

Appendix D. Prevalence Rates of Food Insecurity by State, 1996-98, 2000-2002, and 2003-05

State-level prevalence rates of food insecurity and very low food security for the period 2003-05 are compared with 3-year average rates for 2000-02 and 1996-98 in table D-1. The statistics for 2003-05 are repeated from table 7. The statistics for the two earlier periods were reported previously in *Household Food Security in the United States, 2002* (Nord et al., 2003). The statistics for 1996-98 presented here and in *Household Food Security in the United States, 2002* were revised from those reported in *Prevalence of Food Insecurity and Hunger, by State, 1996-1998* (Nord et al., 1999) to adjust for differences in data collection procedures in the two periods.³⁸

In four States—Florida, Hawaii, North Dakota, and Oregon—prevalence rates of food insecurity declined from 2000-02 to 2003-05 by statistically significant percentages, while 15 States registered statistically significant increases. The prevalence of very low food security increased by statistically significant percentages in 14 States and the District of Columbia during that period, and no State registered a statistically significant decline.³⁹

Statistically significant changes from 1996-98 to 2003-05 were as follows: Prevalence rates of food insecurity declined in 6 States and increased in 17 States. Prevalence rates of very low food security declined in 5 States and increased in 15 States.

³⁸To reduce the burden on survey respondents, households—especially those with higher incomes—that report no indication of any food access problems on two or three “screener” questions are not asked the questions in the food security module. They are classified as food secure. Screening procedures in the CPS food security surveys were modified from year to year prior to 1998 to achieve an acceptable balance between accuracy and respondent burden. Since 1998, screening procedures have remained unchanged. The older, more restrictive screening procedures depressed prevalence estimates—especially for food insecurity—compared with those in use since 1998 because a small proportion of food insecure households were screened out along with those that were food secure. To provide an appropriate baseline for assessing changes in State prevalence rates of food insecurity, statistics from the 1996-98 report were adjusted upward to offset the estimated effects of the earlier screening procedures on each States’ prevalence rates. The method used to calculate these adjustments was described in detail in *Household Food Security in the United States, 2001* (Nord et al., 2002), appendix D.

³⁹Seasonal effects on food security measurement (discussed in section 1) probably bias prevalence rates for 1996-98 and 2000-02 upward somewhat compared with 2003-05. At the national level, this effect may have raised the measured prevalence rate of food insecurity in 1996-98 by about 0.8 percentage points and the prevalence rate of very low food security by about 0.4 percentage points. Effects for the period 2000-02 were probably about half as large. However, seasonal effects may have differed from State to State.

Table D-1

Prevalence of household-level food insecurity and very low food security by State, 1996-98 (average), 2000-02 (average), and 2003-05 (average)¹

State	Food Insecurity (low or very low food security)					Very low food security				
	Average	Average	Average	Change	Change	Average	Average	Average	Change	Change
	2003-05	2000-02	1996-98 ¹	2000-02 to 2003-05*	1996-98 to 2003-05*	2003-05	2000-02	1996-98 ¹	2000-02 to 2003-05*	1996-98 to 2003-05*
	Percent			Percentage points		Percent			Percentage points	
U.S.	11.4	10.8	11.3	0.6*	0.1	3.8	3.3	3.7	0.5*	0.1
AK	12.2	11.8	8.7	.4	3.5*	4.9	4.3	3.6	.6	1.3
AL	12.3	12.5	12.5	-.2	-.2	3.4	3.7	3.3	-.3	.1
AR	14.7	14.6	13.7	.1	1.0	5.6	4.4	4.8	1.2	.8*
AZ	12.2	12.5	14.6	-.3	-2.4	3.8	3.7	4.3	.1	-.5
CA	11.7	11.7	13.3	.0	-1.6*	3.6	3.5	4.3	.1	-.7*
CO	12.0	9.2	10.8	2.8*	1.2*	3.9	2.8	3.8	1.1*	.1
CT	8.2	7.6	11.0	.6	-2.8	2.6	2.8	4.1	-.2	-1.5
DC	11.4	9.3	13.7	2.1*	-2.3	3.8	2.3	4.7	1.5*	-.9
DE	6.6	6.8	8.1	-.2	-1.5	1.9	1.9	2.9	.0	-1.0
FL	9.4	11.8	13.2	-2.4*	-3.8*	3.5	3.7	4.5	-.2	-1.0*
GA	12.4	12.9	10.9	-.5	1.5	5.1	3.5	3.4	1.6*	1.7*
HI	7.8	11.9	12.9	-4.1*	-5.1*	2.8	3.6	3.1	-.8	-.3
IA	10.9	9.1	8.0	1.8*	2.9*	3.5	2.8	2.6	.7	.9
ID	14.1	13.7	11.3	.4	2.8*	3.7	4.3	3.3	-.6	.4
IL	9.1	8.6	9.6	.5	-.5	3.2	2.7	3.2	.5	.0
IN	11.1	8.9	9.0	2.2*	2.1*	4.1	2.8	2.9	1.3*	1.2*
KS	12.3	11.7	11.5	.6	.8	4.6	3.9	4.2	.7	.4
KY	12.8	10.8	9.7	2.0*	3.1*	4.2	2.9	3.4	1.3*	.8
LA	12.8	13.1	14.4	-.3	-1.6	3.6	2.9	4.4	.7	-.8
MA	7.8	6.4	7.5	1.4	.3	3.0	2.1	2.1	.9*	.9*
MD	9.4	8.2	8.7	1.2	.7	3.6	2.9	3.3	.7	.3
ME	12.3	9.0	9.8	3.3*	2.5*	4.6	2.8	4.0	1.8*	.6
MI	11.5	9.2	9.6	2.3*	1.9*	4.1	3.0	3.1	1.1*	1.0*
MN	7.7	7.1	8.6	.6	-.9	3.0	2.2	3.1	.8	-.1
MO	11.7	9.9	10.1	1.8*	1.6*	4.0	3.3	3.0	.7*	1.0*
MS	16.5	14.8	14.6	1.7*	1.9	4.4	4.5	4.2	-.1	.2
MT	11.2	12.8	11.2	-1.6	.0	4.6	4.1	3.0	.5	1.6*
NC	13.2	12.3	9.8	.9	3.4*	4.5	3.7	2.7	.8	1.8*
ND	6.4	8.1	5.5	-1.7*	.9	2.2	2.0	1.6	.2	.6*
NE	10.3	10.7	8.7	-.4	1.6*	4.0	3.1	2.5	.9	1.5*
NH	6.5	6.7	8.6	-.2	-2.1*	2.2	2.1	3.1	.1	-.9
NJ	8.1	8.5	8.9	-.4	-.8	2.6	2.7	3.1	-.1	-.5*
NM	16.8	14.3	16.5	2.5	.3	5.7	3.8	4.8	1.9*	.9
NV	8.4	9.3	10.4	-.9	-2.0	3.0	3.3	4.0	-.3	-1.0
NY	10.4	9.4	11.9	1.0*	-1.5*	3.1	2.9	4.1	.2	-1.0*
OH	12.6	9.8	9.7	2.8*	2.9*	3.8	3.3	3.5	.5	.3
OK	14.6	14.3	13.1	.3	1.5	4.8	5.1	4.2	-.3	.6
OR	11.9	13.7	14.2	-1.8*	-2.3	3.9	5.0	6.0	-1.1	-2.1*
PA	9.8	9.4	8.3	.4	1.5*	2.9	2.7	2.6	.2	.3
RI	12.4	10.1	10.2	2.3*	2.2*	4.1	3.4	2.7	.7	1.4*
SC	15.5	12.3	11.0	3.2*	4.5*	6.3	4.3	3.5	2.0*	2.8*
SD	9.5	8.0	8.2	1.5*	1.3*	3.2	2.2	2.2	1.0*	1.0*
TN	13.0	11.3	11.8	1.7	1.2	4.2	3.3	4.4	.9	-.2
TX	16.0	14.8	15.2	1.2	.8	5.1	4.1	5.5	1.0*	-.4
UT	14.5	15.2	10.3	-.7	4.2*	5.1	4.6	3.1	.5	2.0*
VA	8.4	7.3	10.2	1.1	-1.8	2.7	1.8	3.0	.9*	-.3
VT	9.5	9.0	8.8	.5	.7	3.9	2.4	2.7	1.5*	1.2*
WA	11.2	12.3	13.2	-1.1	-2.0*	3.9	4.4	4.7	-.5	-.8
WI	9.5	8.1	8.5	1.4*	1.0	2.7	3.3	2.6	-.6	.1
WV	8.9	9.4	9.5	-.5	-.6	3.0	2.7	3.1	.3	-.1
WY	11.1	10.7	9.9	.4	1.2	4.1	4.3	3.5	-.2	.6

*Change was statistically significant with 90-percent confidence ($t > 1.645$).

¹ Statistics for 1996-98 were revised to account for changes in survey screening procedures introduced in 1998.

Source: Prepared by ERS based on Current Population Survey Food Security Supplement data.