

Poverty in the United States: 2002

Issued September 2003

P60-222

Current Population Reports *Consumer Income*

By
Bernadette D. Proctor
and
Joseph Dalaker



Demographic Programs

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



Acknowledgments

This report was prepared under the direction of **Joseph Dalaker** and **Sharon Stern**, Acting Chief, Poverty and Health Statistics Branch. **Charles T. Nelson**, Assistant Division Chief for Income, Poverty, and Health Statistics, Housing and Household Economic Statistics Division, provided overall direction.

David Nguyen and **John Dinh**, Demographic Surveys Division, processed the Current Population Survey 2002 and 2003 Annual Social and Economic Supplement files. **Caroline Carbaugh**, Chief of the Survey Processing Branch, **Jaime Hasiuk**, **Thy Le**, **Stacy Lyons**, **Mary Thrift Bush**, and **Kirk Davis** programmed the detailed tables and produced the publication tables.

Tim J. Marshall, under the supervision of **Greg Weyland**, Demographic Surveys Division, prepared specifications for the computer-assisted interviewing instrument used to conduct the Annual Social and Economic Supplement. **Andrew M. Stevenson**, Technologies Management Office, programmed the instrument.

Additional people within the Census Bureau also made significant contributions to the preparation of this report. **Kathleen S. Short**, **Erika Steinmetz**, **Alemayehu Bishaw**, **Shailesh Bhandari**, and **Larry Long** reviewed the contents.

Sampling review was conducted by **Jana Shepherd** and **Alfred G. Meier** of Demographic Statistical Methods Division.

U.S. Census Bureau field representatives and telephone interviewers collected the data. Without their dedication, the preparation of this report or any other report from the Current Population Survey would be impossible.

Greg Carroll, **Barbara M. Abbott**, **Jan Sweeney**, and **Mary Stinson** of the Administrative and Customer Services Division, **Walter C. Odom**, Chief, provided publications and printing management, graphics design and composition, and editorial review for print and electronic media. General direction and production management were provided by **Susan L. Rappa**, Chief, Publications Services Branch.

Poverty in the United States: 2002

Issued September 2003

P60-222



U.S. Department of Commerce
Donald L. Evans,
Secretary

Samuel W. Bodman,
Deputy Secretary

Economics and Statistics Administration
Kathleen B. Cooper,
Under Secretary for Economic Affairs

U.S. CENSUS BUREAU
Charles Louis Kincannon,
Director

Suggested Citation

Proctor, Bernadette D. and
Joseph Dalaker, U.S. Census Bureau,
Current Population Reports, P60-222,
Poverty in the United States: 2002,
U.S. Government Printing Office,
Washington, DC,
2003.



Economics and Statistics Administration

Kathleen B. Cooper,
Under Secretary for Economic Affairs



U.S. CENSUS BUREAU

Charles Louis Kincannon,
Director

Hermann Habermann,
Deputy Director and Chief Operating Officer

Vacant,
Principal Associate Director for Programs

Nancy M. Gordon,
Associate Director for Demographic Programs

Daniel H. Weinberg,
Chief, Housing and Household Economic Statistics
Division

Contents

TEXT

Poverty in the United States: 2002	1
Introduction	1
Highlights	1
Accuracy Statement	1
Poverty in the United States	2
New Racial Groups	3
The Official Measure of Poverty	4
Race and Hispanic Origin	5
Age	7
Nativity	7
Families and Unrelated Individuals	7
Work Experience	8
Region	9
Residence	9
State Poverty Data	9
Interpreting State Poverty Data	11
Depth of Poverty Measures	9
Ratio of Income to Poverty Level	9
Example: “Depth of Poverty” Measures	12
Income Deficit	12
Transitions Into and Out of Poverty	14
Alternative Poverty Measures	14
Poverty Estimates Based on National Academy of Sciences Recommendations	14
Official and Alternative (NAS-Based) Poverty Estimates: How Do They Differ?	16
Poverty Estimates Using Alternative Income Definitions	18
What Alternative Measures of Income Are Used for Alternative Poverty Estimates?	18
Notes, Additional Data, and Users’ Comments	20
CPS Data Collection	20
Model-Based State Estimates	20
Additional Data and Contacts	21
Comments	21

TEXT TABLES

1. Number in Poverty and Poverty Rate by Race and Hispanic Origin: 2001 and 2002	2
2. People and Families in Poverty by Selected Characteristics: 2001 and 2002	6
3. Work Experience During the Year for People Aged 16 and Older: 2002	7
4. Percent of People in Poverty by State: 2000, 2001, and 2002	10

5. People with Income Below Specified Ratios of Their Poverty Thresholds by Selected Characteristics: 2002	12
6. Income Deficit or Surplus of Families and Unrelated Individuals by Poverty Status: 2002	13
7. Alternative Poverty Estimates Based on National Academy of Sciences Recommendations: 2001 and 2002	17
8. Poverty Estimates Based on Alternative Measures of Income and Deflators: 2001 and 2002	19

FIGURES

1. Number in Poverty and Poverty Rate: 1959 to 2002	3
2. Poverty Rates by Age: 1959 to 2002	5
3. Percent of People in Families by Number of Workers: 2001 and 2002	8
4. Poverty Rates of People in Families by Family Type and Presence of Workers: 2002 ...	8
5. States With Significant Changes in 2-Year Average Poverty Rates: 2001-2002 Less 2000-2001	11
6. Duration of Poverty Spells: 1996 to 1999	15
7. Selected Alternative Poverty Estimates by Type of Deflator: 1959 to 2002	20

APPENDIXES. Time Series Poverty Estimates

A-1. Poverty Status of People by Family Relationship, Race and Hispanic Origin: 1959 to 2002	22
A-2. Poverty Status of People by Age, Race and Hispanic Origin: 1959 to 2002	28
A-3. Poverty Status of Families by Type of Family: 1959 to 2002	33

Poverty in the United States: 2002

INTRODUCTION

Poverty data offer an important way to evaluate the nation's economic well-being. This report illustrates how the official poverty rates vary by selected characteristics — age, race and Hispanic origin, nativity, family composition, work experience, and geography. These data show how many people were in poverty in 2002 and how the poverty population has changed. A description of how the Census Bureau measures poverty may be found on page 4. Because the poverty population in the United States is too diverse to be characterized along any one dimension, the report also includes several alternative ways of measuring poverty, and is accompanied by a separate report, *Supplemental Measures of Material Well-Being: Expenditures, Consumption, and Poverty: 1998 and 2001* (P23-201).

HIGHLIGHTS

- The official poverty rate in 2002 was 12.1 percent, up from 11.7 percent in 2001.
- In 2002, people below the official poverty thresholds numbered 34.6 million, a figure 1.7 million higher than the 32.9 million in poverty in 2001.

- At 16.7 percent, the poverty rate for children did not change between 2001 and 2002, but remained higher than that of 18-to-64-year-olds and seniors aged 65 and over. However, the number of children in poverty increased to 12.1 million in 2002, up from 11.7 million in 2001.
- For people 18 to 64 years old, both the number in poverty and the poverty rate rose from 2001 to 2002 — from 17.8 million to 18.9 million, and from 10.1 percent to 10.6 percent, respectively. Similarly, the number of elderly in poverty increased from 3.4 million in 2001 to 3.6 million in 2002, though their poverty rate remained unchanged at 10.4 percent.¹
- Because racial and ethnic categories were redefined in 2002, no single comparison of poverty rates by race between 2001 and 2002 meets all needs. However, using a variety of definitions for the race categories for 2002,

¹ The poverty rate for people aged 65 and over was statistically indistinguishable from the rate for 18-to-64-year-olds. Because the poverty rates in this report are estimates, two groups that appear to have different poverty rates may not truly have different rates from one another. See text box.

- The poverty rates in 2002 for non-Hispanic Whites (8.0 percent for those who identified with no other race groups) and Asians (10.0 percent to 10.3 percent, depending on the race definition) were not different from the rates for the closest groups available in 2001.²
- Among people who reported Black in 2002, 23.9 percent to 24.1 percent were in poverty, depending on the race definition. Both figures were higher than the 22.7 percent for those who reported Black in 2001.
- For Hispanics (who may be of any race), the poverty rate was 21.8 percent in 2002, unchanged from 2001.³

² The poverty rates for the various racial subgroups that include Asians (ranging from 10.0 to 10.3 percent) were not statistically distinguishable from one another.

³ Because Hispanics may be of any race, data in this report for Hispanics overlap slightly with data for the Black population and for the Asian population. Based on the 2003 Current Population Survey Annual Social and Economic Supplement (CPS ASEC), 3.5 percent of Blacks who reported only one race and 1.6 percent of Asians who reported only one race were of Hispanic origin. For the poverty population, Hispanics made up 4.0 percent of Blacks (single race) and 1.6 percent of Asians (single race). Despite the sample expansion, single-year data for the American Indian and Alaska Native population and the Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander population are not shown in this report because of their small sample sizes in the 2003 CPS ASEC. Data users should exercise caution when interpreting aggregate results for both the Hispanic population and the Asian population because they consist of many distinct groups that differ in socio-economic characteristics, culture, and recency of immigration. In addition, the CPS does not use separate population controls for weighting the Asian sample to national totals. For further information, see www.bls.census.gov/cps/ads/adsmain.htm.

Accuracy Statement

The estimates in this report are based on interviewing a sample of the population. Respondents provide answers to the best of their ability, but as with all surveys, the estimates may differ from the actual values. All statements in this report have undergone statistical testing, and all comparisons are significant at the 90-percent confidence level. Further information on the source and accuracy of the estimates is at www.census.gov/hhes/poverty/poverty02/pov02src.pdf.

- In 2002, 7.2 million families (9.6 percent) were in poverty, up from 6.8 million (9.2 percent) in 2001.
- For married-couple families, the number in poverty and the poverty rate rose from 2001 to 2002 — from 2.8 million to 3.1 million, and from 4.9 percent to 5.3 percent, respectively.
- The number of female householder families with no husband present in poverty increased to 3.6 million in 2002 from 3.5 million in 2001. The poverty rate for these families was unchanged from 2001, at 26.5 percent.

- The poverty rate in the Midwest increased from 9.4 percent in 2001 to 10.3 percent in 2002. The poverty rates in the Northeast, South, and West did not change.
- The number in poverty and the poverty rate for people living in the suburbs rose from 12.1 million and 8.2 percent in 2001 to 13.3 million and 8.9 percent in 2002; neither the number in poverty nor the poverty rate changed in central cities or outside metropolitan areas.⁴

⁴ In this report, “suburbs” refers to metropolitan areas outside central cities.

POVERTY IN THE UNITED STATES

For the second consecutive year, the poverty rate and the number in poverty both rose from the prior year. In 2002, the poverty rate was 12.1 percent (34.6 million people), up from 11.7 percent (32.9 million people) in 2001. Figure 1 displays poverty rates and the number in poverty over time, beginning with 1959, the first year for which poverty statistics are available. Tables 1 and 2 present the number in poverty and poverty rates in 2001 and 2002 for many demographic groups, and show which groups had statistically significant changes.

Table 1.
Number in Poverty and Poverty Rate by Race and Hispanic Origin: 2001 and 2002

(Numbers in thousands, confidence intervals (C.I.) in thousands or percentage points as appropriate)

Race and Hispanic origin	2001					Race and Hispanic origin	2002					Change in poverty (2002 less 2001) ¹			
	Total	Below poverty level					Total	Below poverty level				Number	90-percent C.I. (±)	Percent	90-percent C.I. (±)
		Number	90-percent C.I. (±)	Percent	90-percent C.I. (±)			Number	90-percent C.I. (±)	Percent	90-percent C.I. (±)				
All races	281,475	32,907	644	11.7	0.2	All races	285,317	34,570	658	12.1	0.2	*1,663	683	*0.4	0.2
White	229,675	22,739	546	9.9	0.2	White alone or in combination	234,584	24,074	561	10.3	0.2	*1,335	631	*0.4	0.3
						White alone ²	230,376	23,466	554	10.2	0.2	*727	627	*0.3	0.3
						White alone, not Hispanic	194,144	15,567	458	8.0	0.2	296	520	0.2	0.3
White, not Hispanic	194,538	15,271	454	7.8	0.2	Black alone or in combination	37,207	8,884	336	23.9	0.8	*748	335	*1.2	0.9
Black	35,871	8,136	300	22.7	0.8	Black alone ³	35,678	8,602	331	24.1	0.9	*466	332	*1.4	0.9
Asian and Pacific Islander	12,465	1,275	129	10.2	1.0	Asian alone or in combination	12,487	1,243	132	10.0	1.0	-32	137	-0.2	1.1
						Asian alone ⁴	11,541	1,161	127	10.1	1.1	-114	135	-0.1	1.1
						Asian, Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander, either alone or in combination	13,498	1,378	139	10.2	1.0	103	141	-	1.1
						Asian and/or Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander ⁵	12,338	1,271	133	10.3	1.0	-4	138	0.1	1.1
Hispanic (of any race)	37,312	7,997	300	21.4	0.8	Hispanic (of any race)	39,216	8,555	309	21.8	0.8	*558	255	0.4	0.7

-Represents zero. *Statistically different from zero at the 90-percent confidence level. For an explanation of confidence intervals, see “Standard errors and their use” at www.census.gov/hhes/poverty/poverty02/pov02src.pdf.

¹Details may not sum to totals because of rounding.

²The 2003 Current Population Survey asked respondents to choose one or more races. White alone refers to people who reported White and did not report any other race category. The use of this single-race population does not imply that it is the preferred method of presenting or analyzing data. The Census Bureau uses a variety of approaches. Information on people who reported more than one race, such as “White and American Indian and Alaska Native” or “Asian and Black or African American,” is available from Census 2000 through American FactFinder. About 2.6 percent of people reported more than one race in 2000.

³Black alone refers to people who reported Black and did not report any other race category.

⁴Asian alone refers to people who reported Asian and did not report any other race category.

⁵Asian and/or Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander refers to people who reported either or both of these categories, but did not report any other category.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2002 and 2003 Annual Social and Economic Supplements.

New Racial Groups

The estimates in this report are based on the Current Population Survey (CPS) 2001, 2002, and 2003 Annual Social and Economic Supplement (ASEC) and provide information for calendar years 2000, 2001, and 2002, respectively.

For the first time in 2003, CPS respondents were asked to identify themselves in one or more racial groups;⁵ previously they had to choose one. This change complicates year-to-year comparisons. We do not know how people who reported more than one race in 2002 previously reported their race. Therefore, there is *no single way* to compare changes to poverty by race.


⁵ OMB establishes the official guidelines for the collection and classification of data for race (including the option for respondents to mark more than race) and Hispanic origin. Race and Hispanic origin are treated as separate and distinct concepts in accordance with OMB's guidelines. For further information, see www.whitehouse.gov/omb/ombdir15.html.

Table 1 compares last year's single-race figures with two different figures this year: one comparison is based on those who reported one race alone and the other is based on those who reported either that race only or that race and at least one other race. For example, this year's poverty report will compare the 2001 poverty figures for Blacks with 2002 poverty figures for those who reported themselves as:

1. Black alone, did not report any other race, and
2. Black alone or in combination with some other race(s).

The Census Bureau will provide year-to-year comparisons for each racial group, with the exception of American Indians and Alaska Natives, and Native Hawaiians and Other Pacific Islanders, who will not be examined separately (because the sample was not sufficiently large).

Figure 1.
Number in Poverty and Poverty Rate: 1959 to 2002



Note: The data points represent the midpoints of the respective years.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 1960-2003 Annual Social and Economic Supplements.

The Official Measure of Poverty

Following the Office of Management and Budget's (OMB) Statistical Policy Directive 14, the Census Bureau uses a set of money income thresholds that vary by family size and composition to determine who is in poverty (see the matrix below).

Poverty Thresholds in 2002 by Size of Family and Number of Related Children Under 18 Years

(Dollars)

Size of family unit	Related children under 18 years								
	None	One	Two	Three	Four	Five	Six	Seven	Eight or more
One person (unrelated individual):									
Under 65 years	9,359								
65 years and over	8,628								
Two people:									
Householder under 65 years	12,047	12,400							
Householder 65 years and over	10,874	12,353							
Three people	14,072	14,480	14,494						
Four people	18,556	18,859	18,244	18,307					
Five people	22,377	22,703	22,007	21,469	21,141				
Six people	25,738	25,840	25,307	24,797	24,038	23,588			
Seven people	29,615	29,799	29,162	28,718	27,890	26,924	25,865		
Eight people	33,121	33,414	32,812	32,285	31,538	30,589	29,601	29,350	
Nine people or more	39,843	40,036	39,504	39,057	38,323	37,313	36,399	36,173	34,780

Source: U.S. Census Bureau.

If a family's total income is less than that family's threshold, then that family, and every individual in it, is considered in poverty. The official poverty thresholds do not vary geographically, but they are updated annually for inflation using the Consumer Price Index (CPI-U). The official poverty definition uses money income before taxes and does not include capital gains and noncash benefits (such as public housing, medicaid, and food stamps).

Example: Suppose Family A consists of five people: two children, their mother, father, and great-aunt. Family A's poverty threshold in 2002 was \$22,007. Suppose also that each member had the following income in 2002:

Mother	\$10,000
Father	5,000
Great-aunt	10,000
First child	0
Second child	0
Total:	\$25,000

Since their total family income, \$25,000 was greater than their threshold (\$22,007), the family would not be considered "in poverty" according to the official poverty measure.

While the thresholds in some sense represent families' needs, the official poverty measure should be interpreted as a statistical yardstick rather than as a complete description of what people and families need to live. Moreover, many of the government's aid programs use different dollar amounts as eligibility criteria.

Poverty rates and the number in poverty are one important way of examining people's well-being. Other more detailed measures of poverty are considered in the sections "Depth of Poverty Measures" and "Alternative Poverty Measures," and in the recent Census Bureau report, *Supplemental Measures of Material Well-Being: Expenditures, Consumption and Poverty* (P23-201).


For a history of the official poverty measure see "The Development of the Orshansky Thresholds and Their Subsequent History as the Official U.S. Poverty Measure," by Gordon Fisher, at www.census.gov/hhes/poverty/povmeas/papers/orshansky.html.

Weighted average thresholds:

Some data users want a summary of the 48 thresholds to get a general sense of the "poverty line." These average thresholds provide that summary, but they are not used to compute poverty data.

One person	\$ 9,183
Two people	11,756
Three people	14,348
Four people	18,392
Five people	21,744
Six people	24,576
Seven people	28,001
Eight people	30,907
Nine people or more	37,062

Figure 2.
Poverty Rates by Age: 1959 to 2002



Note: The data points represent the midpoints of the respective years.
 Data for people 18 to 64 and 65 and older are not available from 1960 to 1965.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 1960-2003 Annual Social and Economic Supplements.

Race and Hispanic Origin

Until this year, the CPS questionnaire asked respondents to choose only a single race. As a result of a new standard issued by the Office of Management and Budget, this year's questionnaire asked respondents to report one or more racial groups.⁶ Consequently, this report will discuss ten racial and ethnic groups. Although the new groups do not align exactly with the ones used in previous years, Table 1 shows poverty rates for 2001 using the five racial and ethnic groups we could report that year, the rate for 2002 using the new groups, and the percentage-point changes between similar groups.

In 2002, among people who reported only one race, the poverty

rate was 8.0 percent for people who indicated they were non-Hispanic White, unchanged from the closest category available in 2001. Although the poverty rate for non-Hispanic Whites was lower than for the other racial and ethnic groups, non-Hispanic Whites accounted for 45.0 percent of the people in poverty and 68.0 percent of the total population.

Among people who indicated that they were Black (and no other race) in 2002, 24.1 percent were in poverty, higher than the 22.7 percent for those who reported Black in 2001. The number in poverty also rose (from 8.1 million to 8.6 million). For the Black population that includes those who identified with more than one race (in addition to single-race Blacks), the corresponding figures in 2002 were 23.9 percent and 8.9 million, also significant increases from 2001.

The race category "Asian or Pacific Islander" was divided into two groups in 2002: "Asians" and "Native Hawaiians and Other Pacific Islanders." That distinction makes poverty rate comparisons with Asians and Pacific Islanders in 2001 especially difficult. Table 1 thus compares poverty rates for four groups in 2002 with the Asian and Pacific Islander poverty rate in 2001. The poverty rate for single-race Asians in 2002 was 10.1 percent — not statistically different from the rate for Asians and Pacific Islanders in 2001. None of the other poverty rates for groups including the Asian population differed statistically from the rate for Asians and Pacific Islanders in 2001.

Among people who reported Hispanic (of any race), the number in poverty increased, from 8.0 million in 2001 to 8.6 million in 2002, while the poverty rate remained unchanged at 21.8 percent in 2002.

⁶ This supplement that collects income is now called the Annual Social and Economic Supplement (ASEC). It was formerly called the Annual Demographic Survey or simply the "March Supplement."

Table 2.
People and Families in Poverty by Selected Characteristics: 2001 and 2002

(Numbers in thousands, confidence intervals (C.I.) in thousands or percentage points as appropriate)

Characteristic	2001 below poverty level				2002 below poverty level				Change in poverty (2002 less 2001) ¹			
	Number	90-percent C.I. (±)	Percent	90-percent C.I. (±)	Number	90-percent C.I. (±)	Percent	90-percent C.I. (±)	Number	90-percent C.I. (±)	Percent	90-percent C.I. (±)
PEOPLE												
Total	32,907	644	11.7	0.2	34,570	658	12.1	0.2	*1,663	683	*0.4	0.2
Family Status												
In families	23,215	551	9.9	0.2	24,534	566	10.4	0.2	*1,319	586	*0.4	0.3
Householder	6,813	172	9.2	0.2	7,229	178	9.6	0.2	*416	199	*0.4	0.3
Related children under 18	11,175	323	15.8	0.5	11,646	332	16.3	0.5	*472	344	*0.5	0.5
Related children under 6	4,188	207	18.2	1.0	4,296	211	18.5	1.0	108	219	0.3	1.0
In unrelated subfamilies	466	82	39.8	7.6	417	77	33.7	6.7	-48	84	-6.1	7.6
Reference person	172	50	36.4	11.4	167	49	31.7	10.0	-6	51	-4.6	11.4
Children under 18	292	56	44.6	9.9	241	51	35.4	8.4	-51	58	-9.2	9.7
Unrelated individual	9,226	207	19.9	0.5	9,618	212	20.4	0.5	*392	240	0.5	0.5
Male	3,833	122	17.3	0.6	4,023	125	17.7	0.7	*190	141	0.4	0.7
Female	5,393	149	22.3	0.7	5,595	153	22.9	0.7	*203	171	0.6	0.8
Age												
Under 18 years	11,733	329	16.3	0.5	12,133	337	16.7	0.5	*400	350	0.4	0.5
18 to 64 years	17,760	483	10.1	0.3	18,861	498	10.6	0.3	*1,101	515	*0.5	0.3
65 years and over	3,414	129	10.1	0.4	3,576	132	10.4	0.4	*163	137	0.3	0.3
Nativity												
Native	27,698	597	11.1	0.2	29,012	609	11.5	0.2	*1,314	633	*0.4	0.3
Foreign born	5,209	308	16.1	1.0	5,558	317	16.6	1.0	*349	329	0.6	1.0
Naturalized citizen	1,186	148	9.9	1.2	1,285	154	10.0	1.1	99	158	0.1	1.3
Not a citizen	4,023	271	19.7	1.3	4,273	280	20.7	1.3	250	290	1.1	1.5
Region												
Northeast	5,687	266	10.7	0.5	5,871	270	10.9	0.5	184	281	0.2	0.5
Midwest	5,966	278	9.4	0.4	6,616	293	10.3	0.5	*650	299	*0.9	0.5
South	13,515	458	13.5	0.5	14,019	466	13.8	0.5	*505	484	0.3	0.5
West	7,739	364	12.1	0.6	8,064	372	12.4	0.7	325	385	0.3	0.7
Residence												
Inside metropolitan areas	25,446	575	11.1	0.3	27,096	591	11.6	0.3	*1,649	612	*0.5	0.3
Inside central cities	13,394	427	16.5	0.5	13,784	433	16.7	0.5	390	451	0.2	0.5
Outside central cities	12,052	406	8.2	0.3	13,311	426	8.9	0.3	*1,259	436	*0.7	0.3
Outside metropolitan areas	7,460	394	14.2	0.8	7,474	395	14.2	0.8	14	415	-	0.8
FAMILIES												
Total	6,813	172	9.2	0.2	7,229	178	9.6	0.2	*416	199	*0.4	0.3
Type of Family												
Married-couple	2,760	102	4.9	0.2	3,052	107	5.3	0.2	*292	120	*0.5	0.2
Female householder, no husband present	3,470	116	26.4	1.0	3,613	118	26.5	1.0	*143	133	0.1	1.2
Male householder, no wife present	583	45	13.1	1.1	564	44	12.1	1.0	-20	51	-1.1	1.2

-Represents zero. *Statistically different from zero at the 90-percent confidence level. For explanation of confidence intervals, see "Standard errors and their use" at www.census.gov/hhes/poverty/poverty02/pov02src.pdf.

¹Details may not sum to totals because of rounding.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2002 and 2003 Annual Social and Economic Supplements.

Table 3.
Work Experience During the Year for People Aged 16 and Older: 2002

(Numbers in thousands, confidence intervals (C.I.) in thousands or percentage points as appropriate)

Characteristic	Total	Number in poverty	90-percent C.I. (±)	Percent in poverty	90-percent C.I. (±)
All workers	151,546	8,954	351	5.9	0.2
Worked full-time year-round ...	100,659	2,635	193	2.6	0.2
Not full-time year-round	50,887	6,318	297	12.4	0.6
Did not work at least one week ..	69,595	14,647	443	21.0	0.6

Notes: Full-time, year-round workers are those who worked 50 or more weeks and 35 or more hours per week during the calendar year. Paid vacations are counted as time worked. For an explanation of confidence intervals, see "Standard errors and their use" at www.census.gov/hhes/poverty/poverty02/pov02src.pdf. Details may not sum to totals because of rounding.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2003 Annual Social and Economic Supplement.

Age

People 18 to 64 years old accounted for most of the net change between 2001 and 2002; both their number in poverty and poverty rate increased (18.9 million and 10.6 percent in 2002, up from 17.8 million and 10.1 percent in 2001). People 65 and over showed an increase only in the number in poverty in 2002 — 3.6 million, up from 3.4 million in 2001 — while their poverty rate remained unchanged at 10.4 percent in 2002.⁷

In 2002, the number of children in poverty under 18 was 12.1 million, up from 11.7 million in 2001. This increase did not translate into a higher poverty rate: 16.7 percent in 2002, unchanged from 2001. The poverty rate for children was higher than the rates for the other two age groups shown in Table 2. In addition, children represented a disproportionate share of the people in poverty (35.1 percent), as they were only one-fourth (25.5 percent) of the total population.

Children under 6 have been particularly vulnerable to poverty. In

⁷ The poverty rate for people aged 65 and over was statistically indistinguishable from the rate for 18-to-64-year-olds.

2002, the poverty rate for related children under 6 was 18.5 percent, unchanged from 2001. Of children under 6 living in families with a female householder, no spouse present, 48.6 percent were in poverty, five times the rate of their counterparts in married-couple families (9.7 percent).

Nativity

The foreign born experienced an increase in their number in poverty — 5.6 million in 2002, compared with 5.2 million in 2001 — but not in their poverty rate — 16.6 percent in 2002. In contrast, the native population had increases in both their poverty rate (from 11.1 percent to 11.5 percent) and number in poverty (from 27.7 million to 29.0 million) between 2001 and 2002.⁸

Of the foreign-born population, approximately 3 in 8 (38.4 percent) were naturalized citizens,

⁸ Natives are defined as people born in the United States, Puerto Rico, or an outlying areas of the United States, and those born in a foreign country but who had at least one parent who was a U.S. citizen. All others are foreign-born regardless of date of entry into the United States or citizenship status. The Current Population Survey, the source of these data, does not extend to Puerto Rico or to the outlying areas of the United States, and thus those living there are excluded from the official poverty statistics.

and the rest were noncitizens. Poverty rates for these two groups bracketed the 11.5 percent rate for the native population — 10.0 percent (1.3 million) for foreign-born naturalized citizens and 20.7 percent (4.3 million) for those who had not become citizens. Neither foreign-born group experienced an increase in their poverty rate or the number of people in poverty.

Families and Unrelated Individuals

The poverty rate and number of families in poverty increased to 9.6 percent, or 7.2 million, in 2002, up from 9.2 percent or 6.8 million in 2001. Both married-couple families and families with a female householder and no husband present experienced an increase in the number in poverty between 2001 and 2002, but married-couple families also had an increase in the poverty rate whereas female householder families did not.

Specifically, the poverty rate and number in poverty married-couple families increased from 4.9 percent and 2.8 million in 2001 to 5.3 percent and 3.1 million in 2002.

The number of families in poverty with a female householder and no husband present increased from 3.5 million in 2001 to 3.6 million in 2002, but their poverty rate for 2002 (26.5 percent) did not change. Families with a female householder and no husband present made up half of all families in poverty. In 2002, families with a male householder, no spouse present showed no increase in their number in poverty or their poverty rate (564,000 and 12.1 percent in 2002).

For unrelated individuals (people not living with any relatives), the number in poverty increased to

9.6 million in 2002, up from 9.2 million in 2001, whereas their poverty rate was unchanged from 2001 (20.4 percent). Among unrelated individuals, both men (4.0 million in 2002, up from 3.8 million in 2001) and women (5.6 million in 2002, up from 5.4 million in 2001) showed increases in their number in poverty in 2002. The poverty rates for men (17.7 percent) and women (22.9 percent) were unchanged in 2001. Women accounted for 58.2 percent of unrelated individuals in poverty in 2002.

Work Experience


Those who worked in 2002 had a lower poverty rate than those who did not — 5.9 percent compared with 21.0 percent (see Table 3).⁹ Among full-time year-round workers, the poverty rate was much lower than for those who worked part-time or part-year (2.6 percent compared with 12.4 percent).

Looking at the data another way, we see that 37.9 percent, or 9.0 million of those in poverty worked, but the jobs they held were usually not full-time year-round. Among the working-age poverty population, 11.2 percent held full-time year-round jobs in 2002 (2.6 million), compared with 26.8 percent (6.3 million) who worked part-time or part-year, and 62.1 percent (14.6 million) did not work at all.

Because poverty is a family-based measure, the income of one family member affects the poverty status of the other members, such as children and other dependents. Therefore, Figure 3 and Figure 4 display data for people in families (of all ages), by the number of workers in the family.

⁹ These data refer to people aged 16 and older.

Figure 3.
Percent of People in Families by Number of Workers: 2001 and 2002




Note: Details may not sum to totals because of rounding.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2002 and 2003 Annual Social and Economic Supplements.

Figure 4.
Poverty Rates of People in Families by Family Type and Presence of Workers: 2002

(Percent)



Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2003 Annual Social and Economic Supplement.

Turning first to Figure 3, the percentage of people without any workers in their family rose to 10.3 percent in 2002, from 10.0 percent in 2001. The remaining 89.7 percent lived with at least one worker in 2002.

Figure 4 shows lower poverty rates for family members living with at least one worker than for family members with no workers — 7.9 percent compared with 32.0 percent. Among all family types, poverty rates were higher for those not living with workers than for those who lived with at least one worker.

Region

The Midwest was the only region to show an increase in both the number in poverty and poverty rate in 2002, up to 6.6 million or 10.3 percent from 6.0 million or 9.4 percent in 2001. The poverty rates for the Northeast and West remained unchanged in 2002 at 10.9 percent and 12.4 percent.¹⁰ In 2002, 14.0 million people in poverty lived in the South, up from 13.5 million in 2001. The South still had the highest poverty rate at 13.8 percent in 2002, unchanged from 2001. The South had a disproportionately large share of those in poverty: 40.6 percent, compared with 35.6 percent of all people.

Residence

The poverty rate and number in poverty increased in the suburbs, from 8.2 percent or 12.1 million in 2001 to 8.9 percent or 13.3 million in 2002. For people living inside central cities, the poverty rate was 16.7 percent in 2002, unchanged from 2001. Nonetheless, a disproportionate share of people in poverty lived inside central cities:

¹⁰ The poverty rates for the Northeast and Midwest were not statistically different from each other.

39.9 percent compared with 29.0 percent of all people. Taking suburbs and central cities together, the poverty rate for people in metropolitan areas was 11.6 percent in 2002, up from 11.1 percent in 2001. Among those living outside metropolitan areas, the number in poverty and their poverty rate were 7.5 million and 14.2 percent in 2002, unchanged from 2001.

State Poverty Data

Table 4 contains poverty rates for the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the United States using 3-year averages covering 2000 to 2002 to improve the statistical reliability of the estimates. (See the text box “Interpreting State Poverty Data” on page 11.) Readers should be aware that although Arkansas appeared to have the highest poverty rate in Table 4 (18.0 percent), it was not statistically different from the rates for four states — Louisiana, Mississippi, New Mexico, and West Virginia — and the District of Columbia, although it was higher than the rates for the other states. Similarly, the 3-year average poverty rate for New Hampshire, even though it appeared to be lowest (5.6 percent), was not statistically different from that of Minnesota.

To compare changes in poverty rates at the state level, the Census Bureau recommends using 2-year moving averages (2000-2001 and 2001-2002). Based on this approach, Figure 5 shows that nine states — Arkansas, Florida, Hawaii, Illinois, Maine, Michigan, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Utah — showed increases while the other states remained unchanged.

DEPTH OF POVERTY MEASURES

While categorizing people as “in poverty” or “not in poverty” is one

summary of their economic position, in reality economic situations fall into a much broader spectrum. Two “depth of poverty” measures more fully reflect the distribution of people’s economic well-being. The ratio of income to poverty compares a family’s income with its poverty threshold, and expresses that comparison as a ratio. The income deficit (surplus) tells how many dollars a family’s or unrelated individual’s income is below (above) its poverty threshold. These measures illustrate how the composition of the low-income population varies by the severity of poverty.

Ratio of Income to Poverty Level

Table 5 presents the number and percentage of people below multiples of their poverty threshold — those below 50 percent of poverty (“Under 0.50”), those in poverty (“Under 1.00”), and those below 125 percent of poverty (“Under 1.25”).

In 2002, the number of those in “severe poverty” — defined as those with family (unrelated individual) incomes below one-half of their poverty threshold — rose to 14.1 million, from 13.4 million in 2001. Those in severe poverty represented 4.9 percent of the total population and 40.7 percent of the poverty population, rates unchanged from 2001 to 2002 (see Table 5).

The number and percent of “near poor” (people with incomes at or above their threshold but below 125 percent of their threshold) remained unchanged in 2002, at 12.5 million and 4.4 percent, respectively.

The demographic makeup of the population varies at varying degrees of poverty. For instance, in 2002 the older population was

Table 4.
Percent of People in Poverty by State: 2000, 2001, and 2002

(Confidence intervals (C.I.) in percentage points)

State	3-year average (2000-2002)		2-year average (2000-2001)		2-year average (2001-2002)		Change in percentage points (2001-2002 average less 2000-2001 average) ¹	
	Percent	90-percent C.I. (±)	Percent	90-percent C.I. (±)	Percent	90-percent C.I. (±)	Percent	90-percent C.I.(±)
United States ...	11.7	0.2	11.5	0.2	11.9	0.2	*0.4	0.2
Alabama	14.6	1.4	14.6	1.6	15.2	1.7	0.6	1.3
Alaska	8.3	1.1	8.1	1.2	8.7	1.2	0.6	1.0
Arizona	13.3	1.4	13.2	1.7	14.1	1.7	0.9	1.4
Arkansas	18.0	1.6	17.1	1.9	18.8	1.9	*1.7	1.6
California	12.8	0.6	12.6	0.7	12.8	0.7	0.2	0.6
Colorado	9.4	1.0	9.3	1.2	9.2	1.2	-	1.0
Connecticut	7.8	0.9	7.5	1.1	7.8	1.1	0.3	0.9
Delaware	8.1	1.1	7.6	1.3	7.9	1.3	0.4	1.1
District of Columbia ..	16.8	1.6	16.7	1.9	17.6	1.9	0.9	1.6
Florida	12.1	0.8	11.8	0.9	12.6	0.9	*0.8	0.7
Georgia	12.1	1.3	12.5	1.5	12.1	1.5	-0.5	1.2
Hawaii	10.6	1.2	10.2	1.4	11.4	1.5	*1.2	1.2
Idaho	11.8	1.3	12.0	1.6	11.4	1.6	-0.6	1.3
Illinois	11.2	0.8	10.4	0.9	11.5	1.0	*1.1	0.8
Indiana	8.7	0.9	8.5	1.1	8.8	1.1	0.3	0.9
Iowa	8.3	1.0	7.8	1.2	8.3	1.2	0.5	1.0
Kansas	9.4	1.1	9.1	1.2	10.1	1.3	1.0	1.0
Kentucky	13.1	1.3	12.6	1.5	13.4	1.5	0.8	1.3
Louisiana	17.0	1.6	16.7	1.8	16.9	1.8	0.1	1.5
Maine	11.3	1.1	10.2	1.2	11.9	1.3	*1.7	1.1
Maryland	7.3	0.9	7.3	1.1	7.3	1.1	-	0.9
Massachusetts	9.6	1.0	9.4	1.1	9.5	1.1	0.1	1.0
Michigan	10.3	0.8	9.6	1.0	10.5	1.0	*0.9	0.8
Minnesota	6.5	0.9	6.5	1.0	6.9	1.0	0.4	0.8
Mississippi	17.6	1.7	17.1	1.9	18.9	2.0	*1.7	1.6
Missouri	9.6	1.1	9.4	1.2	9.8	1.3	0.4	1.0
Montana	13.7	1.5	13.7	1.8	13.4	1.8	-0.3	1.5
Nebraska	9.5	1.2	9.0	1.3	10.0	1.4	1.0	1.1
Nevada	8.3	1.0	8.0	1.2	8.0	1.2	-	1.0
New Hampshire	5.6	0.8	5.5	1.0	6.1	1.0	0.6	0.8
New Jersey	7.8	0.8	7.7	0.9	8.0	0.9	0.3	0.7
New Mexico	17.8	1.8	17.7	2.1	17.9	2.1	0.2	1.7
New York	14.0	0.7	14.0	0.8	14.1	0.8	0.1	0.7
North Carolina	13.1	1.1	12.5	1.2	13.4	1.3	0.9	1.1
North Dakota	11.9	1.2	12.1	1.5	12.7	1.5	0.6	1.2
Ohio	10.1	0.8	10.3	1.0	10.1	1.0	-0.1	0.8
Oklahoma	14.7	1.4	15.0	1.7	14.6	1.6	-0.4	1.3
Oregon	11.2	1.2	11.3	1.4	11.3	1.4	-	1.2
Pennsylvania	9.2	0.7	9.1	0.8	9.5	0.9	0.4	0.7
Rhode Island	10.3	1.0	9.9	1.2	10.3	1.2	0.4	1.0
South Carolina	13.5	1.3	13.1	1.5	14.7	1.6	*1.6	1.3
South Dakota	10.2	1.1	9.6	1.3	10.0	1.3	0.4	1.1
Tennessee	14.2	1.4	13.8	1.7	14.5	1.7	0.7	1.4
Texas	15.3	0.8	15.2	1.0	15.3	1.0	0.1	0.8
Utah	9.3	1.1	9.1	1.3	10.2	1.4	*1.1	1.1
Vermont	9.9	1.1	9.9	1.3	9.8	1.3	-0.1	1.1
Virginia	8.7	1.0	8.1	1.2	8.9	1.2	0.8	1.0
Washington	10.8	1.2	10.8	1.4	10.8	1.4	0.1	1.2
West Virginia	16.0	1.4	15.6	1.6	16.6	1.6	1.0	1.3
Wisconsin	8.6	1.0	8.6	1.1	8.2	1.1	-0.4	0.9
Wyoming	9.5	1.2	9.7	1.4	8.8	1.3	-0.9	1.1

-Represents zero. *Statistically different from zero at the 90-percent confidence level.

¹Details may not sum to totals because of rounding.

Note: For explanation of confidence intervals, see "Standard errors and their use" at www.census.gov/hhes/poverty/poverty02/pov02src.pdf.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2001, 2002, and 2003 Annual Social and Economic Supplements.

Interpreting State Poverty Data


Poverty estimates for states are not as reliable as national estimates. These state poverty rate estimates are intended to provide a sense of the ranges within which the poverty rates probably exist. We recommend using caution when comparing poverty rate estimates across states, or poverty rates for the same state across years, because their variability is high.

Why show averages? Why not show the latest year alone?

Averaging poverty rates over several years improves the estimates' reliability. An estimate's reliability is measured by a 90-percent confidence interval: the smaller the confidence interval, the more reliable the estimate. For instance, using 2002 data alone, Alabama had a

confidence interval of ± 1.89 percentage points around its poverty rate, but using a 3-year average, the confidence interval decreased to ± 1.40 percentage points. For more information on confidence intervals, see the CPS Source and Accuracy Statement at www.census.gov/hhes/poverty/poverty02/pov02src.pdf.

Figure 5.
States With Significant Changes in 2-Year Average Poverty Rates: 2001-2002 Less 2000-2001



Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2001, 2002, and 2003 Annual Social and Economic Supplements.

Example: “Depth of Poverty” Measures

Suppose Family A has five people — two children and three adults — and has an income of \$25,000.

$$\text{Ratio of income to poverty} = \frac{\text{Family A's income}}{\text{Family A's poverty threshold}} = \frac{\$25,000}{\$22,007} = 1.14$$

Since Family A's income-to-poverty ratio was at least as great as one, Family A is not in poverty. However, since its ratio was also less than 1.25, it would be considered “near poor,” and its five members would be tallied in Table 5 as “Under 1.25.” All people in the same family have the same ratio.

Since Family A's income was greater than its threshold, its income surplus — the number of dollars above its poverty threshold — was \$2,993 (\$25,000 - \$22,007). Family A would be tallied in the bottom half of Table 6, in the column, “\$2,000 to \$2,999.”

Table 5.
People With Income Below Specified Ratios of Their Poverty Thresholds by Selected Characteristics: 2002

(Numbers in thousands)

Characteristic	Total	Under 0.50		Under 1.00		Under 1.25	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
All people	285,317	14,068	4.9	34,570	12.1	47,084	16.5
Age							
Under 18 years	72,696	5,047	6.9	12,133	16.7	16,230	22.3
18 to 24 years	27,438	2,259	8.2	4,536	16.5	5,816	21.2
25 to 34 years	39,243	2,087	5.3	4,674	11.9	6,285	16.0
35 to 44 years	44,074	1,614	3.7	4,087	9.3	5,531	12.6
45 to 54 years	40,234	1,321	3.3	2,999	7.5	3,985	9.9
55 to 59 years	15,470	524	3.4	1,302	8.4	1,744	11.3
60 to 64 years	11,930	472	4.0	1,263	10.6	1,711	14.3
65 years and over.....	34,234	745	2.2	3,576	10.4	5,780	16.9
Family Status							
In families	236,921	9,492	4.0	24,534	10.4	33,961	14.3
Householder.....	75,616	2,888	3.8	7,229	9.6	9,998	13.2
Related children under 18	71,619	4,699	6.6	11,646	16.3	15,665	21.9
Related children under 6	23,247	1,914	8.2	4,296	18.5	5,708	24.6
Unrelated individual	47,156	4,323	9.2	9,618	20.4	12,590	26.7
Male.....	22,685	1,940	8.6	4,023	17.7	5,099	22.5
Female	24,471	2,383	9.7	5,595	22.9	7,491	30.6

Note: Details may not sum to totals because of rounding.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2003 Annual Social and Economic Supplement.

more highly concentrated just above their poverty thresholds than below the thresholds. Among people aged 65 and over, 2.2 percent were below 50 percent of their poverty threshold, compared with 4.9 percent for all people, and 10.4 percent were in poverty, compared with 12.1 percent for all

people. However, people 65 and over and the total population had similar percentages below 125 percent of poverty (16.9 percent for seniors, statistically indistinguishable from 16.5 percent for all people). Since the older population was more sparsely populated among those in poverty, in

comparison with the entire population, the older population therefore was more highly concentrated among the “near poor.”

Income Deficit

The income deficit for families in poverty (the difference in dollars between a family's income and its

Table 6.
Income Deficit or Surplus of Families and Unrelated Individuals by Poverty Status: 2002

(Numbers of families and unrelated individuals in thousands, deficits and surpluses in dollars)

Characteristic	Total	Size of deficit or surplus										Average deficit or surplus	Deficit or surplus per capita
		Under \$500	\$500 to \$999	\$1,000 to \$1,999	\$2,000 to \$2,999	\$3,000 to \$3,999	\$4,000 to \$4,999	\$5,000 to 5,999	\$6,000 to \$6,999	\$7,000 to \$7,999	\$8,000 or more		
Deficit for Those Below Poverty Level													
All families.....	7,229	432	291	656	611	492	508	526	465	379	2,868	7,205	2,123
Married-couple families..	3,052	232	138	332	249	221	220	213	226	130	1,091	6,727	1,836
Families with a female householder, no husband present.....	3,613	172	126	260	302	244	249	279	198	219	1,565	7,648	2,371
Families with a male householder, no wife present.....	564	27	27	64	61	27	39	35	42	30	212	6,954	2,311
Unrelated individual.....	9,618	713	599	1,363	1,369	779	656	507	417	415	2,799	4,798	4,798
Male.....	4,023	273	213	524	559	267	318	219	165	159	1,326	5,082	5,082
Female.....	5,595	440	386	839	810	512	338	289	253	257	1,473	4,593	4,593
Surplus for Those Above Poverty Level													
All families.....	68,387	288	375	777	798	853	809	905	863	917	61,800	58,007	18,678
Married-couple families..	54,275	149	180	422	455	452	472	534	556	588	50,468	64,744	20,408
Families with a female householder, no husband present.....	10,013	129	158	289	278	321	275	290	253	223	7,797	28,897	10,022
Families with a male householder, no wife present.....	4,099	10	37	66	66	80	62	81	54	107	3,535	39,920	14,442
Unrelated individual.....	37,538	623	789	1,290	1,652	1,320	1,213	1,392	1,153	868	27,237	26,626	26,626
Male.....	18,662	185	346	452	653	536	441	595	431	347	14,676	30,946	30,946
Female.....	18,876	439	443	838	999	784	772	797	722	521	12,561	22,355	22,355

Note: Details may not sum to totals because of rounding.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2003 Annual Social and Economic Supplement.

poverty threshold) averaged \$7,205 in 2002 (see Table 6), down from \$7,345 in 2001.¹¹

The average income deficit was greater for families in poverty with a female householder with no husband present (\$7,648) than for married-couple families in poverty (\$6,727) and male householder families with no wife present (\$6,954).¹² The income deficit per capita for female-householder families (\$2,371) was higher than for married-couple families (\$1,836)

¹¹ All 2001 figures are expressed in 2002 dollars.

¹² The average income deficit for married-couple families was not statistically distinguishable from that of male-householder families.

but indistinguishable from male-householder families (\$2,311).¹³ The income deficit per capita is computed by dividing the average deficit by the average number of people in that type of family. Because families with a female householder and no husband present were smaller than married-couple families, the greater per capita deficit for female-householder families reflects their smaller family size as well as their lower income.

For unrelated individuals in poverty (people who do not live with

¹³ The income deficit per capita for married-couple families was not statistically distinguishable from that of male-householder families.

relatives), the average income deficit was \$4,798 in 2002; the \$4,593 deficit for women was lower than that for men at \$5,082. Because there were more female than male unrelated individuals aged 65 and over, and because unrelated individuals aged 65 and over have lower poverty thresholds, the lower average deficit for women reflects differences in age, not just income.

In 2002, 432,000 families in poverty had incomes less than \$500 below their poverty thresholds, while 288,000 had incomes within \$500 above their respective poverty thresholds. Therefore, slight modifications to raise the poverty

thresholds would increase the poverty rate less than a slight lowering of the thresholds would reduce it.

TRANSITIONS INTO AND OUT OF POVERTY

The CPS ASEC provides good estimates of the *net* change in the number of people in poverty from one year to the next, but it does not show how long a given person remains in poverty, what percent of the poverty population remained in poverty in the following year, how many people escaped poverty, how many people fell below their poverty threshold, or any changes in a person's poverty status within a given year.

These more dynamic measures of poverty are available from the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP). Unlike the CPS ASEC, which is not designed to follow the same respondents in consecutive years, the SIPP is a *longitudinal* survey that interviews the same respondents multiple times a year over the course of 3 to 4 years.

The latest longitudinal data available from the SIPP come from the 1996 panel, which covered January 1996 to December 1999.¹⁴ Figure 6 displays the distribution of poverty spells by their duration. A poverty spell is the number of consecutive months a person stays in poverty. To be considered in a spell, the person must be in poverty for at least 2 months. To avoid bias, Figure 6 does not show poverty spells that were already underway before the first interview month.

¹⁴ The 2001 panel began collecting data in February 2001, and is scheduled to collect data until January 2004.

According to the 1996 SIPP panel, a little over half of the spells lasted 4 months or less (51.1 percent), and about four-fifths (79.6 percent) of spells were over within 1 year. However, a person can have more than one poverty spell in the same year — they may be in poverty for a few months, come out of poverty, and fall below the poverty level again some time later. Thus, measuring poverty on an annual basis instead of a monthly basis provides a different picture of the poverty population. Among those who were in poverty in 1996 (based on income for the entire year), 65.1 percent remained in poverty in 1997, 55.5 percent were in poverty in 1998 (but may not have been in 1997), and 50.5 percent were in poverty in 1999 (but may not have been in the previous 2 years). By contrast, among those who were not in poverty in 1996, only 2.9 percent were in poverty in 1997, 3.3 percent were in poverty in 1998, and 3.5 percent were in poverty in 1999.¹⁵

In short, the people in poverty are not a static population; rather, people stay in poverty for different lengths of time. About 34.2 percent of all people were in poverty for at least 2 consecutive months from 1996 through 1999, but only 2.0 percent were in poverty every month of that 4-year period.¹⁶

ALTERNATIVE POVERTY MEASURES

This section provides two sets of alternative estimates of poverty. The first section focuses on recom-

¹⁵ The percentage of people who entered poverty in 1998 was not statistically different from the percentage who entered in 1999.

¹⁶ For further information, see John Iceland, *Dynamics of Economic Well-Being: Poverty 1996-1999*, (P70-91) available at www.census.gov/hhes/www/sipp96/sipp96.html.

mendations from the National Academy of Sciences on how to measure resources (income) and how to change the poverty thresholds (the measure of need). The second presents the effects of changing the income measure in ways consistent with the alternative income measures presented in "Income in the United States: 2002" as well as on how changes in the inflation adjustment factor used for the thresholds over the past several decades would affect poverty.¹⁷ Readers will find both of interest in assessing alternative estimates of poverty. We note that some researchers think it is important to consider changes on the resource side and the threshold side together, whereas others focus on how to measure resources while using the historical poverty thresholds. Additional research on measuring economic well-being is underway.¹⁸ The Census Bureau does not choose which changes in poverty measurement methodology are most appropriate; that responsibility rests with the Office of Management and Budget.

Poverty Estimates Based on National Academy of Sciences Recommendations

In 1995, a panel of the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) issued a report that recommended new ways to measure income, families' needs, and other aspects related to measuring poverty.¹⁹ Because the

¹⁷ Carmen DeNavas-Walt, Robert W. Cleveland, and Bruce Webster Jr., *Income in the United States: 2002*, P60-221, September 2003.


¹⁸ One recent example is U.S. Census Bureau, *Supplemental Measures of Material Well-Being: Expenditures, Consumption and Poverty*. Census Bureau, Current Population Reports, P23-201, September 2003.

¹⁹ Citro, Constance F. and Robert T. Michael, *Measuring Poverty: A New Approach*. Washington, DC, National Academy Press, 1995.

Figure 6.

Duration of Poverty Spells: 1996 to 1999

(Percent of poverty spells. Excludes spells underway during the first interview month)



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

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 1996 Survey of Income and Program Participation; from John Iceland, *Dynamics of Economic Well-Being: Poverty 1996-1999*, P70-91, July 2003. See also www.census.gov/hhes/www/sipp96/sipp96.html.

official poverty measure does not take account of how taxes, non-cash benefits, and work-related and medical expenses affect people's well-being, the NAS panel observed that the official measure does not show how policy changes in those areas affect who is considered in poverty. In addition, the panel noted that the official poverty measure does not take into account how the cost of basic goods (such as food and housing) has changed relative to other goods since the early 1960s, when the official poverty measure was developed. Moreover, it does not reflect that those costs vary by geography. Nor do the official thresholds, according to the NAS panel, accurately account for increased expenses and economies of scale that occur as family size increases. Hence, the NAS panel suggested a way to construct a

new poverty measure that addresses these issues.

In response to the professional debate that has followed the publication of the NAS report, the Census Bureau has been conducting research to refine some of the panel's measurement methods and to examine how the NAS panel's recommendations would affect the number in poverty and the poverty rate.²⁰ Six alternative NAS-based measures are discussed below. These measures each account for work-related expenses, noncash benefits (such as food stamps and housing subsidies), and adjust thresholds by family size in similar

²⁰ Kathleen Short, U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Reports, P60-216, *Experimental Poverty Measures: 1999*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC, 2001. See also the Census Bureau's poverty measurement Web site for additional studies: www.census.gov/hhes/poverty/povmeas.html.

ways, but the measures differ among one another by how they account for health care costs and whether they consider geographic differences in the cost of living.²¹ The first three measures (labeled NGA for "no geographic adjustment") do not adjust the thresholds to account for geographic differences in housing costs. The last three (labeled GA) do, but are otherwise identical to their counterparts that do not account for geographic cost differences. (See Short, 2001, for a full discussion of the measures.)

The first measure most closely reflects the NAS panel's approach for taking into account how medical out-of-pocket expenses (MOOP) affect poverty. This measure is called "MOOP subtracted from income" (MSI). These medical expenses include health insurance premiums, copayments made to medical providers that are not covered by insurance, and other expenses paid out of the patient's pocket, such as over-the-counter medications. The MSI measure subtracts these expenses from family income before comparing the income with the family's threshold, which in this case excludes medical care from the family's "needs" (the threshold).

The second measure, "MOOP in the threshold" (MIT), increases the poverty threshold to take MOOP expenses into account, instead of subtracting these expenses from income. Using data from the 1997-1999 Consumer Expenditure

²¹ The NAS panel did not advocate one particular dollar amount upon which to base threshold revisions; rather, they offered a range of thresholds. The analysis here uses the midpoint of the NAS panel's range.

Official and Alternative (NAS-Based) Poverty Estimates: How Do They Differ?

Question	Official measure	Alternative NAS-based estimates
What counts as income?	Gross money income (that is, before taxes) of all family members living in the same housing unit, not counting capital gains.	Like the official measure, the alternative estimates add together the incomes of all family members who live together, except that the alternative estimates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Use after-tax income ▪ Include noncash benefits as income (such as food stamps and housing subsidies) ▪ Deduct some work-related expenses (such as transportation and child care) from income ▪ Take into account medical out-of-pocket expenses (each measure has a different method for doing so)
What is used as a benchmark for need?	First computed in 1963-64, the thresholds were originally based on U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) food budgets designed for families under economic stress. Social Security Administration analysts used 1955 USDA data to find out what portion of their income families spent on food, then multiplied the food budgets by the inverse of that factor to get the thresholds (with some adjustments for two-person families and single people). Except when federal interagency committees made minor revisions, these thresholds have only been updated for inflation annually with the Consumer Price Index (CPI-U), as directed by the Office of Management and Budget's Statistical Policy Directive 14.	Unlike the official thresholds, which have no fixed relationship between thresholds for different-sized families (because they were derived with food budgets and spending data), the alternative estimates start with expenditures for food, clothing, shelter, and utilities (and for some measures, medical expenses) for a family of four—two adults and two children—plus a small additional amount for other expenses. These dollar amounts are adjusted for larger and smaller families, based on some aspects of their relative needs. The adjustments are made using three parameters: the first reflects that children tend to consume less than adults, the second reflects that a doubling of family size does not mean that every expense becomes twice as high, and the third reflects that the first child in a single-adult family represents a greater increase in expenses than the first child in a two-adult family.
What adjustments are made for geographic differences in the cost of living?	None. The same thresholds apply to all parts of the country.	Some estimates (labeled NGA) make no adjustment; others are adjusted using cost indices by state and metropolitan/nonmetropolitan residence, based on housing costs.

For further details about poverty measurement, see: "The Development of the Orshansky Poverty Thresholds and Their Subsequent History as the Official U.S. Poverty Measure" by Gordon Fisher, available at www.census.gov/hhes/poverty/povmeas/papers/orshansky.html; *Experimental Poverty Measures: 1999* by Kathleen Short, available at www.census.gov/prod/2001pubs/p60-216.pdf.

Survey and the 1996 Medical Expenditures Panel Survey, the Census Bureau computed a threshold to allow for food, clothing, shelter, utilities, and MOOP. How much money was allowed for MOOP depended on the family's size, the presence of elderly family members, the self-reported health status of the family members, and differences in health insurance

coverage across families. Thus, for the MIT measures, the thresholds' allowances for MOOP reflect expected — that is, average — medical expenses along those dimensions, not the family's actual expenses.

The third measure, CMB (for "combined" methods), combines attributes of both the MSI and MIT measures. Like the MIT measure,

the CMB includes expected MOOP expenditures in the thresholds. However, like the MSI measure, the CMB takes into account variations in medical needs across families. The CMB measure calculates the difference between the expected MOOP and the actual amounts each family spent out-of-pocket for medical care and subtracts the difference from family income.

Table 7.
Alternative Poverty Estimates Based on National Academy of Sciences Recommendations: 2001 and 2002

(Numbers in thousands, poverty rates in percentages)

Alternative NAS-based method	2001		2002		Change (2002 less 2001) ¹	
	Number below poverty level	Poverty rate	Number below poverty level	Poverty rate	Number below poverty level	Poverty rate
Official measure	32,907	11.7	34,570	12.1	*1,663	*0.4
No Geographic Adjustment of Thresholds						
MSI-NGA (Medical costs alternative 1)	34,790	12.4	35,244	12.4	454	—
MIT-NGA (Medical costs alternative 2)	36,001	12.8	37,013	13.0	*1,012	0.2
CMB-NGA (Medical costs alternative 3)	36,597	13.0	37,135	13.0	538	—
Geographic Adjustment of Thresholds						
MSI-GA (Medical costs alternative 1)	34,694	12.3	35,036	12.3	342	—
MIT-GA (Medical costs alternative 2)	35,824	12.7	36,481	12.8	657	0.1
CMB-GA (Medical costs alternative 3)	36,442	12.9	36,896	12.9	454	—

—Represents zero.

*Statistically different from zero at the 90-percent confidence level.

¹Details may not sum to totals because of rounding.

Notes: While the alternative measures differ among one another in their computation of medical expenses and geographic variations in costs, they are similar in their scaling of thresholds by family size and their treatment of noncash benefits and child care and work-related expenses. See text and footnotes for additional information and references.

For an explanation of the measures, see text and Short (2001).

All measures are updated for inflation with the Consumer Price Index (CPI-U).

See www.census.gov/poverty/povmeas/report.htm for measures updated using growth in median expenditures.

MSI means medical out-of-pocket expenses (MOOP) subtracted from income.

MIT means MOOP included in the thresholds.

CMB means combined methods.

NGA means no geographic adjustment for housing costs.

GA means geographic adjustment for housing costs.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2002 and 2003 Annual Social and Economic Supplements.

This way, families who had greater than expected medical expenses may be classified as in poverty when they otherwise would not be, but those who were unexpectedly healthy — and who thus spent less on MOOP than expected, leaving those funds available for other purposes — are classified as better off than they would be under both the official and MIT measures.

The MSI-NGA, MIT-NGA, and CMB-NGA (no geographic adjustment) measures are complemented by three measures that include adjustments to the thresholds to account for geographic differences in cost of living; hence, they are labeled GA for “geographic

adjustment.” They are otherwise identical to their counterparts that do not account for geographic cost differences.

All six measures use the CPI-U to update the thresholds from 1999 for inflation. Six additional NAS-based measures are presented on the poverty measurement Web site; they use growth in median expenditures since 1999 for food, clothing, shelter and utilities, calculated from the Consumer Expenditure Survey, to update the measures as recommended by the NAS panel (see www.census.gov/hhes/poverty/povmeas/reports.htm).

All of the NAS-based alternative measures yielded a higher poverty

rate in 2002 than the official measure, as shown in Table 7. The MSI-GA measure had the smallest difference from the official measure (12.3 percent compared with 12.1 percent for the official measure), followed by MSI-NGA (12.4 percent). However, the alternative poverty measures were more stable from year to year than the official measure. While the official poverty rate and number in poverty both increased significantly between 2001 and 2002, none of the alternative poverty rates changed and only the MIT-NGA measure showed any increase in the number in poverty between 2001 and 2002.

What Alternative Measures of Income Are Used for Alternative Poverty Estimates?

Money Income (MI) is collected for all people in the sample 15 years old and over. Money income includes earnings, unemployment compensation, workers' compensation, Social Security, Supplemental Security Income, public assistance, veterans' payments, survivor benefits, pension or retirement income, interest, dividends, rents, royalties, income from estates, trusts, educational assistance, alimony, child support, assistance from outside the household, and other miscellaneous sources. It is income before deductions for taxes or other expenses and does not

include lump-sum payments or capital gains.

MI – Tx is money income plus realized capital gains (losses), less federal and state income taxes, and less payroll taxes.

MI – Tx + NC – MM is money income, plus realized capital gains (losses), less federal and state income taxes, less payroll taxes, plus the value of employer-provided health benefits and the value of all noncash transfers except medicare and medicaid. Noncash transfers include food stamps, rent subsidies, and free and reduced-price school lunches.

MI – Tx + NC is money income plus realized capital gains (losses), less federal and state income taxes, less payroll taxes, plus the value of employer-provided health benefits and all noncash transfers.

MI – Tx + NC + HE is money income plus realized capital gains (losses), less federal and state income taxes, less payroll taxes, plus the value of employer-provided health benefits and all noncash transfers, plus the annual benefits of converting one's home equity into an annuity, net of property taxes.

Poverty Estimates Using Alternative Income Definitions

The following data illustrate how poverty rates change when different types of noncash benefits are treated as income and when taxes are taken into account, while holding constant the measure of need (the thresholds). These data series were first developed in the early 1980s, in response to a congressional request.

Recall that the official poverty measure uses money income before taxes, excluding capital gains, to measure resources. Before the Census Bureau developed the alternative income definitions, Congress did not have sufficient data to evaluate whether noncash government benefits were properly targeted.²²

²² U.S. Senate Statement, "Data Collection and Poverty Level," Department of State, Justice, and Commerce, The Judiciary and Related Agencies Appropriation Bill, 1981. U.S. Senate, 96th Congress, 2nd Session, September 16, 1980: 33-34. Cited in U.S. Census Bureau, Technical Paper 56, *Estimates of Poverty Including the Value of Noncash Benefits: 1985*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC, 1986, Appendix A.

In response, the Census Bureau produced a series of reports about the valuation of noncash benefits and taxes and their effects on income and poverty.²³ Since then, analysts have used these data to perform sensitivity analysis — finding out to what extent taxes and various types of noncash benefits each in their turn affect people's well-being.

Table 8 lists ten sets of poverty estimates. The first is the official poverty measure, which is based on money income (MI). Four others compare different, comprehensive, definitions of income (MI-Tx, MI-Tx+NC-MM, MI-Tx+NC, and MI-Tx+NC+HE, described in the text box on this page) with the official poverty thresholds, which are updated for inflation using the Consumer Price Index for Urban Consumers (CPI-U). In the remaining five sets of estimates, resources computed under these five income

²³ See, for example, U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Reports, Series P60, No. 164-RD1, *Measuring the Effects of Benefits and Taxes on Income and Poverty: 1986*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC, 1988.

definitions are compared with a lower set of poverty thresholds; these thresholds were computed using a different, experimental, method for updating for inflation (the CPI-U-X1), but are otherwise identical to the official thresholds.

The tax data were simulated in the alternative income definitions, based on a tax model. Four types of taxes were simulated: federal individual income taxes, state individual income taxes, property taxes on owner-occupied housing, and payroll taxes. Except for food stamps, the value of all the noncash benefits in the income definitions were imputed; those noncash benefits included values of employers' contributions for health insurance, medicare and medicaid, rent subsidies, free and reduced price school lunches, and return on equity in one's own home.²⁴ Food stamp

²⁴ For detailed descriptions of how the noncash benefits and taxes were estimated in the alternative measures, see Appendixes B and C of P60-186RD, *Measuring the Effect of Benefits and Taxes on Income and Poverty: 1992*.

Table 8.
**Poverty Estimates Based on Alternative Measures of Income and Deflators:
 2001 and 2002**

(Numbers in thousands)

Selected alternative income definitions	2001		2002		Change (2002 less 2001) ¹	
	Number below poverty level	Poverty rate	Number below poverty level	Poverty rate	Number below poverty level	Poverty rate
USING OFFICIAL POVERTY THRESHOLDS ADJUSTED USING CPI-U						
MI (Money income; used in official measure of poverty)	32,907	11.7	34,570	12.1	*1,663	*0.4
MI-Tx (Money income plus realized capital gains (losses), less income and payroll taxes)	31,730	11.3	33,164	11.6	*1,434	*0.3
MI-Tx+NC-MM (Money income plus realized capital gains (losses), less income and payroll taxes, plus value of employer-provided health benefits and all noncash transfers except medicare and medicaid)	26,910	9.6	28,166	9.9	*1,256	*0.3
MI-Tx+NC (Money income plus capital gains (losses), less income and payroll taxes, plus value of all noncash transfers)	25,454	9.0	26,750	9.4	*1,296	*0.4
MI-Tx+NC+HE (Money income plus capital gains (losses), less income and payroll taxes, plus value of all noncash transfers, plus imputed return to home equity)	23,473	8.3	24,632	8.6	*1,159	*0.3
USING THRESHOLDS ADJUSTED USING CPI-U-X1						
MI (Money income)	29,389	10.4	30,685	10.8	*1,296	*0.4
MI-Tx (Money income plus realized capital gains (losses), less income and payroll taxes)	27,665	9.8	29,050	10.2	*1,385	*0.4
MI-Tx+NC-MM (Money income plus realized capital gains (losses), less income and payroll taxes, plus value of employer-provided health benefits and all noncash transfers except medicare and medicaid)	22,788	8.1	24,013	8.4	*1,225	*0.3
MI-Tx+NC (Money income plus capital gains (losses), less income and payroll taxes, plus value of all noncash transfers)	22,051	7.8	23,359	8.2	*1,308	*0.4
MI-Tx+NC+HE (Money income plus capital gains (losses), less income and payroll taxes, plus value of all noncash transfers, plus imputed return to home equity)	20,210	7.2	21,517	7.5	*1,307	*0.3

*Statistically different from zero at the 90-percent confidence level.

¹Details may not sum to totals because of rounding.

Note: For further description of the income measure, see text box.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2002 and 2003 Annual Social and Economic Supplements.

amounts were used as reported in the CPS ASEC.

According to all ten sets of estimates, the number in poverty and poverty rate increased between 2001 and 2002. According to the CPI-U-based estimates, subtracting taxes and adding capital gains to the official income definition led to a poverty rate in 2002 lower by half of a percentage point, 11.6 percent, than the official definition. While it seems counterintuitive that using after-tax income would lead to a lower poverty rate, the MI-Tx income measure also takes into


account capital gains (and losses), such as those earned on the sale of one's house, and the Earned Income Tax Credit, which benefits people with low income.

Including noncash benefits as income produced a greater effect on poverty rates than did taxes and capital gains. Excluding medicaid and medicare, noncash benefits led to a poverty rate of 9.9 percent in 2002 (MI-Tx+NC-MM). Including those medical programs further reduced the poverty rate by another half of a percentage point to 9.4 percent (MI-Tx+NC).

Imputed returns on home equity lowered the poverty rate by another 0.8 percentage points, to 8.6 percent in 2002 (MI-Tx+NC+HE).

Turning now to the CPI-U-X1-adjusted thresholds, poverty rates for each set of estimates were lower than their counterparts based on the official thresholds since the adjusted thresholds are roughly 8 percent lower than official thresholds. With no adjustments to the money income definition, the poverty rate was 10.8 percent in 2002 using the CPI-U-X1-adjusted thresholds,

Figure 7.
**Selected Alternative Poverty Estimates by
 Type of Deflator: 1959 to 2002**



Note: Only selected alternatives are shown. Both NAS-based measures (MSI-GA and MIT-NGA) use the CPI-U deflator.
 Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 1960 to 2003 Annual Social and Economic Supplements.

compared with 12.1 percent using the official thresholds. According to the most inclusive income definition (MI-Tx+NC+HE), the poverty rate was 7.5 percent in 2002 when based on the CPI-U-X1-adjusted thresholds, compared with 8.6 percent using the official thresholds. As was seen in the rates based on the official thresholds, treating noncash benefits as income lowered the poverty rate substantially when the thresholds were held constant.

Additional information about the NAS-based poverty estimates and the poverty estimates using alternative income definitions may be found on the Census Bureau's Poverty Web site, www.census.gov/hhes/www/poverty.html. The

Census Bureau plans to continue to issue reports on alternative estimates in order to help policymakers, researchers, and the public improve their understanding of how measurement issues affect their perception of who is in poverty.

NOTES, ADDITIONAL DATA, AND USERS' COMMENTS

CPS Data Collection

The information in this report was collected in the 50 states and the District of Columbia and does not include residents of Puerto Rico and outlying areas. The population controls used to prepare the estimates are based on results of Census 2000. Specifically, the estimates in this report are controlled to national population estimates by age, race, sex, and Hispanic or

Latino origin, and to state population estimates by age.

Because the CPS is primarily a household survey, people without conventional housing who are not living in shelters are excluded from these poverty statistics. The CPS also excludes armed forces personnel living on military bases and people living in institutions, such as jails. For further documentation about the CPS ASEC, see www.bls.census.gov/cps/ads/adsmain.htm.

Model-Based State Estimates

The Census Bureau also produces improved (in the sense of having lower standard errors) annual poverty data for the states, as well as biennial estimates for counties,

based on models using data from the ASEC, the decennial census, and administrative records as well as personal income data published by the Bureau of Economic Analysis. Estimates for 1999 are available on the Internet at: www.census.gov/hhes/www/saipe.html. Estimates for income year 2000 will be available later this fall.

Additional Data and Contacts

Detailed tables, historical tables, press releases and briefings, and unpublished data are available electronically on the U.S. Census Bureau's Poverty Web site. The Web site may be accessed through the Census Bureau's home page at

www.census.gov or directly at www.census.gov/hhes/www/poverty.html. Technical disclosure avoidance methods have been applied to CPS microdata to prevent disclosure of individuals' identities. These protected microdata are available for downloading through the FERRET system. FERRET may be accessed by clicking on "Access Tools" on the Census Bureau's home page or by clicking the FERRET link on the poverty Web site.

If you have trouble finding poverty data or have questions about them, you may contact the Housing and Household Economic Statistics Division statistical

information staff by e-mail at hhes-info@census.gov or by telephone at 301-763-3242.

Comments

The Census Bureau welcomes the comments and advice of data and report users. If you have suggestions or comments, please write to:

Charles Nelson
Assistant Division Chief, Income,
Poverty, and Health Statistics
Housing and Household Economic
Statistics Division
U.S. Census Bureau
Washington, DC 20233-8500

or send e-mail to
charles.t.nelson@census.gov.

APPENDIX TABLES

Table A-1.
Poverty Status of People by Family Relationship, Race, and Hispanic Origin: 1959 to 2002

[Numbers in thousands. People as of March of the following year]

Year and characteristic	All people			People in families						Unrelated individuals		
	Below poverty level			All families			Families with female householder, no husband present			Below poverty level		
				Below poverty level			Below poverty level					
	Total	Number	Percent	Total	Number	Percent	Total	Number	Percent	Total	Number	Percent
ALL RACES												
2002	285,317	34,570	12.1	236,921	24,534	10.4	40,529	11,657	28.8	47,156	9,618	20.4
2001	281,475	32,907	11.7	233,911	23,215	9.9	39,261	11,223	28.6	46,392	9,226	19.9
2000 ¹	278,944	31,581	11.3	231,909	22,347	9.6	38,375	10,926	28.5	45,624	8,653	19.0
1999 ^f	276,208	32,791	11.9	230,789	23,830	10.3	38,580	11,764	30.5	43,977	8,400	19.1
1998	271,059	34,476	12.7	227,229	25,370	11.2	39,000	12,907	33.1	42,539	8,478	19.9
1997	268,480	35,574	13.3	225,369	26,217	11.6	38,412	13,494	35.1	41,672	8,687	20.8
1996	266,218	36,529	13.7	223,955	27,376	12.2	38,584	13,796	35.8	40,727	8,452	20.8
1995	263,733	36,425	13.8	222,792	27,501	12.3	38,908	14,205	36.5	39,484	8,247	20.9
1994	261,616	38,059	14.5	221,430	28,985	13.1	37,253	14,380	38.6	38,538	8,287	21.5
1993	259,278	39,265	15.1	219,489	29,927	13.6	37,861	14,636	38.7	38,038	8,388	22.1
1992 ^f	256,549	38,014	14.8	217,936	28,961	13.3	36,446	14,205	39.0	36,842	8,075	21.9
1991 ^f	251,192	35,708	14.2	212,723	27,143	12.8	34,795	13,824	39.7	36,845	7,773	21.1
1990	248,644	33,585	13.5	210,967	25,232	12.0	33,795	12,578	37.2	36,056	7,446	20.7
1989	245,992	31,528	12.8	209,515	24,066	11.5	32,525	11,668	35.9	35,185	6,760	19.2
1988 ^f	243,530	31,745	13.0	208,056	24,048	11.6	32,164	11,972	37.2	34,340	7,070	20.6
1987 ^f	240,982	32,221	13.4	206,877	24,725	12.0	31,893	12,148	38.1	32,992	6,857	20.8
1986	238,554	32,370	13.6	205,459	24,754	12.0	31,152	11,944	38.3	31,679	6,846	21.6
1985	236,594	33,064	14.0	203,963	25,729	12.6	30,878	11,600	37.6	31,351	6,725	21.5
1984	233,816	33,700	14.4	202,288	26,458	13.1	30,844	11,831	38.4	30,268	6,609	21.8
1983	231,700	35,303	15.2	201,338	27,933	13.9	30,049	12,072	40.2	29,158	6,740	23.1
1982	229,412	34,398	15.0	200,385	27,349	13.6	28,834	11,701	40.6	27,908	6,458	23.1
1981	227,157	31,822	14.0	198,541	24,850	12.5	28,587	11,051	38.7	27,714	6,490	23.4
1980	225,027	29,272	13.0	196,963	22,601	11.5	27,565	10,120	36.7	27,133	6,227	22.9
1979	222,903	26,072	11.7	195,860	19,964	10.2	26,927	9,400	34.9	26,170	5,743	21.9
1978	215,656	24,497	11.4	191,071	19,062	10.0	26,032	9,269	35.6	24,585	5,435	22.1
1977	213,867	24,720	11.6	190,757	19,505	10.2	25,404	9,205	36.2	23,110	5,216	22.6
1976	212,303	24,975	11.8	190,844	19,632	10.3	24,204	9,029	37.3	21,459	5,344	24.9
1975	210,864	25,877	12.3	190,630	20,789	10.9	23,580	8,846	37.5	20,234	5,088	25.1
1974	209,362	23,370	11.2	190,436	18,817	9.9	23,165	8,462	36.5	18,926	4,553	24.1
1973	207,621	22,973	11.1	189,361	18,299	9.7	21,823	8,178	37.5	18,260	4,674	25.6
1972	206,004	24,460	11.9	189,193	19,577	10.3	21,264	8,114	38.2	16,811	4,883	29.0
1971	204,554	25,559	12.5	188,242	20,405	10.8	20,153	7,797	38.7	16,311	5,154	31.6
1970	202,183	25,420	12.6	186,692	20,330	10.9	19,673	7,503	38.1	15,491	5,090	32.9
1969	199,517	24,147	12.1	184,891	19,175	10.4	17,995	6,879	38.2	14,626	4,972	34.0
1968	197,628	25,389	12.8	183,825	20,695	11.3	18,048	6,990	38.7	13,803	4,694	34.0
1967	195,672	27,769	14.2	182,558	22,771	12.5	17,788	6,898	38.8	13,114	4,998	38.1
1966	193,388	28,510	14.7	181,117	23,809	13.1	17,240	6,861	39.8	12,271	4,701	38.3
1965	191,413	33,185	17.3	179,281	28,358	15.8	16,371	7,524	46.0	12,132	4,827	39.8
1964	189,710	36,055	19.0	177,653	30,912	17.4	(NA)	7,297	44.4	12,057	5,143	42.7
1963	187,258	36,436	19.5	176,076	31,498	17.9	(NA)	7,646	47.7	11,182	4,938	44.2
1962	184,276	38,625	21.0	173,263	33,623	19.4	(NA)	7,781	50.3	11,013	5,002	45.4
1961	181,277	39,628	21.9	170,131	34,509	20.3	(NA)	7,252	48.1	11,146	5,119	45.9
1960	179,503	39,851	22.2	168,615	34,925	20.7	(NA)	7,247	48.9	10,888	4,926	45.2
1959	176,557	39,490	22.4	165,858	34,562	20.8	(NA)	7,014	49.4	10,699	4,928	46.1

See footnotes at end of table.

Table A-1.
Poverty Status of People by Family Relationship, Race, and Hispanic Origin: 1959 to 2002—Con.

[Numbers in thousands. People as of March of the following year]

Year and characteristic	All people			People in families						Unrelated individuals		
	Total	Below poverty level		All families			Families with female householder, no husband present			Total	Below poverty level	
		Number	Percent	Total	Below poverty level		Total	Below poverty level			Number	Percent
					Number	Percent		Number	Percent			
WHITE ALONE²												
2002.....	230,376	23,466	10.2	190,823	16,043	8.4	24,903	5,992	24.1	38,575	7,105	18.4
WHITE³												
2001.....	229,675	22,739	9.9	190,413	15,369	8.1	24,619	5,972	24.3	38,294	6,996	18.3
2000 ¹	227,846	21,645	9.5	188,966	14,692	7.8	24,166	5,609	23.2	37,699	6,454	17.1
1999 ^f	225,361	22,169	9.8	187,833	15,353	8.2	23,913	5,947	24.9	36,441	6,411	17.6
1998.....	222,837	23,454	10.5	186,184	16,549	8.9	24,211	6,674	27.6	35,563	6,386	18.0
1997.....	221,200	24,396	11.0	185,147	17,258	9.3	23,773	7,296	30.7	34,858	6,593	18.9
1996.....	219,656	24,650	11.2	184,119	17,621	9.6	23,744	7,073	29.8	34,247	6,463	18.9
1995.....	218,028	24,423	11.2	183,450	17,593	9.6	23,732	7,047	29.7	33,399	6,336	19.0
1994.....	216,460	25,379	11.7	182,546	18,474	10.1	22,713	7,228	31.8	32,569	6,292	19.3
1993.....	214,899	26,226	12.2	181,330	18,968	10.5	23,224	7,199	31.0	32,112	6,443	20.1
1992 ^f	213,060	25,259	11.9	180,409	18,294	10.1	22,453	6,907	30.8	31,170	6,147	19.7
1991 ^f	210,133	23,747	11.3	177,619	17,268	9.7	21,608	6,806	31.5	31,207	5,872	18.8
1990.....	208,611	22,326	10.7	176,504	15,916	9.0	20,845	6,210	29.8	30,833	5,739	18.6
1989.....	206,853	20,785	10.0	175,857	15,179	8.6	20,362	5,723	28.1	29,993	5,063	16.9
1988 ^f	205,235	20,715	10.1	175,111	15,001	8.6	20,396	5,950	29.2	29,315	5,314	18.1
1987 ^f	203,605	21,195	10.4	174,488	15,593	8.9	20,244	5,989	29.6	28,290	5,174	18.3
1986.....	202,282	22,183	11.0	174,024	16,393	9.4	20,163	6,171	30.6	27,143	5,198	19.2
1985.....	200,918	22,860	11.4	172,863	17,125	9.9	20,105	5,990	29.8	27,067	5,299	19.6
1984.....	198,941	22,955	11.5	171,839	17,299	10.1	19,727	5,866	29.7	26,094	5,181	19.9
1983.....	197,496	23,984	12.1	171,407	18,377	10.7	19,256	6,017	31.2	25,206	5,189	20.6
1982.....	195,919	23,517	12.0	170,748	18,015	10.6	18,374	5,686	30.9	24,300	5,041	20.7
1981.....	194,504	21,553	11.1	169,868	16,127	9.5	18,795	5,600	29.8	23,913	5,061	21.2
1980.....	192,912	19,699	10.2	168,756	14,587	8.6	17,642	4,940	28.0	23,370	4,760	20.4
1979.....	191,742	17,214	9.0	168,461	12,495	7.4	17,349	4,375	25.2	22,587	4,452	19.7
1978.....	186,450	16,259	8.7	165,193	12,050	7.3	16,877	4,371	25.9	21,257	4,209	19.8
1977.....	185,254	16,416	8.9	165,385	12,364	7.5	16,721	4,474	26.8	19,869	4,051	20.4
1976.....	184,165	16,713	9.1	165,571	12,500	7.5	15,941	4,463	28.0	18,594	4,213	22.7
1975.....	183,164	17,770	9.7	165,661	13,799	8.3	15,577	4,577	29.4	17,503	3,972	22.7
1974.....	182,376	15,736	8.6	166,081	12,181	7.3	15,433	4,278	27.7	16,295	3,555	21.8
1973.....	181,185	15,142	8.4	165,424	11,412	6.9	14,303	4,003	28.0	15,761	3,730	23.7
1972.....	180,125	16,203	9.0	165,630	12,268	7.4	13,739	3,770	27.4	14,495	3,935	27.1
1971.....	179,398	17,780	9.9	165,184	13,566	8.2	13,502	4,099	30.4	14,214	4,214	29.6
1970.....	177,376	17,484	9.9	163,875	13,323	8.1	13,226	3,761	28.4	13,500	4,161	30.8
1969.....	175,349	16,659	9.5	162,779	12,623	7.8	12,285	3,577	29.1	12,570	4,036	32.1
1968.....	173,732	17,395	10.0	161,777	13,546	8.4	12,190	3,551	29.1	11,955	3,849	32.2
1967.....	172,038	18,983	11.0	160,720	14,851	9.2	12,131	3,453	28.5	11,318	4,132	36.5
1966.....	170,247	19,290	11.3	159,561	15,430	9.7	12,261	3,646	29.7	10,686	3,860	36.1
1965.....	168,732	22,496	13.3	158,255	18,508	11.7	11,573	4,092	35.4	10,477	3,988	38.1
1964.....	167,313	24,957	14.9	156,898	20,716	13.2	(NA)	3,911	33.4	10,415	4,241	40.7
1963.....	165,309	25,238	15.3	155,584	21,149	13.6	(NA)	4,051	35.6	9,725	4,089	42.0

See footnotes at end of table.

Table A-1.
Poverty Status of People by Family Relationship, Race, and Hispanic Origin: 1959 to 2002—Con.

[Numbers in thousands. People as of March of the following year]

Year and characteristic	All people			People in families						Unrelated individuals		
	Total	Below poverty level		All families			Families with female householder, no husband present			Total	Below poverty level	
		Number	Percent	Total	Below poverty level		Total	Below poverty level			Number	Percent
					Number	Percent		Number	Percent			
WHITE³—Con.												
1962.....	162,842	26,672	16.4	153,348	22,613	14.7	(NA)	4,089	37.9	9,494	4,059	42.7
1961.....	160,306	27,890	17.4	150,717	23,747	15.8	(NA)	4,062	37.6	9,589	4,143	43.2
1960.....	158,863	28,309	17.8	149,458	24,262	16.2	(NA)	4,296	39.0	9,405	4,047	43.0
1959.....	156,956	28,484	18.1	147,802	24,443	16.5	(NA)	4,232	40.2	9,154	4,041	44.1
WHITE ALONE, NOT HISPANIC²												
2002.....	194,144	15,567	8.0	158,764	9,389	5.9	18,664	3,733	20.0	34,614	5,947	17.2
WHITE, NOT HISPANIC³												
2001.....	194,538	15,271	7.8	159,178	9,122	5.7	18,365	3,661	19.9	34,603	5,882	17.0
2000 ¹	193,691	14,366	7.4	158,838	8,664	5.5	18,196	3,412	18.8	33,943	5,356	15.8
1999 ^f	192,565	14,735	7.7	158,550	9,013	5.7	17,892	3,545	19.8	33,189	5,412	16.3
1998.....	192,754	15,799	8.2	159,301	10,061	6.3	18,547	4,074	22.0	32,573	5,352	16.4
1997.....	191,859	16,491	8.6	158,796	10,401	6.5	18,474	4,604	24.9	32,049	5,632	17.6
1996.....	191,459	16,462	8.6	159,044	10,553	6.6	18,597	4,339	23.3	31,410	5,455	17.4
1995.....	190,951	16,267	8.5	159,402	10,599	6.6	18,340	4,183	22.8	30,586	5,303	17.3
1994.....	192,543	18,110	9.4	161,254	12,118	7.5	18,186	4,743	26.1	30,157	5,500	18.2
1993.....	190,843	18,882	9.9	160,062	12,756	8.0	18,508	4,724	25.5	29,681	5,570	18.8
1992 ^f	189,001	18,202	9.6	159,102	12,277	7.7	18,016	4,640	25.8	28,775	5,350	18.6
1991 ^f	189,116	17,741	9.4	158,850	11,998	7.6	17,609	4,710	26.7	29,215	5,261	18.0
1990.....	188,129	16,622	8.8	158,394	11,086	7.0	17,160	4,284	25.0	28,688	5,002	17.4
1989.....	186,979	15,599	8.3	158,127	10,723	6.8	16,827	3,922	23.3	28,055	4,466	15.9
1988 ^f	185,961	15,565	8.4	157,687	10,467	6.6	16,828	3,988	23.7	27,552	4,746	17.2
1987 ^f	184,936	16,029	8.7	157,785	11,051	7.0	16,787	4,075	24.3	26,439	4,613	17.4
1986.....	184,119	17,244	9.4	157,665	12,078	7.7	16,739	4,350	26.0	25,525	4,668	18.3
1985.....	183,455	17,839	9.7	157,106	12,706	8.1	16,749	4,136	24.7	25,544	4,789	18.7
1984.....	182,469	18,300	10.0	156,930	13,234	8.4	16,742	4,193	25.0	24,671	4,659	18.9
1983.....	181,393	19,538	10.8	156,719	14,437	9.2	16,369	4,448	27.2	23,894	4,746	19.9
1982.....	181,903	19,362	10.6	157,818	14,271	9.0	15,830	4,161	26.3	23,329	4,701	20.2
1981.....	180,909	17,987	9.9	157,330	12,903	8.2	16,323	4,222	25.9	22,950	4,769	20.8
1980.....	179,798	16,365	9.1	156,633	11,568	7.4	15,358	3,699	24.1	22,455	4,474	19.9
1979.....	178,814	14,419	8.1	156,567	10,009	6.4	15,410	3,371	21.9	21,638	4,179	19.3
1978.....	174,731	13,755	7.9	154,321	9,798	6.3	15,132	3,390	22.4	20,410	3,957	19.4
1977.....	173,563	13,802	8.0	154,449	9,977	6.5	14,888	3,429	23.0	19,114	3,825	20.0
1976.....	173,235	14,025	8.1	155,324	10,066	6.5	14,261	3,516	24.7	17,912	3,959	22.1
1975.....	172,417	14,883	8.6	155,539	11,137	7.2	13,809	3,570	25.9	16,879	3,746	22.2
1974.....	171,463	13,217	7.7	155,764	9,854	6.3	13,763	3,379	24.6	15,699	3,364	21.4
1973.....	170,488	12,864	7.5	155,330	9,262	6.0	12,731	3,185	25.0	15,158	3,602	23.8
BLACK ALONE OR IN COMBINATION												
2002.....	37,207	8,884	23.9	31,008	6,985	22.5	13,551	5,145	38.0	6,034	1,851	30.7
BLACK ALONE⁴												
2002.....	35,678	8,602	24.1	29,671	6,761	22.8	13,030	4,980	38.2	5,858	1,800	30.7

See footnotes at end of table.

Table A-1.
Poverty Status of People by Family Relationship, Race, and Hispanic Origin: 1959 to 2002—Con.

[Numbers in thousands. People as of March of the following year]

Year and characteristic	All people			People in families						Unrelated individuals		
	Total	Below poverty level		All families			Families with female householder, no husband present			Total	Below poverty level	
		Number	Percent	Total	Below poverty level		Total	Below poverty level			Number	Percent
					Number	Percent		Number	Percent			
BLACK³												
2001	35,871	8,136	22.7	29,869	6,389	21.4	12,550	4,694	37.4	5,873	1,692	28.8
2000 ¹	35,425	7,982	22.5	29,378	6,221	21.2	12,383	4,774	38.6	5,885	1,702	28.9
1999 ^f	35,756	8,441	23.6	29,819	6,758	22.7	12,823	5,232	40.8	5,668	1,562	27.5
1998	34,877	9,091	26.1	29,333	7,259	24.7	13,156	5,629	42.8	5,390	1,752	32.5
1997	34,458	9,116	26.5	28,962	7,386	25.5	13,218	5,654	42.8	5,316	1,645	31.0
1996	34,110	9,694	28.4	28,933	7,993	27.6	13,193	6,123	46.4	4,989	1,606	32.2
1995	33,740	9,872	29.3	28,777	8,189	28.5	13,604	6,553	48.2	4,756	1,551	32.6
1994	33,353	10,196	30.6	28,499	8,447	29.6	12,926	6,489	50.2	4,649	1,617	34.8
1993	32,910	10,877	33.1	28,106	9,242	32.9	13,132	6,955	53.0	4,608	1,541	33.4
1992 ^f	32,411	10,827	33.4	27,790	9,134	32.9	12,591	6,799	54.0	4,410	1,569	35.6
1991 ^f	31,313	10,242	32.7	26,565	8,504	32.0	11,960	6,557	54.8	4,505	1,590	35.3
1990	30,806	9,837	31.9	26,296	8,160	31.0	11,866	6,005	50.6	4,244	1,491	35.1
1989	30,332	9,302	30.7	25,931	7,704	29.7	11,190	5,530	49.4	4,180	1,471	35.2
1988 ^f	29,849	9,356	31.3	25,484	7,650	30.0	10,794	5,601	51.9	4,095	1,509	36.8
1987 ^f	29,362	9,520	32.4	25,128	7,848	31.2	10,701	5,789	54.1	3,977	1,471	37.0
1986	28,871	8,983	31.1	24,910	7,410	29.7	10,175	5,473	53.8	3,714	1,431	38.5
1985	28,485	8,926	31.3	24,620	7,504	30.5	10,041	5,342	53.2	3,641	1,264	34.7
1984	28,087	9,490	33.8	24,387	8,104	33.2	10,384	5,666	54.6	3,501	1,255	35.8
1983	27,678	9,882	35.7	24,138	8,376	34.7	10,059	5,736	57.0	3,287	1,338	40.7
1982	27,216	9,697	35.6	23,948	8,355	34.9	9,699	5,698	58.8	3,051	1,229	40.3
1981	26,834	9,173	34.2	23,423	7,780	33.2	9,214	5,222	56.7	3,277	1,296	39.6
1980	26,408	8,579	32.5	23,084	7,190	31.1	9,338	4,984	53.4	3,208	1,314	41.0
1979	25,944	8,050	31.0	22,666	6,800	30.0	9,065	4,816	53.1	3,127	1,168	37.3
1978	24,956	7,625	30.6	22,027	6,493	29.5	8,689	4,712	54.2	2,929	1,132	38.6
1977	24,710	7,726	31.3	21,850	6,667	30.5	8,315	4,595	55.3	2,860	1,059	37.0
1976	24,399	7,595	31.1	21,840	6,576	30.1	7,926	4,415	55.7	2,559	1,019	39.8
1975	24,089	7,545	31.3	21,687	6,533	30.1	7,679	4,168	54.3	2,402	1,011	42.1
1974	23,699	7,182	30.3	21,341	6,255	29.3	7,483	4,116	55.0	2,359	927	39.3
1973	23,512	7,388	31.4	21,328	6,560	30.8	7,188	4,064	56.5	2,183	828	37.9
1972	23,144	7,710	33.3	21,116	6,841	32.4	7,125	4,139	58.1	2,028	870	42.9
1971	22,784	7,396	32.5	20,900	6,530	31.2	6,398	3,587	56.1	1,884	866	46.0
1970	22,515	7,548	33.5	20,724	6,683	32.2	6,225	3,656	58.7	1,791	865	48.3
1969	22,011	7,095	32.2	20,192	6,245	30.9	5,537	3,225	58.2	1,819	850	46.7
1968	21,944	7,616	34.7	(NA)	6,839	33.7	(NA)	3,312	58.9	(NA)	777	46.3
1967	21,590	8,486	39.3	(NA)	7,677	38.4	(NA)	3,362	61.6	(NA)	809	49.3
1966	21,206	8,867	41.8	(NA)	8,090	40.9	(NA)	3,160	65.3	(NA)	777	54.4
1959	18,013	9,927	55.1	(NA)	9,112	54.9	(NA)	2,416	70.6	1,430	815	57.0
ASIAN ALONE OR IN COMBINATION												
2002	12,487	1,243	10.0	10,742	816	7.6	1,146	175	15.3	1,708	417	24.4
ASIAN ALONE⁵												
2002	11,541	1,161	10.1	9,899	763	7.7	1,019	155	15.2	1,613	390	24.2

See footnotes at end of table.

Table A-1.
Poverty Status of People by Family Relationship, Race, and Hispanic Origin: 1959 to 2002—Con.

[Numbers in thousands. People as of March of the following year]

Year and characteristic	All people			People in families						Unrelated individuals			
	Total	Below poverty level		Total	All families			Families with female householder, no husband present			Total	Below poverty level	
		Number	Percent		Number	Percent	Total	Below poverty level		Number		Percent	
								Number	Percent				
ASIAN AND PACIFIC ISLANDER³													
2001.....	12,465	1,275	10.2	10,745	873	8.1	1,333	198	14.8	1,682	393	23.4	
2000 ¹	12,672	1,258	9.9	11,044	895	8.1	1,231	289	23.4	1,588	350	22.0	
1999 ^f	11,955	1,285	10.7	10,507	1,010	9.6	1,201	275	22.9	1,415	270	19.1	
1998.....	10,873	1,360	12.5	9,576	1,087	11.4	1,123	373	33.2	1,266	257	20.3	
1997.....	10,482	1,468	14.0	9,312	1,116	12.0	932	313	33.6	1,134	327	28.9	
1996.....	10,054	1,454	14.5	8,900	1,172	13.2	1,018	300	29.5	1,120	255	22.8	
1995.....	9,644	1,411	14.6	8,582	1,112	13.0	919	266	28.9	1,013	260	25.6	
1994.....	6,654	974	14.6	5,915	776	13.1	582	137	23.6	696	179	25.7	
1993.....	7,434	1,134	15.3	6,609	898	13.6	725	126	17.4	791	228	28.8	
1992 ^f	7,779	985	12.7	6,922	787	11.4	729	183	25.0	828	193	23.3	
1991 ^f	7,192	996	13.8	6,367	773	12.1	721	177	24.6	785	209	26.6	
1990.....	7,014	858	12.2	6,300	712	11.3	638	132	20.7	668	124	18.5	
1989.....	6,673	939	14.1	5,917	779	13.2	614	212	34.6	712	144	20.2	
1988 ^f	6,447	1,117	17.3	5,767	942	16.3	650	263	40.5	651	160	24.5	
1987 ^f	6,322	1,021	16.1	5,785	875	15.1	584	187	32.0	516	138	26.8	
HISPANIC⁶													
2002.....	39,216	8,555	21.8	34,598	7,184	20.8	7,013	2,554	36.4	4,364	1,255	28.8	
2001 ³	37,312	7,997	21.4	33,110	6,674	20.2	6,830	2,585	37.8	3,981	1,211	30.4	
2000 ¹	35,955	7,747	21.5	31,700	6,430	20.3	6,469	2,444	37.8	3,978	1,163	29.2	
1999 ^f	34,632	7,876	22.7	30,872	6,702	21.7	6,527	2,642	40.5	3,481	1,068	30.7	
1998.....	31,515	8,070	25.6	28,055	6,814	24.3	6,074	2,837	46.7	3,218	1,097	34.1	
1997.....	30,637	8,308	27.1	27,467	7,198	26.2	5,718	2,911	50.9	2,976	1,017	34.2	
1996.....	29,614	8,697	29.4	26,340	7,515	28.5	5,641	3,020	53.5	2,985	1,066	35.7	
1995.....	28,344	8,574	30.3	25,165	7,341	29.2	5,785	3,053	52.8	2,947	1,092	37.0	
1994.....	27,442	8,416	30.7	24,390	7,357	30.2	5,328	2,920	54.8	2,798	926	33.1	
1993.....	26,559	8,126	30.6	23,439	6,876	29.3	5,333	2,837	53.2	2,717	972	35.8	
1992 ^f	25,646	7,592	29.6	22,695	6,455	28.4	4,806	2,474	51.5	2,577	881	34.2	
1991 ^f	22,070	6,339	28.7	19,658	5,541	28.2	4,326	2,282	52.7	2,146	667	31.1	
1990.....	21,405	6,006	28.1	18,912	5,091	26.9	3,993	2,115	53.0	2,254	774	34.3	
1989.....	20,746	5,430	26.2	18,488	4,659	25.2	3,763	1,902	50.6	2,045	634	31.0	
1988 ^f	20,064	5,357	26.7	18,102	4,700	26.0	3,734	2,052	55.0	1,864	597	32.0	
1987 ^f	19,395	5,422	28.0	17,342	4,761	27.5	3,678	2,045	55.6	1,933	598	31.0	
1986.....	18,758	5,117	27.3	16,880	4,469	26.5	3,631	1,921	52.9	1,685	553	32.8	
1985.....	18,075	5,236	29.0	16,276	4,605	28.3	3,561	1,983	55.7	1,602	532	33.2	
1984.....	16,916	4,806	28.4	15,293	4,192	27.4	3,139	1,764	56.2	1,481	545	36.8	
1983.....	16,544	4,633	28.0	15,075	4,113	27.3	3,032	1,670	55.1	1,364	457	33.5	
1982.....	14,385	4,301	29.9	13,242	3,865	29.2	2,664	1,601	60.1	1,018	358	35.1	
1981.....	14,021	3,713	26.5	12,922	3,349	25.9	2,622	1,465	55.9	1,005	313	31.1	
1980.....	13,600	3,491	25.7	12,547	3,143	25.1	2,421	1,319	54.5	970	312	32.2	
1979.....	13,371	2,921	21.8	12,291	2,599	21.1	2,058	1,053	51.2	991	286	28.8	

See footnotes at end of table.

Table A-1.
Poverty Status of People by Family Relationship, Race, and Hispanic Origin: 1959 to 2002—Con.

[Numbers in thousands. People as of March of the following year]

Year and characteristic	All people			People in families						Unrelated individuals		
	Total	Below poverty level		All families			Families with female householder, no husband present			Total	Below poverty level	
		Number	Percent	Total	Below poverty level		Total	Below poverty level			Number	Percent
					Number	Percent		Number	Percent			
HISPANIC⁶—Con.												
1978.....	12,079	2,607	21.6	11,193	2,343	20.9	1,817	1,024	56.4	886	264	29.8
1977.....	12,046	2,700	22.4	11,249	2,463	21.9	1,901	1,077	56.7	797	237	29.8
1976.....	11,269	2,783	24.7	10,552	2,516	23.8	1,766	1,000	56.6	716	266	37.2
1975.....	11,117	2,991	26.9	10,472	2,755	26.3	1,842	1,053	57.2	645	236	36.6
1974.....	11,201	2,575	23.0	10,584	2,374	22.4	1,723	915	53.1	617	201	32.6
1973.....	10,795	2,366	21.9	10,269	2,209	21.5	1,534	881	57.4	526	157	29.9
1972.....	10,588	2,414	22.8	10,099	2,252	22.3	1,370	733	53.5	488	162	33.2

¹For 1999, figures are based on 2000 census population controls. For 1992, figures are based on 1990 census population controls. For 1991, figures are revised to correct for nine omitted weights from the original March 1992 CPS file. For 1988 and 1987, figures are based on new processing procedures and are also revised to reflect corrections to the files after publication of the 1988 advance report, *Money Income and Poverty Status in the United States: 1988*, P-60, No. 166.

NA Not available.

¹Consistent with 2001 data through implementation of Census 2000-based population controls and a 28,000 household sample expansion.

²The 2003 CPS allowed respondents to choose more than one race. White alone refers to people who reported White and did not report any other race category. The use of this single-race population does not imply that it is the preferred method of presenting or analyzing data. The Census Bureau uses a variety of approaches. Information on people who reported more than one race, such as "White and American Indian and Alaska Native" or "Asian and Black or African American," in Census 2000 is forthcoming and will be available through American FactFinder in 2003. About 2.6 percent of people reported more than one race.

³For 2001 and earlier years, the CPS allowed respondents to report only one race group. The reference race groups for 2001 and earlier poverty data are: White, non-Hispanic White, Black, and Asian and Pacific Islander.

⁴Black or African American alone refers to people who reported Black or African American and did not report any other race category.

⁵Asian alone refers to people who reported Asian and did not report any other race category.

⁶Hispanics may be of any race.

Note: Prior to 1979, people in unrelated subfamilies were included in people in families. Beginning in 1979, people in unrelated subfamilies are included in all people but are excluded from people in families.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 1968 to 2003 Annual Social and Economic Supplements.

Table A-2.
Poverty Status of People by Age, Race, and Hispanic Origin: 1959 to 2002

[Numbers in thousands. People as of March of the following year]

Year and characteristic	Under 18 years						18 to 64 years			65 years and over		
	All people			Related children in families			Total	Below poverty level		Total	Below poverty level	
	Total	Below poverty level		Total	Below poverty level			Number	Percent		Number	Percent
		Number	Percent		Number	Percent						
ALL RACES												
2002.....	72,696	12,133	16.7	71,619	11,646	16.3	178,388	18,861	10.6	34,234	3,576	10.4
2001.....	72,021	11,733	16.3	70,950	11,175	15.8	175,685	17,760	10.1	33,769	3,414	10.1
2000 ¹	71,741	11,587	16.2	70,538	11,005	15.6	173,638	16,671	9.6	33,566	3,323	9.9
1999 ^f	71,685	12,280	17.1	70,424	11,678	16.6	171,146	17,289	10.1	33,377	3,222	9.7
1998.....	71,338	13,467	18.9	70,253	12,845	18.3	167,327	17,623	10.5	32,394	3,386	10.5
1997.....	71,069	14,113	19.9	69,844	13,422	19.2	165,329	18,085	10.9	32,082	3,376	10.5
1996.....	70,650	14,463	20.5	69,411	13,764	19.8	163,691	18,638	11.4	31,877	3,428	10.8
1995.....	70,566	14,665	20.8	69,425	13,999	20.2	161,508	18,442	11.4	31,658	3,318	10.5
1994.....	70,020	15,289	21.8	68,819	14,610	21.2	160,329	19,107	11.9	31,267	3,663	11.7
1993.....	69,292	15,727	22.7	68,040	14,961	22.0	159,208	19,781	12.4	30,779	3,755	12.2
1992 ^f	68,440	15,294	22.3	67,256	14,521	21.6	157,680	18,793	11.9	30,430	3,928	12.9
1991 ^f	65,918	14,341	21.8	64,800	13,658	21.1	154,684	17,586	11.4	30,590	3,781	12.4
1990.....	65,049	13,431	20.6	63,908	12,715	19.9	153,502	16,496	10.7	30,093	3,658	12.2
1989.....	64,144	12,590	19.6	63,225	12,001	19.0	152,282	15,575	10.2	29,566	3,363	11.4
1988 ^f	63,747	12,455	19.5	62,906	11,935	19.0	150,761	15,809	10.5	29,022	3,481	12.0
1987 ^f	63,294	12,843	20.3	62,423	12,275	19.7	149,201	15,815	10.6	28,487	3,563	12.5
1986.....	62,948	12,876	20.5	62,009	12,257	19.8	147,631	16,017	10.8	27,975	3,477	12.4
1985.....	62,876	13,010	20.7	62,019	12,483	20.1	146,396	16,598	11.3	27,322	3,456	12.6
1984.....	62,447	13,420	21.5	61,681	12,929	21.0	144,551	16,952	11.7	26,818	3,330	12.4
1983.....	62,334	13,911	22.3	61,578	13,427	21.8	143,052	17,767	12.4	26,313	3,625	13.8
1982.....	62,345	13,647	21.9	61,565	13,139	21.3	141,328	17,000	12.0	25,738	3,751	14.6
1981.....	62,449	12,505	20.0	61,756	12,068	19.5	139,477	15,464	11.1	25,231	3,853	15.3
1980.....	62,914	11,543	18.3	62,168	11,114	17.9	137,428	13,858	10.1	24,686	3,871	15.7
1979.....	63,375	10,377	16.4	62,646	9,993	16.0	135,333	12,014	8.9	24,194	3,682	15.2
1978.....	62,311	9,931	15.9	61,987	9,722	15.7	130,169	11,332	8.7	23,175	3,233	14.0
1977.....	63,137	10,288	16.2	62,823	10,028	16.0	128,262	11,316	8.8	22,468	3,177	14.1
1976.....	64,028	10,273	16.0	63,729	10,081	15.8	126,175	11,389	9.0	22,100	3,313	15.0
1975.....	65,079	11,104	17.1	64,750	10,882	16.8	124,122	11,456	9.2	21,662	3,317	15.3
1974.....	66,134	10,156	15.4	65,802	9,967	15.1	122,101	10,132	8.3	21,127	3,085	14.6
1973.....	66,959	9,642	14.4	66,626	9,453	14.2	120,060	9,977	8.3	20,602	3,354	16.3
1972.....	67,930	10,284	15.1	67,592	10,082	14.9	117,957	10,438	8.8	20,117	3,738	18.6
1971.....	68,816	10,551	15.3	68,474	10,344	15.1	115,911	10,735	9.3	19,827	4,273	21.6
1970.....	69,159	10,440	15.1	68,815	10,235	14.9	113,554	10,187	9.0	19,470	4,793	24.6
1969.....	69,090	9,691	14.0	68,746	9,501	13.8	111,528	9,669	8.7	18,899	4,787	25.3
1968.....	70,385	10,954	15.6	70,035	10,739	15.3	108,684	9,803	9.0	18,559	4,632	25.0
1967.....	70,408	11,656	16.6	70,058	11,427	16.3	107,024	10,725	10.0	18,240	5,388	29.5
1966.....	70,218	12,389	17.6	69,869	12,146	17.4	105,241	11,007	10.5	17,929	5,114	28.5
1965.....	69,986	14,676	21.0	69,638	14,388	20.7	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
1964.....	69,711	16,051	23.0	69,364	15,736	22.7	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
1963.....	69,181	16,005	23.1	68,837	15,691	22.8	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
1962.....	67,722	16,963	25.0	67,385	16,630	24.7	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
1961.....	66,121	16,909	25.6	65,792	16,577	25.2	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
1960.....	65,601	17,634	26.9	65,275	17,288	26.5	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
1959.....	64,315	17,552	27.3	63,995	17,208	26.9	96,685	16,457	17.0	15,557	5,481	35.2

See footnotes at end of table.

Table A-2.
Poverty Status of People by Age, Race, and Hispanic Origin: 1959 to 2002—Con.

[Numbers in thousands. People as of March of the following year]

Year and characteristic	Under 18 years						18 to 64 years			65 years and over		
	All people			Related children in families			Total	Below poverty level		Total	Below poverty level	
	Total	Below poverty level		Total	Below poverty level			Number	Percent		Number	Percent
		Number	Percent		Number	Percent						
WHITE ALONE²												
2002.....	55,703	7,549	13.6	54,900	7,203	13.1	144,694	13,178	9.1	29,980	2,739	9.1
WHITE³												
2001.....	56,089	7,527	13.4	55,238	7,086	12.8	143,796	12,555	8.7	29,790	2,656	8.9
2000 ¹	55,980	7,307	13.1	55,021	6,834	12.4	142,164	11,754	8.3	29,703	2,584	8.7
1999 ^f	55,833	7,639	13.7	54,873	7,194	13.1	139,974	12,085	8.6	29,553	2,446	8.3
1998.....	56,016	8,443	15.1	55,126	7,935	14.4	138,061	12,456	9.0	28,759	2,555	8.9
1997.....	55,863	8,990	16.1	54,870	8,441	15.4	136,784	12,838	9.4	28,553	2,569	9.0
1996.....	55,606	9,044	16.3	54,599	8,488	15.5	135,586	12,940	9.5	28,464	2,667	9.4
1995.....	55,444	8,981	16.2	54,532	8,474	15.5	134,149	12,869	9.6	28,436	2,572	9.0
1994.....	55,186	9,346	16.9	54,221	8,826	16.3	133,289	13,187	9.9	27,985	2,846	10.2
1993.....	54,639	9,752	17.8	53,614	9,123	17.0	132,680	13,535	10.2	27,580	2,939	10.7
1992 ^f	54,110	9,399	17.4	53,110	8,752	16.5	131,694	12,871	9.8	27,256	2,989	11.0
1991 ^f	52,523	8,848	16.8	51,627	8,316	16.1	130,312	12,097	9.3	27,297	2,802	10.3
1990.....	51,929	8,232	15.9	51,028	7,696	15.1	129,784	11,387	8.8	26,898	2,707	10.1
1989.....	51,400	7,599	14.8	50,704	7,164	14.1	128,974	10,647	8.3	26,479	2,539	9.6
1988 ^f	51,203	7,435	14.5	50,590	7,095	14.0	128,031	10,687	8.3	26,001	2,593	10.0
1987 ^f	51,012	7,788	15.3	50,360	7,398	14.7	126,991	10,703	8.4	25,602	2,704	10.6
1986.....	51,111	8,209	16.1	50,356	7,714	15.3	125,998	11,285	9.0	25,173	2,689	10.7
1985.....	51,031	8,253	16.2	50,358	7,838	15.6	125,258	11,909	9.5	24,629	2,698	11.0
1984.....	50,814	8,472	16.7	50,192	8,086	16.1	123,922	11,904	9.6	24,206	2,579	10.7
1983.....	50,726	8,862	17.5	50,183	8,534	17.0	123,014	12,347	10.0	23,754	2,776	11.7
1982.....	50,920	8,678	17.0	50,305	8,282	16.5	121,766	11,971	9.8	23,234	2,870	12.4
1981.....	51,140	7,785	15.2	50,553	7,429	14.7	120,574	10,790	8.9	22,791	2,978	13.1
1980.....	51,653	7,181	13.9	51,002	6,817	13.4	118,935	9,478	8.0	22,325	3,042	13.6
1979.....	52,262	6,193	11.8	51,687	5,909	11.4	117,583	8,110	6.9	21,898	2,911	13.3
1978.....	51,669	5,831	11.3	51,409	5,674	11.0	113,832	7,897	6.9	20,950	2,530	12.1
1977.....	52,563	6,097	11.6	52,299	5,943	11.4	112,374	7,893	7.0	20,316	2,426	11.9
1976.....	53,428	6,189	11.6	53,167	6,034	11.3	110,717	7,890	7.1	20,020	2,633	13.2
1975.....	54,405	6,927	12.7	54,126	6,748	12.5	109,105	8,210	7.5	19,654	2,634	13.4
1974.....	55,590	6,223	11.2	55,320	6,079	11.0	107,579	7,053	6.6	19,206	2,460	12.8
1973.....	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	56,211	5,462	9.7	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	2,698	14.4
1972.....	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	57,181	5,784	10.1	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	3,072	16.8
1971.....	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	58,119	6,341	10.9	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	3,605	19.9
1970.....	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	58,472	6,138	10.5	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	4,011	22.6
1969.....	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	58,578	5,667	9.7	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	4,052	23.3
1968.....	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	6,373	10.7	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	17,062	3,939	23.1
1967.....	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	6,729	11.3	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	16,791	4,646	27.7
1966.....	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	7,204	12.1	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	16,514	4,357	26.4
1965.....	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	8,595	14.4	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
1960.....	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	11,229	20.0	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
1959.....	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	11,386	20.6	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	4,744	33.1
WHITE ALONE, NOT HISPANIC²												
2002.....	43,614	4,090	9.4	43,017	3,848	8.9	122,511	9,157	7.5	28,018	2,321	8.3

See footnotes at end of table.

Table A-2.
Poverty Status of People by Age, Race, and Hispanic Origin: 1959 to 2002—Con.

[Numbers in thousands. People as of March of the following year]

Year and characteristic	Under 18 years						18 to 64 years			65 years and over		
	All people			Related children in families			Total	Below poverty level		Total	Below poverty level	
	Total	Below poverty level		Total	Below poverty level			Number	Percent		Number	Percent
		Number	Percent		Number	Percent						
WHITE, NOT HISPANIC³												
2001	44,095	4,194	9.5	43,459	3,887	8.9	122,470	8,811	7.2	27,973	2,266	8.1
2000 ¹	44,244	4,018	9.1	43,554	3,715	8.5	121,499	8,130	6.7	27,948	2,218	7.9
1999 ^f	44,272	4,155	9.4	43,570	3,832	8.8	120,341	8,462	7.0	27,952	2,118	7.6
1998	45,355	4,822	10.6	44,670	4,458	10.0	120,282	8,760	7.3	27,118	2,217	8.2
1997	45,491	5,204	11.4	44,665	4,759	10.7	119,373	9,088	7.6	26,995	2,200	8.1
1996	45,605	5,072	11.1	44,844	4,656	10.4	118,822	9,074	7.6	27,033	2,316	8.6
1995	45,689	5,115	11.2	44,973	4,745	10.6	118,228	8,908	7.5	27,034	2,243	8.3
1994	46,668	5,823	12.5	45,874	5,404	11.8	119,192	9,732	8.2	26,684	2,556	9.6
1993	46,096	6,255	13.6	45,322	5,819	12.8	118,475	9,964	8.4	26,272	2,663	10.1
1992 ^f	45,590	6,017	13.2	44,833	5,558	12.4	117,386	9,461	8.1	26,025	2,724	10.5
1991 ^f	45,236	5,918	13.1	44,506	5,497	12.4	117,672	9,244	7.9	26,208	2,580	9.8
1990	44,797	5,532	12.3	44,045	5,106	11.6	117,477	8,619	7.3	25,854	2,471	9.6
1989	44,492	5,110	11.5	43,938	4,779	10.9	116,983	8,154	7.0	25,504	2,335	9.2
1988 ^f	44,438	4,888	11.0	43,910	4,594	10.5	116,479	8,293	7.1	25,044	2,384	9.5
1987 ^f	44,461	5,230	11.8	43,907	4,902	11.2	115,721	8,327	7.2	24,754	2,472	10.0
1986	44,664	5,789	13.0	44,041	5,388	12.2	115,157	8,963	7.8	24,298	2,492	10.3
1985	44,752	5,745	12.8	44,199	5,421	12.3	114,969	9,608	8.4	23,734	2,486	10.5
1984	44,886	6,156	13.7	44,349	5,828	13.1	114,180	9,734	8.5	23,402	2,410	10.3
1983	44,830	6,649	14.8	44,374	6,381	14.4	113,570	10,279	9.1	22,992	2,610	11.4
1982	45,531	6,566	14.4	45,001	6,229	13.8	113,717	10,082	8.9	22,655	2,714	12.0
1981	45,950	5,946	12.9	45,440	5,639	12.4	112,722	9,207	8.2	22,237	2,834	12.7
1980	46,578	5,510	11.8	45,989	5,174	11.3	111,460	7,990	7.2	21,760	2,865	13.2
1979	46,967	4,730	10.1	46,448	4,476	9.6	110,509	6,930	6.3	21,339	2,759	12.9
1978	46,819	4,506	9.6	46,606	4,383	9.4	107,481	6,837	6.4	20,431	2,412	11.8
1977	47,689	4,714	9.9	47,459	4,582	9.7	106,063	6,772	6.4	19,812	2,316	11.7
1976	48,824	4,799	9.8	48,601	4,664	9.6	104,846	6,720	6.4	19,565	2,506	12.8
1975	49,670	5,342	10.8	49,421	5,185	10.5	103,496	7,039	6.8	19,251	2,503	13.0
1974	50,759	4,820	9.5	50,520	4,697	9.3	101,894	6,051	5.9	18,810	2,346	12.5
BLACK ALONE OR IN COMBINATION												
2002	12,114	3,817	31.5	11,931	3,733	31.3	22,170	4,376	19.7	2,922	691	23.6
BLACK ALONE⁴												
2002	11,275	3,645	32.3	11,111	3,570	32.1	21,547	4,277	19.9	2,856	680	23.8
BLACK³												
2001	11,556	3,492	30.2	11,419	3,423	30.0	21,462	4,018	18.7	2,853	626	21.9
2000 ¹	11,480	3,581	31.2	11,296	3,495	30.9	21,161	3,794	17.9	2,785	607	21.8
1999 ^f	11,488	3,813	33.2	11,260	3,698	32.8	21,518	4,000	18.6	2,750	628	22.8
1998	11,317	4,151	36.7	11,176	4,073	36.4	20,837	4,222	20.3	2,723	718	26.4
1997	11,367	4,225	37.2	11,193	4,116	36.8	20,400	4,191	20.5	2,691	700	26.0
1996	11,338	4,519	39.9	11,155	4,411	39.5	20,155	4,515	22.4	2,616	661	25.3
1995	11,369	4,761	41.9	11,198	4,644	41.5	19,892	4,483	22.5	2,478	629	25.4
1994	11,211	4,906	43.8	11,044	4,787	43.3	19,585	4,590	23.4	2,557	700	27.4
1993	11,127	5,125	46.1	10,969	5,030	45.9	19,272	5,049	26.2	2,510	702	28.0

See footnotes at end of table.

Table A-2.
Poverty Status of People by Age, Race, and Hispanic Origin: 1959 to 2002—Con.

[Numbers in thousands. People as of March of the following year]

Year and characteristic	Under 18 years						18 to 64 years			65 years and over		
	All people			Related children in families			Total	Below poverty level		Total	Below poverty level	
	Total	Below poverty level		Total	Below poverty level			Number	Percent		Number	Percent
		Number	Percent		Number	Percent						
BLACK³—Con.												
1992 ^f	10,956	5,106	46.6	10,823	5,015	46.3	18,952	4,884	25.8	2,504	838	33.5
1991 ^f	10,350	4,755	45.9	10,178	4,637	45.6	18,355	4,607	25.1	2,606	880	33.8
1990	10,162	4,550	44.8	9,980	4,412	44.2	18,097	4,427	24.5	2,547	860	33.8
1989	10,012	4,375	43.7	9,847	4,257	43.2	17,833	4,164	23.3	2,487	763	30.7
1988 ^f	9,865	4,296	43.5	9,681	4,148	42.8	17,548	4,275	24.4	2,436	785	32.2
1987 ^f	9,730	4,385	45.1	9,546	4,234	44.4	17,245	4,361	25.3	2,387	774	32.4
1986	9,629	4,148	43.1	9,467	4,037	42.7	16,911	4,113	24.3	2,331	722	31.0
1985	9,545	4,157	43.6	9,405	4,057	43.1	16,667	4,052	24.3	2,273	717	31.5
1984	9,480	4,413	46.6	9,356	4,320	46.2	16,369	4,368	26.7	2,238	710	31.7
1983	9,417	4,398	46.7	9,245	4,273	46.2	16,065	4,694	29.2	2,197	791	36.0
1982	9,400	4,472	47.6	9,269	4,388	47.3	15,692	4,415	28.1	2,124	811	38.2
1981	9,374	4,237	45.2	9,291	4,170	44.9	15,358	4,117	26.8	2,102	820	39.0
1980	9,368	3,961	42.3	9,287	3,906	42.1	14,987	3,835	25.6	2,054	783	38.1
1979	9,307	3,833	41.2	9,172	3,745	40.8	14,596	3,478	23.8	2,040	740	36.2
1978	9,229	3,830	41.5	9,168	3,781	41.2	13,774	3,133	22.7	1,954	662	33.9
1977	9,296	3,888	41.8	9,253	3,850	41.6	13,483	3,137	23.3	1,930	701	36.3
1976	9,322	3,787	40.6	9,291	3,758	40.4	13,224	3,163	23.9	1,852	644	34.8
1975	9,421	3,925	41.7	9,374	3,884	41.4	12,872	2,968	23.1	1,795	652	36.3
1974	9,439	3,755	39.8	9,384	3,713	39.6	12,539	2,836	22.6	1,721	591	34.3
1973	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	9,405	3,822	40.6	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	1,672	620	37.1
1972	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	9,426	4,025	42.7	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	1,603	640	39.9
1971	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	9,414	3,836	40.4	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	1,584	623	39.3
1970	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	9,448	3,922	41.5	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	1,422	683	48.0
1969	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	9,290	3,677	39.6	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	1,373	689	50.2
1968	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	4,188	43.1	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	1,374	655	47.7
1967	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	4,558	47.4	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	1,341	715	53.3
1966	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	4,774	50.6	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	1,311	722	55.1
1959	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	5,022	65.6	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	711	62.5
ASIAN ALONE OR IN COMBINATION												
2002	3,199	353	11.0	3,159	338	10.7	8,292	804	9.7	995	86	8.7
ASIAN ALONE⁵												
2002	2,683	315	11.7	2,648	302	11.4	7,881	764	9.7	977	82	8.4
ASIAN AND PACIFIC ISLANDER³												
2001	3,215	369	11.5	3,169	353	11.1	8,352	814	9.7	899	92	10.2
2000 ¹	3,294	420	12.7	3,256	407	12.5	8,500	756	8.9	878	82	9.3
1999 ^f	3,212	381	11.9	3,178	367	11.5	7,879	807	10.2	864	96	11.1
1998	3,137	564	18.0	3,099	542	17.5	6,951	698	10.0	785	97	12.4
1997	3,096	628	20.3	3,061	608	19.9	6,680	753	11.3	705	87	12.3
1996	2,924	571	19.5	2,899	553	19.1	6,484	821	12.7	647	63	9.7
1995	2,900	564	19.5	2,858	532	18.6	6,123	757	12.4	622	89	14.3
1994	1,739	318	18.3	1,719	308	17.9	4,401	589	13.4	513	67	13.0
1993	2,061	375	18.2	2,029	358	17.6	4,871	680	14.0	503	79	15.6

See footnotes at end of table.

Table A-2.
Poverty Status of People by Age, Race, and Hispanic Origin: 1959 to 2002—Con.

[Numbers in thousands. People as of March of the following year]

Year and characteristic	Under 18 years						18 to 64 years			65 years and over		
	All people			Related children in families			Total	Below poverty level		Total	Below poverty level	
	Total	Below poverty level		Total	Below poverty level			Number	Percent		Number	Percent
		Number	Percent		Number	Percent						
ASIAN AND PACIFIC ISLANDER³—Con.												
1992 ^f	2,218	363	16.4	2,199	352	16.0	5,067	568	11.2	494	53	10.8
1991 ^f	2,056	360	17.5	2,036	348	17.1	4,582	565	12.3	555	70	12.7
1990	2,126	374	17.6	2,098	356	17.0	4,375	422	9.6	514	62	12.1
1989	1,983	392	19.8	1,945	368	18.9	4,225	512	12.1	465	34	7.4
1988 ^f	1,970	474	24.1	1,949	458	23.5	4,035	583	14.4	442	60	13.5
1987 ^f	1,937	455	23.5	1,908	432	22.7	4,010	510	12.7	375	56	15.0
HISPANIC⁶												
2002	13,210	3,782	28.6	12,971	3,653	28.2	23,952	4,334	18.1	2,053	439	21.4
2001 ³	12,763	3,570	28.0	12,539	3,433	27.4	22,653	4,014	17.7	1,896	413	21.8
2000 ¹	12,399	3,522	28.4	12,115	3,342	27.6	21,734	3,844	17.7	1,822	381	20.9
1999 ^f	12,188	3,693	30.3	11,912	3,561	29.9	20,782	3,843	18.5	1,661	340	20.5
1998	11,152	3,837	34.4	10,921	3,670	33.6	18,668	3,877	20.8	1,696	356	21.0
1997	10,802	3,972	36.8	10,625	3,865	36.4	18,217	3,951	21.7	1,617	384	23.8
1996	10,511	4,237	40.3	10,255	4,090	39.9	17,587	4,089	23.3	1,516	370	24.4
1995	10,213	4,080	40.0	10,011	3,938	39.3	16,673	4,153	24.9	1,458	342	23.5
1994	9,822	4,075	41.5	9,621	3,956	41.1	16,192	4,018	24.8	1,428	323	22.6
1993	9,462	3,873	40.9	9,188	3,666	39.9	15,708	3,956	25.2	1,390	297	21.4
1992 ^f	9,081	3,637	40.0	8,829	3,440	39.0	15,268	3,668	24.0	1,298	287	22.1
1991 ^f	7,648	3,094	40.4	7,473	2,977	39.8	13,279	3,008	22.7	1,143	237	20.8
1990	7,457	2,865	38.4	7,300	2,750	37.7	12,857	2,896	22.5	1,091	245	22.5
1989	7,186	2,603	36.2	7,040	2,496	35.5	12,536	2,616	20.9	1,024	211	20.6
1988 ^f	7,003	2,631	37.6	6,908	2,576	37.3	12,056	2,501	20.7	1,005	225	22.4
1987 ^f	6,792	2,670	39.3	6,692	2,606	38.9	11,718	2,509	21.4	885	243	27.5
1986	6,646	2,507	37.7	6,511	2,413	37.1	11,206	2,406	21.5	906	204	22.5
1985	6,475	2,606	40.3	6,346	2,512	39.6	10,685	2,411	22.6	915	219	23.9
1984	6,068	2,376	39.2	5,982	2,317	38.7	10,029	2,254	22.5	819	176	21.5
1983	6,066	2,312	38.1	5,977	2,251	37.7	9,697	2,148	22.5	782	173	22.1
1982	5,527	2,181	39.5	5,436	2,117	38.9	8,262	1,963	23.8	596	159	26.6
1981	5,369	1,925	35.9	5,291	1,874	35.4	8,084	1,642	20.3	568	146	25.7
1980	5,276	1,749	33.2	5,211	1,718	33.0	7,740	1,563	20.2	582	179	30.8
1979	5,483	1,535	28.0	5,426	1,505	27.7	7,314	1,232	16.8	574	154	26.8
1978	5,012	1,384	27.6	4,972	1,354	27.2	6,527	1,098	16.8	539	125	23.2
1977	5,028	1,422	28.3	5,000	1,402	28.0	6,500	1,164	17.9	518	113	21.9
1976	4,771	1,443	30.2	4,736	1,424	30.1	6,034	1,212	20.1	464	128	27.7
1975	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	4,896	1,619	33.1	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	137	32.6
1974	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	4,939	1,414	28.6	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	117	28.9
1973	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	4,910	1,364	27.8	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	95	24.9

^fFor 1999, figures are based on 2000 census population controls. For 1992, figures are based on 1990 census population controls. For 1991, figures are revised to correct for nine omitted weights from the original March 1992 CPS file. For 1988 and 1987, figures are based on new processing procedures and are also revised to reflect corrections to the files after publication of the 1988 advance report, *Money Income and Poverty Status in the United States: 1988*, P-60, No. 166.

NA Not available.

¹Consistent with 2001 data through implementation of Census 2000-based population controls and a 28,000 household sample expansion.

²The 2003 CPS allowed respondents to choose more than one race. White alone refers to people who reported White and did not report any other race category. The use of this single-race population does not imply that it is the preferred method of presenting or analyzing data. The Census Bureau uses a variety of approaches. Information on people who reported more than one race, such as "White and American Indian and Alaska Native" or "Asian and Black or African American," in Census 2000 is forthcoming and will be available through American FactFinder in 2003. About 2.6 percent of people reported more than one race.

³For 2001 and earlier years, the CPS allowed respondents to report only one race group. The reference race groups for 2001 and earlier poverty data are: White, non-Hispanic White, Black, and Asian and Pacific Islander.

⁴Black or African American alone refers to people who reported Black or African American and did not report any other race category.

⁵Asian alone refers to people who reported Asian and did not report any other race category.

⁶Hispanics may be of any race.

Note: Prior to 1979, people in unrelated subfamilies were included in people in families. Beginning in 1979, people in unrelated subfamilies are included in all people but are excluded from people in families.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 1968 to 2003 Annual Social and Economic Supplements.

Table A-3.
Poverty Status of Families by Type of Family: 1959 to 2002

[Numbers in thousands. Families as of March of the following year]

Year and characteristic	All families			Married-couple families			Male householder, no wife present			Female householder, no husband present		
	Total	Below poverty level		Total	Below poverty level		Total	Below poverty level		Total	Below poverty level	
		Number	Percent		Number	Percent		Number	Percent		Number	Percent
ALL RACES												
2002	75,616	7,229	9.6	57,327	3,052	5.3	4,663	564	12.1	13,626	3,613	26.5
2001	74,340	6,813	9.2	56,755	2,760	4.9	4,440	583	13.1	13,146	3,470	26.4
2000 ¹	73,778	6,400	8.7	56,598	2,636	4.7	4,277	485	11.3	12,903	3,278	25.4
1999 ^f	73,206	6,792	9.3	56,290	2,748	4.9	4,099	485	11.8	12,818	3,559	27.8
1998	71,551	7,186	10.0	54,778	2,879	5.3	3,977	476	12.0	12,796	3,831	29.9
1997	70,884	7,324	10.3	54,321	2,821	5.2	3,911	508	13.0	12,652	3,995	31.6
1996	70,241	7,708	11.0	53,604	3,010	5.6	3,847	531	13.8	12,790	4,167	32.6
1995	69,597	7,532	10.8	53,570	2,982	5.6	3,513	493	14.0	12,514	4,057	32.4
1994	69,313	8,053	11.6	53,865	3,272	6.1	3,228	549	17.0	12,220	4,232	34.6
1993	68,506	8,393	12.3	53,181	3,481	6.5	2,914	488	16.8	12,411	4,424	35.6
1992 ^f	68,216	8,144	11.9	53,090	3,385	6.4	3,065	484	15.8	12,061	4,275	35.4
1991 ^f	67,175	7,712	11.5	52,457	3,158	6.0	3,025	392	13.0	11,693	4,161	35.6
1990	66,322	7,098	10.7	52,147	2,981	5.7	2,907	349	12.0	11,268	3,768	33.4
1989	66,090	6,784	10.3	52,137	2,931	5.6	2,884	348	12.1	10,890	3,504	32.2
1988 ^f	65,837	6,874	10.4	52,100	2,897	5.6	2,847	336	11.8	10,890	3,642	33.4
1987 ^f	65,204	7,005	10.7	51,675	3,011	5.8	2,833	340	12.0	10,696	3,654	34.2
1986	64,491	7,023	10.9	51,537	3,123	6.1	2,510	287	11.4	10,445	3,613	34.6
1985	63,558	7,223	11.4	50,933	3,438	6.7	2,414	311	12.9	10,211	3,474	34.0
1984	62,706	7,277	11.6	50,350	3,488	6.9	2,228	292	13.1	10,129	3,498	34.5
1983	62,015	7,647	12.3	50,081	3,815	7.6	2,038	268	13.2	9,896	3,564	36.0
1982	61,393	7,512	12.2	49,908	3,789	7.6	2,016	290	14.4	9,469	3,434	36.3
1981	61,019	6,851	11.2	49,630	3,394	6.8	1,986	205	10.3	9,403	3,252	34.6
1980	60,309	6,217	10.3	49,294	3,032	6.2	1,933	213	11.0	9,082	2,972	32.7
1979	59,550	5,461	9.2	49,112	2,640	5.4	1,733	176	10.2	8,705	2,645	30.4
1978	57,804	5,280	9.1	47,692	2,474	5.2	1,654	152	9.2	8,458	2,654	31.4
1977	57,215	5,311	9.3	47,385	2,524	5.3	1,594	177	11.1	8,236	2,610	31.7
1976	56,710	5,311	9.4	47,497	2,606	5.5	1,500	162	10.8	7,713	2,543	33.0
1975	56,245	5,450	9.7	47,318	2,904	6.1	1,445	116	8.0	7,482	2,430	32.5
1974	55,698	4,922	8.8	47,069	2,474	5.3	1,399	125	8.9	7,230	2,324	32.1
1973	55,053	4,828	8.8	46,812	2,482	5.3	1,438	154	10.7	6,804	2,193	32.2
1972	54,373	5,075	9.3	46,314	(NA)	(NA)	1,452	(NA)	(NA)	6,607	2,158	32.7
1971	53,296	5,303	10.0	45,752	(NA)	(NA)	1,353	(NA)	(NA)	6,191	2,100	33.9
1970	52,227	5,260	10.1	44,739	(NA)	(NA)	1,487	(NA)	(NA)	6,001	1,952	32.5
1969	51,586	5,008	9.7	44,436	(NA)	(NA)	1,559	(NA)	(NA)	5,591	1,827	32.7
1968	50,511	5,047	10.0	43,842	(NA)	(NA)	1,228	(NA)	(NA)	5,441	1,755	32.3
1967	49,835	5,667	11.4	43,292	(NA)	(NA)	1,210	(NA)	(NA)	5,333	1,774	33.3
1966	48,921	5,784	11.8	42,553	(NA)	(NA)	1,197	(NA)	(NA)	5,171	1,721	33.1
1965	48,278	6,721	13.9	42,107	(NA)	(NA)	1,179	(NA)	(NA)	4,992	1,916	38.4
1964	47,836	7,160	15.0	41,648	(NA)	(NA)	1,182	(NA)	(NA)	5,006	1,822	36.4
1963	47,436	7,554	15.9	41,311	(NA)	(NA)	1,243	(NA)	(NA)	4,882	1,972	40.4
1962	46,998	8,077	17.2	40,923	(NA)	(NA)	1,334	(NA)	(NA)	4,741	2,034	42.9
1961	46,341	8,391	18.1	40,405	(NA)	(NA)	1,293	(NA)	(NA)	4,643	1,954	42.1
1960	45,435	8,243	18.1	39,624	(NA)	(NA)	1,202	(NA)	(NA)	4,609	1,955	42.4
1959	45,054	8,320	18.5	39,335	(NA)	(NA)	1,226	(NA)	(NA)	4,493	1,916	42.6

^fFor 1999, figures are based on 2000 census population controls. For 1992, figures are based on 1990 census population controls. For 1991, figures are revised to correct for nine omitted weights from the original March 1992 CPS file. For 1988 and 1987, figures are based on new processing procedures and are also revised to reflect corrections to the files after publication of the 1988 advance report, *Money Income and Poverty Status in the United States: 1988*, P-60, No. 166.

NA Not available.

¹Consistent with 2001 data through implementation of Census 2000-based population controls and a 28,000 household sample expansion.

Note: Before 1979, unrelated subfamilies were included in all families. Beginning in 1979, unrelated subfamilies are excluded from all families.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 1968 to 2003 Annual Social and Economic Supplements.

U.S. Department of Commerce
Economics and Statistics Administration
U.S. CENSUS BUREAU
Washington, DC 20233

OFFICIAL BUSINESS

Penalty for Private Use \$300

FIRST-CLASS MAIL
POSTAGE & FEES PAID
U.S. Census Bureau
Permit No. G-58

P60-222

Poverty in the United States: 2002 **Current Population Reports** *Consumer Income*

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