

Appendix D—Prevalence Rates of Food Insecurity by State, 1996-98, 2001-03, and 2004-06

State-level prevalence rates of food insecurity and very low food security for the period 2004-06 are compared with 3-year average rates for 2001-03 and 1996-98 in table D-1. The prevalence rates for 2004-06 are repeated from table 7. The prevalence rates for the two earlier periods were reported previously in *Household Food Security in the United States, 2003* (Nord et al., 2004). The 1996-98 statistics presented here and in *Household Food Security in the United States, 2003* 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.¹ They are presented as a baseline to assess longer term changes in State-level food security conditions.²

In four States—California, Florida, Hawaii, and Montana—prevalence rates of food insecurity declined from 2001-03 to 2004-06 by statistically significant percentages. In 13 States and the District of Columbia, prevalence rates increased by statistically significant percentages, with the largest increases observed in Maine and the District of Columbia. During the same period, the prevalence of very low food security declined by statistically significant percentages in Florida and New Jersey and increased by statistically significant percentages in 17 States and the District of Columbia. The largest increases were in Louisiana, Maine, and Mississippi. Changes not marked as statistically significant in table D-1 were within ranges that could have resulted from sampling variation (that is, by the interviewed households not precisely representing all households in the State).

¹To 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 the effects of the earlier screening procedures on each State’s prevalence rate. 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.

²Seasonal effects on food security measurement (discussed in first chapter) probably bias prevalence rates for 1996-98 upward somewhat compared with 2001-03 and 2004-06. 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. 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), 2001-03 (average), and 2004-06 (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
	2004-06	2001-03	1996-98 ¹	2001-03 to 2004-06*	1996-98 to 2004-06*	2004-06	2001-03	1996-98 ¹	2001-03 to 2004-06*	1996-98 to 2004-06*
	Percent		Percentage points			Percent		Percentage points		
U.S.	11.3	11.0	11.3	0.3*	0.0	3.9	3.4	3.7	0.5*	0.2
AK	12.6	11.5	8.7	1.1	3.9*	5.1	4.1	3.6	1.0	1.5*
AL	12.1	12.5	12.5	-.4	-.4	3.3	3.2	3.3	.1	0.0
AR	14.3	15.5	13.7	-1.2	.6	5.8	4.7	4.8	1.1	1.0
AZ	13.1	12.3	14.6	.8	-1.5	4.3	3.8	4.3	.5	0.0
CA	10.9	12.2	13.3	-1.3*	-2.4*	3.7	3.6	4.3	.1	-.6
CO	12.0	9.7	10.8	2.3*	1.2	4.4	3.0	3.8	1.4*	.6
CT	8.6	8.0	11.0	.6	-2.4	2.7	3.0	4.1	-.3	-1.4
DC	12.5	9.0	13.7	3.5*	-1.2	3.8	2.4	4.7	1.4*	-.9
DE	7.8	6.7	8.1	1.1	-.3	2.6	1.8	2.9	.8	-.3
FL	8.9	11.7	13.2	-2.8*	-4.3*	3.1	3.7	4.5	-.6*	-1.4*
GA	12.6	12.9	10.9	-.3	1.7	5.0	3.6	3.4	1.4*	1.6*
HI	7.8	9.9	12.9	-2.1*	-5.1*	2.8	3.3	3.1	-.5	-.3
IA	11.4	9.5	8.0	1.9*	3.4*	3.9	3.0	2.6	.9*	1.3*
ID	12.7	13.7	11.3	-1.0	1.4	3.5	3.9	3.3	-.4	.2
IL	9.8	7.9	9.6	1.9*	.2	3.5	2.5	3.2	1.0*	.3
IN	10.8	9.9	9.0	.9	1.8	4.0	3.4	2.9	.6	1.1*
KS	12.5	11.7	11.5	.8	1.0	4.5	4.4	4.2	.1	.3
KY	13.6	11.2	9.7	2.4*	3.9*	4.6	3.3	3.4	1.3*	1.2*
LA	14.4	12.3	14.4	2.1*	0.0	5.0	2.6	4.4	2.4*	.6
MA	8.1	6.2	7.5	1.9*	.6	3.0	2.3	2.1	.7*	.9*
MD	9.5	7.7	8.7	1.8*	.8	3.9	2.9	3.3	1.0*	.6
ME	12.9	9.2	9.8	3.7*	3.1*	5.3	2.9	4.0	2.4*	1.3*
MI	12.2	10.1	9.6	2.1*	2.6*	4.6	3.4	3.1	1.2*	1.5*
MN	8.2	7.1	8.6	1.1	-.4	3.2	2.2	3.1	1.0*	.1
MO	12.3	10.4	10.1	1.9*	2.2*	4.4	3.6	3.0	.8*	1.4*
MS	18.1	14.9	14.6	3.2*	3.5	6.4	4.0	4.2	2.4*	2.2*
MT	9.9	12.5	11.2	-2.6*	-1.3	4.3	4.0	3.0	.3	1.3*
NC	12.9	13.7	9.8	-.8	3.1*	4.4	4.5	2.7	-.1	1.7*
ND	6.4	6.9	5.5	-.5	.9	2.2	2.0	1.6	.2	.6
NE	9.5	10.4	8.7	-.9	.8	3.8	3.0	2.5	.8	1.3*
NH	7.4	6.4	8.6	1.0	-1.2	2.2	2.1	3.1	.1	-.9*
NJ	7.7	8.6	8.9	-.9	-1.2	2.1	3.1	3.1	-1.0*	-1.0*
NM	16.1	14.8	16.5	1.3	-.4	5.8	4.4	4.8	1.4	1.0
NV	8.8	9.2	10.4	-.4	-1.6	3.2	3.4	4.0	-.2	-.8
NY	9.8	10.0	11.9	-.2	-2.1*	3.2	3.1	4.1	.1	-.9*
OH	12.7	10.9	9.7	1.8*	3.0*	4.1	3.6	3.5	.5	.6*
OK	14.6	14.1	13.1	.5	1.5	5.3	5.2	4.2	.1	1.1*
OR	11.9	12.9	14.2	-1.0	-2.3	4.4	4.3	6.0	.1	-1.6*
PA	10.0	9.5	8.3	.5	1.7*	3.3	2.6	2.6	.7*	.7*
RI	11.3	11.1	10.2	.2	1.1	3.7	3.6	2.7	.1	1.0*
SC	14.7	13.5	11.0	1.2	3.7*	5.9	4.9	3.5	1.0	2.4*
SD	9.5	8.9	8.2	.6	1.3*	3.3	2.4	2.2	.9*	1.1*
TN	12.5	10.9	11.8	1.6	.7	4.3	3.3	4.4	1.0	-.1
TX	15.9	14.9	15.2	1.0*	.7	5.3	4.1	5.5	1.2*	-.2
UT	14.5	14.6	10.3	-.1	4.2*	5.1	4.4	3.1	.7	2.0*
VA	7.9	8.4	10.2	-.5	-2.3*	2.8	2.2	3.0	.6	-.2
VT	9.6	8.9	8.8	.7	.8	4.3	3.0	2.7	1.3*	1.6*
WA	10.3	11.6	13.2	-1.3	-2.9*	3.6	3.9	4.7	-.3	-1.1*
WI	8.9	9.0	8.5	-.1	.4	2.7	3.2	2.6	-.5	.1
WV	9.3	8.9	9.5	.4	-.2	3.2	2.7	3.1	.5	.1
WY	10.6	10.1	9.9	.5	.7	3.7	4.2	3.5	-.5	.2

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

¹Statistics 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.