Evaluation of Median Income and Earnings Estimates:

A Comparison of the American Community Survey and the Current
Population Survey

Bruce H. Webster Jr.
Income Surveys Branch
Housing and Household Economics Statistics Division
U.S. Census Bureau

March 12, 2007

Introduction

This report is one in a series of reports that compares data from the American Community Survey (ACS) with data from the Current Population Survey (CPS) Annual Social and Economic Supplement (ASEC). The data analysis in this report focuses on comparisons of national estimates of income between the 2004 and 2005 ACS and the 2005 and 2006 CPS ASEC (income years 2004 and 2005). This analysis also compares state level estimates from the 2005 ACS with 2-year average estimates from CPS ASEC. The report looks for both statistical and substantive differences, and possible explanations. This report also examines methodological differences in the collection of income data between the two surveys.

Methodology

The tables included in this report compare income summary measures from the ACS and ASEC. Comparisons consist primarily of differences between the income estimates. Tables display the ACS and ASEC estimates, the margins of error representing the 90 percent confidence interval of the estimates, and the percent differences between estimates (defined as the ACS estimate minus the ASEC estimate, all divided by the average of the two estimates). An asterisk (*) denotes a statistically significant difference.

At the national level, the ACS and ASEC variances were quite small, resulting in many statistically significant differences between the ACS and ASEC income estimates, although some of those differences may not be substantive. The remainder of the methodology section examines differences across the two surveys that may help to explain and substantiate differences between the two surveys.

Sample frame

Both the 2004 and 2005 ACS surveyed a national sample of housing units, both occupied and vacant. Data were collected in all of the nation's 3,141 counties in 2005, and in a sample of 1,240 counties in 2004. The 2005 sample is designed to provide estimates of housing and socio-economic characteristics of the household population for the nation, all states, and all areas with a population of 65,000 or more.

The 2005 and 2006 ASEC surveyed a national sample of housing units and noninstitutional group quarters. Data were collected in 1,389 counties for both the 2005 and the 2006 ASEC. The sample is designed primarily to produce estimates of the labor force characteristics of the civilian noninstitutional population 16 years of age and older for the nation and all states.

A primary difference between the two survey universes is that the ASEC, unlike the ACS, may include noninstitutional group quarters (e.g. college dormitories, emergency

and transitional shelters, worker dormitories, and group homes) if these units are part of the sampling frame.[1]

Sample size and mode of data collection

The 2004 ACS interviewed a total of 586,966 addresses, while the 2005 ACS interviewed a total of 1,924,527 addresses. Data were collected continuously throughout the year using a combination of mail-out/mail-back questionnaires, Computer-Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI), and Computer-Assisted Personal Interviewing (CAPI). Each month a unique national sample of addresses receives an ACS questionnaire. Addresses that do not respond are telephoned during the second month of collection if a phone number for the address is available, and personal visits are conducted during the third (the last month of data collection) for a subsample of the remaining nonresponding units. The 2004 ACS achieved an overall survey response rate, calculated as the initially weighted estimate of interviews divided by the initially weighted estimate of cases eligible to be interviewed, of 93.1 percent[2], while the 2005 ACS response rate was 97.3 percent.

The 2005 ASEC contained interviews from about 99,000 households, while the 2006 ASEC contained interviews from about 97,400 households. The ASEC interviews were collected over a three-month period – February, March, and April – in 2005 and 2006 as a supplement to the basic monthly CPS conducted during those months, with most of the data collected in March. All ASEC data are collected via CATI/CAPI, with interviews conducted over a 10-day period each month.[3] The response rate for the 2005 ASEC was 90.5 percent, and the response rate for the 2006 ASEC was 90.9 percent. Both the ACS and ASEC employ experienced permanent interviewers for CATI and CAPI data collection.

Residence rules

The ACS and the ASEC employ different residence rules to determine which individuals in a household are eligible for interview; the ACS uses the concept of current residence

---

[1] Another difference to note is in the sampling frames. The ACS used the Master Address File as the only sampling frame, and this is updated semi-annually from Post Office records, while the CPS selected a sample of building permits in most areas for both the 2005 ASEC and the 2006 ASEC to supplement the older construction taken from the 2000 Census.

[2] As a result of a reduction in funding in 2004, ACS dropped the telephone and personal visit follow-up operations for the January 2004 panel, thus only allowing mail respondents to contribute to the overall response for that panel. Dropping the nonresponse follow-up operations for that single panel month reduced the annual response rate by about four percentage points. If we exclude the January panel from the calculation, the annual response rate rises to 97.3%. More discussion of this can be found at http://www.census.gov/acs/www/acs-php/quality_measures_response_2005.php.

[3] Approximately 6,000 households in the sample, or about 1/10th of the sample, have their interviews conducted over a three-week period in February and April. This is done primarily to augment the survey to publish health insurance estimates used for the State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP). These households are chosen from the previous year's sample, and are households with children, or with minority, non-Hispanic householders.

while the ASEC uses a version of usual residence. This difference may contribute to variation in the universes on which social characteristics depend.

The ACS interviews everyone who is in the housing unit on the day of interview who is living or staying in the sample unit for more than two months, regardless of whether or not they maintain a usual residence elsewhere, as well as all people staying there who do not have a usual residence elsewhere. If a person who usually lives in the housing unit is away for more than two months at the time of the survey contact, he or she is not a current resident of that unit. This rule recognizes that people can have more than one place where they live or stay over the course of a year, and these people could affect estimates of population characteristics for some substate areas.

The ASEC interviews everyone staying in the sample housing unit at the time of the interview who considers the housing unit as their usual residence or who has no usual residence elsewhere. In addition, the ASEC also includes temporarily absent individuals who consider the housing unit as their usual residence. In theory, the ASEC residence rules and sampling frame would allow for college students who are away from home temporarily to be counted at their parent's residence.

While the use of usual residence or current residence as the classification basis would produce substantially the same statistics for the vast majority of areas of the country, there might be appreciable differences for areas where large numbers of people spend several months of the year in units that they do not consider their "usual" residences. Given that this report only compares national and state data, the difference in residence rules likely plays little role in any observed difference in the estimates.

Questionnaire Items On Income

Among other questions, the ACS asks people 15 years and older about money income from various sources during the last 12 months as measured from the survey interview date to a year ago (questionnaire items 41 and 42 on the 2004/2005 ACS questionnaire). Thus, during a given year, there are 12 different reference periods spanning 23 months. The income types included are as follows:

1. wages, salary, commissions, bonuses, or tips from all jobs;
2. self-employment income from own nonfarm businesses or farm businesses, including proprietorships and partnerships;
3. interest, dividends, net rental income, royalty income, or income from estates and trusts;
4. Social Security or Railroad Retirement;
5. Supplemental Security income (SSI);
6. any public assistance or welfare payments from the state or local welfare office;
7. retirement, survivor, or disability pensions; and
8. income from any other sources received regularly such as Veterans' payments, unemployment compensation, child support or alimony.

Each question asks first if the type of income was received during the reference period. If a positive response is given, the dollar amount of that income is requested.

Income data are collected as part of the ASEC in the months of February, March and April as a supplement to the regular CPS monthly labor force interviews. The ASEC asks each person in the sample who is 15 years old and over about the amount of income received from a list of sources in the previous calendar year. This list of income types is both longer and more detailed than the ACS types of income. The ASEC asks a series of questions identifying more than 50 sources of income and collecting data for each source separately (Appendix D of the "Current Population Survey, Annual Social and Economic Supplement 2006, Technical Documentation" contains the full ASEC questionnaire).[4] Income items are collected using separate questions for each income source, such as income from own business, farm, unemployment compensation, and income from worker's compensation payments, and continues up to a series of questions on other income sources such as hobbies, severance pay, and others. It is believed that this series of probing income questions helps respondents to remember and report smaller amounts which otherwise could have been forgotten.

Item nonresponse

Item nonresponse is the failure of a responding unit to provide complete and usable information for a data item. Item allocation rates are often used as a measure of the level of item nonresponse. These rates are computed as the ratio of the number of eligible people or households for which a value was allocated for a specific item to the number of people or households eligible to have responded to that item. For example, one element of income is earnings. In the 2005 ACS, 13.5 percent of eligible respondents' had at least some of their earnings data allocated, while in the 2004 ACS it was 14.0 percent. In the 2006 ASEC (2005 income data), 29.9 percent of eligible respondents' had at least some of their earnings data allocated, while in the 2005 ASEC it was 32.6 percent. For more information on nonresponse rates, see the Data Quality Measures on the ACS website at <http://www.census.gov/acs/www/UseData/sse/index.htm>, and for ASEC, the CPS Technical Paper 66.

Eligible respondents

In the 2000 through 2005 ACS, data tabulation was limited only to people living in housing units. It includes both the civilian and military populations and excludes group quarter residents. On the other hand, the ASEC represents the civilian non-institutional population and therefore includes people living in noninstitutional group quarters, such as college dormitories. The ASEC data collection includes military personnel who live in housing units with at least one other civilian adult. The income universe for both surveys

---

[4] The 2006 Public Use File technical documentation is available online at http://www.census.gov/apsd/techdoc/cps/cpsmar06.pdf. The 2005 ACS Questionnaire is available online at http://www.census.gov/acs/www/Downloads/SQuest05.pdf.

excludes individuals under 15 years old, people living in military barracks, and people living in institutional group quarters.

College students living in dormitories are treated differently in the two surveys. The CPS includes these students in the household where they maintain their permanent address, that is, their family home address within the United States. The ACS did not include group quarters in 2004 or 2005; thus, college students living (away from their parent's house) in dormitories for more than 2 months were not included. As a result, during some of the data collection period – for example in August when college students may be living at home on summer break – data on college students may have been collected with their families.

At other times during the year – for example in April when college students have likely been living away from their parents' home for more than 2 months – data on college students may not have been collected in the ACS. When ACS adds group quarters, the college dormitory residents will be sampled and interviewed. This exclusion of group quarters population may have a slight effect on some ACS income estimates. Since people in households tend to have higher incomes than people living in group quarters, the ACS per capita income may be higher than if it included group quarters residents. The ACS began to include group quarters population in 2006.

Time frame / Reference period

Since the ACS collects data nearly everyday of the year and asks for income received during the 12 months previous to the interview, the yearly estimates combine 12 different reference periods spanning 23 months. For example, for a household responding in October of 2005, the reference period for reporting income was October 2004 through September 2005. This type of reference period presents a challenge to respondents who are more used to thinking of income in terms of calendar year as they do for tax-reporting purposes. The income estimates for the given year include all the people interviewed in that year, regardless of the reference period. As an example, income estimates from the 2005 ACS represent a reference period that spans from January 2004 though November 2005 (see Figure 1). All income estimates are inflation adjusted to reflect calendar year dollars. That is, the 12 different reference periods are adjusted to reflect a fixed reference period, from January to December of the given year, using the Consumer Price Index (CPI).

On the other hand, the ASEC conducts interviews from February to April and asks about the previous calendar year income-- the 2006 ASEC uses 2005 as the income reference period. The ASEC is conducted during these three months to take advantage of the individual income tax-reporting time frame. Since April 15th is the deadline for filing the previous year's tax returns, respondents are likely to have recently prepared tax returns or be in the midst of preparing such returns and might report their income more accurately than at other times of the year.

Comparison of Income Estimates
National estimates of median household income

Median household income for the nation from the 2005 ACS was $46,242. The same estimate from the 2004 ACS was $46,178 (in 2005 dollars). These estimates are not statistically different from each other.

The 2006 ASEC estimated national median household income for 2005 at $46,326. The 2005 ASEC estimate for 2004 was $45,817 (in 2005 dollars). This is an increase of 1.1 percent in inflation-adjusted dollars between 2004 and 2005.

Comparing the estimates across the two surveys, neither the 2004 nor the 2005 national median household income estimates were statistically different from each other.

Race[5]

Both surveys include estimates of national median household income by race and Hispanic origin.[6] The ASEC has one-year and two-year estimates[7] for race groups, and this paper will make comparisons to both sets of estimates for the following groups; Whites, White non-Hispanics, Blacks, Asians, and Hispanics.

The two surveys show the same trends in income by race, for both 2004 and 2005 (see Table 1). Asians had the highest median household income, followed by Whites and White non-Hispanics. Blacks had the lowest median household income in both surveys, preceded by Hispanics. This is true of the ACS estimates and the one-year and two-year estimates from the ASEC.

Comparing the 2005 one-year estimates between the two surveys shows that the only race group with a significant difference was Whites. The ACS estimate of median income for White households, at $49,453, and the ASEC estimate, at $48,554, has a difference of 1.8%. In 2004, the estimates for both the White race group and the Hispanics were different between the two surveys. The same significant differences were seen between the ACS and the two-year ASEC estimates.

---

[5] Federal Surveys now give respondents the option of reporting more than one race. Therefore, two basic ways of defining a race group, such as Asian, are possible. The first includes those who reported Asian and no other race (Asian alone); the second includes everyone who reported Asian regardless of whether they reported another race (Asian alone or in combination with one or more races). The use of the single-race population in this report does not imply that is the preferred method of presenting or analyzing data. The Census uses a variety of approaches.

[6] The householder is the person (or one of the people) in whose name the unit is owned or rented, and the person to whom the relationship of other household members is recorded. If the unit is owned jointly by a married couple, either the husband or the wife may be listed as the householder. Since only one person in each household is designated as the householder, the number of householders is equal to the number of households. This report uses the characteristics of the householder to describe the household.

[7] The two-year average median is the sum of two inflation adjusted (real) one-year medians divided by two.

Earnings of Full-Time, Year-Round Workers

The earnings for full-time year-round workers by sex are also available from both surveys, and these estimates are contained in Table 1 as well. In 2005, the ACS estimate of median earnings for male full-time, year round workers was $41,965, a decrease from an inflation-adjusted 2004 estimate of $42,572. In 2005, females working full-time, year-round had a median of $32,168, again a decrease from an inflation-adjusted 2004 estimate of $32,423.

In the ASEC, a similar pattern is observed – both men and women showed decreases in median earnings for full-time, year-round workers. In 2005, the ASEC estimate for males was $41,386, significantly lower than the inflation-adjusted 2004 estimate of $42,160. Females working full-time, year-round in 2005 had a median of $31,858; a decrease from the inflation-adjusted 2004 estimate of $32,285.

A comparison of the estimates between the two surveys shows that for both males and females, the 2005 ACS estimate is significantly higher than the 2005 ASEC estimate. The $579 difference in the estimates for male full-time, year-round workers was equivalent to a 1.4 percent difference. For female full-time, year-round workers, the $310 difference was a 1.0 percent difference. The 2004 estimate for males in the ACS was also 1.0 percent higher than the same estimate from the ASEC.[8]

Per Capita Income

The per capita income of the nation was available from both surveys   Table 1 shows that in 2005 the ACS estimate of per capita income is $25,035. This was 0.8 percent higher than the inflation-adjusted 2004 ACS estimate, of $24,823.

Once again, the ASEC shows a similar trend. The 2005 ASEC estimate was $25,036, 1.5 percent higher than the inflation-adjusted 2004 ASEC estimate, which was $24,655.

A comparison of the per capita estimates across the two surveys does not show any significant differences.

State Estimates of Median Household Income

The ASEC uses multi-year averages to increase the reliability of state estimates. This paper uses two-year averages of 2004 and 2005 data (the two calendar years covered by the 2005 and 2006 ASEC), since they approximate the reference period of the 2005 ACS respondents (as shown in Figure 1), and provide more reliable estimates than 2005 alone.

A two-year average rate represents the effects of a two-year economic period, and situations may occur during that timeframe that have a bearing on median household

---

[8] The mentioned differences between ACS vs ASEC in this paragraph were not intended to imply differences of differences, there is no statistical difference between the 1.4 and either 1.0 difference.

incomes, depending on the direction of the economic change over that period. If the economy is improving in the second year of the average, the two-year median household income of a given state may be lower than it would be if only the second year's data was included.

Table 2 presents national and state data comparing two-year ASEC estimates to 2005 ACS estimates. At the national level, the two-year median household income from the ASEC ($46,071) is not statistically different from the 2005 ACS estimate of $46,242.

In 19 states, the two-year ASEC estimates differed from the 2005 ACS estimates. In 12 of those states (Idaho, Iowa, Minnesota, Nebraska, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia) the two-year ASEC was higher. In the other seven states (California, Connecticut, Georgia, Illinois, Montana, New York, Virginia), the ASEC estimate was lower than the ACS estimate. The absolute value differences ranged from 3.1 percent to 11.3 percent.

Summary

This report shows that ASEC and ACS estimates are relatively consistent in their estimates of income at the national level. Differences in methodology suggest that one of the surveys may result in higher or lower estimates of income, but the data do not show a systematic difference between the two surveys.

There is some evidence of a difference in the measurement of earnings. The 2005 and 2004 ACS estimates of median earnings for full-time year-round workers are higher than the same estimates from the ASEC. This difference is seen for both men and women in 2005 and for men in 2004.

For selected characteristics, the national estimates of income differed between the two surveys. For example, the 2005 estimate of median household income for Whites was higher in the ACS ($49,453) than in the ASEC ($48,554). The same was true in 2004 as well.

The state median household incomes were not statistically different in the ACS and ASEC for 31 states and the District of Columbia. Of the remaining 19 states, the ACS estimated higher median household incomes in seven states and lower median household incomes in 12 states. These differences ranged from 3 to 12 percent.

References

Clark, Sandra Luckett, John Iceland, Thomas Palumbo, Mai Weismantle, and Kirby
Posey, *Comparing Employment, Income , and Poverty: Census 2000 and Current
Population Survey*, U.S. Census Bureau, September 2003.
http://www.census.gov/hhes/poverty/census2000.html

Nelson, Charles, Edward Welniak, and Kirby Posey, "Income in the American
Community Survey: Comparisons to Census 2000," US Census Bureau working
paper, 2003.
http://www.census.gov/acs/www/Downloads/ACS/ASA_nelson.pdf

U.S. Census Bureau, "American Community Survey 2005 Questionnaire"
http://www.census.gov/acs/www/Downloads/SQuest05.pdf

U.S. Census Bureau, "American Community Survey, Using the data," internet guide to
the ACS data. http://www.census.gov/acs/www/

U.S. Census Bureau, *Current Population Survey, 2004 Annual Social and Economic
(ASEC) Supplement, Technical Documentation.*
http://www.census.gov/apsd/techdoc/cps/cpsmar04.pdf

U.S. Census Bureau, *Current Population Survey, 2005 Annual Social and Economic
(ASEC) Supplement, Technical Documentation.*
http://www.census.gov/apsd/techdoc/cps/cpsmar05.pdf

U.S. Census Bureau, *Current Population Survey, 2006 Annual Social and Economic
(ASEC) Supplement, Technical Documentation.*
http://www.census.gov/apsd/techdoc/cps/cpsmar06.pdf

U.S. Census Bureau, *Technical Paper 66: Current Population Survey Design and
Methodology*, March, 2002. http://www.census.gov/prod/2006pubs/tp-66.pdf

Table 1. Income and Earnings Estimates by Selected Characterisitics and Survey: 2004 and 2005
(In 2005 inflation-adjusted dollars. Data comes from the 2005 American Community Survey and 2005-2006 Current Population Survey)

Characteristics	ACS		CPS ASEC		Dollar Difference	Percent Difference
	Estimate	Margin of Error(+/-)[1]	Estimate	Margin of Error(+/-)[1]		
2005						
Median Household Income						
All Households	$46,242	104	$46,326 +	255	-$84	-0.2%
RACE (ONE-YEAR CPS ASEC ESTIMATES)						
White	$49,453 +	133	$48,554	349	$899 *	1.8% *
White, non-Hispanic	$50,622	103	$50,784	283	-$162	-0.3%
Black	$30,939	171	$30,858	495	$81	0.3%
Asian	$60,367 +	385	$61,094	1,171	-$727	-1.2%
Hispanic origin (any race)	$36,278 +	193	$35,967	587	$311	0.9%
RACE (TWO-YEAR CPS ASEC ESTIMATES)						
White	$49,453 +	133	$48,386	271	$1,067 *	2.2% *
White, non-Hispanic	$50,622	103	$50,665	274	-$43	-0.1%
Black	$30,939	171	$30,980	422	-$41	-0.1%
Asian	$60,367 +	385	$60,261	1,359	$106	0.2%
Hispanic origin (any race)	$36,278 +	193	$35,692	580	$586	1.6%
Median Earnings of Full-Time, Year-Round Workers						
Male	$41,965 +	61	$41,386 +	148	$579 *	1.4% *
Female	$32,168 +	54	$31,858 +	133	$310 *	1.0% *
Per Capita Income	$25,035 +	50	$25,036 +	160	-$1	0.0%
2004						
Median Household Income						
All Households	$46,178	221	$45,817	333	$361	0.8%
RACE (ONE-YEAR CPS ASEC ESTIMATES)						
White	$49,037	242	$48,218	311	$819 *	1.7% *
White, non-Hispanic	$50,415	270	$50,546	381	-$131	-0.3%
Black	$31,182	358	$31,101	532	$81	0.3%
Asian	$58,039	1,063	$59,427	2,077	-$1,388	-2.4%
Hispanic origin (any race)	$37,131	350	$35,417	816	$1,714 *	4.7% *
RACE (TWO-YEAR CPS ASEC ESTIMATES)						
White	$49,037	242	$48,321	256	$716 *	1.5% *
White, non-Hispanic	$50,415	270	$50,624	322	-$209	-0.4%
Black	$31,182	358	$31,281	497	-$99	-0.3%
Asian	$58,039	1,063	$59,268	1,639	-$1,229	-2.1%
Hispanic origin (any race)	$37,131	350	$35,217	664	$1,914 *	5.3% *
Median Earnings of Full-Time, Year-Round Workers						
Male	$42,572	109	$42,160	153	$412 *	1.0% *
Female	$32,423	90	$32,285	134	$138	0.4%
Per Capita Income	$24,823	93	$24,655	156	$168	0.7%

[1]This number added to and subtracted from the estimate yields the 90-percent confidence interval around the estimate.
*Statistically significant difference between ACS and CPS ASEC estimates at the 90-percent confidence level.
+Indicates 2005 estimates with significant differences from the 2004 estimate.
Source: U.S. Census Bureau

Table 2. Median Household Income Estimates by State and Survey: 2005
(In 2005 inflation adjusted dollars. Data comes from the 2005 American Community Survey and 2005-2006 Current Population Survey)

State	ACS		CPS ASEC		Dollar Difference	Percent Difference
	Estimate	Margin of Error(+/-)[1]	2-year Average(04-05) Estimate	Margin of Error(+/-)[1]		
United States	$46,242	104	$46,071	243	$171	0.4%
Alabama	$36,879	529	$37,502	1,732	-$623	-1.7%
Alaska	$56,234	1,807	$56,398	2,376	-$164	-0.3%
Arizona	$44,282	646	$45,279	1,658	-$997	-2.2%
Arkansas	$34,999	599	$36,406	1,584	-$1,407	-3.9%
California	$53,629	324	$51,312	779	$2,317 *	4.4% *
Colorado	$50,652	553	$51,518	1,987	-$866	-1.7%
Connecticut	$60,941	812	$56,889	2,255	$4,052 *	6.9% *
Delaware	$52,499	1,416	$50,445	1,729	$2,054	4.0%
District of Columbia	$47,221	1,934	$44,949	2,768	$2,272	4.9%
Florida	$42,433	272	$42,440	991	-$7	0.0%
Georgia	$45,604	438	$44,140	1,002	$1,464 *	3.3% *
Hawaii	$58,112	1,969	$58,854	2,015	-$742	-1.3%
Idaho	$41,443	841	$45,009	1,818	-$3,566 *	-8.2% *
Illinois	$50,260	338	$48,008	1,243	$2,252 *	4.6% *
Indiana	$43,993	503	$43,091	1,548	$902	2.1%
Iowa	$43,609	520	$45,671	1,970	-$2,062 *	-4.6% *
Kansas	$42,920	732	$42,233	1,926	$687	1.6%
Kentucky	$37,369	479	$36,750	1,467	$619	1.7%
Louisiana	$36,729	575	$37,442	1,745	-$713	-1.9%
Maine	$42,801	969	$43,317	1,824	-$516	-1.2%
Maryland	$61,592	595	$59,762	2,183	$1,830	3.0%
Massachusetts	$57,184	694	$54,888	2,349	$2,296	4.1%
Michigan	$46,039	449	$44,801	1,218	$1,238	2.7%
Minnesota	$52,024	366	$56,098	1,589	-$4,074 *	-7.5% *
Mississippi	$32,938	615	$34,396	1,665	-$1,458	-4.3%
Missouri	$41,974	360	$43,266	1,419	-$1,292	-3.0%
Montana	$39,301	965	$36,202	1,295	$3,099 *	8.2% *
Nebraska	$43,849	762	$46,587	1,908	-$2,738 *	-6.1% *
Nevada	$49,169	890	$48,496	2,104	$673	1.4%
New Hampshire	$56,768	999	$57,850	2,314	-$1,082	-1.9%
New Jersey	$61,672	526	$60,246	2,460	$1,426	2.3%
New Mexico	$37,492	749	$39,916	2,255	-$2,424 *	-6.3% *
New York	$49,480	422	$46,659	1,112	$2,821 *	5.9% *
North Carolina	$40,729	321	$41,820	1,220	-$1,091	-2.6%
North Dakota	$41,030	705	$41,362	1,699	-$332	-0.8%
Ohio	$43,493	340	$44,349	1,389	-$856	-1.9%
Oklahoma	$37,063	566	$39,292	1,768	-$2,229 *	-5.8% *
Oregon	$42,944	582	$43,262	1,680	-$318	-0.7%
Pennsylvania	$44,537	392	$45,941	1,239	-$1,404 *	-3.1% *
Rhode Island	$51,458	1,374	$49,511	2,377	$1,947	3.9%
South Carolina	$39,316	614	$40,107	1,528	-$791	-2.0%
South Dakota	$40,310	890	$42,816	1,628	-$2,506 *	-6.0% *
Tennessee	$38,874	481	$39,376	1,544	-$502	-1.3%
Texas	$42,139	247	$42,102	671	$37	0.1%
Utah	$47,934	946	$53,693	1,536	-$5,759 *	-11.3% *
Vermont	$45,686	1,196	$49,808	1,771	-$4,122 *	-8.6% *
Virginia	$54,240	540	$52,383	1,580	$1,857 *	3.5% *
Washington	$49,262	644	$51,119	1,452	-$1,857 *	-3.7% *
West Virginia	$33,452	801	$35,467	1,548	-$2,015 *	-5.8% *
Wisconsin	$47,105	394	$45,956	1,732	$1,149	2.5%
Wyoming	$46,202	1,518	$45,817	1,826	$385	0.8%

[1]This number added to and subtracted from the estimate yields the 90-percent confidence interval around the estimate.
*Statistically significant difference between ACS and CPS ASEC estimates at the 90-percent confidence level.
Source: U.S. Census Bureau

Figure 1. Illustration of Rolling (Overlapping) Reference Period of Income in the Past 12 Months by Month of ACS Interview: 2005