

# Children and the Households They Live In: 2000

Issued March 2004

*Census 2000 Special Reports*

CENSR-14

By  
Terry Lugaia  
and  
Julia Overturf

The vast majority of the 72.1 million people under 18 years in the United States in 2000 lived in households (71.8 million, compared with 302,000 in group quarters). This report describes their social and economic characteristics and those of their parents, their householders, and the households they lived in, as well as their relationship to the householder. In this report, people under age 18 living in households are referred to as children. Since the breadth of Census 2000 allows analysis at several levels of geography, many of these characteristics are examined at the national, regional, and state levels.<sup>1</sup> A closer look at characteristics across places of 100,000 or more population is included as well. Detailed data on characteristics of children will be available in PHC-T-30, "Characteristics of Children Under 18 Years, by Age, for the United

<sup>1</sup> The text of this report discusses data for the United States, including the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Data for the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico are shown in Tables 2 and 4 and Figures 2, 3, and 4.

Figure 1.

## Reproduction of the Question on Relationship to Householder From Census 2000

### 2 How is this person related to Person 1?

Mark  ONE box.

- Husband/wife
- Natural-born son/daughter
- Adopted son/daughter
- Stepson/stepdaughter
- Brother/sister
- Father/mother
- Grandchild
- Parent-in-law
- Son-in-law/daughter-in-law
- Other relative — *Print exact relationship.*

If NOT RELATED to Person 1:

- Roomer, boarder
- Housemate, roommate
- Unmarried partner
- Foster child
- Other nonrelative

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 questionnaire.

States, Regions, States, and Puerto Rico: 2000."

The question about each person's relationship to the householder (one of the people in whose name the house was owned or rented) was asked of all people in the United States in Census 2000.

U S C E N S U S B U R E A U

*Helping You Make Informed Decisions*

U.S. Department of Commerce  
Economics and Statistics Administration  
U.S. CENSUS BUREAU

United States  
**Census  
2000**

Additional data on a wide range of social and economic characteristics were collected on the long-form questionnaire from a sample of 1 in 6 households. Since these sample items, such as educational attainment, language spoken at home, nativity, and poverty status are integral to the analysis of children and their households, only sample data were used for this report. Thus, estimates in this report for relationship, age, sex, race, and Hispanic origin differ slightly from 100-percent data released previously.<sup>2</sup>

For Census 2000, additional categories were added to the relationship to householder question, in order to reflect the increased complexity of American households (Figure 1). The four new categories were adopted son/daughter (which was combined with natural-born son/daughter in 1990), parent-in-law, son-in-law/daughter-in-law, and foster child (which was combined with roomer, boarder in 1990).<sup>3</sup> Write-in answers for the category of "Other relative," such as brother/sister-in-law, nephew/niece, and cousin are also featured in this report to identify children living in extended family households.

<sup>2</sup> The estimates in this report are based on responses from a sample of the population. As with all surveys, estimates may vary from the actual values because of sampling variation or other factors. All comparisons made in this report have undergone statistical testing and are significant at the 90-percent confidence level.

<sup>3</sup> The categories of adopted child and foster child were requested by both government and private sector groups to study these special populations and any requirements they have which differ from those of other children in the household. The category "foster child" was restricted to those under the age of 18. "Parent-in-law" and "son/daughter-in-law" were added to help determine the incidence of multi-generational families living together.

## RELATIONSHIP TO HOUSEHOLDER FOR CHILDREN UNDER 18

**The number of people under 18 grew by 8.5 million between 1990 and 2000; nine out of ten were sons or daughters of the householder.**

Overall, the population under 18 grew by 13 percent, from 63.6 million in 1990 to 72.1 million in 2000. Only 302,000 lived in group quarters in 2000. Most were aged 15 to 17 (170,000), representing 1.4 percent of that age group and a higher percentage than for any of the younger age groups (0.2 percent of those through age 11, and 0.5 percent for children aged 12 to 14, Table 1).

Children under 18 represented 26 percent of the population in households in 2000. The proportions ranged from 23 percent in West Virginia and Florida to 33 percent in Utah (Table 2). Only 21 percent of the population in the District of Columbia was under 18 in 2000.

Ninety percent (64.7 million) of children in the United States were sons or daughters of the householder in 2000.<sup>4</sup> The proportion ranged from 88 percent of children under 6 years to 92 percent of those aged 12 to 14. The term "son or daughter of the householder," unless otherwise noted, includes all biological, step, and adopted children of the householder living in the same home, even if they were married or had children of their own. Among children, 59.8 million (83 percent) were biological sons and daughters of the householder, 3.3 million were stepchildren, and 1.6 million were adopted children. Some biological children of the householder may

<sup>4</sup> The remaining 7.2 million people under 18 were either the householder or the spouse (64,000), other relatives (5.9 million), or non-relatives of the householder (1.3 million).

also live with a stepparent or an adoptive parent (the householder's spouse), but Census 2000 collected information on relationship to the householder only, and not to other people in the household.

Therefore, estimates in this report do not represent a count of all sons and daughters in step-family or adopted-family relationships.<sup>5</sup>

## Grandchildren of the householder numbered 4.4 million.

In 2000, 5.9 million children were relatives of the householder other than the sons or daughters. This category includes brothers, sisters, grandchildren, sons and daughters-in-law, brothers and sisters-in-law, nephews, nieces, cousins, and those identified as other relatives, because they did not fit into the listed categories. A higher proportion of children under 6 were other relatives of the householder (11 percent) than in any other age group (7 percent of children aged 6 to 11 and 15 to 17, and 6 percent of children aged 12 to 14).

The 4.4 million grandchildren of the householder represented 6 percent of all children in households. Nine percent of those under 6 years, 6 percent of those aged 6 to 11, and 4 percent of children aged 12 to 17 were listed as grandchildren of the householder. This was also the largest subcategory of other relatives (75 percent of other relatives). In 2000, 845,000 children were the niece or nephew of the householder which was 1.2 percent of all children in households. Nieces and nephews represented 14 percent of all other relatives under

<sup>5</sup> A special report comparing the characteristics of adopted children with those of biological children and stepchildren was released using sample data from Census 2000. See Rose M. Kreider. *Adopted Children and Stepchildren: 2000*. 2000 Census Special Report, CENSR-6RV, U.S. Census Bureau, Washington, DC, 2003.

Table 1.  
**Population Under 18 Years by Age and Relationship to Householder: 2000**

(For information on confidentiality protection, sampling error, nonsampling error, and definitions, see [www.census.gov/prod/cen2000/doc/sf3.pdf](http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2000/doc/sf3.pdf))

Relationship	Total		Under 6 years		6 to 11 years		12 to 14 years		15 to 17 years	
	Number	Per-cent	Number	Per-cent	Number	Per-cent	Number	Per-cent	Number	Per-cent
<b>Total</b> . . . . .	<b>72,145,523</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>23,026,593</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>25,042,234</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>12,205,669</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>11,871,027</b>	<b>100.0</b>
In group quarters . . . . .	302,098	0.4	35,024	0.2	38,348	0.2	58,949	0.5	169,777	1.4
<b>In households</b> . . . . .	<b>71,843,425</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>22,991,569</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>25,003,886</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>12,146,720</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>11,701,250</b>	<b>100.0</b>
Householder . . . . .	41,027	0.1	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)	41,027	0.4
Spouse . . . . .	23,287	—	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)	23,287	0.2
Son or daughter . . . . .	64,651,959	90.0	20,120,106	87.5	22,803,985	91.2	11,200,237	92.2	10,527,631	90.0
Biological child . . . . .	59,773,654	83.2	19,402,432	84.4	20,934,537	83.7	10,036,471	82.6	9,400,214	80.3
Adopted child . . . . .	1,586,004	2.2	389,296	1.7	598,326	2.4	316,636	2.6	281,746	2.4
Stepchild . . . . .	3,292,301	4.6	328,378	1.4	1,271,122	5.1	847,130	7.0	845,671	7.2
Other relatives . . . . .	5,853,756	8.1	2,516,544	10.9	1,783,830	7.1	748,907	6.2	804,475	6.9
Brother/Sister . . . . .	262,028	0.4	24,410	0.1	57,716	0.2	59,506	0.5	120,396	1.0
Grandchild . . . . .	4,388,908	6.1	2,063,340	9.0	1,372,498	5.5	514,875	4.2	438,195	3.7
Son/Daughter-in-law . . . . .	25,984	—	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)	25,984	0.2
Brother/Sister-in-law . . . . .	43,319	0.1	4,301	—	5,639	—	8,991	0.1	24,388	0.2
Nephew/Niece . . . . .	844,768	1.2	296,606	1.3	265,705	1.1	130,887	1.1	151,570	1.3
Cousin . . . . .	70,041	0.1	16,588	0.1	17,561	0.1	11,649	0.1	24,243	0.2
Other relatives . . . . .	218,708	0.3	111,299	0.5	64,711	0.3	22,999	0.2	19,699	0.2
Nonrelatives . . . . .	1,273,396	1.8	354,919	1.5	416,071	1.7	197,576	1.6	304,830	2.6
Roomer/Boarder . . . . .	144,569	0.2	49,552	0.2	38,079	0.2	19,545	0.2	37,393	0.3
Housemate/Roommate . . . . .	45,411	0.1	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)	45,411	0.4
Unmarried partner . . . . .	22,576	—	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)	22,576	0.2
Foster child . . . . .	291,507	0.4	93,222	0.4	101,698	0.4	48,445	0.4	48,142	0.4
Other nonrelatives . . . . .	769,333	1.1	212,145	0.9	276,294	1.1	129,586	1.1	151,308	1.3

— Represents or rounds to zero.

X Not applicable.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000, Summary File 3.

18 years and 19 percent of other relatives aged 15 to 17.

In 2000, 219,000 children were related to the householder but did not fit into the most common categories. They are simply listed as other relatives. Examples in this category include great-grandchildren and great-niece or great-nephew.

Nearly 2 percent of children were not relatives of the householder. One category of nonrelative which is of particular interest to both policymakers and social agencies is foster children.<sup>6</sup> Foster children made

<sup>6</sup> Although the foster child population changes frequently, with children entering and leaving the foster care system on a daily basis, Census 2000 gives us a snapshot of that population in April 2000.

up 23 percent of the nonrelative population under 18 years.<sup>7</sup>

Among all children in households, just 0.4 percent (292,000) were foster children. The majority of foster children were under 12 years (67 percent). Other categories of nonrelatives of the householder include those sharing housing, such as housemates, roommates, and unmarried partners.

<sup>7</sup> Relatives of children sometimes serve as foster care parents. In those cases where the householder was also related to the foster child, respondents were instructed to mark the appropriate relative category instead of "foster child." The monthly average number of children in Title IV-E foster care in 1999 was 297,312 children. A survey by the Department of Health and Human Services found that 29 percent of children were in foster care with relatives ([www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/cb/dis/tables/secllgb/national.htm](http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/cb/dis/tables/secllgb/national.htm)).

### Children in the Midwest were the most likely to be sons or daughters of the householder.

A richer picture of children in America can be obtained by comparing their characteristics across regions, states, and smaller areas. The percentage distribution of the categories of children's relationship to the householder does not vary by more than 2 to 3 percent from region to region, but does vary more among states (Table 2). The Midwest had the highest percentage of children who were sons or daughters of the householder (92 percent), while the South had the lowest (88.8 percent).<sup>8</sup> In four states, less than 88 percent of

<sup>8</sup> Figure 3 shows the states in each region.

Table 2.  
**Relationship to Householder for Children Under 18 Years for the United States, Regions, States, and for Puerto Rico: 2000**

(For information on confidentiality protection, sampling error, nonsampling error, and definitions, see [www.census.gov/prod/cen2000/doc/sf3.pdf](http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2000/doc/sf3.pdf))

Area	Population under 18 years		Percent of population under 18 years						
	Number	Percent of total population	Total	Son or daughter	Grandchild	Householder/spouse	Other relatives <sup>1</sup>	Foster child	Other nonrelatives <sup>2</sup>
<b>United States</b> .....	<b>71,843,425</b>	<b>26.3</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>90.0</b>	<b>6.1</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>1.4</b>
<b>Region</b>									
Northeast .....	12,950,914	24.9	100.0	91.1	5.5	0.1	1.7	0.5	1.2
Midwest .....	16,564,597	26.5	100.0	92.0	4.8	0.1	1.4	0.4	1.4
South .....	25,420,728	26.1	100.0	88.8	7.3	0.1	2.1	0.3	1.3
West .....	16,907,186	27.4	100.0	89.0	6.0	0.1	2.8	0.4	1.6
<b>State</b>									
Alabama .....	1,118,593	25.8	100.0	89.0	8.0	0.1	1.7	0.3	0.9
Alaska .....	189,471	31.2	100.0	92.5	3.9	0.1	1.4	0.6	1.5
Arizona .....	1,356,722	27.0	100.0	88.3	6.9	0.1	2.7	0.4	1.7
Arkansas .....	677,058	26.0	100.0	89.3	7.2	0.2	1.7	0.3	1.3
California .....	9,181,501	27.8	100.0	87.4	6.7	0.1	3.6	0.5	1.7
Colorado .....	1,092,399	26.0	100.0	92.1	4.3	0.1	1.7	0.4	1.3
Connecticut .....	836,486	25.4	100.0	92.7	4.5	–	1.4	0.4	1.0
Delaware .....	193,502	25.5	100.0	89.1	7.0	0.1	2.0	0.3	1.5
District of Columbia .....	113,257	21.1	100.0	77.6	15.2	0.2	4.7	0.6	1.7
Florida .....	3,620,198	23.2	100.0	88.5	7.0	0.1	2.3	0.4	1.6
Georgia .....	2,156,648	27.1	100.0	88.3	7.5	0.1	2.4	0.3	1.3
Hawaii .....	293,335	24.9	100.0	81.2	12.8	–	3.5	0.5	1.9
Idaho .....	366,307	29.0	100.0	94.0	3.3	0.1	1.0	0.3	1.3
Illinois .....	3,229,496	26.7	100.0	89.4	6.5	0.1	2.3	0.5	1.2
Indiana .....	1,566,193	26.5	100.0	92.0	4.8	0.1	1.1	0.3	1.6
Iowa .....	728,731	25.8	100.0	94.5	2.9	0.1	0.8	0.4	1.4
Kansas .....	708,948	27.2	100.0	93.4	3.7	0.1	1.2	0.5	1.1
Kentucky .....	989,476	25.2	100.0	91.7	5.4	0.1	1.2	0.4	1.3
Louisiana .....	1,213,215	28.0	100.0	86.7	9.5	0.1	2.2	0.3	1.1
Maine .....	299,676	24.2	100.0	93.7	3.0	0.1	0.7	0.6	2.0
Maryland .....	1,348,418	26.1	100.0	88.8	7.2	0.1	2.2	0.4	1.3
Massachusetts .....	1,489,821	24.3	100.0	92.9	4.3	0.1	1.3	0.4	1.0
Michigan .....	2,581,860	26.6	100.0	91.3	5.3	0.1	1.5	0.4	1.5
Minnesota .....	1,281,802	26.8	100.0	94.8	2.5	0.1	1.0	0.4	1.3
Mississippi .....	770,659	28.0	100.0	85.7	10.6	0.1	2.3	0.2	1.1
Missouri .....	1,420,150	26.1	100.0	91.6	5.2	0.1	1.2	0.4	1.5
Montana .....	228,330	26.0	100.0	93.0	4.0	0.1	0.9	0.6	1.3
Nebraska .....	446,966	26.9	100.0	94.3	2.9	0.1	1.0	0.5	1.2
Nevada .....	507,832	25.8	100.0	89.1	5.8	0.1	2.6	0.3	2.0
New Hampshire .....	307,913	25.7	100.0	94.4	2.9	–	0.7	0.3	1.7
New Jersey .....	2,075,445	25.3	100.0	90.7	6.0	0.1	2.0	0.3	1.0
New Mexico .....	505,349	28.3	100.0	88.5	7.9	0.1	2.0	0.3	1.2
New York .....	4,644,735	25.2	100.0	89.4	6.3	0.1	2.3	0.6	1.3
North Carolina .....	1,954,915	25.1	100.0	89.7	6.6	0.1	1.9	0.3	1.3
North Dakota .....	160,201	25.9	100.0	95.5	2.3	–	0.7	0.4	1.1
Ohio .....	2,877,469	26.0	100.0	91.9	5.1	0.1	1.2	0.4	1.4
Oklahoma .....	886,471	26.6	100.0	90.1	6.2	0.2	1.6	0.6	1.3
Oregon .....	840,493	25.1	100.0	91.6	4.2	0.1	1.6	0.7	1.9
Pennsylvania .....	2,903,312	24.5	100.0	91.6	5.5	0.1	1.3	0.4	1.2
Rhode Island .....	246,351	24.4	100.0	93.0	4.4	0.1	1.2	0.3	1.1
South Carolina .....	1,004,519	25.9	100.0	87.8	8.7	0.1	2.0	0.4	1.0
South Dakota .....	200,283	27.6	100.0	93.3	4.0	–	1.1	0.4	1.2
Tennessee .....	1,391,510	25.1	100.0	89.5	7.1	0.1	1.7	0.4	1.2
Texas .....	5,852,717	28.8	100.0	88.5	7.5	0.1	2.5	0.2	1.2
Utah .....	713,589	32.5	100.0	93.2	4.1	0.1	1.4	0.3	1.0
Vermont .....	147,175	25.0	100.0	94.7	2.6	0.1	0.6	0.6	1.5
Virginia .....	1,729,484	25.3	100.0	90.7	5.8	0.1	1.7	0.4	1.3
Washington .....	1,504,510	26.1	100.0	92.6	3.7	0.1	1.5	0.4	1.7
West Virginia .....	400,088	22.7	100.0	91.4	5.7	0.1	1.0	0.5	1.3
Wisconsin .....	1,362,498	26.2	100.0	93.9	3.1	0.1	1.0	0.5	1.4
Wyoming .....	127,348	26.5	100.0	93.3	3.8	0.1	1.0	0.4	1.5
<b>Puerto Rico</b> .....	<b>1,086,666</b>	<b>28.9</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>86.3</b>	<b>10.8</b>	<b>0.3</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>0.3</b>

– Represents or rounds to zero.



<sup>1</sup>Other relatives include brother/sister, nephew/niece, cousin, brother/sister-in-law, son/daughter-in-law, and the category “other relative.” An example of a relationship in the latter category would be great-grandchild.

<sup>2</sup>Other nonrelatives include roomer/boarder, housemate/roommate, unmarried partners, and the category “other nonrelative.” An example of the latter category would be a child of an unmarried partner or roommate but not a related child of the householder.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000, Summary File 3.

## Figure 2. Children Under 18 Years Other Than a Son or Daughter of the Householder: 2000

(Includes other relatives of the householder such as grandchildren, and nonrelatives. Excludes children living in group quarters, householders, reference persons in related subfamilies, and their spouses. Sons and daughters of the householder include biological, adopted, and step children, regardless of marital status. Data based on sample. For information on confidentiality protection, sampling error, nonsampling error, and definitions, see [www.census.gov/prod/cen2000/doc/sf3.pdf](http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2000/doc/sf3.pdf))



Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Summary File 3. American Factfinder at [factfinder.census.gov](http://factfinder.census.gov) provides census data and mapping tools.



children were sons or daughters of the householder: California (87 percent), Hawaii (81 percent), Louisiana (87 percent) and Mississippi (86 percent). In the District of Columbia, the corresponding figure was 78 percent.

Figure 2 maps the proportions of children who were other than sons or daughters of the householder by individual counties. The lighter colored areas of the map show where children were most likely to be sons or daughters of the householder. In many counties in the Midwest, only 5 percent or less of children lived in households not maintained by a parent, and an almost unbroken band of counties in the Northeast had less than 10 percent. Even in counties where the proportions were relatively high, the vast majority of children were sons or daughters of the householder: the proportion exceeded 17 percent in only a handful of counties.

Several factors may influence the likelihood of children growing up in households not maintained by their parents, such as marital disruptions, parental absences, or parents' difficulties in maintaining their own homes. Areas with high proportions of children who were not sons or daughters of the householder were clustered in the South and the Southwest. There were notably high concentrations along the Mississippi Valley and in parts of Arizona, New Mexico, South Dakota, and Alaska which had relatively high proportions of American Indian and Alaska Native populations. Cultural traditions about living arrangements and extended families may partly explain why a large percentage of children in these areas lived in households maintained by people other than their parents.

Some coastal states that receive large numbers of immigrants, such as California, Florida, and Hawaii, are characterized by above-average proportions of children who were not sons or daughters of the householder. In 2000, 19 percent of children in Hawaii were not sons or daughters, which is almost twice the national average of 10 percent. In the case of children of immigrant families, relatives or friends already living in the United States may provide housing assistance until these families establish themselves. Similarly, economically disadvantaged families may need to combine their households with others in order to obtain affordable housing. Areas with high proportions of children who are not sons or daughters of the householder may also have high percentages of extended families. States with relatively low proportions, at about one-half the national level (5 percent), are clustered in the northern half of the country — for example, North Dakota, Minnesota, Iowa, and Vermont.


Other categories of the relationship to the householder also differed by geography. The South had the highest percentage of grandchildren of the householder (7.3 percent), while the West had the highest percentage of young people who were other relatives (2.8 percent) and other nonrelatives (1.6 percent). At the state level, more than 10 percent of children in Hawaii, Mississippi, and the District of Columbia (a state equivalent) were grandchildren of the householder. California and Hawaii had the highest state-level percentages of children who were other relatives of the householder: 3.6 percent and 3.5 percent respectively. In the District of Columbia, 4.7 percent were identified as other relatives.

Although relatively small in number, some children aged 15 to 17 were in relationship roles that are typically associated with older adults. In 2000, 41,000 maintained their own household (0.4 percent of the age group) and 23,000 were the spouse of the householder (0.2 percent). Another 23,000 were unmarried partners of the householder and 26,000 were sons-in-law or daughters-in-law of the householder. Although marriage for those under 18 years has always been relatively uncommon, and in fact is prohibited in all states without parental consent,<sup>9</sup> Census 2000 showed that, excluding those who were separated, 89,000 women aged 15 to 17 were married. Nationally, they represented only 1.6 percent of women in this age group. The proportion has decreased since 1950, when 6.6 percent of women 15 to 17 were married.<sup>10</sup>

Figure 3 shows the percent married for women aged 15 to 17 by state. The South and the West had similar proportions of married women in this age group (2.0 percent and 1.8 percent, respectively), while the Northeast and the Midwest had slightly lower but still similar proportions (1.0 percent and 1.1 percent, respectively). Of all states, Texas had the highest percentage of women aged 15 to 17 who were married (2.9 percent). Many states had only around 1 percent or less, such as New Hampshire, Maine, and Vermont in the Northeast (see PHC-T-30, Table 7).

<sup>9</sup> For an overview of current state laws regarding marriage, see Karen N. Gardiner, et al., "State Policies to Promote Marriage." Final Report submitted to U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Washington, DC, 2002, Table 4.

<sup>10</sup> U.S. Bureau of the Census, U.S. Census of Population: 1950. Vol. II, Characteristics of the Population, Part 1, United States Summary. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC, 1953.



## SOCIAL AND DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF CHILDREN

Census 2000 allowed respondents to choose more than one race. With the exception of the Two-or-More-Races population, all race groups discussed in this report refer to people who indicated only one racial identity among the six major categories: White, Black or African American, American Indian and Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, and Some Other Race.<sup>11</sup> The use of

<sup>11</sup> For further information on each of 6 major race groups and the Two-or-More-Races population, see reports from the Census 2000 Brief series (C2KBR/01), available on Census 2000 Web site at [www.census.gov/population/www/cen2000/briefs.html](http://www.census.gov/population/www/cen2000/briefs.html).

the single-race population in this report does not imply that it is the preferred method of presenting or analyzing data. The Census Bureau uses a variety of approaches.<sup>12</sup>

For children, the distribution by race and ethnicity varies widely by relationship to the householder (Table 3). Although Blacks represented 15 percent of all children,

<sup>12</sup> This report draws heavily on Summary File 3, a Census 2000 product that can be accessed through American FactFinder, available from the Census Bureau's Web site, [www.census.gov](http://www.census.gov). Information on people who reported they were more than one race, such as White **and** American Indian and Alaska Native or Asian **and** Black or African American, can be found in Summary File 4, also available through American FactFinder in 2003. About 2.6 percent of people reported being more than one race.

they represented approximately 32 percent of all grandchildren, 35 percent of foster children, and 29 percent of relatives of the householder other than their sons, daughters, and grandchildren.<sup>13</sup> The 17 percent of children who were Hispanic (of any race) were

<sup>13</sup> Hereafter this report uses the term Black to refer to people who are Black or African American, the term Pacific Islander to refer to people who are Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander, and the term Hispanic to refer to people who are Hispanic or Latino.

Because Hispanics may be of any race, data in this report for Hispanics overlap with data for racial groups. Based on Census 2000 sample data, the proportion Hispanic was 8.0 percent for Whites, 1.9 percent for Blacks, 14.6 percent for American Indians and Alaska Natives, 1.0 percent for Asians, 9.5 percent for Pacific Islanders, 97.1 percent for those reporting Some Other Race, and 31.1 percent for those reporting Two or More Races.

Table 3.  
**Characteristics of Children Under 18 Years by Relationship to Householder: 2000**

(For information on confidentiality protection, sampling error, nonsampling error, and definitions, see [www.census.gov/prod/cen2000/doc/sf3.pdf](http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2000/doc/sf3.pdf))

Characteristic	Total	Son or daughter	Grandchild	Householder/spouse <sup>1</sup>	Other relatives <sup>2</sup>	Foster child	Other nonrelatives <sup>3</sup>
<b>Total, under 18 years</b>	<b>71,843,425</b>	<b>64,651,959</b>	<b>4,388,908</b>	<b>64,314</b>	<b>1,464,848</b>	<b>291,507</b>	<b>981,889</b>
<b>PERCENT</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Race and Hispanic or Latino Origin</b>							
White alone	68.8	70.9	48.6	62.2	39.1	47.8	66.5
Black or African American alone	14.8	13.3	32.3	14.8	28.8	35.3	13.1
American Indian and Alaska Native alone	1.1	1.0	2.1	1.5	1.9	3.1	1.5
Asian alone	3.4	3.4	2.4	2.6	4.8	1.1	2.4
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone	0.2	0.1	0.3	0.2	0.5	0.3	0.2
Some other race alone	7.7	7.2	8.9	14.5	19.9	7.4	11.6
Two or more races	4.1	4.0	5.4	4.3	5.0	5.1	4.8
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	17.0	16.1	21.1	28.4	38.4	17.2	24.2
White alone, not Hispanic or Latino	61.1	63.6	39.0	50.6	23.8	40.8	56.1
<b>Nativity</b>							
Native	95.6	95.9	97.2	80.4	79.3	97.3	89.3
Foreign born	4.4	4.1	2.8	19.6	20.7	2.7	10.7
<b>Living Arrangement<sup>4</sup></b>							
Living in married couple family group	68.0	74.7	10.8	(X)	5.5	(X)	(X)
Living in mother only family group	20.9	20.0	39.9	(X)	21.6	(X)	(X)
Living in father only family group	5.8	5.4	13.8	(X)	6.0	(X)	(X)
Living with neither parent	5.4	(X)	35.5	100.0	67.0	100.0	100.0
<b>Child in Unmarried Partner Household<sup>5</sup></b>	5.7	5.3	2.7	(X)	6.1	9.4	46.0
<b>Educational Attainment of the Householder</b>							
Less than high school	19.9	17.8	40.3	68.8	40.6	24.0	28.5
High school graduate (includes equivalency)	27.0	26.8	29.2	21.4	27.4	28.6	32.9
Some college	29.2	29.9	22.0	8.7	22.9	32.4	27.0
Bachelor's degree or more	23.9	25.5	8.5	1.1	9.1	15.0	11.6
<b>Employment Status of the Householder</b>							
In labor force	83.8	86.1	55.6	62.0	70.4	70.9	81.8
Employed <sup>6</sup>	95.8	96.0	94.8	86.1	92.4	95.8	94.3
Unemployed <sup>6</sup>	4.2	4.0	5.2	13.9	7.6	4.2	5.7
Not in labor force	16.2	13.9	44.4	38.0	29.6	29.1	18.2
<b>Poverty Status in 1999<sup>7</sup></b>							
In poverty	16.0	15.5	20.6	51.1	24.7	(X)	(X)
Not in poverty	84.0	84.5	79.4	48.9	75.3	(X)	(X)
<b>Tenure of Householder</b>							
Owns home	66.8	67.1	70.2	26.4	51.8	71.7	52.5
Rents home	33.3	32.9	29.8	73.6	48.2	28.3	47.5
<b>Total, 3 to 17 years</b>	<b>60,518,194</b>	<b>54,932,195</b>	<b>3,201,260</b>	<b>64,314</b>	<b>1,217,977</b>	<b>243,341</b>	<b>859,107</b>
<b>PERCENT</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>School Enrollment</b>							
Enrolled in school <sup>8</sup>	90.8	91.4	86.4	53.4	83.4	90.8	82.6
Nursery school, preschool, or kindergarten	15.0	15.0	19.3	(X)	11.2	15.4	11.5
Public school <sup>9</sup>	68.0	66.8	77.4	(X)	83.7	84.9	80.2
Elementary (grades 1-8)	55.1	55.6	52.8	1.8	47.0	55.9	47.3
Public school <sup>9</sup>	89.1	88.7	92.9	94.8	95.0	96.3	95.4
High school (grades 9-12)	20.6	20.8	14.2	47.7	24.9	19.4	23.4
Public school <sup>9</sup>	90.9	90.6	93.7	92.2	95.1	95.9	94.8
Not enrolled in school	9.2	8.6	13.6	46.6	16.6	9.2	17.4
<b>Total, 5 to 17 years</b>	<b>52,826,320</b>	<b>48,097,684</b>	<b>2,602,671</b>	<b>64,314</b>	<b>1,078,672</b>	<b>213,519</b>	<b>769,460</b>
<b>PERCENT</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Residence in 1995</b>							
Same house in 1995	52.9	53.8	55.8	23.6	34.2	25.6	20.9
Different house in 1995	47.1	46.2	44.2	76.4	65.8	74.4	79.1
<b>Language Spoken at Home</b>							
English only	81.6	81.9	84.2	67.8	60.5	88.9	79.2
Language other than English	18.4	18.1	15.8	32.2	39.5	11.1	20.8
<b>Disability Status</b>							
Severe hearing or vision impairment	1.0	1.0	1.3	2.2	1.3	2.7	1.4
Condition limiting basic activities	1.0	1.0	1.5	3.8	1.4	3.2	1.5
Difficulty learning, remembering or concentrating	4.5	4.3	5.9	4.6	5.4	20.6	5.9
Difficulty dressing, bathing or getting around inside the house	0.9	0.8	1.3	1.7	1.3	4.6	1.1
With any disability	5.7	5.5	7.6	8.8	7.1	22.4	7.6
With multiple disabilities <sup>10</sup>	1.2	1.1	1.7	2.4	1.5	5.5	1.5

X Not applicable.

<sup>1</sup>Refers to householders and spouses who are aged 15 to 17 years.

<sup>2</sup>Other relatives include brother/sister, nephew/niece, cousin, brother/sister-in-law, son/daughter-in-law, and the category "other relative." An example in the latter category would be great-grandchild.

<sup>3</sup>Other nonrelatives include roomer/boarder, housemate/roommate, unmarried partners, and the category "other nonrelative." An example in the latter category would be a child of an unmarried partner or roommate, but not a related child of the householder.

<sup>4</sup>Determined by relationship to householder or to reference person in a related subfamily. Universe excludes children aged 15 to 17 who are householders, reference persons of subfamilies, and their spouses.

<sup>5</sup>Excludes children aged 15 to 17 who are the householder or unmarried partner in an unmarried-partner household.

<sup>6</sup>Percent based on householders who were in the labor force.

<sup>7</sup>Poverty universe excludes children unrelated to the householder (foster children and other nonrelatives).

<sup>8</sup>Enrolled in school includes children enrolled in college, not shown separately.

<sup>9</sup>Percent based on those enrolled in grade category.

<sup>10</sup>Includes children aged 5 to 17 with any combination of two or more disabilities.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000, Summary File 3.



over-represented among grandchildren (21 percent), other relatives (38 percent), and other nonrelatives of the householder (24 percent). This finding suggests that Hispanic children may more frequently live in extended families. Hispanics also accounted for 28 percent of children aged 15 to 17 who were householders or spouses, which might indicate early marriage patterns. Above-average proportions of married teenagers were found in Texas and Arizona, where Hispanics constitute large portions of the population.

Overall, 4 percent of children were foreign born, but they represented 20 percent of householders or spouses aged 15 to 17 and 21 percent of other relatives under age 18. Just 3 percent of foster children were foreign born.

### **About two-thirds of children lived in married-couple family groups in 2000.**

Living arrangements influence children's daily interactions with adult role models and can affect the potential economic resources available for such things as education, personal development, and extracurricular activities. One particularly influential characteristic is whether children are living with two married parents. Studies have shown that children living with two married parents have more daily interactions, such as eating meals together and talking or playing, than those living with unmarried parents. Other aspects of children's lives appear to be affected more by the number of parents available than by parents' marital status.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>14</sup> See Terry Lugaia. *A Child's Day: 2000 (Selected Indicators of Child Well-Being)*. Current Population Reports, P70-89. U.S. Census Bureau, Washington, DC, 2003.

Table 3 shows that two-thirds of children lived in married-couple family groups in 2000. A family group consists of related members, regardless of whether the householder is part of that "family." Married-couple family groups include husband-wife families (in which the husband or wife is the householder) and husband-wife subfamilies (in which someone else, such as a parent of the husband or wife, is the householder).<sup>15</sup>

Twenty-seven percent of children lived in a single-parent family group, and 5 percent lived in a household with neither parent present. Grandchildren of the householder were most likely to be living in single-parent, mother-only family groups (40 percent). Another 36 percent of grandchildren of the householder were living with no parent present.

The lowest proportion of children not living with married parents was found in the Midwest (30 percent), while the highest was in the South (35 percent, Table 4). At the state level, Utah had the lowest proportion of children not living with two married parents (19 percent), while Mississippi and Louisiana had the highest (44 percent and 42 percent, respectively). The low percentage for Utah is clearly related to the fact that it led the Nation in the proportion of households which contained married-couple families with children.<sup>16</sup> In the District of Columbia, two out of every three children did not live with two married parents.

Figure 4 shows geographical differences in the proportion of children living with or without two married

<sup>15</sup> The parents may not necessarily be biological parents. Step and adoptive parents are also included.

<sup>16</sup> See Tavia Simmons and Grace O'Neill. *Households and Families: 2000*. 2000 Census Brief, C2KBR/01-8. U.S. Census Bureau, Washington, DC, 2001.

parents. People under 18 years who were householders, spouses of the householder, or parents in a subfamily are not included. The lighter colors of the map reflect counties where children were more likely to live with married parents. For example, most counties in the central Great Plains, along with many of the counties in the inland Western states, had very low proportions of children not living with two married parents in 2000.

The darker areas of the map show where there are relatively high concentrations of children living without two married parents. One such area is in the Mississippi Valley. Vital statistics data show that Mississippi and Louisiana have consistently above-average proportions of children born out of wedlock.<sup>17</sup> Also, states experiencing large amounts of international migration, such as Florida and California, may have high proportions of children in families who do not move as complete units, and long travel distances may create family disruptions during moves.

### **Six percent of children lived in unmarried-partner households in 2000.**

In 2001, 4.1 million children lived in a household where the householder was living with another adult to whom he or she was not married and whose relationship was identified as an unmarried partner (Table 3). These children could be in any of the parental living arrangements shown in Table 3. For example, a child living with married parents could also be living with a grandparent householder who has an unmarried partner. A child categorized as living with one

<sup>17</sup> See J.A. Martin, et al. *Births: Final Data for 2001*. National Vital Statistics Reports, Vol 51, No. 2. Hyattsville, MD: National Center for Health Statistics: 2002, and earlier reports.

Table 4.  
**Children Under 18 Years With Selected Social and Economic Characteristics for the United States, Regions, States, and for Puerto Rico: 2000**

(For information on confidentiality protection, sampling error, nonsampling error, and definitions, see [www.census.gov/prod/cen2000/doc/sf3.pdf](http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2000/doc/sf3.pdf))

Area	Total <sup>1</sup>	Percent who are—								
		Not son or daughter of householder	Not living in married-couple family group <sup>2</sup>	Living in unmarried-partner households <sup>3</sup>	Living with foreign-born householder	Living with householder not in labor force	Living in poverty <sup>4</sup>	Living in metropolitan areas	Living in renter-occupied home	Living in household receiving state or local assistance
<b>United States . . . . .</b>	<b>71,623,390</b>	<b>9.9</b>	<b>31.9</b>	<b>5.7</b>	<b>17.1</b>	<b>16.2</b>	<b>16.0</b>	<b>80.6</b>	<b>33.2</b>	<b>7.4</b>
<b>REGION</b>										
Northeast . . . . .	12,922,110	8.9	31.2	5.8	18.5	16.8	14.7	89.8	34.0	7.9
Midwest . . . . .	16,522,671	8.0	29.6	5.7	7.9	12.6	12.8	74.4	26.6	6.4
South . . . . .	25,320,270	11.1	34.5	5.3	13.1	17.0	18.2	76.0	32.9	6.4
West . . . . .	16,858,339	10.9	31.0	6.2	31.1	18.1	16.8	86.7	39.4	9.5
<b>STATE</b>										
Alabama . . . . .	1,113,870	10.9	36.0	4.0	2.4	18.6	21.0	70.0	29.1	4.8
Alaska . . . . .	189,040	7.4	29.7	7.2	7.0	14.3	11.0	39.6	34.7	12.3
Arizona . . . . .	1,351,681	11.6	33.5	7.3	22.9	18.3	18.6	57.8	33.2	6.8
Arkansas . . . . .	673,828	10.6	34.2	4.0	4.4	16.9	21.2	50.5	35.4	5.8
California . . . . .	9,155,482	12.5	32.6	6.4	44.2	21.4	18.8	96.9	45.7	11.7
Colorado . . . . .	1,089,191	7.8	27.3	4.8	13.5	12.5	10.7	84.5	28.7	4.0
Connecticut . . . . .	834,815	7.3	29.0	5.5	13.7	13.2	10.0	95.8	30.4	6.6
Delaware . . . . .	192,822	10.8	35.1	7.0	7.6	13.2	11.8	81.8	28.3	5.6
District of Columbia . . . . .	112,667	22.3	67.0	7.0	15.6	31.9	31.0	100.0	62.7	22.0
Florida . . . . .	3,607,241	11.4	36.6	6.8	23.6	17.8	17.0	93.2	33.6	6.2
Georgia . . . . .	2,147,838	11.6	35.9	5.3	9.5	16.2	16.6	69.5	33.3	6.0
Hawaii . . . . .	292,519	18.8	33.0	5.7	23.2	19.8	13.4	70.4	46.3	15.0
Idaho . . . . .	365,286	5.8	22.9	4.5	8.2	9.3	13.6	39.1	26.9	4.6
Illinois . . . . .	3,220,200	10.6	31.1	5.1	19.0	15.9	13.8	86.2	29.7	7.1
Indiana . . . . .	1,562,380	7.9	29.5	6.2	4.0	11.6	11.6	72.2	26.3	5.2
Iowa . . . . .	727,281	5.4	24.1	5.5	4.5	8.9	10.4	45.6	23.3	5.9
Kansas . . . . .	707,016	6.5	25.7	4.5	8.3	10.3	11.4	57.5	27.5	4.5
Kentucky . . . . .	985,917	8.2	30.6	5.2	2.3	17.9	20.2	49.1	30.3	8.2
Louisiana . . . . .	1,207,425	13.3	41.6	5.8	3.4	20.3	26.1	75.3	34.3	7.1
Maine . . . . .	299,171	6.2	28.5	7.8	2.8	12.3	12.9	35.9	23.6	8.4
Maryland . . . . .	1,345,009	11.1	34.2	5.8	13.1	13.8	10.2	93.1	30.2	4.6
Massachusetts . . . . .	1,486,871	7.0	28.6	5.3	17.0	15.6	11.5	96.3	31.3	6.2
Michigan . . . . .	2,575,424	8.7	32.2	6.1	6.9	13.4	13.3	83.2	24.0	8.0
Minnesota . . . . .	1,279,535	5.1	23.8	5.3	8.3	9.3	9.1	71.1	17.4	6.4
Mississippi . . . . .	766,125	14.3	43.6	5.9	1.5	20.8	26.5	35.7	32.1	7.3
Missouri . . . . .	1,415,698	8.4	31.9	6.1	3.4	12.9	15.1	68.7	28.3	7.2
Montana . . . . .	227,748	6.9	27.7	5.5	1.8	11.2	18.2	33.0	28.9	7.1
Nebraska . . . . .	445,897	5.6	24.9	4.6	6.8	9.5	11.7	52.6	28.6	5.5
Nevada . . . . .	506,429	10.8	34.2	7.9	26.4	16.7	13.4	86.8	38.9	4.2
New Hampshire . . . . .	307,569	5.6	24.5	6.6	4.9	9.7	7.2	61.8	23.3	4.5
New Jersey . . . . .	2,071,146	9.3	28.0	5.1	24.2	15.6	10.7	100.0	30.9	5.4
New Mexico . . . . .	502,977	11.4	36.7	8.2	15.0	20.0	24.4	54.1	29.5	10.4
New York . . . . .	4,633,369	10.5	35.2	5.9	27.9	21.1	19.5	92.3	44.0	10.5
North Carolina . . . . .	1,947,627	10.2	33.7	5.3	7.7	15.0	15.6	67.9	32.1	5.8
North Dakota . . . . .	159,933	4.5	22.9	5.3	2.1	9.1	13.4	42.7	25.7	5.7
Ohio . . . . .	2,869,694	8.1	31.7	6.1	3.3	13.0	13.9	80.7	29.3	6.9
Oklahoma . . . . .	882,729	9.7	32.1	4.9	6.0	14.5	19.0	61.5	33.9	7.0
Oregon . . . . .	838,324	8.2	29.1	6.3	13.9	12.1	13.9	73.1	35.6	6.9
Pennsylvania . . . . .	2,896,513	8.3	30.1	5.9	5.3	14.0	14.2	84.8	25.2	6.8
Rhode Island . . . . .	245,704	6.9	33.2	6.5	19.1	18.2	16.4	94.3	37.0	12.1
South Carolina . . . . .	1,000,064	12.2	38.3	5.6	3.5	17.5	18.3	69.4	29.1	4.9
South Dakota . . . . .	199,916	6.7	27.0	6.3	2.3	10.8	16.5	34.4	28.2	6.3
Tennessee . . . . .	1,386,167	10.4	34.4	4.8	3.6	15.8	17.5	69.0	31.0	8.0
Texas . . . . .	5,827,214	11.4	31.3	4.7	24.6	17.9	20.0	85.8	35.1	6.7
Utah . . . . .	711,772	6.7	18.8	2.9	9.6	8.9	9.6	75.9	21.9	4.8
Vermont . . . . .	146,952	5.3	27.1	7.6	3.7	10.8	10.6	27.5	24.0	8.3
Virginia . . . . .	1,725,031	9.3	30.6	4.7	10.8	13.2	11.8	80.4	31.6	4.7
Washington . . . . .	1,500,902	7.4	28.4	6.3	15.3	12.8	13.0	83.1	33.3	7.9
West Virginia . . . . .	398,696	8.5	29.5	6.4	1.2	19.7	23.7	42.5	26.6	8.2
Wisconsin . . . . .	1,359,697	6.1	26.7	5.8	5.6	10.6	10.7	68.5	26.5	3.3
Wyoming . . . . .	126,988	6.6	26.4	5.9	3.0	8.9	13.7	29.7	28.3	5.3
<b>Puerto Rico . . . . .</b>	<b>1,078,472</b>	<b>13.4</b>	<b>37.7</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>44.3</b>	<b>57.9</b>	<b>83.2</b>	<b>35.4</b>	<b>26.7</b>



<sup>1</sup>Excludes householders, reference persons of subfamilies, and their spouses.

<sup>2</sup>Those in married-couple family groups were living with a parent (householder or reference person of a subfamily) who is married with his or her spouse present.

<sup>3</sup>Excludes people 15 to 17 who are the householder or unmarried partner in an unmarried partner household.

<sup>4</sup>Poverty universe excludes children unrelated to the householder, including foster children and other nonrelatives.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000, Summary File 3.



parent in an unmarried partner household may be the son or daughter of both the householder and his or her partner. These children were living with both parents, but only the relationship of the child to the householder was obtained in Census 2000.

Foster children were almost twice as likely to live in an unmarried-partner household (9 percent) as children who were sons or daughters of the householder (5 percent). Almost half of “other nonrelative” children were living in an unmarried-partner household. One possible explanation for this high percentage is the Census 2000 classification method. Children living with a parent who was the unmarried partner of the householder were classified as nonrelatives of the householder, unless the child was also the biological child of the householder.

Two New England states, Maine and Vermont, and two western states, New Mexico and Nevada, had 8 percent of children under 18 living in unmarried-partner households, compared with 3 percent for Utah (Table 4). Seven percent of children in the District of Columbia were living in an unmarried-partner household.

**One out of every six children lived with a householder who was not in the labor force.**

In some states, such as Wyoming and Utah in the West, only 9 percent of children lived with a householder not in the labor force (Table 4). In California, New York, and Mississippi, around 21 percent of children lived with a householder who was not in the labor force in 2000, the highest percentage of any states. Thirty-two percent of children in the District of Columbia lived with a householder who was not in the labor force.

Grandchildren were more likely than sons and daughters of the householder to live with a householder who was not in the labor force and who did not have a bachelor's degree or higher (Table 3). These differences may be due largely to the high percentage of retired householders with grandchildren and the lower educational levels of older populations.<sup>18</sup>

**New Hampshire led the nation with the lowest proportion of children living in poverty: 7 percent.**

Since poverty status is determined by income and the number of related people in the household, data on poverty are available only for children who were related to the householder or were householders themselves. Young people who were householders or spouses were the only relationship group with more than one-half of their population living below the official poverty line, an indication of the relatively poor economic status of teenage couples and householders. They were also the only group to have a greater percentage living in homes that were rented rather than owned.

Regionally, the Midwest had the lowest proportion of children in poverty (13 percent), while the South had the highest (18 percent, Table 4). In New Hampshire, 7 percent of children lived in poverty, about one-half of the national proportion (16 percent). Mississippi and Louisiana had the highest proportions for states (27 percent and 26 percent, respectively). The District of Columbia had 31 percent of children in poverty.

<sup>18</sup> For more detailed tabulations on parental and householder characteristics, see Census 2000, PHC-T-30, *Characteristics of Children Under 18 Years by Age, for the United States, Regions, States, and Puerto Rico: 2000*.

**Minnesota had the lowest proportion of children in rental housing in the country: 17 percent.**

Nationwide, 33 percent of children lived in renter-occupied households in 2000. The Midwest was the region with the lowest proportion of renters at 27 percent, while the West had the highest (39 percent). Hawaii and California led the states with 46 percent. In the District of Columbia, 63 percent of children lived in rented homes.

Except for foster children, all relationship categories had similar percentages of children with any disability: 22 percent of foster children, compared with 5 percent to 9 percent of children in other relationship categories (Table 3). By far the most common disability, especially for foster children, was “Difficulty learning, remembering, or concentrating” (21 percent).

The highest school enrollment rates were found for sons and daughters of the householder (91 percent, Table 3). Nearly 47 percent of children aged 15 to 17 who were householders or spouses were not enrolled in school, probably reflecting the adult responsibilities that conflict with school attendance. This percentage was much higher than in any other relationship category and is also influenced by the fact that the householder/spouse category includes only those aged 15 to 17, an age group with historically higher nonenrollment rates than younger ages.

**More than one-third of children aged 16 and 17 who were enrolled in school were also in the labor force.**

Table 5 illustrates the levels of school enrollment and labor force activity of children aged 16 and 17 and how they differ by their



Table 5.  
**Labor Force and School Enrollment Status for Children Aged 16 and 17 by Relationship to Householder: 2000**

(Limited to children living in households. For information on confidentiality protection, sampling error, nonsampling error, and definitions, see [www.census.gov/prod/cen2000/doc/sf3/pdf](http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2000/doc/sf3/pdf))

Characteristic	Total	Son or daughter	Householder	Spouse	Son/daughter-in-law	Housemate/roommate	Unmarried partner	Other relationships <sup>1</sup>
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>7,760,859</b>	<b>6,921,264</b>	<b>36,114</b>	<b>22,314</b>	<b>20,761</b>	<b>36,888</b>	<b>21,041</b>	<b>702,477</b>
<b>PERCENT.....</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>
Enrolled in school.....	93.6	95.4	56.5	44.4	61.1	56.7	49.5	83.0
In labor force.....	35.0	36.1	27.5	16.5	18.1	25.9	25.9	26.2
Employed.....	28.7	29.9	21.0	11.7	13.0	20.2	19.0	19.3
Unemployed.....	6.3	6.2	6.4	4.8	5.1	5.8	6.9	6.9
Not in labor force.....	58.6	59.3	29.0	27.9	43.0	30.7	23.7	56.8
Not enrolled in school.....	6.4	4.6	43.5	55.6	38.9	43.3	50.5	17.0
In labor force.....	3.5	2.4	29.2	22.2	16.9	32.3	28.9	9.6
Employed.....	2.5	1.6	24.0	16.4	12.4	26.9	20.9	7.3
Unemployed.....	1.0	0.8	5.2	5.9	4.4	5.3	8.0	2.2
Not in labor force.....	2.9	2.2	14.3	33.4	22.0	11.1	21.6	7.4

<sup>1</sup>Other relationships include grandchild, foster child, brother/sister, nephew/niece, cousin, brother/sister-in-law, roomer/boarder, and the categories "other relative" and "other nonrelative."

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000, Summary File 3.

relationship to the householder. In 2000, the vast majority of the 7.8 million children aged 16 and 17 were enrolled in school (94 percent). Within this age group, 35 percent were also in the labor force, meaning that they worked at or were looking for an after-school or weekend job, or had early release from school in order to go to work. Of those not enrolled, the majority (54 percent) were in the labor force. Three percent were neither enrolled in school nor in the labor force.

Among children aged 16 and 17, 95 percent of sons and daughters of householders were enrolled in school, and only 2 percent were both not enrolled in school and not in the labor force. Among other teenagers, the picture is quite different. Householders, spouses, and unmarried partners had much lower enrollment rates than sons or daughters of householders and those in other relationships (such as cousins, other relatives, and other

nonrelatives). Only 44 percent of spouses of the householder and one-half of unmarried partners aged 16 and 17 were enrolled in school. Spouses were more likely than unmarried partners to be out of the labor force if they were not enrolled in school (33 and 22 percent, respectively).

**California had the highest proportion of children living with a foreign-born householder.**

Regionally, the West had the highest proportion of children living with a foreign-born householder, 31 percent, compared with 8 percent for the Midwest in 2000 (Table 4). At the state level, 44 percent of children in California lived in households with a foreign-born householder, more than twice the national average (17 percent). New York, which also has a long history of attracting immigrants, had 28 percent of its children under 18 living in households with a foreign-born

householder. In contrast, only 1 percent of children in West Virginia lived with a foreign-born householder. The proportion for the District of Columbia was 16 percent.

**In eight states, 90 percent or more of children lived in metropolitan areas.**

Seven of the eight states where at least 90 percent of the children lived in metropolitan areas in 2000 were east of the Mississippi, the exception being California, where 97 percent of children lived in metropolitan areas. Two of these states were in the South — Florida and Maryland — both with 93 percent. The other five were in the Northeast: New Jersey (100 percent), Massachusetts (96 percent), Connecticut (96 percent), Rhode Island (94 percent), and New York (92 percent). Vermont had the lowest proportion of children living in metropolitan areas, 28 percent, far from the Northeast regional



proportion of 90 percent. The national proportion was 81 percent.

**Nationally, 7 percent of children lived in households which received some type of state or local assistance.**

The proportion of children in households receiving assistance ranged from 3 percent in Wisconsin to 15 percent in Hawaii. Also, 20 percent of children in Hawaii lived with householders not in the labor force and 13 percent lived in poverty. The states with the next highest percentages of children receiving assistance were Alaska, Rhode Island, and California, where approximately 12 percent of children lived in homes receiving assistance. The rate in the District of Columbia was 22 percent.

**SOCIAL AND DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF CHILDREN IN DIFFERENT PARENTAL LIVING ARRANGEMENTS**

Table 6 shows data on a number of demographic, social, and economic characteristics of children tabulated by their living arrangement and by the nativity status of the householder. The four types of living arrangements are: living with a married-couple family group, living with the mother only, living with the father only, and living with neither parent. In addition, but shown separately, children could also live with a householder who was living with an unmarried partner.

In 2000, 70 percent of children in married-couple family groups and 54 percent of children in father-only family groups were non-Hispanic White, as compared to 69 percent of all children. The proportions of White, non-Hispanic children in mother-only family groups and those living with neither parent were lower: 42 percent and

38 percent, respectively. Blacks accounted for 15 percent of all children, 34 percent in mother-only family groups, and 30 percent living with neither parent. Hispanics accounted for 17 percent of all children, 16 percent of children in married-couple family groups, and 25 percent of those living without a parent in the house.

**In all four types of parental living arrangements, at least 86 percent of children aged 3 to 17 were enrolled in school.**

Little variation was found in the percentage of children enrolled in nursery, preschool, or kindergarten, ranging from 13 percent for children living with neither parent to 15 percent for children living with a married couple. Public school enrollment, as opposed to private, was most common among children enrolled in elementary school or high school (89 percent and 91 percent of those enrolled, respectively). The rate was much lower for children enrolled in nursery school, preschool, or kindergarten (68 percent).

In 2000, 4.7 percent of children aged 5 to 17 in married-couple family groups were reported as having one or more of four types of disability, but the percentage was close to twice that for those living with neither parent present (9.5 percent). Difficulty learning, remembering, or concentrating was the most frequently cited disability in every type of living arrangement.

**Almost one-fourth of all children lived with a householder who had a bachelor's degree or more education.**

Thirty percent of children in married-couple family groups were living with householders who had at least a bachelor's degree, compared with 9 percent of children living with neither parent present and

12 percent of children living in single-parent family groups (Table 6). Among children living in unmarried partner households, just 8 percent of the householders had a bachelor's degree or more education.

Children living with no parent present were more likely to live with a householder who was not in the labor force than those in the other three types of living arrangements (33 percent). Nineteen percent of children in unmarried partner households had householders who were not in the labor force. Unemployment rates are based on the percentage of people who are in the labor force, unemployed, and looking for work. The rate of unemployed householders was highest among children living in mother-only family group households, at 10 percent, compared with 3 percent for children living in married-couple family groups.

**Seventeen percent of children lived with a foreign-born householder.**

In 2000, over one-half of all children living with a foreign-born householder were Hispanic (56 percent) compared with 9 percent of children living with a native householder. Non-Hispanic White children accounted for 16 percent of those living with foreign-born householders and 71 percent of children living with native householders.

The percentage of those speaking English at home differs greatly by householder-nativity status. Less than one-quarter (23 percent) of children living with a foreign-born householder but 93 percent of those living with a native householder spoke only English at home. Children living with a foreign-born householder were more likely to live with a householder who did not have a high school diploma

Table 6.

## Characteristics of Children Under 18 Years by Their Living Arrangements and Householder Nativity Status: 2000

(For information on confidentiality protection, sampling error, nonsampling error, and definitions, see [www.census.gov/prod/cen2000/doc/sf3.pdf](http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2000/doc/sf3.pdf))

Characteristic	Total children <sup>1</sup>	Living arrangements <sup>2</sup>				In unmarried-partner household <sup>3</sup>	Householder nativity	
		Married-couple family group	Mother-only family group	Father-only family group	Living with neither parent		Foreign born	Native
<b>Total, under 18 years</b> .....	<b>71,623,390</b>	<b>48,746,172</b>	<b>14,938,921</b>	<b>4,145,181</b>	<b>3,793,116</b>	<b>4,083,793</b>	<b>12,246,950</b>	<b>59,376,440</b>
<b>PERCENT</b> .....	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Race and Hispanic or Latino Origin</b>								
White alone .....	68.8	76.8	49.5	62.6	48.3	59.6	39.7	74.8
Black or African American alone .....	14.8	7.5	33.7	17.9	30.3	19.6	7.6	16.3
American Indian and Alaska Native alone .....	1.1	0.8	1.6	1.9	2.1	2.1	0.6	1.2
Asian alone .....	3.4	4.1	1.6	2.2	2.4	1.4	17.0	0.6
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone .....	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.1
Some other race alone .....	7.6	6.9	8.2	10.2	11.8	11.4	28.4	3.4
Two or more races .....	4.1	3.6	5.2	5.0	4.7	5.7	6.4	3.6
Hispanic or Latino (of any race) .....	17.0	15.6	18.2	21.6	24.7	23.5	56.0	8.9
White alone, not Hispanic or Latino .....	61.2	69.5	42.0	53.5	37.9	50.3	15.7	70.5
<b>Educational Attainment of the Householder</b>								
Less than high school .....	19.8	15.8	25.6	29.4	37.4	29.0	46.1	14.4
High school graduate (includes equivalency) .....	27.0	25.2	30.7	32.7	29.2	34.8	17.4	29.0
Some college .....	29.2	29.0	32.1	25.9	24.0	27.8	17.0	31.8
Bachelor's degree or more .....	23.9	29.9	11.6	11.9	9.4	8.3	19.5	24.9
<b>Employment Status of the Householder</b>								
In labor force .....	83.8	88.7	73.1	80.3	67.1	80.8	74.8	85.7
Employed <sup>4</sup> .....	95.8	97.4	90.5	94.4	93.6	92.3	94.4	96.1
Unemployed <sup>4</sup> .....	4.2	2.6	9.5	5.6	6.4	7.7	5.6	3.9
Not in labor force .....	16.2	11.3	26.9	19.7	32.9	19.2	25.2	14.3
<b>Poverty Status in 1999<sup>5</sup></b>								
Living in poverty .....	16.0	8.0	38.6	20.0	29.6	34.8	23.1	14.5
Not living in poverty .....	84.0	92.0	61.4	80.0	70.4	65.2	76.9	85.5
<b>Tenure of Householder</b>								
Owns home .....	66.8	76.8	40.2	53.9	57.7	43.2	52.1	69.9
Rents home .....	33.2	23.2	59.8	46.1	42.3	56.8	47.9	30.1
<b>Total, 3 to 17 years</b> .....	<b>60,298,159</b>	<b>40,990,137</b>	<b>12,756,650</b>	<b>3,374,224</b>	<b>3,177,148</b>	<b>3,190,973</b>	<b>10,142,051</b>	<b>50,156,108</b>
<b>PERCENT</b> .....	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>School Enrollment</b>								
Enrolled in school <sup>6</sup> .....	90.9	91.3	91.3	88.9	86.2	87.9	88.4	91.4
Nursery school, preschool, or kindergarten .....	15.1	15.4	15.1	14.3	12.5	17.0	14.4	15.2
Public school <sup>7</sup> .....	68.0	62.8	79.4	79.2	82.6	81.0	75.4	66.6
Elementary (grades 1-8) .....	55.3	55.3	56.5	54.6	51.1	55.8	54.6	55.4
Public school <sup>7</sup> .....	89.1	86.9	93.5	93.8	94.9	95.3	91.7	88.6
High school (grades 9-12) .....	20.4	20.6	19.6	19.8	22.3	15.0	19.2	20.7
Public school <sup>7</sup> .....	90.9	89.4	93.6	94.3	94.9	95.5	92.3	90.6
Not enrolled in school .....	9.1	8.7	8.7	11.1	13.8	12.1	11.6	8.6
<b>Total, 5 to 17 years</b> .....	<b>52,606,285</b>	<b>35,697,233</b>	<b>11,167,792</b>	<b>2,919,705</b>	<b>2,821,555</b>	<b>2,688,914</b>	<b>8,745,731</b>	<b>43,860,554</b>
<b>PERCENT</b> .....	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Residence in 1995</b>								
Same house in 1995 .....	52.9	57.7	43.1	45.9	38.0	34.3	46.7	54.1
Different house in 1995 .....	47.1	42.3	56.9	54.1	62.0	65.7	53.3	45.9
<b>Language Spoken at Home</b>								
English only .....	81.6	81.4	83.5	81.2	77.8	80.7	23.0	93.3
Language other than English .....	18.4	18.6	16.5	18.8	22.2	19.3	77.0	6.7
<b>Disability status</b>								
Severe hearing or vision impairment .....	1.0	0.8	1.3	1.1	1.5	1.3	1.0	1.0
Condition limiting basic activities .....	1.0	0.8	1.6	1.1	1.8	1.0	1.2	0.8
Difficulty learning, remembering or concentrating .....	4.5	3.7	6.3	4.6	7.6	5.8	2.3	4.9
Difficulty dressing, bathing or getting around inside the house .....	0.9	0.7	1.2	0.9	1.6	1.3	0.9	1.0
With any disability .....	5.7	4.7	8.0	6.1	9.5	7.4	3.8	6.1
With multiple disabilities <sup>8</sup> .....	1.2	0.9	1.7	1.2	2.1	1.4	1.1	1.2

<sup>1</sup>Universe does not include children who are householders, reference persons of subfamilies, and their spouses.

<sup>2</sup>Determined by relationship of child to householder or to reference person in a related subfamily.

<sup>3</sup>Excludes children aged 15 to 17 who are the householder or unmarried partner in an unmarried-partner household.

<sup>4</sup>Percent distribution based on householders who were in the labor force.

<sup>5</sup>Poverty universe excludes children unrelated to the householder including foster children and nonrelatives.

<sup>6</sup>Enrolled in school includes children enrolled in college, not shown separately.

<sup>7</sup>Percent based on those enrolled in grade category.

<sup>8</sup>Includes children aged 5 to 17 with any combination of two or more disabilities.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000, Summary File 3.

(46 percent) than were children living with a native householder (14 percent). Children living with a foreign-born householder were also more likely to be in poverty than those living with a native householder (23 percent and 15 percent, respectively).

### **Two-thirds of children lived in owned homes.**

Nationwide, 67 percent of children lived in owned homes, led by 77 percent of those in married-couple family groups. More children in father-only family groups (54 percent) and no-parent living arrangements (58 percent) lived in an owned home than did those in mother-only family groups (40 percent).

### **Poverty rates for children differed by race, Hispanic origin, and family living arrangements.**

Children in mother-only family groups were almost five times as likely to be in poverty as those in married-couple family groups (39 percent and 8 percent, respectively). Children who were unrelated to the householder are not included in the calculation of poverty levels since poverty status is partially based on family size. Thirty percent of children who were related to the householder but living with no parent present were in poverty.

Figure 5 shows differences in the percentage of children in poverty in 1999 by race and Hispanic origin for the four living arrangements. For all of the race and ethnic groups shown, children living in married-couple families had the lowest poverty rates, while those in mother-only family groups experienced the highest rates. Non-Hispanic White children were the least likely to be in poverty in all

living arrangements except for those with no parent present. In the latter group, Asians and non-Hispanic Whites were both statistically lowest. Among children living in mother-only family groups, the poverty rate ranged from a high of 50 percent for American Indian and Alaska Native children to a low of 28 percent for non-Hispanic White children. This was the largest percentage-point range in poverty rates within any of the parental living arrangement categories. Asian children had the second lowest poverty rate for 3 of the 4 parental living arrangements, except for those living in married-couple family groups.

### **CHARACTERISTICS OF CHILDREN BY PLACE**

Table 7 shows the places of 100,000 or more people with the five highest and lowest percentages of children by selected characteristics.<sup>19</sup> In 2000, only 2 percent of the children in Naperville, Illinois, were not sons or daughters of the householder. At the other end of the spectrum, more than one-quarter of children in Baltimore, Maryland, lived in households where they were not sons or daughters of the householder. The rates for the remaining four of the top five places were all more than 20 percent.

Only 9 percent of children in Naperville, Illinois, did not live with two married parents and only 1 percent lived in unmarried-partner households, the lowest proportions for places of 100,000 or more population (Table 7). In a number of places, the proportions

<sup>19</sup> Census 2000 shows 245 places in the United States with 100,000 or more population. This includes 238 incorporated places (including 4 city-county consolidations) and 7 census designated places that are not legally incorporated. For a list of places by state, see [www.census.gov/population/www/cen2000/phc-t6.html](http://www.census.gov/population/www/cen2000/phc-t6.html).

of children not living with two married parents was twice that of the national average of 32 percent. This was true in Gary, Indiana; Detroit, Michigan; Baltimore, Maryland; Atlanta, Georgia, and Hartford, Connecticut. The proportion of unmarried-partner households in Hartford (13 percent) was more than twice that of the national average (6 percent).

In Jackson, Mississippi, only 1 percent of children lived with a foreign-born householder. By contrast, four places in California recorded 75 percent or more, as did Hialeah, Florida (88 percent). In Livonia, Michigan, only 6 percent of children lived with a householder who was not in the labor force, while in Providence, Rhode Island, this category accounted for 38 percent. Livonia also had the lowest percentage of children living in rented homes (7 percent). The five places with the highest percentages in rented homes were all in Connecticut and New Jersey, led by Hartford, Connecticut, (80 percent) and Newark, New Jersey (76 percent).

Naperville, Illinois, had one of the lowest percentages of children in poverty in 1999, at just 2 percent, and had the lowest rate of children in homes receiving public assistance, only 0.4 percent. At 45 percent, Brownsville, Texas, was the place of 100,000 or more people with the highest percentage of children in poverty. The places shown with the highest percentages of children in homes receiving state or local assistance were Rochester, Providence, and Hartford in the Northeast and Fresno and Sacramento in the West.

### **Accuracy of the Estimates**


The data contained in this report are based on the sample of households who responded to the Census

Figure 5.


### Poverty Rate in 1999 for Children Under 18 Years by Race and Hispanic Origin and Living Arrangement: 2000

(Percent below the poverty level. For information on confidentiality protection, sampling error, nonsampling error, and definitions, see [www.census.gov/prod/cen2000/doc/sf3.pdf](http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2000/doc/sf3.pdf))


#### Living in married-couple family group




#### Living in mother-only family group



#### Living in father-only family group



#### Living with neither parent



Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000, Summary File 3.

Table 7.  
**Places of 100,000 or More Population With the Five Highest and Five Lowest Percentages of Children Under 18 With Selected Social and Economic Characteristics: 2000**

(For information on confidentiality protection, sampling error, nonsampling error, and definitions, see [www.census.gov/prod/cen2000/doc/sf3.pdf](http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2000/doc/sf3.pdf))

Characteristic	Five highest				Five lowest			
	Place	Total children	Percent	90-percent confidence interval	Place	Total children	Percent	90-percent confidence interval
Not son or daughter of householder	Baltimore, MD	159,328	25.7	25.3 - 26.1	Naperville, IL	40,888	1.8	1.6 - 2.0
	Gary, IN	30,515	24.0	23.0 - 25.0	Overland Park, KS	38,157	3.2	2.9 - 3.5
	Santa Ana, CA	114,259	22.7	22.2 - 23.3	Irvine, CA	33,296	3.8	3.3 - 4.3
	Washington, DC	112,667	22.3	21.8 - 22.9	Fort Collins, CO	25,129	3.9	3.4 - 4.4
	Newark, NJ	75,167	22.0	21.4 - 22.6	Ann Arbor, MI	18,791	4.2	3.7 - 4.7
Not living in married-couple family group <sup>1</sup>	Hartford, CT	35,993	72.9	71.1 - 74.7	Naperville, IL	40,888	9.0	8.1 - 9.9
	Gary, IN	30,515	70.2	68.1 - 72.3	Overland Park, KS	38,157	15.2	14.0 - 16.4
	Detroit, MI	292,697	69.1	68.5 - 69.7	Livonia, MI	23,970	15.7	14.1 - 17.0
	Baltimore, MD	159,328	67.3	66.4 - 68.3	Sterling Heights, MI	29,930	15.9	14.3 - 17.3
	Atlanta, GA	91,189	67.1	65.8 - 68.4	Plano, TX	63,279	15.9	14.7 - 17.1
Living in unmarried-partner households <sup>2</sup>	Hartford, CT	35,977	13.3	12.6 - 14.0	Naperville, IL	40,888	1.2	1.0 - 1.4
	Allentown, PA	26,092	12.5	11.7 - 13.3	Irvine, CA	33,296	2.0	1.7 - 2.3
	Syracuse, NY	36,251	11.8	11.1 - 12.6	Plano, TX	63,236	2.1	1.8 - 2.3
	Patterson, NJ	43,843	11.6	11.0 - 12.2	Provo, UT	22,879	2.1	1.8 - 2.4
	Springfield, MA	43,249	11.0	10.4 - 11.6	Livonia, MI	23,970	2.2	1.9 - 2.5
Living with foreign-born householder	Hialeah, FL	52,043	87.9	87.2 - 88.6	Jackson, MS	51,811	1.1	0.9 - 1.3
	Santa Ana, CA	114,259	86.5	85.9 - 87.1	Flint, MI	37,812	1.3	1.0 - 1.6
	E. Los Angeles, CA*	42,804	81.0	80.0 - 82.1	Birmingham, AL	59,903	1.9	1.7 - 2.2
	El Monte, CA	39,069	79.1	78.0 - 80.2	Evansville, IN	27,515	1.9	1.4 - 2.4
	Glendale, CA	43,382	75.6	74.4 - 76.7	Gary, IN	30,515	2.0	1.6 - 2.4
Living with householder not in labor force	Providence, RI	44,856	37.7	36.7 - 38.7	Livonia, MI	23,970	5.8	5.2 - 6.4
	Newark, NJ	75,167	35.8	35.0 - 36.6	Naperville, IL	40,888	6.5	6.1 - 7.0
	Miami, FL	77,926	35.7	34.9 - 36.4	Plano, TX	63,279	6.7	6.3 - 7.1
	E. Los Angeles, CA*	42,804	34.5	33.4 - 35.6	Overland Park, KS	38,157	6.9	6.4 - 7.4
	Hialeah, FL	52,043	33.9	33.0 - 34.8	Gilbert, AZ	37,548	7.3	6.7 - 7.9
Living in poverty in 1999 <sup>3</sup>	Brownsville, TX	47,561	44.7	43.6 - 45.8	Naperville, IL	40,754	2.2	1.9 - 2.4
	Hartford, CT	35,280	40.9	39.9 - 41.9	Gilbert, AZ	37,149	2.9	2.5 - 3.3
	New Orleans, LA	126,270	40.0	39.4 - 40.6	Overland Park, KS	37,875	2.9	2.6 - 3.2
	Providence, RI	44,084	39.9	38.8 - 41.0	Livonia, MI	23,780	3.0	2.6 - 3.4
	Atlanta, GA	89,451	38.6	37.8 - 39.4	Plano, TX	62,682	4.5	4.1 - 4.9
Living in renter occupied home	Hartford, CT	35,993	79.7	78.8 - 80.6	Livonia, MI	23,970	6.9	6.4 - 7.4
	Newark, NJ	75,167	75.9	75.3 - 76.5	Naperville, IL	40,888	7.9	7.4 - 8.3
	New Haven, CT	30,807	73.6	72.6 - 74.6	Sterling Heights, MI	29,930	11.6	11.0 - 12.2
	Jersey City, NJ	58,640	72.1	71.4 - 72.9	Gilbert, AZ	37,548	12.7	12.0 - 13.4
	Elizabeth, NJ	31,530	71.4	70.4 - 72.4	Peoria, AZ	30,586	15.0	14.2 - 15.8
Living in household receiving state or local assistance	Rochester, NY	61,001	29.6	28.8 - 30.4	Naperville, IL	40,528	0.4	0.3 - 0.5
	Providence, RI	44,856	28.2	27.3 - 29.1	Overland Park, KS	38,157	0.9	0.7 - 1.1
	Fresno, CA	139,103	27.8	27.3 - 28.3	Gilbert, AZ	37,548	1.0	0.8 - 1.2
	Sacramento, CA	109,751	27.1	26.5 - 27.7	Plano, TX	63,279	1.1	0.9 - 1.3
	Hartford, CT	35,993	26.9	25.9 - 27.9	Irvine, CA	33,296	1.3	1.0 - 1.6

\* East Los Angeles, CA, is a census designated place and is not legally incorporated.

<sup>1</sup>Those in married-couple family groups were living with a parent (householder or reference person of a subfamily) who is married with his or her spouse present.

<sup>2</sup>Excludes people 15 to 17 who are the householder or unmarried partner in an unmarried-partner household.

<sup>3</sup>Poverty universe excludes children unrelated to the householder, including foster children and other nonrelatives.

Note: Excludes householders, reference persons of subfamilies, and their spouses.

Note: Because of sampling error, the estimates in this table may not be significantly different from one another or from rates for other geographic areas not listed in this table.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000, Summary File 3.



---

2000 long form. Nationally, approximately one out of every six housing units was included in this sample. As a result, the sample estimates may differ somewhat from the 100-percent figures that would have been obtained if all housing units, people within those housing units, and people living in group quarters had been enumerated using the same questionnaires, instructions, enumerators, and so forth. The sample estimates also differ from the values that would have been obtained from different samples of housing units, and hence of people living in those housing units, and people living in group quarters. The deviation of a sample estimate from the average of all possible samples is called the sampling error.

In addition to the variability that arises from the sampling procedures, both sample data and 100-percent data are subject to nonsampling error. Nonsampling error may be introduced during any of the various complex operations used to collect and process data. Such errors may include: not enumerating every household or every person in the population, failing to obtain all required information from the respondents, obtaining incorrect or inconsistent information, and recording information incorrectly. In addition, errors can occur during the field review of the enumerators' work, during clerical handling of the census questionnaires, or during the electronic processing of the questionnaires.

While it is impossible to completely eliminate error from an operation as large and complex as the decennial census, the Census Bureau attempts to control the sources of

such error during the data collection and processing operations. The primary sources of error and the programs instituted to control error in Census 2000 are described in detail in Summary File 3 Technical Documentation under Chapter 8, "Accuracy of the Data," located at [www.census.gov/prod/cen2000/doc/sf3.pdf](http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2000/doc/sf3.pdf).

Nonsampling error may affect the data in two ways: (1) errors that are introduced randomly will increase the variability of the data and, therefore, should be reflected in the standard errors; and (2) errors that tend to be consistent in one direction will bias both sample and 100-percent data in that direction. For example, if respondents consistently tend to underreport their incomes, then the resulting estimates of households or families by income category will tend to be understated for the higher income categories and overstated for the lower income categories. Such biases are not reflected in the standard errors.

All statements in this Census 2000 report have undergone statistical testing and all comparisons are significant at the 90-percent confidence level, unless otherwise noted. The estimates in tables, maps, and other figures may vary from actual values due to sampling and nonsampling errors. As a result, estimates in one category used to summarize statistics in the maps and figures may not be significantly different from estimates assigned to a different category. Further information on the accuracy of the data is located at [www.census.gov/prod/cen2000/doc/sf3.pdf](http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2000/doc/sf3.pdf). For further information on the computation and use of

standard errors, contact the Decennial Statistical Studies Division at 301-763-4242.

### **For More Information**

For more information on children's relationships to householders in the United States, visit the U.S. Census Bureau's Internet site at [www.census.gov/population/www/socdemo/hh-fam.html](http://www.census.gov/population/www/socdemo/hh-fam.html).

Data on children and on the relationship of various household members to the householder from Census 2000 Summary File 3 were released on a state-by-state basis during the summer of 2002. Census 2000 Summary File 3 data are available on the Internet via [factfinder.census.gov](http://factfinder.census.gov) and for purchase on CD-ROM and on DVD.

For information on confidentiality protection, nonsampling error, sampling error, and definitions, also see [www.census.gov/prod/cen2000/doc/sf3.pdf](http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2000/doc/sf3.pdf) or contact our Customer Services Center at 301-763-INFO (4636).

Information on other population and housing topics is presented in the Census 2000 Briefs and Census 2000 Special Reports series, located on the U.S. Census Bureau's Web site at [www.census.gov/population/www/cen2000/briefs.html](http://www.census.gov/population/www/cen2000/briefs.html). This series presents information on race, Hispanic origin, age, sex, household type, housing tenure, and other social, economic, and housing characteristics.

For more information about Census 2000, including data products, call our Customer Services Center at 301-763-INFO (4636), or e-mail [webmaster@census.gov](mailto:webmaster@census.gov).

