3/3/2008
Rose M. Kreider
Housing and Household Economic Statistics Division
U.S. Bureau of the Census
Washington, D.C. 20233-8800

**Improvements to Demographic Household Data in the Current Population Survey: 2007**

**Introduction**

The changing structure of American families can only be tracked if data are available to document the changes that are occurring. To more accurately reflect cohabitation and children's coresidence with their parents, the Census Bureau improved the way it collects information about two important family concepts in the Current Population Survey (CPS). The first improvement concerns the identification of unmarried partners. Beginning with the 2007 data collection of the CPS, a direct question was added to the CPS asking whether unmarried adults were living with a boyfriend, girlfriend or partner. The second improvement concerns the identification of the number and type of parents in the household. A second parent "pointer"-- which indicates the presence of the person's parent in the household--was added to identify whether a child is living with both their father and their mother. In addition, the type of relationship between the child and parent, whether biological, step, or adoptive was also obtained as a basic part of the interview.

Since 1996, the CPS has collected information about unmarried partners of the householder via the relationship to householder item. In the demographics section of the interview, respondents are asked to identify the relationship of each household member to the householder–someone who owns or rents the property. One of the response categories for this

1

question is "unmarried partner." In 1996, there were an estimated 2.9 million opposite sex

unmarried partner households, or 2.9 percent of all households, and in 2006, there were an

estimated 5.0 million unmarried partner households, or 4.4 percent of all households.[1] The new

direct question was added to identify couples in the household in which neither partner is the

householder.

Unmarried couples often have children present in the household. In 1996, an estimated

43 percent of the unmarried partner households included children under 18, while in 2006, 39

percent contained children under 18. This is a concern to policy makers since research shows

that children living with married parents fare better on average than those with cohabiting

parents.[2] The ability to track children living with two unmarried parents is important to building

an understanding of how their characteristics might differ from families with two married

parents. Previously in the CPS, children with two unmarried parents were tabulated under single

parent families, so the addition of a second parent pointer adds accuracy to the measurement of

---

[1] See historical table UC-1, which can be accessed on the U.S. Census Bureau website at:
http://www.census.gov/population/socdemo/hh-fam/uc1.xls
     The percentage of all households which were unmarried partner households.

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

[2] Acs, Gregory, and Sandi Nelson. 2002. "The Kids Are Alright? Children's Well-Being and the Rise in Cohabitation," *Assessing the New Federalism*, Policy Brief B-48, The Urban Institute, Washington, DC.
     Manning, Wendy, and Daniel T. Lichter. 1996. "Parental Cohabitation and Children's Economic Well-Being," *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 58:998-1010.

coresidence of children and their parents. It also allows a better idea of economic resources potentially available for children.

The further addition of questions asking the type of relationship between children and their parents (biological, step or adopted), now make it possible to see coresidential step family relationships.[3] While previously the CPS could be used to identify which children lived with two married parents, beginning in 2007, the CPS can now be used to provide estimates of children living with a stepparent, step sibling, or half-sibling. Given the level of divorce and remarriage, significant numbers of children and adults live in blended families. Estimates from the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP) show that about 17 percent of children live in a blended family.[4] The availability of estimates of blended families from a nationally representative data source collected monthly may assist policy makers in a better understanding of changes occurring in American families.

**Objectives**

The main objectives of this working paper are twofold:

1. To inform users of the availability in CPS data of the following new items.

    A. a cohabitation pointer based on a direct question; and

    B. two parent pointers and the type of relationship with each parent, whether

---

[3] The question text and response categories include foster child, although respondents are supposed to report foster children in the relationship to householder rather than by using the parent pointers. Edited data do not show foster children via the parent pointers and type, but only in the relationship to householder item.

[4] Kreider, Rose M. 2008. "Living Arrangements of Children: 2004," *Current Population Reports*, P70-114, U.S. Census Bureau, Washington, DC.

biological, step or adoptive.

2. To evaluate the new CPS estimates by comparing them with those from other nationally representative surveys.

This paper uses the March Annual Social and Economic Supplement (ASEC) 2007 data collection of CPS, which is normally used to produce the Families and Living Arrangements detailed tables released on the Census Bureau's website. The detailed tables include information on children's living arrangements as well as characteristics of unmarried couples.

**Addition of a Direct Cohabitation Question to CPS**

Since 1996, the CPS has included a category on the relationship to householder question for "unmarried partner." This method only captures information about unmarried couples where one is the householder (person who owns or rents the dwelling). In 2007, a new question was asked in the CPS of adults who were not living with a spouse, and were living with an adult nonrelative–"Does [respondent] have a boyfriend/girlfriend or partner in the household?" The new question seeks to capture couples that do not include the householder, in addition to those who identified themselves as the unmarried partner of the householder. The direct question may also capture some partners of the householder who were reported as some relationship other than "unmarried partner" in the relationship to householder item, for example, "roommate" or "nonrelative."

Before placing the direct cohabitation question on the CPS survey, the Census Bureau conducted a test survey. The Questionnaire Design Experimental Research Survey (QDERS) is a

methodological survey conducted by the Census Bureau that is used to develop and test questions. Several methods of capturing whether adults were cohabiting were tested, and the most effective way to do this was determined to be the direct question to adults who were living with at least one nonrelative and did not report being married and living with a spouse. This line of questioning in the test survey captured an additional 17 percent of adults who were cohabiting, compared with simply having a category of "unmarried partner" on the relationship to householder question. These results from the QDERS survey provide a benchmark for the gains we might expect in the number of cohabiting couples with the addition of the direct cohabitation question to CPS.

Table 1 shows ASEC 2007, SIPP 2004 Wave 2, and ACS 2006 data, comparing estimates of opposite sex unmarried couples traditionally captured through the relationship to householder item in each survey along with estimates of couples captured through the direct cohabitation question in ASEC 2007 and through the Household Relationship Topical Module in SIPP 2004. The second interview of the SIPP 2004 longitudinal panel contained a Household Relationship Topical Module, which collected information about how each household member was related to every other household member. This matrix allows the detection of all cohabiting couples within the household, even those in which neither member is the householder.

The direct question in ASEC 2007 captured proportionately more of these non-householder couples than did the Household Relationship Topical Module in SIPP 2004. Results in Table 1 show that ASEC 2007 captured an additional 1.1 million cohabiting couples, 21 percent over the traditional method of household relationship identification alone, which yielded 5.2 million unmarried partner households. This increase was composed of about 380,000

previously unidentified couples (other than those containing the householder) plus 690,000 who

reported cohabiting with the householder although not identifying themselves as an unmarried

partner in the relationship to householder item (see Table 2).  The SIPP topical module resulted

in an additional 357,000 cohabiting couples, 7 percent over the 5.1 million captured using the

relationship to householder item.  Of course, the SIPP data collection took place in June through

September of 2004, while the ASEC collection was in March of 2007, so that some of the

difference could be due to change in the composition of unmarried couples over these three

years, as well as the fact that the information about unmarried partners was collected in different

ways.

The estimates from the three surveys of opposite-sex unmarried partner households do

not differ statistically, at about 5.2 million households.  The new direct cohabitation question in

CPS represents an improvement over the household relationship topical module method of

measuring additional cohabiting couples.  The improvement compared with SIPP is mainly due

to the couples in which one is the householder, but the other partner is not reported as the

unmarried partner of the householder.  In the ASEC, these couples represent an additional 13

percent over the couples where the householder is reported to have an unmarried partner

(690,000/5.2 million), while in SIPP these couples represent only an additional 3 percent over the

couples including the householder and unmarried partner (145,000/5.1 million).[5]  While there are

not a larger *number* of these additional couples compared with the overall estimate of unmarried

partner households, they comprise the majority of the additional couples identified using the

---

[5] This estimate was calculated from the SIPP 2004 panel, Wave 2, and does not appear in
the tables.

direct cohabitation question in CPS.

There are several other nationally representative surveys that collect information about cohabitation. The National Survey of Family Growth (NSFG), conducted by the National Center for Health Statistics collects a relationship history, as well as how the respondent is related to every other household member, but the sample is limited to the population age 15 to 44, whereas CPS includes all ages. The National Longitudinal Survey of Youth (NLSY) includes a direct question "Are you currently living as a partner with someone?" But like the NSFG, the survey does not cover all adults. NLSY follows a particular cohort over time. So it is difficult to compare estimates of cohabiting couples from these surveys with the ASEC estimates.

Table 2 compares the characteristics of cohabiting couples in the ASEC 2007 who are reported in the relationship to householder item as the householder and their unmarried partner, with couples who are captured with the new direct cohabitation question. This permits us to see whether the additional couples identified with the direct question differ significantly from those captured by the relationship to householder item.

In the text, I will refer to the two groups of couples as follows. Couples identified in the relationship to householder item, and labeled "unmarried partner households" in Table 2, will be referred to as "householder couples." One of the partners is the householder, and the other was reported as the unmarried partner of the householder. The "additional couples" include those identified using the direct cohabitation question. Most of these couples include a householder (64.5 percent), but the partner identified via the direct cohabitation question was not reported as the unmarried partner of the householder on the relationship to householder item. Respondents who reported someone in the household as the unmarried partner of the householder on the

relationship to householder item were not asked the direct cohabitation question. The direct question was asked of adults who were not married spouse present, and who had at least one adult nonrelative in the household. So, respondents may have reported the partner of the householder as an other nonrelative in the relationship to householder question, but when asked directly, reported the person as the cohabiting partner of the householder.

Table 2 shows that the men and women in householder couples tend to be older than those in the additional couples identified using the direct cohabitation question. While 17 percent of the men in householder couples were age 15 to 24, 27 percent of those in additional couples were in this youngest age group. Similarly for women, 25 percent of those in householder couples were age 15 to 24, while 39 percent of those in additional couples were in this age group. A higher percentage of the additional couples were either within one year of each other in age, 28.9 percent compared with 26.1 percent of householder couples, or the man was 2 to 4 years older than the woman, 28.5 percent compared with 23.5 percent for householder couples.

The race distribution for the couples shows that a higher percentage of the additional couples were both Hispanic (13.0 percent compared with 10.1 percent), or both Other non-Hispanic (4.2 percent compared with 2.6 percent) than householder couples. Additional couples were also less likely to be composed of two Black non-Hispanic partners than householder couples (7.9 percent compared with 10.0 percent).

In keeping with the fact that the additional couples are younger than the householder couples, they are also more likely to be never married. Less than half (48.5 percent) of the householder couples were comprised of two never married partners, while 57.9 percent of the

additional couples had two never married partners. The younger age distribution of the

additional couples is also evident in their lower percentage who have any children present, 33.0

percent compared with 42.3 percent of householder couples. Of those householder couples who

had children under 18 present (2.2 million), 49.5 percent had joint biological children present

(1.1 million).

The distribution of educational attainment is quite similar across the two groups of

couples. Of the categories shown, the two groups of couples differed only in the percentage in

which the man had at least a bachelor's degree, but the woman did not (8.1 percent of the

householder couples compared with 5.3 percent of the additional couples). A lower percentage

of the additional couples are both employed, 55.2 percent compared with 62.2 percent of the

householder couples.

Table 3 shows estimates of same sex unmarried couples from ASEC 2007, SIPP 2004,

and ACS 2006. Each survey collected the data a little differently. The ASEC data include

couples identified based on the direct cohabitation question, in which neither partner is the

"unmarried partner" of the householder in the relationship to householder item, as well as those

identified through the relationship to householder item. The SIPP data include householder

couples as well as couples where neither is the householder, but who were identified using the

household relationship topical module. The ACS estimate only includes couples in which one is

the householder and the other is reported as their unmarried partner in the relationship to

householder item. The ACS data are collected both by mail, on paper, and through personal

interviews while the other two surveys are done by personal interview, mainly by phone.

Estimates of number of same-sex unmarried couples from the ASEC and the SIPP differ statistically (436,000 and 347,000 respectively), but represent the same percentage, 6 percent, of all unmarried couples in each survey. These estimates are substantially lower than the ACS 2006 estimate of 780,000, or about 13 percent of all unmarried couples and the Census 2000 enumeration of 594,000 couples. The CPS has historically had much lower estimates of same sex unmarried couples than the ACS and the decennial census. Perhaps since the CPS is conducted mainly by phone interview, while the ACS and the decennial census are paper questionnaires filled out by the respondent in their home and mailed back, the CPS respondents may be less inclined to reveal the nature of their relationship with a partner.

The CPS and the SIPP surveys are not reliable sources of estimates of same sex unmarried couples or their characteristics because of their relatively smaller sample size than the ACS, and because estimates of these couples are roughly half what we would expect based on the ACS. At the same time, it should be noted that the ASEC 2007 estimate of same sex couples-- 436,000, or 6.5 percent of all unmarried couples, is an improvement over earlier CPS estimates. For example, the 2006 ASEC estimate:–237,000, or 4.5 percent of all unmarried couples is significantly lower than the 2007 ASEC estimate.


**Addition of a second parent pointer, and type parent to CPS**

Beginning in 2007, the CPS added a second parent pointer, as well as questions about the type of relationship between parents and their children. The SIPP has had these questions in place since the 1996 panel. The addition of a second parent pointer and type parent to the CPS allows for a detailed look at the number of parents with whom children live, and whether they are

the children's biological, step, or adoptive mother or father. The SIPP and CPS are the only Census Bureau surveys that allow such a detailed look at children's living arrangements.

This section of the paper provides further detail about the data now available in the CPS, as well as comparing the CPS estimates with earlier SIPP estimates. A short discussion about the reliability and use of state estimates in the CPS and the SIPP is also included.

Since both surveys have a spouse pointer in addition to parent pointers, it is also possible to identify the spouse of the parents living with the child. Because of the new addition of a direct question on cohabitation in the 2007 CPS, it is also possible to see whether the children's parents are cohabiting, either with a second parent, or with someone else. Although SIPP did not have a direct cohabitation question, it did contain detailed household relationship information, so it is possible to see whether children in that survey were living with a parent who was cohabiting, even if neither the parent nor their partner was the householder. These two surveys are the only Census Bureau surveys from which it is possible to get estimates of children living with unmarried parents who are cohabiting even when neither the parent nor their partner is the householder. Other nationally representative surveys which contain this level of detail about children's living arrangements are rare. The National Health Interview Survey, conducted by the National Center for Health Statistics, and the National Survey of American Families, conducted by the Urban Institute are two examples.

Estimates from ASEC 2007 of the percentage of children living with two, one or no parents compare well with other nationally representative surveys that contain information about

two coresident parents and the type of relationship between the child and parent.[6]  The National

Health Interview Survey 2006 shows 70.4 percent of children under 18 living with 2 parents,

23.2 percent living with mother only, 3.4 percent with father only, and 2.9 percent living with no

parent.[7]  Unlike in the SIPP and the ASEC, the NHIS counts children living with foster parents as

living with parents, so we might expect the percentage of children living with no parents to be

lower in the NHIS.  The 2002 National Survey of American Families shows 71 percent of

children under 18 living with 2 parents, 25 percent living with 1 parent, and 4 percent living with

no parents.[8]

Since both CPS and SIPP contain a state variable, it is possible to create state level tables

of children's living arrangements.  This comparison will provide some insight into the reliability

of state level estimates from CPS and SIPP for children's living arrangements by state.

However, the reliability of the estimates requires some scrutiny, since the sample size is

relatively small.

Table 4 shows the distribution of children by number of parents present, using the old and

---

[6] There are no published margins of error for the NHIS estimates in this report.  Because of that, we make no conclusion about the statistical significance of any apparent difference between most NHIS estimates and the corresponding estimates for ASEC and NSAF.  However, because of the size of the ASEC and NSAF margins of error, we can conclude there is no statistical difference between the 2 parent estimates for all three surveys.  Furthermore, there is no statistical difference between the 1 parent estimates for ASEC and NSAF, but the difference between the no parent estimates for ASEC and NSAF is statistically significant.

[7] Bloom, B. and R.A. Cohen. 2007. *Summary Health Statistics for U.S. Children: National Health Interview Survey, 2006*. National Center for Health Statistics. Vital Health Stat 10:234.

[8] Acs, Gregory and Sandi Nelson. 2003. "Changes in Family Structure and Child Well-Being: Evidence from the 2002 National Survey of America's Families," The Urban Institute, Washington, DC.

new methods of identifying parents in the household. Previously, CPS had only one parent pointer, so the only cases in which it was possible to determine the presence of a second parent was when that parent was married to the person identified as the child's parent. Using this method in the 2007 data, 67.8 percent of the children under 18 were living with two parents, while 28.7 percent were living with one parent. Using both parent pointers, and categorizing the children as living with two parents as long as they pointed to both a mother and a father, regardless of the marital status of those parents results in 70.7 percent of the children living with two parents, and 25.8 percent living with one parent. Overall, the new parent pointer questions increase the number of children living with two parents by 2.2 million.

Table 5 compares the new estimates from ASEC 2007 with the SIPP 2004 Wave 2 estimates for the number and type of parents with whom children lived. SIPP 2004 shows 69.7 percent of children living with two parents, while ASEC shows 70.7 percent with two parents. These estimates are quite close, considering there are several years between the two data collections and the ASEC universe is slightly different, since it excludes children who are either the family reference person, or the spouse of a family reference person. This is the universe normally used for the table package produced from ASEC data, while the Living Arrangements of Children reports produced from SIPP data include all children under 18. Estimates of the percentage of children living with one parent do not differ statistically between the two surveys (26 percent), with 23 percent living with mother only, and 3 percent living with father only.

ASEC 2007 data show a higher percentage of children living with their biological mother and father, 63.3 percent compared with 60.8 percent from SIPP 2004, as well as a higher percentage living with a married biological mother and father, 60.8 percent and 58.3 percent,

respectively. The percentage of children living with no parents differs statistically across the two surveys, but the differences are small, 3.5 percent for ASEC and 3.9 percent for SIPP.

Estimates of the percentage of children living with at least one biological parent do not differ across the two surveys (about 94 percent). While estimates of the percentage living with at least one adoptive parent are statistically different, the differences are small. When rounded, about 2 percent of children under 18 live with at least one adoptive parent. SIPP 2004 shows a slightly higher percentage of children living with at least one stepparent, 7.6 percent compared with 6.2 percent from ASEC. A discussion of the source of differences in the estimates from SIPP and ASEC appears later in this paper.

Table 6 shows further detail for children living with unmarried parents–whether their parents were cohabiting, and whether they were living with one or two parents. The percentage of children living with an unmarried parent does not differ between ASEC and SIPP and was about 29 percent. In each survey, about 3 percent lived with their unmarried mother and father, or their unmarried father only. An additional 23 percent lived with their unmarried mother only. As a percentage of the 21.2 million children living with an unmarried parent, ASEC data show that 10 percent lived with two unmarried parents, 11 percent lived with their unmarried father only, and the majority, 79 percent, lived with their unmarried mother only.

ASEC 2007 data shows 4.2 million children lived with a parent who had an unmarried partner. Forty-four percent of these children (1.9 million) lived with their biological mother and father. This latter estimate is one that could not be derived from CPS data prior to 2007; it is only possible because of the addition of a second parent pointer, as well as the type of relationship of the child to his or her mother and/or father.

**State estimates using SIPP and ASEC data**

Tables 7 and 8 show estimates from ASEC 2007 and SIPP 2004, of children by state and the number of parents with whom they lived. Table 7 shows the percentage of children who lived with two parents, by state. While the estimates of the percentage of children living with two parents are quite close at the national level in the two surveys, more variation exists when comparing the state estimates across surveys. While it is possible to create state level estimates from these surveys, the primary purpose of the SIPP and CPS is to provide national level estimates, rather than to be representative at the state level, as is the case for American Community Survey or the decennial census. The margin of error reported in these tables gives some idea of the error around these estimates. However, estimates for some states may differ so widely between the two surveys that the reliability of those estimates is in question. For example, the percentage of children in the District of Columbia who lived with two parents is estimated at 11 percent using SIPP 2004 data, but ASEC data show an estimate of 40 percent. These estimates differ statistically. Wyoming, another of the smallest areas, has an estimate of 89 percent from SIPP, but 76 percent from ASEC, and these estimates do not differ statistically. Despite these wide differences for several small areas, for the most part, the estimates from the two surveys usually fall within the margin of error around the estimates. Estimates of the percentage of children living with two parents differed statistically between the two surveys for the following areas: California, the District of Columbia, Kansas, Louisiana, Maryland, New York, Utah and Virginia.

Table 8 shows the percentage of children living with mother only, father only, or no parents, by state, for the SIPP 2004 and the ASEC 2007 based on the total number of children in

15

each state shown in Table 7.  As in Table 7, estimates for smaller areas diverged widely in some

cases when considering estimates of the percentage of children living with mother only.  Most of

the state estimates do not differ significantly across surveys, in part because the margins of error

around the estimates are relatively large.  Estimates of the percentage of children living with

mother only differed statistically between the two surveys for the following areas: California, the

District of Columbia, Kansas, Louisiana, Nebraska, New York, Utah and Wyoming.  Estimates

for small proportions of the population, such as the proportion of children living with father only

or with no parents are even riskier to compare across surveys at the state level, since the margins

of error are often fairly large.

State estimates from either the SIPP or CPS can provide a general idea of the variation of

the characteristic across states, but should not be used to create ranking tables of states with the

highest percentage of children living with two parents.  The margins of error around the estimates

preclude a reliable determination of  which state is the "highest" or "lowest" on a particular

characteristic.


**Sources of difference between SIPP and CPS estimates**

There are various differences between the SIPP and CPS that contribute to variation in

the estimates from the two surveys.  The CPS has a larger sample size–about 100,000 households

in the March ASEC data collection, compared with about 44,000 households in the SIPP 2004

panel.  The larger sample size lends greater reliability to the ASEC estimates, especially for small

subgroups of children, even though the SIPP is also a nationally representative survey.

As noted earlier in the paper, the universe for the ASEC estimates shown in the tables

here excludes children under 18 who are themselves a family reference person or the spouse of a family reference person. This is the universe which has always been used for the annual table package produced using ASEC data, and that is why it has been used here. The SIPP report on living arrangements of children has not excluded these children previously, and so we show all children under 18 for the SIPP estimates. Only a small number of children are family reference people, about 309,000 in the ASEC 2007 data, so this should not have a large effect on differences between the two sets of estimates.

The SIPP estimates are derived from the second interview of the panel. As with any longitudinal panel, there is some attrition over time. So the respondents to the second interview represent the nation somewhat less well than in the initial interview. The weights are designed to compensate for this attrition where possible.

Although the design of the weights for the two surveys is similar, it is not exactly the same, and it is possible that these differences might affect estimates of the distribution of children across particular characteristics that are involved in the weighting scheme. Weights for both surveys are adjusted to represent age, sex, race, and Hispanic origin distributions for the nation.

Another source of differences in the estimates from the SIPP and the CPS is the way the data were collected. As mentioned previously, while the CPS has added a direct cohabitation question in addition to the "unmarried partner" category of the relationship to householder item, the SIPP captured additional cohabiting couples via the household relationship topical module. This supplement to the core SIPP interview asked for the relationship of each household member to every other household member. "Unmarried partner" was one of the categories on the

expanded list of relationships from which the respondent could choose.  In contrast, the cohabitation question in ASEC was asked during the demographics section at the beginning of the interview, and was a direct question to adults not already recorded as the householder's unmarried partner and who were living with at least one adult nonrelative.  The number of additional couples (1.1 million) obtained from the direct cohabitation question in the CPS exceeded the additional couples (357,000) obtained from the household relationship topical module in the SIPP.

The editing procedures do differ between the two surveys, although the basic logic used is very similar.  However, the processing programs were constructed by different staff, and have different histories, likely leading to some small differences in the way a small number of cases are edited.

One difference in the editing between these two particular data sets is an edit done in SIPP 2004 to correct an instrument malfunction.  In SIPP, after a respondent reports that a person's mother is present in the household, the next question asks whether this is the person's biological, step, or adoptive mother.  If the respondent reports that this is the person's stepmother, they are asked a followup question.  The followup question asks whether the stepmother is also this person's adoptive mother.  The intention of this question was to collect the incidence of adoptions by stepparents, since stepparents may sometimes adopt their stepchildren, and the adoption would allow the stepparent increased legal rights with regard to the child.

The instrument was supposed to switch the reported type mom to adopted if a stepmother was reported to also be the adoptive mother of the child.  Unfortunately, this question appears to

have been misinterpreted by respondents, who may have construed it to mean they were in the process of adopting the child, or that they had informally adopted the child. Whatever the reason, the estimates of the number of stepchildren who had been adopted by their stepparents within the four-month reference period for the interview was greater than estimates of the number of children adopted worldwide annually.[9] In order to edit these responses, children who were reported as stepchildren in the first interview were retained as the stepchild of that parent in the second interview, regardless of the answer to this followup question in the second interview. The resulting 2004 estimates then became comparable with the 2001 SIPP estimates, and also compared well with the ASEC estimates. It is important to keep in mind that the editing of these data does differ between the SIPP and the CPS, so it is not useful to focus on small differences between estimates from the two surveys, especially regarding blended families.

Finally, we might expect that there would be some real differences in the distribution of children across these characteristics, since the ASEC data were collected in March of 2007, while the SIPP 2004 data were collected in June through September of 2004. There are few other nationally representative data sets that could track changes in the coresidence of children and parents during this time. The last time the NSAF was fielded was 2002. The NHIS, though fielded each year, is rarely used for extensive analysis about children's living arrangements, since it is designed to provide estimates of the health status of the population.

---

[9] Menozzi, Clare and Barry Mirkin. 2007. "Child Adoption: A Path to Parenthood?" Paper presented at the Population Association of America annual meetings held March 29-31, 2007. The United Nations Population Division estimated that about 260,000 children are adopted annually worldwide.

**Conclusion**

The addition of a second parent pointer and type mom and dad to the CPS, as well as the addition of a direct cohabitation question improve the ability of these data to reflect the living situations of America's families. The estimates from ASEC 2007 data compare well with SIPP 2004 estimates, as well as with other nationally representative surveys. While state level estimates may be used to give a general idea of state variation in a particular characteristic, they are not suitable to provide a detailed comparison among states, such as a ranking table. CPS data are widely used by researchers, and improvement in the measurement of family living arrangements provides an opportunity for further study about the association between family structure and child well-being.

**Table 1. Opposite Sex Cohabiting Couples**

| | All Cohabiting Couples | | | Unmarried Partner Households[1] | | | Other Couples[2] | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number | Margin of error[3] | Percent | Number | Percent | Margin of error[3] | Number | Percent | Margin of error[3] |
| **ASEC 2007** | 6,274 | 132 | 100.0 | 5,204 | 82.9 | 0.8 | 1,070 | 17.1 | 0.8 |
| **SIPP 2004** | 5,502 | 309 | 100.0 | 5,145 | 93.5 | 1.4 | 357 | 6.5 | 1.4 |
| **ACS 2006** | X | X | X | 5,238 | 100.0 | X | X | X | X |

X- Not applicable.

1 Includes couples where one is the householder, and the other is reported as the unmarried partner on the relationship to householder item.

2 Including couples where neither is reported as the unmarried partner of the householder on the relationship to householder item.

3 This number, when added to or subtracted from the estimate, represents the 90-percent confidence interval around the estimate.

Source:  Current Population Survey, Annual Social and Economic Supplement 2007; Survey of Income and Propram Participation 2004 panel, Wave 2; and American Community Survey 2006, Table B11009.

**Table 2. Characteristics of Opposite Sex Cohabiting Couples: ASEC 2007**

| | Unmarried Partner Households[1] | | | Additional Couples[2] | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number | Percent | Margin of error[3] | Number | Percent | Margin of error[3] |
| **Total** | 5,204 | 100.0 | X | 1,070 | 100.0 | X |
| **Relationship to Householder** | | | | | | |
| Householder or unmarried partner of householder | 5,204 | 100.0 | X | X | X | X |
| Householder and other nonrelative | X | X | X | 690 | 64.5 | 2.5 |
| Neither is householder | X | X | X | 380 | 35.5 | 2.5 |
| **Man's age** | | | | | | |
| 15 to 24 years | 883 | 17.0 | 0.9 | 292 | 27.3 | 2.3 |
| 25 to 39 years | 2,366 | 45.5 | 1.2 | 464 | 43.3 | 2.6 |
| 40 to 59 years | 1,580 | 30.4 | 1.1 | 238 | 22.2 | 2.1 |
| 60 and over | 375 | 7.2 | 0.6 | 76 | 7.1 | 1.3 |
| **Woman's age** | | | | | | |
| 15 to 24 years | 1,290 | 24.8 | 1.0 | 413 | 38.7 | 2.5 |
| 25 to 39 years | 2,214 | 42.5 | 1.2 | 360 | 33.7 | 2.4 |
| 40 to 59 years | 1,398 | 26.9 | 1.0 | 242 | 22.6 | 2.2 |
| 60 and over | 302 | 5.8 | 0.5 | 54 | 5.1 | 1.1 |
| **Couple's age gap** | | | | | | |
| Man is more than 4 years younger | 628 | 12.1 | 0.8 | 116 | 10.9 | 1.6 |
| Man is 2 to 4 years younger | 527 | 10.1 | 0.7 | 76 | 7.1 | 1.3 |
| Couple is within 1 year of each other | 1,359 | 26.1 | 1.0 | 309 | 28.9 | 2.3 |
| Man is 2 to 4 years older | 1,221 | 23.5 | 1.0 | 305 | 28.5 | 2.3 |
| Man is more than 4 years older | 1,469 | 28.2 | 1.1 | 263 | 24.6 | 2.2 |
| **Couple's race and origin** | | | | | | |
| Both White non-Hispanic | 3,239 | 62.2 | 1.1 | 647 | 60.5 | 2.5 |
| Both Black non-Hispanic | 521 | 10.0 | 0.7 | 84 | 7.9 | 1.4 |
| Both Other non-Hispanic | 136 | 2.6 | 0.4 | 44 | 4.2 | 1.0 |
| Both Hispanic | 526 | 10.1 | 0.7 | 139 | 13.0 | 1.7 |
| Neither Hispanic, different race groups | 361 | 6.9 | 0.6 | 56 | 5.3 | 1.2 |
| One is Hispanic, one is non-Hispanic | 422 | 8.1 | 0.6 | 99 | 9.2 | 1.5 |
| **Couple's marital status** | | | | | | |
| Both are never married | 2,523 | 48.5 | 1.2 | 619 | 57.9 | 2.5 |
| Man is ever married, woman is never married | 556 | 10.7 | 0.7 | 95 | 8.9 | 1.5 |
| Woman is ever married, man is never married | 641 | 12.3 | 0.8 | 104 | 9.7 | 1.5 |
| Both are ever married | 1,483 | 28.5 | 1.1 | 251 | 23.4 | 2.2 |
| **Presence of children** | | | | | | |
| No children are present | 3,005 | 57.7 | 1.2 | 717 | 67.0 | 2.4 |
| Children of one or both partners are present | 2,199 | 42.3 | 1.2 | 352 | 33.0 | 2.4 |
| Joint biological children | 1,088 | 20.9 | 1.0 | 151 | 14.2 | 1.8 |
| No joint biological kids, only she has children | 727 | 14.0 | 0.8 | 150 | 14.0 | 1.8 |
| No joint biological kids, only he has children | 211 | 4.1 | 0.5 | 34 | 3.1 | 0.9 |
| No joint biological kids, both have children | 173 | 3.3 | 0.4 | 17 | 1.6 | 0.6 |
| **Couple's educational attainment** | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Both have some college or less | 3,797 | 73.0 | 1.0 | 805 | 75.3 | 2.2 |
| Both have a bachelor's degree or more | 505 | 9.7 | 0.7 | 116 | 10.8 | 1.6 |
| He has at least a bachelor's, she does not | 421 | 8.1 | 0.6 | 57 | 5.3 | 1.2 |
| She has at least a bachelor's, he does not | 481 | 9.2 | 0.7 | 92 | 8.6 | 1.4 |
| **Couple's labor force participation** | | | | | | |
| Both are employed | 3,237 | 62.2 | 1.1 | 590 | 55.2 | 2.6 |
| Man employed, woman unemployed or NILF | 950 | 18.3 | 0.9 | 232 | 21.7 | 2.1 |
| Woman employed, man unemployed or NILF | 548 | 10.5 | 0.7 | 123 | 11.5 | 1.6 |
| Neither employed | 469 | 9.0 | 0.7 | 124 | 11.6 | 1.7 |

X- Not applicable.

1 Includes couples where one is the householder, and the other is reported as the unmarried partner on the relationship to householder item.

2 Includes couples where neither is reported as the unmarried partner of the householder on the relationship to householder item.

3 This number, when added to or subtracted from the estimate, represents the 90-percent confidence interval around the estimate.

NOTE:  The weight of the householder is used in instances where the unmarried couple includes the householder and the weight of the male partner is used for non-householder couples.  This follows current practice in decennial census data where the weight of the male is used for married couple subfamilies.

Source: Current Population Survey, Annual Social and Economic Supplement 2007; Survey of Income and Program Participation 2004 panel, Wave 2.

**Table 3. Same Sex Unmarried Couples**

(Numbers in thousands.)

| | Number | Percent of all unmarried couples | Margin of error[1] |
|---|---|---|---|
| **ASEC 2007** | 436 | 6.5 | 0.5 |
| **SIPP 2004** | 347 | 5.9 | 1.3 |
| **ACS 2006** | 780 | 13.0 | 0.2 |
| **Census 2000** | 594 | 10.9 | X |

[1] This number, when added to or subtracted from the estimate, represents the 90-percent confidence interval around the estimate.

X - Not applicable.  Data are from 100 percent enumeration.

Source:  Current Population Survey, Annual Social and Economic Supplement 2007; Survey of Income and Program Participation 2004 panel, Wave 2; American Community Survey 2006, Table B11009, and Census 2000, Table PCT14.

**Table 4. Children by Presence of Parent(s), ASEC 2007**

| | Old definition[1] | | | New definition[2] | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number | Percent | Margin of error[3] | Number | Percent | Margin of error[3] |
| Children[4] | 73,756 | 100.0 | (X) | 73,756 | 100.0 | (X) |
| Two parents | 49,999 | 67.8 | 0.6 | 52,154 | 70.7 | 0.6 |
| One parent | 21,201 | 28.7 | 0.6 | 19,047 | 25.8 | 0.5 |
| Mother only | 17,881 | 24.2 | 0.5 | 16,658 | 22.6 | 0.5 |
| Father only | 3,320 | 4.5 | 0.3 | 2,389 | 3.2 | 0.2 |
| No parent | 2,556 | 3.5 | 0.2 | 2,556 | 3.5 | 0.2 |

X - Not applicable.

[1] Before 2007, ASEC collected only one "parent pointer."  So the presence of two parents was only known if they were married to each other and both present in the household.

[2] In 2007, CPS began collecting information on the presence and type of two parents in the household.

[3] This number, when added to or subtracted from the estimate, represents the 90-percent confidence interval around the estimate.

[4] Excludes children under 18 who are family reference people or are the spouse of a family reference person.

Source:  Current Population Survey, Annual Social and Economic Supplement 2007

**Table 5. Children by Presence and Type of Parent(s), ASEC 2007 and SIPP 2004**

(Numbers in thousands)

| | SIPP 2004 | | | ASEC 2007[1] | | |
| | Total | | | Total | | |
| Living arrangements | Number | Percent | Margin of error[2] | Number | Percent | Margin of error[2] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Children | 73,227 | | | 73,756 | | |
| Percent | | 100.0 | (X) | | 100.0 | (X) |
| Living with -- | | | | | | |
| Two parents[3] | 51,013 | 69.7 | 0.7 | 52,154 | 70.7 * | 0.6 |
| Married parents | 48,787 | 66.6 | 0.7 | 49,999 | 67.8 * | 0.6 |
| Unmarried parents | 2,227 | 3.0 | 0.3 | 2,154 | 2.9 | 0.2 |
| | | | | | | |
| Biological mother and father | 44,541 | 60.8 | 0.8 | 46,681 | 63.3 * | 0.6 |
| Married parents | 42,727 | 58.3 | 0.8 | 44,808 | 60.8 * | 0.6 |
| Biological mother and stepfather | 4,149 | 5.7 | 0.4 | 3,312 | 4.5 * | 0.3 |
| Biological father and stepmother | 1,106 | 1.5 | 0.2 | 994 | 1.3 | 0.1 |
| Biological mother and adoptive father | 407 | 0.6 | 0.1 | 214 | 0.3 * | 0.1 |
| Biological father and adoptive mother | 49 | 0.1 | - | 32 | 0.0 * | 0.1 |
| Adoptive mother and father | 668 | 0.9 | 0.1 | 739 | 1.0 | 0.1 |
| Other[4] | 95 | 0.1 | - | 182 | 0.2 * | - |
| | | | | | | |
| One parent | 19,336 | 26.4 | 0.7 | 19,047 | 25.8 | 0.5 |
| Mother only | 16,973 | 23.2 | 0.7 | 16,658 | 22.6 | 0.5 |
| Biological | 16,574 | 22.6 | 0.7 | 16,346 | 22.2 | 0.5 |
| Father only | 2,363 | 3.2 | 0.3 | 2,389 | 3.2 | 0.2 |
| Biological | 2,280 | 3.1 | 0.2 | 2,318 | 3.1 | 0.2 |
| No parent | 2,878 | 3.9 | 0.3 | 2,556 | 3.5 * | 0.2 |
| Grandparents only | 1,598 | 2.2 | 0.2 | 1,306 | 1.8 * | 0.2 |
| Other relatives only | 641 | 0.9 | 0.1 | 784 | 1.1 * | 0.1 |
| Nonrelatives only | 558 | 0.8 | 0.1 | 465 | 0.6 * | 0.1 |
| Other arrangement | 81 | 0.1 | - | 91 | 0.1 | - |
| | | | | | | |
| At least 1 biological parent | 69,105 | 94.4 | 0.4 | 69,897 | 94.8 | 0.3 |
| At least 1 stepparent | 5,532 | 7.6 | 0.4 | 4,607 | 6.2 * | 0.3 |
| At least 1 adoptive parent | 1,504 | 2.1 | 0.2 | 1,271 | 1.7 * | 0.2 |

Dash ("-") Represents or rounds to zero.

X - Not applicable.

* Different at the 90 percent confidence level from the corresponding SIPP 2004 percentage.

1 Excludes children under 18 who are family reference people or are the spouse of a family reference person.

2 This number, when added to or subtracted from the estimate, represents the 90-percent confidence interval
 around the estimate.

3 In the Survey of Income and Program Participation, two coresident parents can be identified regardless of their

marital status.  This means that both married and unmarried parents are included in this category in this table.

4 Includes children living with one adoptive parent and one stepparent, or two stepparents.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Survey of Income and Program Participation, 2004 Panel, Wave 2; Current Population Survey, Annual Social and Economic Supplement, 2007.

**Table 6. Children by Cohabitation Status of Parents, ASEC 2007 and SIPP 2004**

(Numbers in thousands)

| Living arrangements of children | SIPP 2004 | | | ASEC 2007 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number | Margin of error[1] | Percent | Number | Margin of error[1] | Percent |
| Total | 73,227 | 940 | 100.0 | 73,756 | 277 | 100.0 |
| **Living with married parents** | 48,787 | 826 | 66.6 | 49,999 | 461 | 67.8 * |
| **Living with no parent** | 2,878 | 225 | 3.9 | 2,556 | 165 | 3.5 * |
| **Living with an unmarried parent[2]** | 21,563 | 589 | 29.4 | 21,201 | 416 | 28.7 |
| Living with unmarried mother and father | 2,227 | 198 | 3.0 | 2,154 | 152 | 2.9 |
| Living with unmarried mother only | 16,973 | 528 | 23.2 | 16,658 | 382 | 22.6 |
| Living with unmarried father only | 2,363 | 204 | 3.2 | 2,389 | 160 | 3.2 |
| | | | | | | |
| Parent has an unmarried partner[3] | 3,857 | 260 | 5.3 | 4,236 | 210 | 5.7 |
| Biological mother and father | 1,814 | 179 | 2.5 | 1,873 | 142 | 2.5 |
| Biological mother, step or adoptive father | 324 | 76 | 0.4 | 213 | 48 | 0.3 |
| Biological father, step or adoptive mother | 87 | 39 | 0.1 | 61 | 26 | 0.1 |
| Biological mother, partner | 1,271 | 150 | 1.7 | 1,551 | 129 | 2.1 * |
| Biological father, partner | 308 | 74 | 0.4 | 435 | 69 | 0.6 * |
| Step or adoptive parent, partner | 51 | 30 | 0.1 | 96 | 33 | 0.1 |
| | | | | | | |
| Parent has no unmarried partner | 17,705 | 539 | 24.2 | 16,966 | 385 | 23.0 * |
| Biological mother | 15,303 | 504 | 20.9 | 14,795 | 365 | 20.1 |
| Biological father | 1,972 | 186 | 2.7 | 1,883 | 142 | 2.6 |
| Step parent or adoptive parent | 429 | 87 | 0.6 | 288 | 56 | 0.4 * |

* Different at the 90 percent confidence level from the corresponding SIPP 2004 percentage.

[1] This number, when added to or subtracted from the estimate, represents the 90-percent confidence interval around the estimate.

[2] Unmarried includes married spouse absent, widowed, divorced, separated, and never married.

[3] Includes seven thousand weighted children with adoptive and step parents only.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Survey of Income and Program Participation, 2004 Panel, Wave 2;
Current Population Survey, Annual Social and Economic Supplement, 2007.

**Table 7. Children Living With Two Parents, by State of Residence: ASEC 2007 and SIPP 2004**

(Numbers in thousands)

| State | SIPP 2004 Total children | Living with two parents[2] Percent | Living with two parents[2] Margin of error[1] | ASEC 2007[3] Total children | Living with two parents[2] Percent | Living with two parents[2] Margin of error[1] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| TOTAL | 73,227 | 69.7 | 0.7 | 73,756 | 70.7 | 0.6 |
| Alabama | 1,121 | 57.4 | 9.1 | 1,110 | 66.9 | 4.8 |
| Alaska[4] | 182 | 80.9 | 12.9 | 181 | 73.5 | 4.6 |
| Arizona | 1,563 | 71.5 | 5.2 | 1,654 | 70.6 | 4.1 |
| Arkansas | 617 | 69.9 | 10.3 | 695 | 65.8 | 4.9 |
| California | 9,498 | 72.2 | 2.0 | 9,525 | 75.3 | 1.6 |
| Colorado | 1,180 | 78.7 | 2.6 | 1,204 | 76.5 | 4.4 |
| Connecticut | 821 | 68.2 | 4.1 | 815 | 70.8 | 5.0 |
| Delaware[4] | 182 | 64.9 | 13.6 | 204 | 66.6 | 5.1 |
| District of Columbia[4] | 78 | 10.9 | 7.8 | 115 | 40.1 | 6.4 |
| Florida | 3,968 | 67.2 | 2.4 | 4,049 | 66.6 | 2.6 |
| Georgia | 2,355 | 68.9 | 4.7 | 2,443 | 69.2 | 3.2 |
| Hawaii4 | 273 | 77.3 | 7.1 | 297 | 74.2 | 4.5 |
| Idaho4 | 387 | 76.6 | 9.0 | 401 | 77.3 | 4.2 |
| Illinois | 3,267 | 69.8 | 2.8 | 3,176 | 72.9 | 2.8 |
| Indiana | 1,610 | 71.1 | 3.1 | 1,573 | 73.9 | 3.8 |
| Iowa | 743 | 77.2 | 2.9 | 703 | 74.5 | 4.8 |
| Kansas | 728 | 79.7 | 3.7 | 695 | 70.1 | 4.9 |
| Kentucky | 1,019 | 68.3 | 7.0 | 1,000 | 69.0 | 5.0 |
| Louisiana | 1,147 | 49.0 | 5.7 | 1,059 | 62.5 | 5.1 |
| Maine[4] | 264 | 74.4 | 5.6 | 285 | 72.1 | 5.5 |
| Maryland | 1,382 | 70.2 | 2.9 | 1,378 | 64.0 | 4.6 |
| Massachusetts | 1,491 | 73.2 | 2.8 | 1,467 | 73.6 | 3.9 |
| Michigan | 2,519 | 68.0 | 4.6 | 2,444 | 69.9 | 3.2 |
| Minnesota | 1,229 | 74.3 | 4.0 | 1,256 | 77.9 | 4.0 |
| Mississippi | 753 | 63.2 | 3.6 | 772 | 61.6 | 4.9 |
| Missouri | 1,423 | 69.3 | 3.8 | 1,397 | 69.1 | 4.3 |
| Montana[4] | 228 | 66.6 | 15.6 | 211 | 71.2 | 5.1 |
| Nebraska[4] | 467 | 84.5 | 5.2 | 443 | 79.6 | 4.3 |
| Nevada[4] | 544 | 70.8 | 11.9 | 645 | 67.1 | 5.0 |
| New Hampshire[4] | 309 | 83.4 | 8.5 | 300 | 78.7 | 4.6 |
| New Jersey | 2,148 | 71.3 | 3.7 | 2,077 | 74.9 | 3.3 |
| New Mexico[4] | 536 | 72.4 | 7.0 | 517 | 65.2 | 5.3 |
| New York | 4,526 | 62.9 | 3.3 | 4,516 | 67.8 | 2.5 |
| North Carolina | 2,121 | 63.5 | 4.5 | 2,188 | 66.0 | 3.5 |
| North Dakota[4] | 161 | 79.1 | 14.5 | 144 | 71.1 | 5.0 |
| Ohio | 2,758 | 71.6 | 4.7 | 2,777 | 68.0 | 3.1 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Oklahoma | 865 | 69.2 | 5.9 | 906 | 64.9 | 5.0 |
| Oregon | 849 | 71.1 | 5.6 | 870 | 77.2 | 4.7 |
| Pennsylvania | 2,781 | 69.9 | 3.6 | 2,770 | 69.8 | 3.0 |
| Rhode Island[4] | 204 | 72.4 | 11.0 | 237 | 70.3 | 5.4 |
| South Carolina | 995 | 63.2 | 4.6 | 1,030 | 64.5 | 5.1 |
| South Dakota[4] | 165 | 74.4 | 13.2 | 193 | 77.5 | 4.1 |
| Tennessee | 1,423 | 64.5 | 4.8 | 1,466 | 66.1 | 4.3 |
| Texas | 6,239 | 68.0 | 3.0 | 6,507 | 70.8 | 2.1 |
| Utah | 887 | 85.0 | 3.0 | 801 | 80.4 | 3.4 |
| Vermont[4] | 118 | 78.9 | 15.8 | 133 | 74.9 | 5.3 |
| Virginia | 1,820 | 77.7 | 2.7 | 1,815 | 73.1 | 3.6 |
| Washington | 1,488 | 73.6 | 2.8 | 1,510 | 71.0 | 4.2 |
| West Virginia[4] | 359 | 73.6 | 10.7 | 395 | 70.0 | 4.8 |
| Wisconsin | 1,306 | 67.5 | 5.9 | 1,286 | 71.7 | 4.4 |
| Wyoming[4] | 135 | 88.5 | 16.2 | 122 | 76.3 | 4.9 |

Dash ("-") Represents or rounds to zero.

[1] This number, when added to or subtracted from the estimate, represents the 90-percent confidence interval around the estimate.

[2] Two coresident parents can be identified regardless of their marital status.
This means that both married and unmarried parents are included in this category in this table.

[3] Excludes children under 18 who are family reference people or are the spouse of a family reference person.

[4] Due to small sample sizes  for SIPP in the smaller populated states, the accuracy of the margins of error
may be inherently unstable.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Survey of Income and Program Participation, 2004 Panel, Wave 2;
Current Population Survey, Annual Social and Economic Supplement, 2007.

**Table 8. Percent of Children Living With One Parent, or No Parents, by State of Residence: ASEC 2007 and SIPP 2004**

| State | SIPP 2004 Living with mother only | | SIPP 2004 Living with father only | ASEC 2007[2] Living with mother only | | ASEC 2007[2] Living with father only | SIPP 2004 Living with no parent | | ASEC 2007[2] Living with no parent | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Percent | Margin of error[1] | Percent | Percent | Margin of error[1] | Percent | Percent | Margin of error[1] | Percent | Margin of error[1] |
| TOTAL | 23.2 | 0.6 | 3.2 | 22.6 | 0.5 | 3.2 | 3.9 | 0.3 | 3.5 | 0.2 |
| Alabama | 29.6 | 5.2 | 5.2 | 26.2 | 4.5 | 1.7 | 7.9 | 2.7 | 5.2 | 2.3 |
| Alaska[3] | 15.3 | 9.9 | - | 17.2 | 4.0 | 4.2 | 3.8 | 3.3 | 5.1 | 2.3 |
| Arizona | 20.7 | 3.4 | 3.9 | 21.1 | 3.7 | 4.2 | 3.9 | 2.0 | 4.2 | 1.8 |
| Arkansas | 20.0 | 10.8 | 3.9 | 26.0 | 4.6 | 2.9 | 6.2 | 3.3 | 5.3 | 2.3 |
| California | 21.3 | 1.8 | 2.6 | 18.4 | 1.5 | 3.0 | 3.9 | 0.8 | 3.3 | 0.7 |
| Colorado | 14.2 | 3.6 | 4.8 | 17.3 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 2.3 | 1.5 | 2.9 | 1.7 |
| Connecticut | 27.1 | 4.2 | 2.7 | 22.5 | 4.6 | 3.1 | 2.1 | 1.8 | 3.7 | 2.0 |
| Delaware[3] | 32.5 | 14.7 | 1.0 | 22.6 | 4.6 | 5.0 | 1.7 | 2.3 | 5.8 | 2.6 |
| District of Columbia[3] | 79.8 | 13.4 | 3.3 | 48.0 | 6.6 | 5.8 | 5.9 | 7.5 | 6.1 | 3.1 |
| Florida | 24.7 | 2.2 | 3.4 | 25.8 | 2.4 | 3.6 | 4.8 | 1.2 | 3.9 | 1.1 |
| Georgia | 21.5 | 4.3 | 3.8 | 24.3 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 5.8 | 0.9 | 3.5 | 1.3 |
| Hawaii[3] | 20.1 | 4.8 | - | 18.0 | 4.0 | 3.2 | 2.6 | 3.1 | 4.6 | 2.2 |
| Idaho[3] | 17.0 | 10.0 | 1.1 | 16.6 | 3.7 | 3.1 | 5.4 | 6.7 | 3.0 | 1.7 |
| Illinois | 22.5 | 3.7 | 4.5 | 21.7 | 2.6 | 3.0 | 3.2 | 0.6 | 2.4 | 1.0 |
| Indiana | 22.6 | 2.5 | 3.3 | 21.7 | 3.6 | 2.7 | 3.1 | 0.8 | 1.7 | 1.1 |
| Iowa | 16.4 | 2.5 | 4.1 | 19.0 | 4.3 | 3.4 | 2.3 | 1.2 | 3.2 | 1.9 |
| Kansas | 15.6 | 4.9 | 3.0 | 23.5 | 4.6 | 4.2 | 1.8 | 1.7 | 2.1 | 1.6 |
| Kentucky | 21.6 | 3.7 | 4.8 | 23.7 | 4.6 | 3.6 | 5.3 | 2.7 | 3.7 | 2.0 |
| Louisiana | 39.4 | 5.8 | 3.7 | 26.5 | 4.6 | 4.2 | 7.9 | 2.5 | 6.8 | 2.6 |
| Maine[3] | 20.9 | 5.3 | 2.8 | 20.3 | 4.9 | 5.3 | 2.0 | 0.9 | 2.4 | 1.9 |
| Maryland | 22.1 | 3.6 | 3.1 | 25.7 | 4.2 | 4.4 | 4.6 | 1.7 | 5.9 | 2.2 |
| Massachusetts | 21.5 | 3.3 | 2.9 | 21.9 | 3.7 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 1.6 | 2.0 | 1.3 |
| Michigan | 25.1 | 4.9 | 3.0 | 23.5 | 3.0 | 4.2 | 3.9 | 1.3 | 2.3 | 1.1 |
| Minnesota | 17.8 | 2.6 | 5.9 | 17.9 | 3.7 | 2.3 | 1.9 | 0.7 | 1.9 | 1.3 |
| Mississippi | 28.8 | 4.1 | 1.3 | 32.4 | 4.7 | 0.7 | 6.7 | 1.4 | 5.3 | 2.3 |
| Missouri | 23.2 | 3.7 | 3.4 | 22.9 | 3.9 | 3.5 | 4.1 | 2.0 | 4.6 | 2.0 |
| Montana[3] | 20.9 | 9.4 | 4.6 | 18.6 | 4.4 | 7.4 | 7.9 | 12.1 | 2.8 | 1.9 |
| Nebraska[3] | 7.0 | 5.1 | 4.4 | 15.6 | 3.9 | 2.5 | 4.1 | 3.3 | 2.3 | 1.6 |
| Nevada[3] | 23.9 | 10.6 | 2.5 | 24.5 | 4.6 | 3.8 | 2.7 | 2.9 | 4.6 | 2.2 |
| New Hampshire[3] | 16.7 | 8.5 | - | 15.1 | 4.0 | 4.4 | - | - | 1.9 | 1.5 |
| New Jersey | 23.7 | 3.4 | 2.5 | 20.9 | 3.1 | 2.2 | 2.5 | 1.3 | 2.0 | 1.1 |
| New Mexico[3] | 24.6 | 6.5 | 0.6 | 24.2 | 4.8 | 6.5 | 2.4 | 1.7 | 4.1 | 2.2 |
| New York | 31.6 | 2.9 | 3.4 | 26.5 | 2.4 | 2.5 | 2.2 | 1.2 | 3.1 | 0.9 |
| North Carolina | 25.6 | 3.9 | 3.2 | 26.6 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 7.8 | 3.2 | 3.9 | 1.4 |
| North Dakota[3] | 15.5 | 8.6 | - | 23.0 | 4.6 | 2.7 | 5.4 | 7.9 | 3.3 | 2.0 |
| Ohio | 23.3 | 4.2 | 2.3 | 26.2 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 2.8 | 1.5 | 2.8 | 1.1 |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Oklahoma | 22.4 | 5.1 | 3.2 | 25.5 | 4.6 | 4.8 | 5.3 | 3.1 | 4.8 | 2.3 |
| Oregon | 16.6 | 3.3 | 6.5 | 14.9 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 5.8 | 2.7 | 4.4 | 2.3 |
| Pennsylvania | 21.4 | 2.5 | 3.7 | 23.1 | 2.8 | 4.5 | 5.1 | 1.5 | 2.6 | 1.1 |
| Rhode Island[3] | 24.3 | 14.2 | - | 25.3 | 5.1 | 2.7 | 3.2 | 3.5 | 1.6 | 1.5 |
| South Carolina | 29.6 | 4.6 | 1.9 | 27.3 | 4.7 | 3.6 | 5.2 | 2.0 | 4.6 | 2.2 |
| South Dakota[3] | 21.6 | 11.7 | 4.1 | 16.8 | 3.7 | 3.9 | - | - | 1.8 | 1.3 |
| Tennessee | 28.1 | 5.6 | 2.2 | 24.7 | 3.9 | 4.1 | 5.2 | 1.3 | 5.1 | 2.0 |
| Texas | 24.6 | 2.6 | 3.0 | 22.7 | 2.0 | 2.5 | 4.4 | 1.0 | 4.0 | 0.9 |
| Utah | 9.8 | 1.2 | 2.6 | 16.1 | 3.2 | 1.6 | 2.6 | 1.1 | 1.9 | 1.2 |
| Vermont[3] | 15.1 | 13.8 | 3.7 | 16.2 | 4.5 | 6.0 | 2.3 | 7.1 | 2.9 | 2.1 |
| Virginia | 18.8 | 2.0 | 1.9 | 20.8 | 3.3 | 2.2 | 1.7 | 0.5 | 3.9 | 1.6 |
| Washington | 20.9 | 2.7 | 2.8 | 22.0 | 3.8 | 4.2 | 2.7 | 0.7 | 2.8 | 1.5 |
| West Virginia[3] | 19.7 | 16.3 | 3.6 | 21.5 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 3.9 | 4.5 | 2.2 |
| Wisconsin | 24.4 | 3.8 | 6.1 | 20.6 | 3.9 | 4.4 | 1.9 | 1.0 | 3.2 | 1.7 |
| Wyoming[3] | 7.0 | 4.7 | - | 14.3 | 4.1 | 5.4 | 4.4 | 8.4 | 3.9 | 2.3 |

Dash ("-") Represents or rounds to zero.

[1] This number, when added to or subtracted from the estimate, represents the 90-percent confidence interval around the estimate.

[2] Excludes children under 18 who are family reference people or are the spouse of a family reference person.

[3] Due to small sample sizes for SIPP in the smaller populated states, the accuracy of the margins of error may be inherently unstable.