Appendix D. Changes in Prevalence Rates of Food Insecurity and Hunger by State, 1996-98 (average) to 2000-02 (average)

To assess changes in prevalence rates of food insecurity and food insecurity with hunger over time, adjustments must be made for year-to-year differences in screening procedures used to reduce respondent burden in the CPS food security surveys.[32] The State-level prevalence rates of food insecurity and hunger reported in *Prevalence of Food Insecurity and Hunger, by State, 1996-1998* (Nord et al., 1999) were based on data that had been edited to be comparable across all years.[33] Those rates cannot be compared directly with the prevalence rates for 2000-02 presented in section 1, which are based on data collected under screening procedures initiated in 1998.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 the households screened out were actually food insecure. The effect of the screening differences at the national level can be seen in figure 2, which presents prevalence rates from 1998 to 2002 based both on the unedited data for each year and on data edited to be comparable across all years.

Table D-1 compares State-level prevalence rates for 2000-02 (repeated from table 7) with the adjusted 1996-1998 rates. The estimated prevalence rates of food insecurity and hunger declined in most States from 1996-98 to 2000-02. Declines in prevalences of food insecurity were statistically significant in six States and the District of Columbia. Declines in prevalence rates of food insecurity with hunger were statistically significant in eight States and the District of Columbia. On the other hand, five States registered increases in food insecurity prevalence rates large enough to be statistically significant, and two States registered statistically significant increases in prevalence rates of food insecurity with hunger.[34]

[32]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.

[33]To make prevalence rates comparable across all years, data for each year were edited so that households were classified as food secure if they would have been screened out of the food security module under procedures used in any year's survey.

[34]Seasonal effects on food security measurement (discussed in section 1) probably bias prevalence rates for 2000-02 downward somewhat compared with 1996-98. Use of 3-year averages reduces the size of this bias substantially (to one-third the size of the effect on comparisons between two single-year statistics). At the national level, this effect would depress the prevalence rate of food insecurity by about 0.4 percentage points and the prevalence rate of food insecurity with hunger by about 0.2 percentage points. However, seasonal effects may vary from State to State.

Table D-1—Changes in prevalence rates of food insecurity and hunger, by State, 1996-98 (average) to 2000-02 (average)[1]

State	Food insecure (with or without hunger)			Food insecure with hunger		
	Average, 1996-98	Average, 2000-02	Change*	Average, 1996-98	Average, 2000-02	Change
	-----Percent-----		*Percentage points*	-----Percent-----		*Percentage points*
U.S. total	11.3	10.8	-0.5*	3.7	3.3	-0.4*
AK	8.7	11.8	3.1*	3.6	4.3	.7
AL	12.5	12.5	0	3.3	3.7	.4
AR	13.7	14.6	.9	4.8	4.4	-.4
AZ	14.6	12.5	-2.1	4.3	3.7	-.6
CA	13.3	11.7	-1.6*	4.3	3.5	-.8*
CO	10.8	9.2	-1.6	3.8	2.8	-1.0*
CT	11.0	7.6	-3.4*	4.1	2.8	-1.3
DC	13.7	9.3	-4.4*	4.7	2.3	-2.4*
DE	8.1	6.8	-1.3	2.9	1.9	-1.0
FL	13.2	11.8	-1.4	4.5	3.7	-.8*
GA	10.9	12.9	2.0	3.4	3.5	.1
HI	12.9	11.9	-1.0	3.1	3.6	.5
IA	8.0	9.1	1.1	2.6	2.8	.2
ID	11.3	13.7	2.4*	3.3	4.3	1.0
IL	9.6	8.6	-1.0*	3.2	2.7	-.5
IN	9.0	8.9	-.1	2.9	2.8	-.1
KS	11.5	11.7	.2	4.2	3.9	-.3
KY	9.7	10.8	1.1	3.4	2.9	-.5
LA	14.4	13.1	-1.3	4.4	2.9	-1.5*
MA	7.5	6.4	-1.1	2.1	2.1	0
MD	8.7	8.2	-.5	3.3	2.9	-.4
ME	9.8	9.0	-.8	4.0	2.8	-1.2
MI	9.6	9.2	-.4	3.1	3.0	-.1
MN	8.6	7.1	-1.5	3.1	2.2	-.9
MO	10.1	9.9	-.2	3.0	3.3	.3
MS	14.6	14.8	.2	4.2	4.5	.3
MT	11.2	12.8	1.6	3.0	4.1	1.1*
NC	9.8	12.3	2.5*	2.7	3.7	1.0*
ND	5.5	8.1	2.6*	1.6	2.0	.4
NE	8.7	10.7	2.0	2.5	3.1	.6
NH	8.6	6.7	-1.9	3.1	2.1	-1.0
NJ	8.9	8.5	-.4	3.1	2.7	-.4
NM	16.5	14.3	-2.2	4.8	3.8	-1.0*
NV	10.4	9.3	-1.1	4.0	3.3	-.7
NY	11.9	9.4	-2.5*	4.1	2.9	-1.2*
OH	9.7	9.8	.1	3.5	3.3	-.2
OK	13.1	14.3	1.2	4.2	5.1	.9
OR	14.2	13.7	-.5	6.0	5.0	-1.0
PA	8.3	9.4	1.1*	2.6	2.7	.1
RI	10.2	10.1	-.1	2.7	3.4	.7
SC	11.0	12.3	1.3	3.5	4.3	.8
SD	8.2	8.0	-.2	2.2	2.2	0
TN	11.8	11.3	-.5	4.4	3.3	-1.1
TX	15.2	14.8	-.4	5.5	4.1	-1.4*
UT	10.3	15.2	4.9*	3.1	4.6	1.5
VA	10.2	7.3	-2.9*	3.0	1.8	-1.2*
VT	8.8	9.0	.2	2.7	2.4	-.3
WA	13.2	12.3	-.9	4.7	4.4	-.3
WI	8.5	8.1	-.4	2.6	3.3	.7
WV	9.5	9.4	-.1	3.1	2.7	-.4
WY	9.9	10.7	.8	3.5	4.3	.8

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

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

Source: Prepared by ERS using data from Current Population Survey Food Security Supplements.