Appendix D. Prevalence Rates of Food Insecurity and Food Insecurity With Hunger by State, 1996-98, 1999-2001, and 2002-04

State-level prevalence rates of food insecurity and food insecurity with hunger for the period 2002-04 are compared with three-year average rates for 1999-2001 and 1996-98 in table D-1. The statistics for 2002-04 are repeated from table 7. The statistics for the two earlier periods were reported previously in *Household Food Security in the United States, 2001* (Nord et al., 2002a). The statistics for 1996-98 presented here and in *Household Food Security in the United States, 2001* 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.[37]

In six States, prevalence rates of food insecurity declined from 1999-2001 to 2002-04 by statistically significant percentages, while 14 States registered statistically significant increases. Only in Oregon did food insecurity with hunger decline by a statistically significant percentage during that period, while 15 States registered statistically significant increases in the prevalence of food insecurity with hunger.[38]

Statistically significant changes from 1996-98 to 2002-04 were as follows: Prevalence rates of food insecurity declined in 7 States and the District of Columbia and increased in 13 States. Prevalence rates of food insecurity with hunger declined in five States and the District of Columbia and increased in seven States.

[37]To 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 and food insecurity with hunger, statistics from the 1996-98 report were adjusted upward to offset the estimated the effects of the earlier screening procedures on each State's 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.

[38]Seasonal effects on food security measurement (discussed in section 1) probably bias prevalence rates for 1996-98 and 1999-2001 upward somewhat compared with 2002-04. 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 food insecurity with hunger by about 0.4 percentage points. Effects for the period 1999-2001 were probably about half as large. However, seasonal effects may have differed from State to State.

Table D-1

Prevalence rates of food insecurity and food insecurity with hunger by State, 1996-98 (average), 1999-2001 (average), and 2002-04 (average)[1]

State	Food Insecure (with or without hunger)					Food Insecure with hunger				
	Average 2002-04	Average 1999-01	Average 1996-98[1]	Change 1999-01 to 2002-04	Change 1996-98 to 2002-04	Average 2002-04	Average 1999-01	Average 1996-98[1]	Change 1999-01 to 2002-04	Change 1996-98 to 2002-04
	Percent			Percentage points		Percent			Percentage points	
U.S. total	11.4	10.4	11.3	1.0*	0.1	3.6	3.1	3.7	0.5*	-0.1
AK	11.7	11.1	8.7	.6	3.0*	4.6	4.3	3.6	.3	1.0
AL	12.2	11.9	12.5	.3	-.3	2.9	3.9	3.3	-1.0	-.4
AR	14.8	12.8	13.7	2.0	1.1	5.3	3.9	4.8	1.4	.5
AZ	12.7	11.6	14.6	1.1	-1.9	3.5	3.6	4.3	-.1	-.8*
CA	12.4	11.8	13.3	.6	-.9	3.9	3.3	4.3	.6*	-.4
CO	11.3	8.6	10.8	2.7*	.5	3.5	2.5	3.8	1.0*	-.3
CT	8.6	6.8	11.0	1.8*	-2.4	3.0	2.6	4.1	.4	-1.1
DC	10.2	9.8	13.7	.4	-3.5*	2.9	2.9	4.7	0.0	-1.8*
DE	6.8	7.3	8.1	-.5	-1.3	1.8	2.1	2.9	-.3	-1.1
FL	10.8	12.2	13.2	-1.4*	-2.4*	3.6	4.0	4.5	-.4	-.9*
GA	12.3	11.6	10.9	.7	1.4	3.8	3.9	3.4	-.1	.4
HI	8.5	10.8	12.9	-2.3*	-4.4*	2.6	3.0	3.1	-.4	-.5
IA	10.2	7.6	8.0	2.6*	2.2*	3.1	2.2	2.6	.9	.5
ID	14.6	13.0	11.3	1.6	3.3*	3.7	4.5	3.3	-.8	.4
IL	9.0	9.2	9.6	-.2	-.6	3.0	2.7	3.2	.3	-.2
IN	10.1	8.5	9.0	1.6	1.1	3.6	2.5	2.9	1.1*	.7
KS	12.3	11.3	11.5	1.0	.8	4.8	3.2	4.2	1.6*	.6
KY	12.2	10.1	9.7	2.1*	2.5*	3.3	3.0	3.4	.3	-.1
LA	11.8	13.2	14.4	-1.4	-2.6*	2.6	3.0	4.4	-.4	-1.8*
MA	7.1	6.7	7.5	.4	-.4	2.7	2.0	2.1	.7	.6
MD	8.6	8.8	8.7	-.2	-.1	3.2	3.1	3.3	.1	-.1
ME	9.8	9.4	9.8	.4	0.0	3.1	3.1	4.0	0.0	-.9
MI	11.3	8.1	9.6	3.2*	1.7*	3.8	2.4	3.1	1.4*	.7*
MN	7.2	7.1	8.6	.1	-1.4	2.5	2.0	3.1	.5	-.6
MO	11.3	8.6	10.1	2.7*	1.2	3.9	2.3	3.0	1.6*	.9
MS	15.8	13.1	14.6	2.7*	1.2	4.5	3.7	4.2	.8	.3
MT	12.2	13.2	11.2	-1.0	1.0	4.7	4.0	3.0	.7	1.7*
NC	13.8	11.1	9.8	2.7*	4.0*	4.9	3.3	2.7	1.6*	2.2*
ND	6.3	8.5	5.5	-2.2*	.8	1.9	2.2	1.6	-.3	.3
NE	10.7	9.9	8.7	.8	2.0*	3.7	2.9	2.5	.8	1.2*
NH	6.4	6.5	8.6	-.1	-2.2*	2.4	1.9	3.1	.5	-.7
NJ	8.5	7.8	8.9	.7	-.4	2.9	2.4	3.1	.5	-.2
NM	15.8	14.6	16.5	1.2	-.7	4.9	4.2	4.8	.7	.1
NV	8.5	10.1	10.4	-1.6*	-1.9	2.9	3.4	4.0	-.5	-1.1
NY	10.5	9.6	11.9	.9	-1.4*	3.2	3.1	4.1	.1	-.9*
OH	11.4	9.1	9.7	2.3*	1.7*	3.4	2.8	3.5	.6	-.1
OK	15.2	12.9	13.1	2.3*	2.1	5.6	3.8	4.2	1.8*	1.4*
OR	11.9	13.7	14.2	-1.8*	-2.3	3.8	5.8	6.0	-2.0*	-2.2*
PA	10.2	8.4	8.3	1.8*	1.9*	2.9	2.2	2.6	.7*	.3
RI	12.1	8.7	10.2	3.4*	1.9*	4.2	2.5	2.7	1.7*	1.5*
SC	14.8	11.3	11.0	3.5*	3.8*	5.5	3.6	3.5	1.9*	2.0*
SD	9.2	7.9	8.2	1.3	1.0	2.8	1.9	2.2	.9*	.6
TN	11.5	11.8	11.8	-.3	-.3	3.5	3.4	4.4	.1	-.9
TX	16.4	13.9	15.2	2.5*	1.2*	4.9	3.6	5.5	1.3*	-.6
UT	14.8	13.8	10.3	1.0	4.5*	4.6	4.6	3.1	0.0	1.5
VA	8.5	7.6	10.2	.9	-1.7	2.6	1.5	3.0	1.1*	-.4
VT	9.0	9.1	8.8	-.1	.2	3.6	1.8	2.7	1.8*	.9
WA	12.0	12.5	13.2	-.5	-1.2*	4.3	4.6	4.7	-.3	-.4
WI	9.0	8.4	8.5	.6	.5	2.8	2.9	2.6	-.1	.2
WV	8.8	10.3	9.5	-1.5*	-.7*	2.9	3.3	3.1	-.4	-.2
WY	11.0	9.9	9.9	1.1	1.1	4.2	3.2	3.5	1.0	.7

*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.