 per week, while those with two or more children paid $86 per week. Payments were also higher for women with higher household incomes (Figure 2).
Data from the SIPP describe a variety of children’s experiences both at home and at school. The SIPP provides information on children living away from home, families eating meals together, television rules for children, reading to children, outings in the last month, and extracurricular activities, including sports, clubs, and lessons.

Interaction With Parents

In 2000, about three-fourths of young children ate dinner with at least one parent each day. Among older children, who had more activities both before and after school, two-thirds shared dinner with a parent every day. In both cases, children of married parents were more likely than children of unmarried parents to have dinner with at least one parent.

Fathers had less frequent interaction with their children than did their spouses or unmarried partners. For example, 55 percent of children under 6 in married-couple families ate breakfast with their mother every day, while 24 percent ate breakfast with their father that often. The meal-time experiences were similar for children living with married and unmarried parents.

Reading to Children

Children living with a never-married parent, with parents who had a high school diploma or less education, or in families in poverty faced a greater likelihood of never being read to than other children. Figure 3 illustrates the relationship between the educational attainment of parents and reading to children. Half of all children aged 1 to 5 were read to by a family member seven or more times a week and 8 percent were never read to by any family member in the week preceding the SIPP.

---

**Figure 3. Children Never Read to by Any Family Member by Parent’s Educational Attainment and Child’s Age: 2000**

(In percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child's age</th>
<th>1 to 2 years</th>
<th>3 to 5 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


---

*The data in this section were taken from the SIPP, 1996 Panel, Wave 12.

*In this section, the term “parent” refers to the designated parent, defined as the biological, step, or adoptive parent, or some other person acting as the child’s guardian, who was the respondent to this portion of the SIPP questionnaire. In married-couple families, the mother was usually the designated parent. In single-parent families, the parent living with the child was the designated parent. When neither parent was in the household, a guardian was the designated parent.*
Custodial Mothers and Fathers and Their Child Support (1999)

In 2000, an estimated 13.5 million parents had custody of 21.7 million children under age 21 whose other parent lived somewhere else, according to the April 2000 supplement to the CPS. Of all custodial parents, 85 percent were mothers. Overall, 26 percent of children in families had a parent who did not live with them.

Custodial Parents and Poverty Levels

Between 1993 and 1999, the proportion of custodial parents and their children living in poverty fell from 33 percent to 26 percent. The 1999 rate was still approximately 2.5 times higher for households headed by custodial mothers (29 percent) than those headed by custodial fathers (11 percent), (Figure 4). The rate for both was higher than the rate for married-couple households (6.3 percent).

Between 1993 and 1999, the proportion of custodial parents employed full-time, year-round increased from 46 percent to 54 percent. At the same time, dependence on public assistance decreased, from 41 percent to 30 percent. Participation rates were about four times as high for custodial mothers (34 percent) as for custodial fathers (9 percent).

Custodial Parents and Child Support

In 2000, 59 percent of custodial parents had child support agreements. Custodial mothers were more likely than custodial fathers to have child support awards: 62 percent, compared with 39 percent. About three-quarters of custodial parents with awards received at least some of their annual child support payments. Forty-five percent received all payments, while 29 percent received some payments but not the full amount. Among those who received support, the average amount received in 1999 was $3,800 for mothers and $3,200 for fathers.
The Census Bureau Can Tell You More


Look for complete reports and detailed tables on the Census Bureau's Web site <www.census.gov>. Click on “F” and select “Families and Living Arrangements,” “H” and select “Households,” or “C” and select “Children.”

Contact the Census Bureau's Customer Service Center at 301-763-INFO (4636).

For information on the living arrangements of children, e-mail <pop@census.gov>.

For information on child support, e-mail <hhes-info@census.gov>. 
The quality of housing in the United States contributes to the quality of life. Since 1973, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has used the American Housing Survey (AHS) to gather information on occupancy, housing costs, fuel usage, water quality, repairs, improvements, and many other housing-related topics. Most housing units (94 percent) were in good condition (lacking moderate or severe housing problems). Information from the AHS helps determine the number of people whose housing was substandard in some way and how many may need housing assistance.

**Types of Structures**

In 2003, there were 120.8 million housing units in the United States. Most units, 74.9 million, were

---

1 The U.S. Census Bureau collects the AHS data for HUD and also collects data on housing through its Housing Vacancy Survey, a monthly supplement to the Current Population Survey. Estimates in this chapter are calculated using sample data from the 2003 American Housing Survey, weighted by housing unit controls based on Census 2000. These controls were adjusted for additions and losses to the housing inventory. As a result, these estimates (which may be shown in text, figures, and tables) will differ from housing unit estimates computed from either the intercensal estimates program or Census 2000. All comparative statements have undergone statistical testing and are significant at the 90-percent confidence level unless otherwise noted. For further information about the sources and accuracy of the estimates, go to Appendix A.

---

**Words That Count**

A **housing unit** is a house, apartment, group of rooms, or single room occupied or intended for occupancy as separate living quarters. Separate living quarters are those in which the occupants live and eat separately from any other people in the building and that have direct access from the outside of the building or through a common hallway.

**Occupied units** are those occupied by at least one person who usually lives in the unit. By definition, the number of occupied housing units is the same as the number of households.

**Year-round housing units** include all occupied and vacant units, regardless of design, that are intended for occupancy at all times of the year.

A **single-family detached unit** is a single-unit housing structure with open space on all four sides.

A **single-family attached unit** is a single-unit housing structure that has one or more unbroken walls extending from ground to roof separating it from adjoining structures, such as a townhouse.

**Multifamily units** are housing units contained in multiunit structures, such as apartment buildings.

**Manufactured homes** are defined as housing units that were originally constructed to be towed on their own chassis. They may have permanent rooms attached or other structural modifications at their present sites. The term does not include prefabricated buildings, modular homes, travel campers, boats, or self-propelled vehicles such as motor homes. Some people use the terms trailers or mobile homes in the same sense as manufactured homes.

**Moderate-to-severe physical problems** include at least one of the following 8 physical problems: (1) all flush toilets were broken at the same time for 6 hours or more on at least 3 occasions during the last 3 months; (2) unvented gas, oil, or kerosene heaters as primary heating equipment; (3) lack of a kitchen sink, refrigerator, or cooking equipment inside the structure for the exclusive use of the unit; (4) at least 3 of the following problems in public areas in multiunit buildings: no working light fixtures, loose or missing steps, loose or missing railings, or no working elevator; (5) at least 3 of the following upkeep problems: water leaks from the outside, such as from the roof, basement, windows, or doors; leaks from inside the structure, such as pipes or plumbing fixtures; holes in the floors; holes or open cracks in the walls or ceilings; more than 8 inches by 11 inches of peeling paint or broken plaster; or signs of rats in the last 90 days; (6) lack of complete plumbing facilities for exclusive use; (7) 3 or more heating equipment breakdowns last winter resulting in uncomfortable home temperatures; and (8) lack of electricity or exposed wiring and room(s) without outlets and blown fuses at least 3 times in the last 90 days.

---
single-family detached structures. Another 7.2 million were single-family attached units, such as townhouses. Manufactured or mobile homes accounted for 9.0 million units. The remaining 29.7 million units were in multifamily structures. While 10.0 million of these units were located in structures with 2 to 4 units, 4.3 million were located in structures with 50 units or more.

Of the 117.2 million units that were meant for year-round use, 72.2 million (62 percent) were owner occupied, 33.6 million (29 percent) were renter occupied, and 11.4 million (10 percent) were vacant, as shown in Figure 1. Another 3.6 million units were vacant seasonal units, not meant for year-round occupancy.

**Occupancy**

Among year-round units, 82 percent of single-family detached units and 52 percent of single-family attached units were owner occupied, as shown in Figure 1. The proportion of owner-occupied manufactured homes was 68 percent. Regardless of the number of units in the structures, owner occupancy rates were lower among multifamily units, averaging 12 percent.

Among year-round units, 16 percent of manufactured homes, 14 percent of multifamily units, and 11 percent of single-family attached units were unoccupied. At 7 percent, the percentage unoccupied was lowest for single-family detached units.

**Housing Elements**

The 2003 AHS found that important housing elements were sometimes missing in both owner-occupied and renter-occupied housing. For instance, occupants believed the water was not safe to drink in 7 percent of owned units and 14 percent of rented units. One percent of owners did not have exclusive use of plumbing facilities or lacked some or all facilities, including hot piped water, bathtub and shower, or flush toilet. The proportion of renters without these plumbing facilities was nearly 2 percent. Less than 1 percent of owner households lacked complete kitchen facilities for exclusive use (including sink, refrigerator, and oven or burners); 4 percent of renter households were without these amenities.

There was no significant difference between the percentages of unoccupied mobile homes and multifamily units.
Housing by Race and Hispanic Origin

Homeownership rates varied among the racial and Hispanic-origin groups. In 2003, 68 percent of all households owned their own home. Seventy-five percent of non-Hispanic White households owned their own home, compared with 57 percent of Asian households, 48 percent of Black households, and 46 percent of Hispanic households.

In 2003, 6 percent of all occupied housing units had moderate-to-severe physical problems that ranged from rats and holes in the floors to the lack of kitchen equipment, including a sink, refrigerator, or cooking equipment for exclusive use. With less than 5 percent of their housing units having moderate-to-severe problems, non-Hispanic White households and Asian households were the least likely to experience these conditions. Black households were most likely to have moderate-to-severe problems (12 percent). The rate was 9 percent for Hispanic households.

Five percent of housing units with a non-Hispanic White householder and 8 percent of those with an Asian householder had been built in the 4 years prior to the 2003 AHS (Figure 2). The proportion living in housing less than 4 years old was 4.1 percent among Black households and 4.3 percent among Hispanic households.

The Census Bureau Can Tell You More

For more detailed information, consult the following U.S. Census Bureau Current Housing Report: American Housing Survey for the United States: 2003 (H150/03).

Look for detailed tables on the Census Bureau’s Web site <www.census.gov>. Click on “A” for the American Housing Survey or “H” for “Housing data.”

Contact the Census Bureau’s Customer Service Center at 301-763-INFO (4636) or e-mail <hhes-info@census.gov>.

For information on the source and accuracy of the data, see Appendix A.
To determine the needs of next year’s class, educators begin by looking at last year’s statistics. Businesses supplying paper, pens, desks, computers, and many other products and services are also interested in the facts about changing school enrollment. Human resource planners look to these numbers to see where the next generation of workers will come from and how well prepared they will be.

In 2001, 8.0 million children were enrolled in nursery school or kindergarten and 33.2 million attended elementary school, according to the October supplement to the Current Population Survey (CPS). High schools and colleges had about 16 million students each, as shown in Figure 1.

---

**Words That Count**

Regular schools include public, parochial, and other private schools that advance a student toward an elementary or high school diploma or a college, university, or professional school degree. Trade schools, business colleges, and schools for the mentally handicapped, which do not advance students to regular school degrees, are not included.

Nursery schools, preschools, or prekindergartens are regular schools that provide educational experiences for children during the years preceding kindergarten. Private homes that provide primarily custodial care are not considered nursery schools. Children in Head Start or similar programs are counted under nursery school or kindergarten, as appropriate.

---

**NURSERY SCHOOL AND KINDERGARTEN**

In 1964, the first year these data were collected, about 500,000 children attended nursery school, compared with 4.3 million in 2001. The majority of non-Hispanic White (55 percent) and Black (59 percent) 3- and 4-year-olds attended nursery school or kindergarten in 2001.

---

Footnotes:

1. Because Hispanics may be any race, data for Hispanics overlap slightly with data for the Black and Asian and Pacific Islander populations. Based on the population aged 3 and older surveyed in the October CPS, 3.0 percent of the Black population and 1.9 percent of the Asian and Pacific Islander population were also Hispanic. Data for American Indian and Alaska Native populations are not shown in this section because of the small sample size in the 2001 CPS.

2. The estimates for high school and college enrollment were not statistically different from each other. The percentage of non-Hispanic White 3- and 4-year-olds attending nursery school in 2001 was not statistically different from the percentage of Black 3- and 4-year-olds enrolled. The percentage of Asian and Pacific Islander 3- and 4-year-olds who attended nursery school was not statistically different from the Hispanic children of this age who were enrolled.

---

**Figure 1. Students by Level of School Enrollment: 1970 to 2001**

In millions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Nursery/Kindergarten</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>High School</th>
<th>Elementary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Forty-two percent of Asian and Pacific Islander children this age also attended. The proportion of Hispanic children attending nursery school was 32 percent.

In 2001, 61 percent of 3- and 4-year-olds in families with incomes of $40,000 or more attended school, compared with 43 percent of children this age in families with incomes less than $20,000.

Among 3- and 4-year-olds, school enrollment was also related to the education and labor force participation of a child’s mother. In 2001, children of mothers who were college graduates were more likely to attend nursery school than children whose mothers did not finish high school—68 percent compared with 36 percent. Also, children of mothers in the labor force were more likely to attend school than those whose mothers were not working or looking for work—58 percent compared with 45 percent.⁴

In October 2001, the majority of 5-year-olds were enrolled in school—93 percent. Most 5-year-olds, 73 percent, were in kindergarten. In addition, 14 percent were in nursery school and 6 percent were in first grade.

The total enrollment in kindergarten was 3.7 million in 2001. During the past three decades, the proportion of 3- to 6-year-olds attending kindergarten all day increased from about 1 in 10 to 6 in 10. Additionally, about half of kindergarteners (51 percent) had been enrolled in nursery school in the preceding year.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL AND HIGH SCHOOL

The large number of students enrolled in elementary school and high school (49 million) in 2001 was not statistically different from the previous record set in 1970—peak enrollment for the Baby Boom Generation. Immigration has contributed to growing enrollment. Among children aged 5 to 17, 20 percent had at least one foreign-born parent—and 5 percent of elementary and high school students were foreign born themselves.

Students enrolled in elementary and high schools in 2001 were more diverse than the general population, as shown in Figure 2. While the proportion of non-Hispanic Whites was smaller in these schools than in the general population 3 and older (62 percent compared with 70 percent), the proportion of Blacks was larger (16 percent compared with 13 percent). The proportion of Asian and Pacific Islander students (4.5 percent) was not statistically different from the proportion of Asians and Pacific Islanders in the general population 3 and older (4.4 percent). Hispanics made up 17 percent of elementary and high school students, compared with 13 percent of the general population 3 and older.⁵

During the 1-year period ending in October 2001, 507,000 students, or 4.7 percent of all students in the 10th, 11th, and 12th grades, dropped out of high school.⁶ The rate was 5.3 percent for boys and 4.1 percent for girls.⁷ The high school dropout rate was larger for Blacks (5.7 percent) than for Asians and Pacific Islanders (2.1 percent) and non-Hispanic Whites (3.8 percent). The dropout rate for Hispanics was 8.1 percent.⁸

---

⁴ The labor force includes people who were employed and those who were unemployed but looking for work.

⁵ The percentages of Blacks and Hispanics in the general population were not statistically different.

⁶ The dropout rate has remained the same since 1997. The total dropout rate in 2001 was not statistically different from the rate for boys, girls, or the Black population.

⁷ The 2001 dropout rate for boys was not statistically different from the overall rate for the Black population. The rate for girls was not statistically different from the overall rate for non-Hispanic Whites.

⁸ The 2001 dropout rate for Hispanics was not statistically different from the rate for people who lived in households with incomes of less than $20,000, and the rate for Asians was not statistically different from the rate for people who lived in households with incomes of $40,000 or more.
The likelihood of dropping out was also higher for students from lower-income families than for students from higher-income families. While 9.0 percent of high school students from families with annual incomes below $20,000 dropped out, 2.2 percent of those from families with annual incomes of $40,000 or more left before graduation.

PATHWAYS FOR YOUNG ADULTS

Among the population aged 18 to 24 in 2001, 13 percent were no longer in school but had not graduated from high school. Among the 81 percent who were high school graduates, 44 percent were enrolled in college.

In October 2001, 16 million students were enrolled in college, in contrast with 14 million a decade earlier. Students under age 25 represented 62 percent of all college students. Women accounted for 57 percent of all college students, continuing the majority role they established in 1979.

The race and Hispanic composition of college students shifted over the course of two decades. In 1979, 84 percent were non-Hispanic White and 10 percent were Black, compared with 67 percent and 14 percent in 2001. About 2 percent of students were of other races in 1979. By 2001, Asians and Pacific Islanders accounted for 8 percent of college students. Additionally, Hispanic enrollment grew from 4 percent of college students in 1979 to 11 percent in 2001. In 2001, 13 percent of all U.S. college students were foreign born.

Over one-third of college students were enrolled part-time in 2001, and this rate was higher for women than men—36 percent compared with 32 percent. Older students may need flexibility to schedule their college careers around jobs and families. While 17 percent of students under age 25 attended college part-time, 63 percent of older students did.

9 Other races included American Indian and Alaska Native and Asian and Pacific Islander in 1979.
10 No statistical difference distinguished the percentage of Hispanics in college in 2000 from the percentage of Blacks enrolled in 1979.
While education has become increasingly important, schooling beyond high school has become increasingly expensive. The average cost of in-state tuition, fees, and room and board for a full-time undergraduate student rose from $2,800 in 1979–80 to $9,200 in 1996–97, according to the U.S. Department of Education. This amounts to a 228 percent increase during a time when median family income rose 112 percent.

Among full-time students under age 25, 71 percent were claimed as dependents on their parents’ income tax returns. Rates of financial dependence were highest among first- and second-year college students (77 percent) and lowest among graduate students (41 percent).

In addition to receiving financial assistance from their parents, students also supplemented their incomes by working or obtaining financial aid. Seventy-two percent of all full-time, postsecondary students worked either full-time or part-time during the previous 4 months, as shown in Figure 3. Third- and fourth-year college students and graduate students were even more likely to have worked than first- and second-year college students or vocational, technical, and business school students.

The majority of full-time, postsecondary students (62 percent) received some form of financial aid during the year, including student loans, grants, fellowships, scholarships, work-study appointments, Veterans Educational Assistance, employer assistance, and other sources. Among students who received aid, the average amount was about $6,000, covering an average of 62 percent of their total costs.

---

**Figure 3.**
**Work Status in the Last 4 Months for Full-Time Postsecondary Students by Enrollment Level: 1996–1997**

(Percent distribution)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment Level</th>
<th>Did not work</th>
<th>Worked part time</th>
<th>Worked full time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College years 1 to 2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College years 3 to 4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College years 5 or higher</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational, technical, or business school</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


---

---

---

---
The Census Bureau Can Tell You More


Look for complete reports and detailed tables on the Census Bureau’s Web site <www.census.gov>. Click on “S” and select “School Enrollment.”

Contact the Census Bureau’s Customer Service Center at 301-763-INFO (4636) or e-mail <pop@census.gov>. 
EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT IN 2002

Data on educational attainment come from the Annual Social and Economic Supplement (ASEC) to the Current Population Survey (CPS). The CPS has tracked changes in education levels since 1947.

In 2002, the percentage of the civilian noninstitutionalized population 25 and older who had a high school diploma or more education remained unchanged from the previous year at 84 percent. The percentage of people 25 to 29 with this much education (86 percent) was also statistically unchanged, indicating that increases in educational attainment among young adults may be leveling off, as shown in Figure 1.

In 2002, the percentage of women 25 and older with high school diplomas (84.4 percent) was higher than the percentage of men (83.8 percent) for the first time since the CPS began collecting these data. Among young women and men (25 to 29), the spread was greater: 88 percent and 85 percent, respectively.

College Graduates

In 2002, more than one-quarter (27 percent) of adults 25 and older had a bachelor’s degree or more education—an increase of about 1 percentage point over the previous year. The increase in the percentage of college graduates resulted from increases for women, non-Hispanic Whites, and Blacks.

Among people 25 and older, 29 percent of men and 25 percent of women held a bachelor’s or higher degree. Among the younger set, 25 to 29, women were more likely to be college graduates than men. While 27 percent of young men held a bachelor’s degree or more, 32 percent of young women did.

As shown in Figure 2, Asians and Pacific Islanders had the highest proportion of college graduates (47 percent), followed by non-Hispanic Whites (29 percent), Blacks (17 percent), and Hispanics (11 percent).

The estimates in this report (which may be shown in text, figures, and tables) are based on responses from a sample of the population and may differ from actual values because of sampling variability or other factors. As a result, apparent differences between the estimates for two or more groups may not be statistically significant. All comparative statements have undergone statistical testing and are significant at the 90-percent confidence level unless otherwise noted. For more information on the accuracy of the data, see Appendix A.

Because Hispanics may be any race, data for Hispanics overlap slightly with data for the Black and the Asian and Pacific Islander populations. Based on the population 25 and older surveyed in the CPS ASEC, 3.7 percent of the Black population and 4.3 percent of the Asian and Pacific Islander population were also Hispanic. Data for the American Indian and Alaska Native population are not shown in this section because of the small sample size in the 2002 CPS ASEC.

Words That Count

Educational attainment, as described in this report, is that of the population 25 and older. It is derived from a single question asked in the ASEC: “What is the highest grade of school . . . completed, or the highest degree . . . received?” Before 1992, educational attainment was measured in the CPS only by years of schooling completed.
The proportion of Hispanics born in the United States who had a bachelor’s degree or higher (14 percent) was larger than that of those born outside the country (9 percent). The corresponding rates for Asians and Pacific Islanders were closer—44 percent of those born in the United States and 48 percent of those born outside the United States.

The Census Bureau Can Tell You More


Look for complete reports and detailed tables on the Census Bureau’s Web site <www.census.gov>. Click on “E” and select “Educational Attainment.”

Contact the Census Bureau’s Customer Service Center at 301-763-INFO (4636) or e-mail <pop@census.gov>.
Over the past 25 years, the disparity in earnings among workers with different levels of educational attainment has increased. In 1975, full-time, year-round workers with a bachelor’s degree earned 1.5 times as much as workers with only a high school diploma. By 1999, the ratio had risen to 1.8. During that same time period, the earnings ratio between people with advanced degrees and those with only a high school diploma increased from 1.8 to 2.6.

Synthetic estimates can illustrate the value of education over a hypothetical working life from age 25 to 64, as shown in Figure 3. CPS data collected in the March 1998, 1999, and 2000 supplements revealed that a high school dropout might expect to earn an average of $1 million (in 1999 dollars) during a lifetime of work (40 years). Workers with a high school diploma would earn about $1.2 million. Some college experience but no degree would bring average lifetime earnings up to $1.5 million, while adding an associate’s degree would increase earnings to $1.6 million. Over a work life, a person with a bachelor’s degree would earn $2.1 million, on average, while lifetime earnings would be about $2.5 million for those with a master’s degree, $3.4 million for those with a doctoral degree, and $4.4 million for those with a professional degree.

---

**Figure 3.**

**Synthetic Work-Life Earnings Estimates for Full-Time, Year-Round Workers by Educational Attainment Based on 1997–1999 Work Experience**

(In millions of 1999 dollars)

- Doctoral degree: $3.4
- Professional degree: $4.4
- Master’s degree: $2.5
- Bachelor’s degree: $2.1
- Associate’s degree: $1.6
- Some college: $1.5
- High school graduate: $1.2
- Not high school graduate: $1.0

MONEY INCOME IN 2003

Income data are used to measure poverty, indicate economic well-being, and assess the need for economic assistance. Information on income in 2003 was collected in the 2004 Annual Social and Economic Supplement (ASEC) to the Current Population Survey (CPS).¹ Traditionally, income data in U.S. Census Bureau reports have been based on the amount of money people or households receive during a calendar year.

Nationally, the 2003 median household income—$43,300—remained unchanged from the previous year, following 2 consecutive years of decline. Between 2002 and 2003, real median household income did from actual values because of sampling variability or other factors. As a result, apparent differences between the estimates for two or more groups may not be statistically significant. All comparative statements have undergone statistical testing and are significant at the 90-percent confidence level unless otherwise noted. For further information about the sources and accuracy of the estimates, go to <www.census.gov/hhes/income/p60-226sa.pdf>.

¹ The ASEC numbers in this chapter differ from ASEC estimates prior to 2001 in that they are based on an expanded sample and use Census 2000-based population controls using administrative records on factors such as births and deaths. These changes have been implemented to improve the reliability of the survey results. The estimates in this report (which may be shown in text, figures, and tables) are based on responses from a sample of the population and may differ otherwise stated. The CPI-U-RS is the most recent system for adjusting for inflation from the Bureau of Labor Statistics. With it, incomes from different years can be compared in dollars with the same purchasing power. The index shows the changing cost of a market basket of goods and services representing the average consumption of the urban population. For more information, see <www.bls.gov/cpi/cpiurstx.htm>.

Earnings include gross (before any deductions) money wage or salary income and net income from farm and nonfarm self-employment.

Net worth or wealth is the sum of the market value of assets owned by every member of the household minus liabilities (secured or unsecured) owed by every member of the household. The major assets not covered in this report are equities in pension plans, the cash value of insurance policies, and the value of home furnishings and jewelry. These are not covered because it is particularly difficult to obtain reliable estimates of the value of these assets in a household survey.

Words That Count

Money income includes earnings, unemployment compensation, workers’ compensation, social security, supplemental security income, cash public assistance, veterans payments, survivor benefits, pension or retirement income, interest, dividends, rents, royalties, payments from estates and trusts, educational assistance, alimony, child support, assistance from outside the household, and other miscellaneous money income. Money income is income before deductions for taxes or other payments have been made. It does not include lump-sum payments, capital gains (losses), or noncash transfers, such as food stamps, rent subsidies, free and reduced-price school lunches, Medicare, and Medicaid.

Median household income is derived by dividing households into two equal halves so that half have incomes above the median and half have incomes below it.

Real or adjusted dollars have been adjusted for changes in the cost of living. In the section on money income, all of the income estimates have been adjusted to 2003 dollars using the Consumer Price Index research series CPI-U-RS unless otherwise stated.
not change for non-Hispanic White, Black, and Asian households. The median for Hispanic households dropped 2.6 percent.2

Among the race and Hispanic-origin groups discussed in this chapter, Black households had the lowest median income (about $30,000) and Asian households had the highest (about $55,500). The median for non-Hispanic White households was about $48,000. The median for Hispanics was $33,000.

Because of the relatively small size of the American Indian and Alaska Native population, the sampling variability of their income data is larger than for the other racial groups and may cause single-year estimates to fluctuate more widely. To reduce the chance of misinterpreting changes in income or comparisons with other groups, the Census Bureau uses 2-year-average medians for measuring changes in the income of American Indians and Alaska Natives over time, and 3-year-average medians when comparing the income of this group with that of other racial and Hispanic-origin groups.3

Comparison of 2-year-average medians (2001 to 2002 and 2002 to 2003) indicates that the real household median income for American Indians and Alaska Natives who reported one or more races increased 4.0 percent over the time period and was unchanged for single-race American Indians and Alaska Natives.

---

2 Unless otherwise stated, the statements concerning racial groups in this chapter are true regardless of whether the respondents also reported another race.

Because Hispanics may be any race, data in this chapter for Hispanics overlap slightly with data for the racial populations. Based on the 2004 ASEC, 2.7 percent of Black householders, 1.3 percent of Asian householders, 26.5 percent of American Indian and Alaska Native householders were Hispanic. Income data for the Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander population are not given here because of their small sample in the ASEC. Creating 3-year averages for the Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander population was not possible because this was the first year the ASEC collected data for this category. The racial and Hispanic-origin classifications used in this chapter adhere to standards issued by the Office of Management and Budget in October 1997.

Because 2003 was the first year that respondents to the ASEC could select more than one racial category, the 2003 categories do not align exactly with the categories provided in earlier surveys. Income levels for Native Hawaiians and Other Pacific Islanders will be reported separately, beginning with the 2005 ASEC report on income, poverty, and health insurance coverage.

3 The 2-year-average median is the sum of two inflation-adjusted (real) single-year medians divided by 2. The 3-year-average median is the sum of three inflation-adjusted (real) single-year medians divided by 3.

A high-income householder may have a large amount of credit card debt. On the other hand, a low-income retired householder may live in a house with no mortgage, drive a paid-off car, and have investments in stocks. To help policymakers and others understand the relationship between income and wealth (or net worth), the Census Bureau’s Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP) periodically collects detailed data on the value of assets and liabilities.

While income is the flow of resources from a job, a transfer program, or some other source, wealth is the level of economic resources that a person or household possesses at any given time. Net worth includes assets—such as savings and investments, real estate, and motor vehicles—minus liabilities, such as mortgages, credit card debt, and student loans. The economic well-being of households depends upon both income and wealth.

The median household net worth in 2000 was $55,000, about 10 percent higher than in 1998, when it was $49,900 (in 2000 dollars). Home equity (the value of the home net of mortgages) constituted the largest share of household net worth in 2000. Sixty-seven percent of households reported owning a home in 2000, and household equity accounted for 32 percent of net worth. Stocks and mutual funds made up the next-largest share of net worth in 2000. About 27 percent of households held this type of asset, and it accounted for about 16 percent of total net worth. The remainder of net worth consisted of a variety of property and investments, including individual retirement accounts (IRAs) and Keogh accounts, vehicles, rental property, and business or professional assets, as illustrated in Figure 2. Fifty-three percent of households had unsecured liabilities, such as credit card debt.

Age was an important aspect of net worth in 2000. Median net worth peaked among households with a householder aged 70 to 74. Households maintained by someone under 35 had more income but lower net worth, on average, than households maintained by someone 65 and older.

Figure 2.
Percent Distribution of Net Worth: 2000*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Own home</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stocks and mutual fund shares</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401K and thrift savings plans</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest-earning assets at financial institutions</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRA or Keogh accounts</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business or profession</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental property</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other real estate</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other interest-earning assets</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other financial investments**</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. savings bonds</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular checking accounts</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsecured liabilities***</td>
<td>-3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Individual outliers that highly influenced the mean value for asset categories were topcoded or excluded. The mean is used to calculate the percent distribution. The outlier adjustments to the individual assets and not the totals led to this column not summing to 100 percent.

**Includes mortgages held for sale of real estate, amount due from sale of business or property, and other financial assets.

***Because net worth is assets less liabilities, unsecured liabilities are subtracted from the distribution of net worth and are shown as a negative.

The 3-year-average median (2001–2003) for American Indians and Alaska Natives ($33,000) was higher than the median for Black households and lower than the median for non-Hispanic White and Asian households. It was not statistically different from the 3-year-average median for Hispanic households.

Among households whose householder had at least one citizen parent or who was born in the United States, Puerto Rico, or any of the U.S. island areas (natives), the 2003 median household income was $44,300—unchanged from the previous year.\(^4\) Foreign-born households experienced a 3.5-percent real decline, bringing their median to $37,500. In households with a foreign-born householder who was not a citizen, real median income dropped 5.6 percent to $32,800.\(^5\)

**Differences by Geography**

In 3 of the 4 regions, real median household income did not change between 2002 and 2003. Real median income in the South dropped 1.5 percent to $39,800. The median household income was $46,700 in the Northeast, $44,700 in the Midwest, and $46,800 in the West.\(^6\)

Using 2-year-average medians to compare income over time (2001–2002 to 2002–2003), median household income rose in 4 states and declined in 10, as shown in Figure 1. Real median income increased in Idaho, North Dakota, Washington, and West Virginia. Four of the states that experienced decline were in the South (Arkansas, Kentucky, North Carolina, and Texas), three were in the Northeast (Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and Rhode Island), two were in the West (Alaska and Arizona), and one was in the Midwest (Illinois).

---

\(^4\) The U.S. island areas include the U.S. Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Guam, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

\(^5\) There was no statistical difference between the percentage change in the income of all foreign-born households and households maintained by a foreign-born householder who was not a citizen.

\(^6\) The 2003 median household incomes for the Northeast and the West are not statistically different.
Looking at 3-year-average medians for 2001–2003, New Jersey’s median household income ($55,200) was not different from the medians for Maryland, New Hampshire, Alaska, Connecticut, and Minnesota, and was higher than the median for all other states and the District of Columbia. Conversely, the median for West Virginia ($31,200) was not different from the median for Mississippi, but was lower than that of all other states and the District of Columbia.

While the median income of households in central cities of metropolitan areas declined by 1.4 percent between 2002 and 2003, the median in metropolitan areas as a whole and in areas outside metropolitan areas did not change.

**Male and Female Earnings**

Of the 80.6 million men 15 and older who worked in 2003, 73 percent worked full-time, year-round, compared with 59 percent of the 71.4 million comparable women. The real median earnings of men who worked full-time, year-round in 2003 ($40,700) did not change from the previous year. The median earnings of their female counterparts declined by 0.6 percent to $30,700. This drop was the first decline in women’s earnings since 1995, as shown in Figure 3. Reflecting the decline in the earnings of women, the female-to-male, full-time, year-round earnings ratio fell from 0.77 to 0.76 between 2002 and 2003.

**The Census Bureau Can Tell You More**


Contact the Census Bureau’s Customer Service Center at 301-763-INFO (4636) or e-mail <hhes-info@census.gov>.

For additional information on wealth, consult the Federal Reserve Board’s Survey of Consumer Finances at <www.federalreserve.gov/pubs/oss2/scfindex.html>.
Since 1959, the U.S. Census Bureau has produced statistics on the number and rate of people in poverty. Information used to calculate poverty rates in 2003 was collected in the 2004 Annual Social and Economic Supplement (ASEC) to the Current Population Survey (CPS). These data help describe the country’s economic well-being.

Poverty is defined according to the Office of Management and Budget’s Statistical Policy Directive 14 using a set of money income thresholds that vary by family size and composition to determine who is in poverty. If a family’s total income is less than the threshold, the family and every individual in it are considered to be in poverty. The official poverty thresholds do not vary geographically but are updated annually for inflation using the Consumer Price Index. The official poverty definition counts money income before taxes and excludes capital gains and the value of noncash benefits (such as public housing, Medicaid, and food stamps). In 2003, the weighted average poverty threshold was $18,810 for a family of four and $14,680 for a family of three.

Figure 1.
Number in Poverty and Poverty Rate: 1959 to 2003

Note: The data points are placed at the midpoints of the respective years.
Between 2002 and 2003, the official poverty rate rose from 12.1 percent to 12.5 percent and the number of people in poverty grew by 1.3 million—to 35.9 million, as shown in Figure 1. The 2003 poverty rate for people aged 18 to 64 (11 percent) was unchanged from the previous year; their numbers grew from 18.9 million to 19.4 million. Among people 65 and older, the poverty rate (10 percent) and the number in poverty (3.6 million) remained unchanged.

Between 2002 and 2003, the percentage in poverty and the number in poverty increased among children under 18 years old. In 2003, 18 percent of children or 12.9 million were in poverty, compared with 17 percent or 12.1 million in 2002.

Figure 2.
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Poverty by Race, Hispanic Origin, and Nativity

Between 2002 and 2003, the poverty rate was unchanged for people who indicated that they were Hispanic, Black, or non-Hispanic White.\(^2\)

The 2003 poverty rate for non-Hispanic Whites (8 percent) was lower than that for the other racial groups. This group accounted for 68 percent of the total population and 44 percent of people in poverty.

Among people who indicated that they were Black, the poverty rate was about 24 percent in both 2002 and 2003. Among Asians, the poverty rate rose from 10 percent in 2002 to 12 percent in 2003.

Because of the small sample size of the American Indian and Alaska Native population in the 2004 CPS, the Census Bureau uses 3-year-average poverty rates to improve accuracy. The 3-year-average poverty rate (2001–2003) for people who reported American Indian or Alaska Native as their only race was 23 percent—not different from the rates for Blacks and Hispanics, but higher than the rates for non-Hispanic Whites and Asians.

The 2003 poverty rate for Hispanics (22 percent) was not different from their 2002 poverty rate. While this rate did not change, the number of Hispanics in poverty grew (as did their total population)—from 8.6 million in 2002 to 9.1 million in 2003.

The number of foreign-born people who lived in poverty rose from 5.6 million in 2002 to 5.9 million in 2003: at the same time, their poverty rate remained unchanged at 17 percent.\(^3\) In contrast, the native population had increases in both the number in poverty and the poverty rate, growing from 29.0 million (or 11.5 percent) to 30.0 million (or 11.8 percent).

Families in Poverty

Between 2002 and 2003, the number of families in poverty and their poverty rate grew from 7.2 million (or 9.6 percent) to 7.6 million (or 10.0 percent). Married-couple families showed no change in either their numbers or poverty rate (3.1 million or 5 percent). In contrast, both the numbers in poverty and poverty rates increased for families in which the householder did not live with a spouse. For households maintained by men who did not live with a spouse, the number of families in poverty grew to 640,000, with a poverty rate of 14 percent. For households maintained by women who did not live with a spouse, the number of families in poverty grew to 3.9 million, with a poverty rate of 28 percent.

Poverty Levels by Region and State

In 2003, the poverty rates for the Northeast (11 percent), Midwest (11 percent), South (14 percent), and West (13 percent) were all unchanged from their 2002 levels.\(^4\)

To improve reliability at the state level, the Census Bureau uses 3-year averages to measure poverty (2001 through 2003 in this report). The 3-year rate for Arkansas (18 percent), which was not different from the rates for New Mexico, Mississippi, Louisiana, West Virginia, and the District of Columbia, was higher than the rates for the other 45 states. The rate for New Hampshire (6 percent), while not different from the rate for Minnesota, was lower than the rates for the remaining 48 states and the District of Columbia.

The Census Bureau uses 2-year moving averages (2001–2002 and 2002–2003) to compare changes in poverty rates at the state level over time. Based on this approach, the poverty rate declined in two states—Mississippi and North Dakota. Among the seven states experiencing increases, three were in the South (North Carolina, Texas, and Virginia), three were in the Midwest (Illinois, Michigan, and South Dakota), and one was in the West (Nevada), as shown in Figure 2.

---

\(^2\) Unless otherwise stated, the statements concerning racial groups in this chapter are true regardless of whether the respondents also reported another race.

\(^3\) Because Hispanics may be any race, data in this chapter for Hispanics overlap slightly with data for the racial populations. Based on the 2004 ASEC, 2.7 percent of Black householders, 1.3 percent of Asian householders, 26.5 percent of American Indian and Alaska Native householders, and 10.0 percent of Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander householders were Hispanic. Poverty data for the Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander population are not given here because of their small sample in the ASEC. Creating 3-year averages for the Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander population was not possible because this was the first year the ASEC collected data for this category. The race or origin of the household is based on the race or origin of the householder, regardless of the race or origin of other household members. The racial and Hispanic-origin classifications used in this chapter adhere to standards issued by the Office of Management and Budget in October 1997.

\(^4\) Because 2003 was the first year that respondents to the ASEC could select more than one racial category, the 2003 categories do not align exactly with the categories provided in earlier surveys. Poverty levels for Native Hawaiians and Other Pacific Islanders will be reported separately beginning with the 2005 ASEC. The foreign-born population consists of people who were not citizens at birth. Natives are people with at least one citizen-parent, or who were born in the United States or any of its island areas. The island areas include: Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Guam, and the Commonwealth of Northern Mariana Islands.

\(^3\) There is no statistical difference between the poverty rates for the Northeast and Midwest.
Poverty (1996 to 1999)

Most surveys produce data for one point in time, while information from longitudinal surveys provides a dynamic view of how people move in and out of poverty over time. Data for this analysis were collected in the 1996 panel of the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP) and reflect the dynamics of poverty from January 1996 to December 1999 for the civilian noninstitutionalized population.

Based on the sample of people who remained in the survey from 1996 to 1999, 40.9 million people, or 16 percent of the population, were in poverty (using the official poverty measure) in an average month in 1996. By 1999, the average number in poverty had fallen to 34.8 million, yielding an average monthly rate of 13 percent. Overall, 34 percent of people were in poverty for at least 2 months during the study period and 2 percent were in poverty every month of the 4-year period from 1996 through 1999.

Reflecting declines in poverty between 1996 and 1999, more people exited than entered poverty over the study period. Of those who were in poverty in 1996, 65 percent remained in poverty in 1997, 56 percent were in poverty in 1998, and 50 percent continued to be in poverty in 1999. Of those who were not in poverty in 1996, 2.9 percent entered poverty in 1997, 3.3 percent in 1998, and 3.5 percent in 1999.

Poverty transitions occur more frequently when using a monthly rather than an annual poverty measure, reflecting the higher volume of short-term fluctuations in income. The majority of poverty experiences ended within 4 months. About four-fifths ended within a year (Figure 3).

Reflected in the table, 2.0 percent of people were in poverty for all 48 months; they are not included in the above distribution.


---

Figure 3. **Duration of Poverty Spells: 1996 to 1999**
(Percent of poverty spells. Excludes spells underway during the first interview month)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 to 4 months</td>
<td>51.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 8 months</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 to 12 months</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 to 16 months</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 to 20 months</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 to 24 months</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 36 months</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 36 months</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 2.0 percent of people were in poverty for all 48 months; they are not included in the above distribution.


---

1 The percentage of people who exited poverty in 1998 was not statistically different from the percentage who exited in 1999.
Participation in Means-Tested Programs: 1996 to 1999

In 1999, the average monthly participation in major means-tested assistance programs was 36 million (13 percent of noninstitutionalized civilians), according to the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP). These programs included:

- Aid to Families With Dependent Children (AFDC) and Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)
- General assistance (GA)
- Food stamps
- Medicaid
- Supplemental Security Income (SSI)
- Housing assistance

Individuals were more likely to participate in Medicaid than in any other means-tested program. During 1999, the average monthly participation rate in this program was 10 percent. Individuals participated in the Supplemental Security Income (SSI) program for longer periods of time than people participated in the food stamp or Medicaid programs.

Unemployed people were more likely to participate in means-tested programs (26 percent) than those with full-time jobs (4 percent). Individuals in households maintained by women were approximately 5 times more likely to participate in an average month than those in married-couple families. Children under 18 years were more likely to receive benefits from some of these programs than people in other age groups. In an average month in 1999, 21 percent of children received some type of benefit, compared with 10 percent of people 18 to 64 years and 13 percent of people 65 and older.

Between 1996 and 1999, the proportion of people in poverty receiving benefits declined from 52 percent to 49 percent. Those in poverty were more likely to receive at least one type of major means-tested benefit than individuals who were not poor. The 1999 participation rate for people who were not in poverty was 8 percent.

The Census Bureau Can Tell You More


Look for complete reports and detailed tables on the Census Bureau’s Web site <www.census.gov>. Click on “P” and select “Poverty” or “W” and select “Well-Being.”

Contact the Census Bureau’s Customer Service Center at 301-763-INFO (4636) or e-mail <hhes-info@census.gov>. 
Knowing the numbers and characteristics of the uninsured is important for decision-makers who hope to address this issue. These estimates on health insurance coverage come from the Annual Social and Economic Supplement (ASEC) to the Current Population Survey (CPS).¹

Between 2002 and 2003, both the number of people with health insurance and the number without it grew.² The percentage of the population who lacked health insurance coverage for the entire year rose from 15.2 percent to 15.6 percent.

Sixty percent were covered by a health insurance plan related to employment for some or all of 2003—a decline from the previous year, as shown in Figure 1. This decline accounts for the fall in total private health insurance coverage, from 70 percent to 69 percent.

---

**Words That Count**

**Private health insurance** is coverage by a health plan provided through an employer or union or purchased by an individual from a private health insurance company.

**Employment-based health insurance** is coverage offered through one’s own employment or a relative’s. It may be offered by an employer or a union.

**Direct-purchase health insurance** is coverage through a plan purchased by an individual from a private health insurance company.

**Government health insurance** includes medicare, medicaid, and military insurance, such as CHAMPUS or TRICARE.

The uninsured rate is based on people who lacked health insurance for all of 2003.
The percentage of the total population covered by government health insurance for at least part of the year rose from 26 percent to 27 percent. Growth in this sector largely reflects the increased number of people covered by medicaid, whose enrollment rose from 11.6 percent to 12.4 percent.

Coverage by Race, Hispanic Origin, and Nativity

In 2003, the Hispanic population had the highest uninsured rate (33 percent), unchanged from the previous year. The uninsured rate for Asians (19 percent) and Blacks (20 percent) was also unchanged from 2002.\footnote{Unless otherwise stated, the statements concerning racial groups in this chapter are true regardless of whether the respondents also reported another race. The health insurance coverage rates for Blacks and Asians were not statistically different from one another. Because Hispanics may be any race, data in this chapter for Hispanics overlap slightly with data for the racial populations. Based on the 2004 ASEC, 2.7 percent of Black householders, 1.3 percent of Asian householders, 26.5 percent of American Indian and Alaska Native householders, and 10.0 percent of Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander householders were Hispanic. Health insurance coverage data for the Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander population are not given here because of their small sample size in the ASEC. Creating 3-year averages for the Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander population was not possible because this was the first year the ASEC collected data for this category. The race or origin of the household is based on the race or origin of the householder, regardless of the race or origin of other household members. The racial and Hispanic-origin classifications used in this chapter adhere to standards issued by the Office of Management and Budget in October 1997. Because 2003 was the first year that respondents to the ASEC could select more than one racial category, the 2003 categories do not align exactly with the categories provided in earlier surveys. Health insurance coverage for Native Hawaiians and Other Pacific Islanders will be reported separately beginning with the 2005 ASEC report on income, poverty, and health insurance coverage.}

At the same time, the uninsured rate for non-Hispanic Whites rose from 10.7 percent in 2002 to 11.1 percent in 2003.

Because of the small sample size of the American Indian and Alaska Native population in the 2004 CPS, the Census Bureau uses 3-year-average uninsured rates to improve accuracy. The 3-year-average uninsured rate (2001–2003) for people who reported American Indian and Alaska Native (27 percent) was higher than the rate for any other race or ethnic group except for Hispanics. Comparisons of 2-year moving averages (2001–2002 and 2002–2003) indicate that the uninsured rate for American Indians and Alaska Natives did not change.

\begin{figure}
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\caption{Differences in 2-Year-Average Uninsured Rates by State: 2002-2003 Less 2001-2002}
\end{figure}

Between 2002 and 2003, the uninsured rate increased from 12.8 percent to 13.0 percent for the native population (people born in the United States or its island areas or who had at least one citizen parent). Among the foreign born, this rate increased from 33 percent to 35 percent. While the rate for naturalized citizens was unchanged at 17 percent, the rate for noncitizens grew from 43 percent to 45 percent.

Children's Health Insurance Coverage

Between 2002 and 2003, the percentage and number of children without health insurance coverage did not change, remaining at 11 percent and 8.4 million, respectively. Among children, the likelihood of health insurance coverage varied by poverty status, age, race, and Hispanic origin. Children in poverty were more likely to be uninsured than the population of all children in 2003—19 percent compared with 11 percent. Children 12 to 17 years old were more likely to be uninsured than those under 12—13 percent compared with 11 percent.

Twenty-one percent of Hispanic children did not have health insurance for all or part of 2003. The comparable rates among children for whom a single race was reported were 7.4 percent for non-Hispanic White children, 15 percent for Black children, and 12 percent for Asian children.

Coverage in the Regions and States

The proportion of people living in the South who lacked health insurance grew from 17.5 percent in 2002 to 18.0 percent in 2003. The rate remained unchanged in the Northeast (12.9 percent), Midwest (12.0 percent), and West (17.6 percent).

Based on a 3-year average (2000–2002), the proportion of people without health insurance was highest in Texas (25 percent) and New Mexico (21 percent) and lowest in Minnesota (8 percent). Comparisons of 2-year moving averages (2000–2001 and 2001–2002) indicate that the proportion without coverage fell in California and Utah and increased in 20 other states, as shown in Figure 2. Six of the states experiencing increases were in the South (Delaware, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia) and another six were in the West (Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, and Washington). Five were in the Midwest (Indiana, Iowa, Nebraska, South Dakota, and Wisconsin) and three were in the Northeast (Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and Rhode Island).

---

4 The foreign-born population consists of people who were not citizens at birth. Natives are people with at least one citizen parent, or who were born in the United States or any of its island areas. The island areas include: Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Guam, and the Commonwealth of Northern Mariana Islands.

5 The health insurance coverage rates were not statistically different for Black children and Asian children in 2003.

6 The health insurance coverage rates were not statistically different in the South and West.

The 1996 panel of the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP) allows researchers to track health insurance patterns between 1996 and 1999. The percentage of people covered throughout the entire year was 78 percent in 1996 and 80 percent in 1999. During this 48-month reference period, 97 percent of people in the United States were covered for at least 1 month and 32 percent lacked health insurance coverage for at least 1 month.

Female health insurance coverage rates were higher than male coverage rates during the 48-month period, as shown in Figure 3. From 1996 to 1999, 69 percent of women and girls and 67 percent of men and boys were always covered. The proportions lacking health insurance for the entire reference period were 2.7 percent and 4.0 percent, respectively.

Higher female coverage rates were due to government health insurance programs, which covered 12 percent of men and boys and 15 percent of women and girls during the entire reference period. Throughout this time, male and female private health insurance rates were about the same, 57.9 percent and 57.7 percent, respectively.

The gender gap in health insurance coverage did not change from 1996 to 1999. In 1996, the percentage of women and girls covered for the entire year was 3 percentage points higher than the rate for men and boys (80 percent and 77 percent, respectively), and this gap was not different in any of the 3 subsequent years.

The Census Bureau Can Tell You More

For more detailed information, consult the following U.S. Census Bureau Current Population Reports: 

Look for complete reports and detailed tables on the Census Bureau's Web site <www.census.gov>. Click on “H” and select “Health Insurance.”

Contact the Census Bureau’s Customer Service Center at 301-763-INFO (4636) or e-mail <hhes-info@census.gov>.
A variety of measures (health, housing, economics, education, or safety) can be used to gauge well-being. The Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP) asks questions about five subject areas to provide one of the most extensive measures of individual well-being found anywhere. These subject areas include: the possession of appliances and other electronic goods, housing conditions, neighborhood conditions, the ability to meet basic needs, and the possibility of receiving assistance during times of need.

**Possession of Appliances and Electronic Goods**

Among high-income households (those in the top 20 percent), 99 percent had telephones in 1998. Among those with incomes in the bottom 20 percent, 90 percent had telephones. While income was important, other factors also influenced the possession of appliances and electronic goods. The lack of air conditioning, for instance, affected household comfort in the South more than in other regions. While 67 percent of Southerners without air conditioning were satisfied with the coolness of their homes in summer, 83 percent of Northeasterners without air conditioning felt this way.

**Housing Conditions**

In 1998, 92 percent of householders were at least somewhat satisfied with their homes’ state of repair. Eighty-seven percent said their homes were free from rats, mice, roaches, or other household pests. Ninety-three percent said they did not have a leaking roof or ceiling.

**Neighborhood Safety**

When asked if they stayed home at certain times because they thought it might be unsafe to go out, 87 percent of respondents in 1998 said no. Ninety-four percent of high-income householders never stayed home because of fear of crime, compared with 77 percent of low-income householders. Householders who considered their neighborhoods safe were more likely to own a dog than those who did not (33 percent and 29 percent, respectively). In neighborhoods that householders reported to be unsafe, 52 percent of dog owners said safety was their reason for getting a dog, compared with 28 percent of those in self-defined safe neighborhoods.

**Essential Expenses**

The SIPP asked householders if there was any instance in the last 12 months when they did not “meet essential expenses.” The difficulty most commonly mentioned was paying utility bills—cited by 9 percent of

---

1 The information in this chapter comes from the Survey of Income and Program Participation, 1996 Panel, Wave 8 Topical Module, which followed respondents through 1998. The estimates in this report (which may be shown in text, figures, and tables) are based on responses from a sample of the population and may differ from actual values because of sampling variability or other factors. As a result, apparent differences between the estimates for two or more groups may not be statistically significant. All comparative statements have undergone statistical testing and are significant at the 90-percent confidence level unless otherwise noted.

1 A “full set of appliances” includes a stove, a refrigerator, a clothes washer, a clothes dryer, a dishwasher, and a telephone. Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Survey of Income and Program Participation, 1996 Panel, Wave 8.
householders. Next, householders said they were likely to skip dental or medical care (8 percent and 6 percent), followed by skipping mortgage or rent payments (5 percent). Few households got so far in arrears that their phone service or utility service was cut off. Less than 1 percent of households reported being evicted in the last 12 months because rent or mortgage payments were not made. In all, 21 percent of U.S. households had difficulty meeting at least one of the essential expenses over the year.

Even the highest-income households sometimes had problems meeting basic needs. Among this group, 8 percent had at least one difficulty, 3 percent did not pay a utility bill, and 2 percent needed to see a doctor but did not go. A high-income household might have had a budget shortfall if income and household composition fluctuated or people tried to extend their resources beyond their limits. In some cases, a household may have had a high income because it was made up of individuals, such as roommates or boarders, who lived on separate budgets, and one of them may have experienced difficulty meeting basic needs.

Differences by Race and Hispanic Origin

Compared with non-Hispanic White households, Hispanic and Black households had higher levels of difficulty meeting essential expenses, elevated fear of crime, and greater need for housing. They also had a lower expectation of obtaining help if it were needed (Figure 1).2


In 2002, the SIPP estimated that 7.8 million adults provided an aggregate of $40 billion in financial support to people outside their immediate household.1 In 1997, there were 8 percent fewer providers (7.2 million) and the total aggregate support was 15 percent less ($34 billion).

About 60 percent of support paid in 2002 ($24 billion) was exclusively for children under 21 years old living outside the household. Another $13 billion was paid to other nonhousehold members who were at least 21. The remaining $3 billion of support was paid for children and other nonhousehold members.

The average amount of support in 2001 was $5,200 and in some cases assisted more than one recipient. In 2001, 5.7 million people paid an average of $4,200 to children under 21 who lived outside their household. Another 2.1 million people in 2002 paid an average of $6,100 to other people outside their household.

The relationship of the support recipient to the support payer was likely to be a parent (36 percent), a child over 21 years of age (27 percent), or another relative (23 percent).4 Spouses or ex-spouses accounted for 11 percent of people receiving support payments.

The Census Bureau Can Tell You More


For information on well-being, contact the Census Bureau’s Education and Social Stratification Branch at 301-763-2464 or e-mail <pop@cenens.gov>.

For information on financial support networks, contact the Housing and Household Economic Statistics Division at 301-763-3242 or e-mail <hhes-info@census.gov>.

---

2 The race or origin of the household is based on the race or origin of the householder, regardless of the race or origin of the other household members. Because Hispanics may be any race, data for Hispanics overlap slightly with data for the Black population. Based on data from Wave 8 of the 1996 Panel of the SIPP, 4 percent of Black households were also Hispanic. Data for Asians and Pacific Islanders and for American Indians and Alaska Natives are not shown in this report because of their small sample size in the 1998 Panel of the SIPP.

3 The information in this section comes from the U.S. Census Bureau’s Survey of Income and Program Participation, June–September 2002. All dollar amounts in this section have been inflation-adjusted to 2002 dollars.

4 The proportion of support recipients who were children over 21 years old was not statistically different from the proportion of recipients who were another type of relative.
Statistics on women and men are clearly valuable to manufacturers and advertisers selling everything from automobiles to zinc oxide. These facts may be even more essential to health care planners and agencies supplying social services. As each generation comes of age, the roles of women and men change, creating a need to continually reexamine the numbers. Every year, new information on education, occupation, living arrangements, poverty status, and a variety of other topics comes from the U.S. Census Bureau’s Annual Social and Economic Supplement (ASEC) to the Current Population Survey (CPS).

Women and girls made up 51 percent of the civilian non-institutionalized population in 2002 (144 million female residents and 138 million male residents), but the share of women and girls in the population varied by age. Among people under 18 years of age, boys outnumbered girls by nearly 2 million. The proportions of men and women in their twenties were not different. The female population gradually began to outnumber the male population after that. Among the population 65 and older, women outnumbered men by 5.3 million.

Overall, there were about 96.6 men for every 100 women in the United States in 2002. This sex ratio varied by race and Hispanic origin, as shown in Figure 1. The Hispanic population had the highest sex ratio (104.4). The Asian and Pacific Islander population and the non-Hispanic White population had sex ratios of 95.1 and 95.9, respectively—while the American Indian and Alaska Native population had a sex ratio of 92.0. The sex ratio for the Black population was 86.6.

A **sex ratio** is the number of male residents per 100 female residents.

The **civilian labor force** consists of all noninstitutionalized civilians 16 and older who are either working or looking for work. The data in this report are for March 2002 and are not adjusted for seasonal changes. Therefore, they may not agree with data released by the U.S. Department of Labor.

**Spell of unemployment** is defined as an uninterrupted period of months in which an individual was unemployed. In this chapter, an individual was unemployed in a given month only if he or she had no job all month and spent at least one week looking for work.

---

**Figure 1.**

**Sex Ratios by Race and Hispanic Origin: 2002**

(Male population per 100 female population)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race and Hispanic Origin</th>
<th>Sex Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>95.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic White</td>
<td>95.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>86.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaska Native</td>
<td>92.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian and Pacific Islander</td>
<td>95.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic (any race)</td>
<td>104.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The labor market of the United States is dynamic and flexible, changing as people enter and exit or change jobs within it. Data on spells of unemployment from the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP) provide insight on how the market allows people to make transitions in response to shifts in labor demand.

The median duration of unemployment for individuals was 1.8 months during the period from January 1996 through December 1999. The median for women was 1.7 months, compared with 1.9 months for men, possibly reflecting differences in the types of jobs they were seeking, the conditions under which they would accept work, and other factors.

The median length of periods of unemployment generally increased with age, as shown in Figure 2, peaking among men and women aged 45 to 54. For men, the shortest median length of unemployment (1.5 months) was for people 16 to 19. For women, the shortest spells were among those under age 25.7

The shorter unemployment spells for younger workers may indicate that their job skills more closely meet the demands of the modern service-oriented labor market. Younger workers may also be less constrained by family responsibilities and better able to move more quickly between jobs. Younger workers also tend to be less well-paid than older workers and more jobs are available in the lower wage ranges.

Note: Includes all unemployment spells for people in the labor force.

There was no statistical difference between the median length of unemployment for women aged 16 to 19 (1.4 months) and those aged 20 to 24 (1.5 months).
**Educational Attainment**

In 2002, 84 percent of both men and women 25 and older had completed high school or more education. Completion rates for higher educational levels also varied by sex. Among the population 25 and older, 29 percent of men and 25 percent of women had bachelor’s degrees or more education. Women in this age group were more likely than men to have completed at least some college or hold an associate’s degree (26 percent compared with 24 percent).⁸

**Occupations**

In 2002, 60 percent of women and 74 percent of men 16 and older participated in the civilian labor force, meaning they were either working or looking for work. The proportions of men and women in certain occupations differed.⁹

Among employed women, 73 percent worked in four occupational groups: administrative support, including clerical (23 percent); professional specialty, such as architects, physicians, and writers (19 percent); service workers, except private household (17 percent); and executive, administrators, and managerial (15 percent).

The top four occupational groups for men accounted for 59 percent of employed men. These occupations included precision production, craft, and repair (18 percent); executive, administrators, and managerial (16 percent); professional specialty (14 percent); and sales (11 percent).

---

⁸ For more information on sex and education, see the chapters on school enrollment and educational attainment.

⁹ The occupational data shown in this report are based on a set of 12 occupational categories. For information on earnings by sex, see the chapter on money income.

---

**The Census Bureau Can Tell You More**


Look for detailed tables on the Census Bureau’s Web site <www.census.gov>. Click on “W” and select “Women.”

Contact the Census Bureau’s Customer Service Center at 301-763-INFO (4636) or e-mail <hhes-info@census.gov>.

For information on women, contact the Special Populations Staff of the Census Bureau at 301-763-2378 or e-mail <pop@census.gov>. 
On average, boys born in the United States at the beginning of the 20th century could expect to live 46 years, while girls born at the same time could expect to live 48 years. At the beginning of the 21st century, life expectancy at birth was 74 for boys and 79 for girls. Today's older adults—those 55 and older—are an important consumer market, as well as an influential social force. The U.S. Census Bureau plays an essential role in getting the facts on this dynamic population. Data on the older population in this chapter come from the Annual Social and Economic Supplement (ASEC) to the Current Population Survey (CPS).

In 2002, 26.6 million men and 33.0 million women in the civilian noninstitutionalized population were 55 and older—creating a ratio of 81 men for every 100 women. Within this age group, the sex ratio was highest among the younger group and lowest among the oldest old. While the ratio was 92 for people 55 to 64, it was 46 for those 85 and older, as illustrated in Figure 1.

**Words That Count**

**Life expectancy at birth** is the average number of years that a person would live if he or she experienced the mortality rate at each year of age experienced by the actual population in a specific year.

**Marital Status**

In 2002, 74 percent of men and 50 percent of women 55 and older were married and living with their spouse. This marriage gap widened with age. For those 55 to 64, 75 percent of men and 63 percent of women were married. The proportions changed to 58 percent of men and 12 percent of women for those 85 and older. Women have longer life expectancies than men, and they were more likely to be widowed than men. Among all people 55 and older, 9 percent of men and 31 percent of women were widowed.

**Education**

Eighty-four percent of people aged 55 to 64 held a high school diploma in 2002; the share dropped to 71 percent for those 65 to 84 and to 58 percent for those 85 and older. In most age categories 55 and older, women and men were equally likely to be high school graduates. Older men were more likely than older women to have a bachelor's degree or more education. For those 55 to 64, the male and female college graduation rates were 31 percent and 22 percent, respectively. For those 65 to 84, 22 percent of men and 13 percent of women were this well educated. In the oldest age group (85+), 17 percent of men and 12 percent of women had at least a bachelor's degree.

---

2 The estimates in this report (which may be shown in text, figures, and tables) are based on responses from a sample of the population and may differ from actual values because of sampling variability or other factors. As a result, apparent differences between the estimates for two or more groups may not be statistically significant. All comparative statements have undergone statistical testing and are significant at the 90-percent confidence level unless otherwise noted. For more information on the accuracy of the data, see Appendix A.
3 A sex ratio is the number of male residents per 100 female residents.
4 All data are for people who are married and living with their spouses. The percentage of men who were married and living with their spouses at age 55 to 64 was not statistically different from the percentage married and living with their spouses at age 65 to 85.
5 The percentages for women aged 65 to 84 and women 85 and older were not statistically different.
Labor Force Participation

In 2002, 77 percent of men aged 55 to 59 were in the civilian labor force. The rate dropped to 57 percent among those 60 to 64 and to 18 percent among those 65 and older. The labor force participation rate for women 55 to 59 was 63 percent. This rate dropped to 44 percent for women 60 to 64 and to 10 percent for those 65 and older.

Poverty Rates

In 2001, 10 percent of people 55 and older lived in poverty. Older women generally had higher poverty rates than older men. Among those 55 to 64, 10 percent of women and 8 percent of men were in poverty. The rates for those 65 and older were 12 percent and 7 percent, respectively.

Diversity

Non-Hispanic Whites accounted for 69 percent of the total population in 2002. The proportion was larger among older groups—66 percent of the population under 55 and 81 percent of those 55 and over were non-Hispanic White. The percentage of non-Hispanic Whites reached 87 percent among the population 85 and older. (See Figure 2.)

The Census Bureau Can Tell You More


Look for complete reports and updated detailed tables on the Census Bureau’s Web site <www.census.gov>. Click on “O” and select “Older (55+) Population Data.”

Contact the Census Bureau’s Customer Service Center at 301-763-INFO (4636) or e-mail <pop@census.gov>.

References to poverty for individuals in 2002 are based on their incomes in calendar year 2001. See the chapter on poverty.
Appendix A: SOURCE AND ACCURACY OF DATA

 SOURCES OF DATA

The data for this report, which cover a wide range of topics and years, came from the Current Population Survey (CPS), the CPS supplements, the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP), the American Housing Survey (AHS), and the U.S. Census Bureau’s Population Estimates Program. The CPS supplements used for this report include the Annual Social and Economic Supplement (ASEC) and supplements on child support, computer and Internet use, school enrollment, fertility, and voting and registration. Prior to 2003, the ASEC was known as the Annual Demographic Survey (ADS).

This report includes data for four different population universes: the resident population (census universe); the civilian noninstitutionalized population (CPS supplements universe); the civilian noninstitutionalized population, plus armed forces living off post or with their families on post (SIPP and CPS ASEC universe); and the universe of housing units (AHS).

Estimates using sample data from the CPS for 2001 and earlier and from SIPP are weighted by population controls. Estimates using sample data from AHS are weighted by housing unit controls. Both sets of controls are based on updated 1990 decennial census data adjusted for estimated net undercount. As such, these estimates are not consistent with population estimates computed from the intercensal estimates program, which are not adjusted for estimated net census undercount. Data from the CPS for 2002 or later are weighted using controls based on Census 2000.


The Population Estimates Program publishes total population estimates each year. The publication of population estimates also includes demographic components of change (births, deaths, and migration). The estimates are also published by age, sex, race, and Hispanic origin. For further information about the population estimates program, see Population Estimates Methodology at <www.census.gov/popest/topics/methodology>.

 ACCURACY OF THE ESTIMATES

A sample survey estimate has two types of error: sampling and nonsampling. The accuracy of an estimate depends on both types of error. The nature of the sampling error is known given the survey design; however, the full extent of the nonsampling error is unknown.

Sampling Error

Since the CPS, SIPP, and AHS estimates come from samples, they may differ from figures from an enumeration of the entire population using the same questionnaires, instructions, and interviewers. For a given estimator, the difference between an estimate based on a sample and the estimate that would result if the sample were to include the entire population is known as sampling error.

Standard errors are primarily measures of the magnitude of sampling error. They are not given in this report because of the wide range of topics included and the wide variety of data sources. Standard errors may be found in the publications that are noted at the end of most sections or by contacting the subject matter specialist provided at the end of each section.

Because the estimates in this report (which may be shown in text, figures, and tables) are based on responses from a sample of the population and may differ from actual values because of sampling variability or other factors, apparent differences between the estimates for two or more groups may not be statistically significant. All comparative statements have undergone statistical testing and are significant at the 90-percent confidence level unless otherwise noted.
**Nonsampling Error**

For a given estimator, the difference between the estimate that would result if the sample were to include the entire population and the true population value being estimated is known as nonsampling error.

To minimize these errors, the Census Bureau employs quality control procedures in sample selection, wording of questions, interviewing, coding, data processing, and data analysis.

**Comparability of Data**

Data obtained from sample surveys and other sources are not entirely comparable. This results from differences in interviewer training and experience, differing survey processes, and in differences in the target population. This is an example of nonsampling variability not reflected in the standard errors. Therefore, caution should be used in comparing results from different sources.

Caution should be used when comparing data from a microdata file that reflect Census 2000–based population controls with data from microdata files from March 1994–December 2001, which reflect 1990 census-based population controls. Caution should also be used when comparing the data from a microdata file that reflect 1990 census–based population controls with data from microdata files from March 1993 and earlier years, which reflect 1980 census–based population controls. When comparing data within microdata files, be sure to use estimates that reflect the same population controls. Microdata files from previous years reflect the census-based population controls for the estimates date that were most current when the estimates were made. Although this change in population controls had relatively little impact on summary measures such as averages, medians, and percentage distributions, it did have a significant impact on levels. For example, use of Census 2000–based population controls results in about a 1-percent increase from the 1990-based population controls in the civilian noninstitutionalized population and in the number of families and households. Therefore, estimates of levels for data collected in 2002 and later years will differ from those for earlier years by more than what could be attributed to actual changes in the population. These differences could be disproportionately higher for certain subpopulation groups than for the total population.