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This report focuses on the participation and characteristics of people who received benefits from any of the following means-tested assistance programs: ${ }^{1}$

- Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)
- General Assistance (GA)
- Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP)/Food Stamps²
- Supplemental Security Income (SSI)
- Medicaid ${ }^{3}$
- Housing Assistance

The data come from the 2004 and 2008 Panels of the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP) and

[^0]cover calendar years 2004 through 2007 and 2009. ${ }^{4}$ SIPP is a longitudinal survey, which means that, unlike periodic point-in-time surveys such as the Current Population Survey (CPS), SIPP follows the same people over

[^1]time. ${ }^{5}$ This longitudinal quality allows examination of the SIPP sample from two perspectives.

First, it is possible to observe the same people over a span of time. The number of months within a period of time when individuals received benefits from one or more means-tested assistance programs can be examined, and entry and exit activity for each program can be measured. For example, the number, timing, and duration of people moving into and out of a particular situation within a time period can be studied, such as the length of time an individual continuously receives program benefits.

Second, a population of interest can be analyzed at single points of time over regular intervals measuring gross activity levels. This cross-sectional

[^2]perspective captures changes over time in the level of an activity, such as the proportion of the population receiving assistance from a particular program at selected points in time.

This report examines means-tested program participation rates and the extent to which the programs are used. Appendix A displays the average monthly participation rates in major means-tested programs by selected characteristics.

## HIGHLIGHTS

In 2009, almost 45 million people, or 18.6 percent of the U.S. population, participated in major meanstested assistance programs in each month, on average. ${ }^{6}$

Individuals were more likely to participate in Medicaid than any of the other programs examined in this report, in 2009. Almost 14 percent of individuals participated in Medicaid in an average month in 2009.

Individuals living in poverty in 2009 were more likely to receive at least one type of major meanstested benefit than individuals who were not living in poverty. A majority of individuals in poverty (70.7 percent) received benefits in at least one month in 2009 compared with 17.4 percent of those not in poverty.

Individuals living in femalehouseholder families were more likely to participate in means-tested programs in an average month in 2009 (46.3 percent) than were

[^3]
## PROGRAM PARTICIPATION

This report investigates the degree of involvement in means-tested assistance programs using the following three concepts, each of which explores a different aspect of program participation. ${ }^{1}$

Average monthly program participation rates: These are annual-average rates-one for each of the years 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, and 2009. ${ }^{2}$ The measure represents the share of the group receiving assistance, on average, during each month of the year in question. The rate is a weighted average of the 12 monthly (crosssectional) estimates of the proportion of people in the group who participated in means-tested assistance programs.

Program participation for 1 or more months in a (specified) year: Percentages are presented for 2004 to 2007 and 2009. The measure represents the proportion of people who took part in any means-tested assistance program at any time during a specified year. It is a measure of gross activity and represents the population as it existed at the end of the year in question.

## Program participation rate for a (specified) number of months in the 24-month period from January 2004 to

 December 2005:3 This measure is based on the number of accumulated (not necessarily consecutive) months a person participated in means-tested assistance programs throughout the entire 24 -month time span. It describes the population who received assistance at the end of the 24 months.[^4]individuals living in married-couple families (12.3 percent) or individuals living in male-householder families (26.5 percent).

Adults (aged 18 and older) who did not graduate from high school were more likely than high school graduates or those with one or more years of college to participate in means-tested programs in an average month in 2009. Participation rates were 33.1 percent, 17.8 percent, and 7.8 percent, respectively, for these groups.

Unemployed adults were more likely to receive means-tested benefits in an average month in 2009 than people with full-time jobs (28.3 percent compared with 5.1 percent).

Children under 18 years of age and people aged 65 and older were more likely than people aged 18 to 64 years to receive benefits from at least one means-tested assistance program in all 24 months from January 2004 to December 2005.

Figure 1.
Average Monthly Participation Rate for Major Means-Tested Programs: 2004-2007 and 2009
(Percent of noninstitutionalized civilian population)


Note: For concept definitions, see Text Box, "Program Participation."
Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP), 2004 Panel, waves 1-12, and 2008 Panel, waves 2-5.

## PROGRAM USAGE: 2004 THROUGH 2007 AND 2009

In 2009, approximately 44.8 million people participated in one or more major means-tested assistance programs on average each month. The average monthly participation rate in major means-tested programs increased from 17.1 percent in 2004 to 17.8 percent in 2005 and remained at a similar level from 2005 through 2007 ( 17.8 percent, 17.8 percent, and 17.4 percent, respectively). It then increased to 18.6 percent in 2009 (Figure 1).

## Participation Rate

In 2007, the average monthly participation rate for Medicaid (14.0 percent) was higher than those for SNAP (7.9 percent), TANF/GA (1.1 percent), housing assistance ( 3.8 percent), and SSI (2.6 percent, Figure 2). From 2004 to 2007, the percentage of people participating in one or more months in Medicaid, SNAP, TANF/GA, and housing assistance declined. However,

Figure 2.
Average Monthly Participation Rates for Major Means-Tested Programs: 2004-2007 and 2009
(Percent of noninstitutionalized civilian population)



Note: For concept definitions, see Text Box, "Program Participation."
Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP), 2004 Panel, waves 1-12, and 2008 Panel, waves 2-5.

Figure 3.
Participation Rates for Major Means-Tested Programs (Participated 1 or More Months): 2004-2007 and 2009
(Percent of noninstitutionalized civilian population)


Note: For concept definitions, see Text Box, "Program Participation."
Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP), 2004 Panel, waves 1-12, and 2008 Panel, waves 2-5.

Figure 4.
Participation Rates for Major Means-Tested Programs: January 2004-December 2005
(Percent of noninstitutionalized civilian population)


Note: For concept definitions, see Text Box, "Program Participation."
Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP), 2004 Panel, waves 1-7.
from 2007 to 2009 participation in one or more months of the year increased for Medicaid, SNAP, TANF/GA, housing assistance, and SSI (Figure 3). A higher proportion of people participated in Medicaid in all 24 months ( 7.3 percent) than in any other program (Figure 4). In comparison, the percentage of people that participated in all 24 months was 3.6 percent for SNAP, 0.3 percent for TANF/GA, 2.2 percent for housing assistance, and 1.4 percent for SSI.

An estimated 33.6 million people received Medicaid benefits in an average month in 2009: 30.8 percent of children under the age of 18 received Medicaid, compared with 8.7 percent of people aged 18 to 64 , and 8.4 percent of people 65 and older (Appendix Table A-5).

## Participation by Poverty Threshold

Among those whose family income fell below the poverty threshold, the average participation rate for at least one type of major meanstested benefit was 56.1 percent in 2009, compared with 11.4 percent for those with family income above the poverty threshold (Figure 5). ${ }^{7}$ The average monthly participation rates for those not in poverty was not statistically different during the 2004-2009 period. ${ }^{8}$ As shown in Figure 6, the percentage of those in poverty who received benefits in at least one month of the calendar year decreased over the 2004 to 2007 period from 72.1 percent to

[^5]Figure 5.
Average Monthly Participation Rates for Major Means-Tested Programs by Poverty Status: 2004-2007 and 2009
(Percent of noninstitutionalized civilian population)


Note: For concept definitions, see Text Box, "Program Participation."
Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP), 2004 Panel, waves 1-12, and 2008 Panel, waves 2-5.

Figure 6.
Participation Rates for Major Means-Tested Programs by Poverty Status (Participated 1 or More Months): 2004-2007 and 2009
(Percent of noninstitutionalized civilian population)


Note: For concept definitions, see Text Box, "Program Participation."
Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP), 2004 Panel, waves 1-12, and 2008 Panel, waves 2-5.
64.8 percent and then increased to 70.7 percent in 2009 . Among those not in poverty, the percentage who received benefits in at least one month of the year increased from 15.5 percent in 2004 to 17.4 percent in 2009.

People who lived in poverty tended to be long-term participants in means-tested programs: 52.6 percent of those with family income below the poverty threshold participated in all 24 months of the 2004-2005 period, compared with 5.5 percent of those not living in poverty (Figure 7).

## Program Participation by Race and Hispanic Origin

Both the likelihood of receiving means-tested assistance and the length of benefit receipt differed among racial groups. In 2009, the average monthly participation rate for Blacks, 38.9 percent, was higher than that of non-Hispanic Whites, at 11.8 percent, and Asian or Pacific Islanders, at 14.9 percent (Figure 8). With respect to any participation during the calendar year, rates in 2004 were 43.4 percent for Blacks, 20.0 percent for Asian or Pacific Islanders, and 14.9 percent for non-Hispanic Whites. In 2009, 46.3 percent of Blacks, 19.5 percent of Asian or Pacific Islanders, and 16.9 percent of non-Hispanic Whites participated in a meanstested program for at least 1 month (Figure 9).

Figure 7.
Participation Rates for Major Means-Tested Programs by Poverty Status: January 2004-December 2005
(Percent of noninstitutionalized civilian population)


Note: For concept definitions, see Text Box, "Program Participation."
Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP), 2004 PaneI, waves 1-7.

The percentage of Blacks receiving any type of assistance in all 24 months of 2004 and 2005 was larger than the percentage of Asian or Pacific Islanders and of non-Hispanic Whites, 25.4 percent compared with 10.6 percent and 6.0 percent, respectively (Figure 10). The corresponding figures for between 12 months and 23 months of participation were 11.9 percent for Blacks, 6.4 percent for Asians or Pacific Islanders, and 4.5 percent for non-Hispanic Whites.

The likelihood of receiving meanstested assistance also varied by ethnicity. ${ }^{9}$ In 2009, the average monthly participation rate for Hispanics, 33.0 percent, was higher than that of non-Hispanic Whites,

[^6]Figure 8.
Average Monthly Participation Rates for Major Means-Tested Programs
by Race and Hispanic Origin: 2004-2007 and 2009
2004


Note: For concept definitions, see Text Box, "Program Participation."
Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP), 2004 Panel, waves 1-12, and 2008 Panel, waves 2-5.

Figure 9.
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Participation Rates for Major Means-Tested Programs by Race and } & \square 2004 \\ \text { Hispanic Origin (Participated l or More Months): 2004-2007 and 2009 } & \square 2005 \\ \text { (Percent of noninstitutionalized civilian population) } & \square 2006 \\ & \square 2007 \\ & \square 2009\end{array}$


[^7]Figure 10.
Participation Rates for Major Means-Tested Programs by Race and Hispanic Origin: January 2004-December 2005
(Percent of noninstitutionalized civilian population)


Note: For concept definitions, see Text Box, "Program Participation."
Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP), 2004 Panel, waves 1-7.
11.8 percent (Figure 8). Similarly, Hispanics were more likely than non-Hispanic Whites to receive benefits for at least 1 month in 2009: 44.1 percent of Hispanics participated in a program for at least 1 month compared with 16.9 percent of non-Hispanic Whites (Figure 9). As shown in Figure 10, Hispanics were more likely than non-Hispanic Whites to be long-term participants, with 18.1 percent of Hispanics participating in each of the 24 months from January 2004 to December 2005, compared with 6.0 percent of non-Hispanic Whites.

## Receipt of Means-Tested Assistance by Age

Figure 11 shows that children under 18 years of age were more likely to receive means-tested benefits than those aged 18 to 64 and those 65 years and older. In an average month during 2009, 34.6 percent of children received some type of means-tested benefit, compared with 13.7 percent of people aged

Figure 11.
Average Monthly Participation Rates for Major Means-Tested Programs by Age: 2004-2007 and 2009
(Percent of noninstitutionalized civilian population)


Under 18 years
18 to 64 years
65 years and over
Note: For concept definitions, see Text Box, "Program Participation."
Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP), 2004 Panel, waves 1-12, and 2008 Panel, waves 2-5.

Figure 12.
Participation Rates for Major Means-Tested Programs by Age (Participated 1 or More Months): 2004-2007 and 2009
(Percent of noninstitutionalized civilian population) $\quad \square 2005$



Note: For concept definitions, see Text Box, "Program Participation."
Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP), 2004 Panel, waves 1-12, and 2008 Panel, waves 2-5.

18 to 64 and 12.6 percent of people 65 years and older. From 2004 to 2009 , the percentage of children who received some type of meanstested benefit in 1 or more months of the year increased 2.6 percentage points from 41.3 percent to 43.9 percent, and the percentage of people aged 18 to 64 that received some type of means-tested benefit in one or more months of the year increased 4.1 percentage points from 15.6 percent to 19.7 percent. ${ }^{10}$ There was no significant change for those 65 years and over (Figure 12). Among children, participation in means-tested programs tended to be long-term, with 19.2 percent collecting benefits in all 24 months of calendar years 2004 and 2005, compared to 12.3 percent collecting benefits in 12 to 23 months and 15.0 percent collecting benefits in 1 to 11 months (Figure 13 ).
${ }^{10}$ For people aged 18 to 64 , the 2004 and 2006 estimates were not statistically different.

Figure 13.
Participation Rates for Major Means-Tested Programs by Age: January 2004-December 2005
(Percent of noninstitutionalized civilian population)


Note: For concept definitions, see Text Box, "Program Participation."
Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP), 2004 Panel, waves 1-7.

## Participation Rates by Family Type

Individuals in female-householder families were more likely to participate in major means-tested programs in an average month in 2009 than were individuals in marriedcouple families-46.3 percent compared with 12.3 percent
(Figure 14). ${ }^{11}$ Similarly, 54.9 percent of individuals in femalehouseholder families participated in means-tested programs for at least 1 month of 2009 , in contrast to 17.9 percent of individuals in married-couple families

[^8](Figure 15). Female-householder families were considerably more likely than married-couple families to receive benefits in each of the 24 months of the 2004-2005 period- 30.1 percent compared with 5.1 percent (Figure 16 ).

Figure 14.
Average Monthly Participation Rates for Major Means-Tested Programs by Family Type: 2004-2007 and 2009
(Percent of noninstitutionalized civilian population)


Note: For concept definitions, see Text Box, "Program Participation."
Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP), 2004 Panel, waves 1-12, and 2008 Panel, waves 2-5.

Figure 15
Participation Rates for Major Means-Tested Programs by Family Type (Participated 1 or More Months): 2004-2007 and 2009
(Percent of noninstitutionalized civilian population)


Note: For concept definitions, see Text Box, "Program Participation."
Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP), 2004 Panel, waves 1-12, and 2008 Panel, waves 2-5.

Figure 16.
Participation Rates for Major Means-Tested
Programs by Family Type: January 2004-
December 2005
(Percent of noninstitutionalized civilian population)


Note: For concept definitions, see Text Box, "Program Participation."
Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP), 2004 Panel, waves 1-7.

## Participation Rates by Education

For people aged 18 and older, lower educational attainment was associated with higher program participation rates. During an average month of 2009, 33.1 percent of people who did not graduate from high school received means-tested benefits, compared with 17.8 percent of high school graduates and 7.8 percent of individuals with one or more years of college (Figure 17). The percentage of individuals who did not graduate from high school and received benefits in at least one month of 2009 (42.9 percent) was higher than the corresponding percentages of high school graduates ( 25.5 percent) and those with one or more years of college (11.9 percent) (Figure 18). Individuals who did not graduate from high school were about twice as likely as high school graduates to receive benefits during the entire 24-month period of 2004

Figure 17.
Average Monthly Participation Rates for Major Means-Tested Programs by Educational Attainment: 2004-2007 and 2009


[^9]Figure 18.
Participation Rates for Major Means-Tested Programs by Educational Attainment (Participated 1 or More Months): 2004-2007 and 2009
(Percent of noninstitutionalized civilian population. People 18 years and older)


Note: For concept definitions, see Text Box, "Program Participation."
Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP), 2004 Panel, waves 1-12, and 2008 Panel, waves 2-5.

Figure 19.
Participation Rates for Major Means-Tested
Programs by Educational Attainment:
January 2004-December 2005
(Percent of noninstitutionalized civilian population. People 18 years and older)


Less than 4 years High school graduate, One or more years of high school no college of college

Note: For concept definitions, see Text Box, "Program Participation."
Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP), 2004 Panel, waves 1-7.
and 2005-22.5 percent compared with 10.2 percent (Figure 19).

## Receipt of Means-Tested

 Benefits by Employment StatusPeople without jobs-those who were unemployed or out of the labor force-were more likely to receive means-tested benefits in an average month of 2009 than were either full-time or part-time workers. ${ }^{12}$ For people 18 years and older, 28.3 percent of the unemployed received means-tested benefits in an average month of 2009, compared with 23.3 percent of those not in the labor force, 14.2 percent of part-time workers, and 5.1 percent of full-time workers (Figure 20). About 36 percent of the unemployed participated in means-tested programs for at least

[^10]1 month of 2009 , in contrast with 9.1 percent of full-time workers (Figure 21 ). Whereas 8.4 percent of those not in the labor force received means-tested benefits between 1 and 11 months from January 2004 to December 2005, 16.0 percent did so in all 24 months of that time period (Figure 22).

Monthly Benefit Amounts by Monthly Participation

For many groups, higher average monthly participation rates for assistance programs were generally associated with higher median monthly family benefits
in the 2004-2007 period. ${ }^{13}$ For example, Figure 23 shows that from 2004 to 2007, Blacks, whose average monthly participation rate

[^11]Figure 20.
Average Monthly Participation Rates for Major Means-Tested Programs by Employment Status: 2004-2007 and 2009
(Percent of noninstitutionalized civilian population. People 18 years and older)


Note: For concept definitions, see Text Box, "Program Participation."
Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP), 2004 Panel, waves 1-12, and 2008 Panel, waves 2-5.

Figure 21.
Participation Rates for Major Means-Tested Programs by Employment Status (Participated 1 or More Months): 2004-2007 and 2009
(Percent of noninstitutionalized civilian population. People 18 years and older)


Note: For concept definitions, see Text Box, "Program Participation."
Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP), 2004 Panel, waves 1-12, and 2008 Panel, waves 2-5.
was 37.6 percent, had a median monthly family benefit of $\$ 374$. In comparison, the non-Hispanic White participation rate was just 10.8 percent, and for this group the median monthly family benefit was lower at $\$ 324$. Over the same period, children under 18 years old had an average monthly participation rate of 32.0 percent, and they received a median monthly family benefit of $\$ 364$, higher than the $\$ 269$ for those 65 and older, whose average monthly participation rate was just 15.0 percent. While families with a female householder, no husband present, had a considerably higher monthly participation rate than married-couple families (44.9 percent and 11.2 percent, respectively), there was no statistically significant difference in their median monthly family benefit amounts (\$376 and \$365, respectively).

Figure 22.
Participation Rates for Major Means-Tested Programs by Employment Status: January 2004-December 2005
(Percent of noninstitutionalized civilian population. People 18 years and older)


Note: For concept definitions, see Text Box, "Program Participation."
Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP), 2004 Panel, waves 1-7.

Figure 23.
Median Monthly Benefit Amount for People Receiving Mean-Tested Program Benefits by Selected Characteristics: 2004-2007


Note: The dollar amounts are inflation-adjusted to 2007 dollars.
Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Survey of Income and Program Participation, 2004 Panel, waves 1-12.

## SOURCE OF THE DATA

The population represented (the population universe) in the 2004 and 2008 Panels of the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP) is the civilian noninstitutionalized population of the United States. The SIPP is a longitudinal survey conducted at 4-month intervals. The data in this report were collected from February 2004 through January 2008 in all 12 waves of the 2004 SIPP and from February 2009 through April 2010 in waves $2-5$ of the 2008 SIPP and refer to the period from January 2004 through December 2007 and January 2009 through December 2009. The institutionalized population, which is excluded from the population universe, is composed primarily of the population in correctional institutions and nursing homes (91 percent of the 4.1 million institutionalized people in Census 2000).

## ACCURACY OF THE ESTIMATES

Statistics from surveys are subject to sampling and nonsampling error. All comparisons presented in this report have taken sampling error into account and are significant at the 90 percent confidence level unless otherwise noted. This means the 90 percent confidence interval for the difference between the estimates being compared does not include zero.

Nonsampling errors in surveys may be attributed to a variety of sources, such as how the survey is designed, how respondents interpret questions, how able and willing respondents are to provide correct answers, and how
accurately the answers are coded and classified. To minimize these errors, the U.S. Census Bureau employs quality control procedures throughout the production process, including the overall design of the surveys, the wording of questions, the review of the work of interviewers and coders, and the statistical review of reports to minimize these errors.

The SIPP weighting procedure uses ratio estimation, whereby sample estimates are adjusted to independent estimates of the national population by age, race, sex, and Hispanic origin. This weighting partially corrects for bias due to under-coverage, but biases may still be present when people who are missed by the survey differ from those interviewed in ways other than age, race, sex, and Hispanic origin. How this weighting procedure affects other variables in the survey is not precisely known. All of these considerations affect comparisons across different surveys or data sources. ${ }^{14}$

For further information on the source of the data and accuracy of the estimates, including standard errors and confidence intervals, go to <www.census.gov/sipp/sourceac /S\&A04_W1toW12(S\&A-10).pdf> (2004 SIPP), or <www.census .gov/sipp/sourceac/S\&A08 _W1 toW6(S\&A-13).pdf> (2008 SIPP).

Additional information on the SIPP, including questions on the topical modules, can be found at the following Web sites: <www.sipp.census.gov/sipp/> (main SIPP Web site), <www.sipp

[^12].census.gov/sipp/workpapr /wp230.pdf> (SIPP Quality Profile), and <www.sipp.census.gov/sipp /usrguide.html> (SIPP User's Guide).

## CONTACTS

Contact Ralph Culver III of the Census Bureau's Demographic Statistical Methods Division on the Internet at <ralph.culver.iii@census .gov> or Jamie Choi of the Census Bureau's Demographic Statistical Methods Division at <jamie.choi @census.gov> for further information on the source of the data and accuracy of the estimates, including confidence intervals.

For information on the content of the report, contact John J. Hisnanick, Chief, Program Participation and Income Transfer Branch at [john.j.hisnanick@census.gov](mailto:john.j.hisnanick@census.gov) or 301-763-2295.

## USER COMMENTS

The Census Bureau welcomes the comments and advice of users of its data and reports. If you have any suggestions or comments, please send an e-mail to <www.ask .census.gov>.
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Appendix Table A-1.
Average Monthly Participation Rates for Any Major Means-Tested Program by Selected Characteristics: 2004-2007 and 2009
(In percent)

| Characteristic | Participation rates in any means-tested program ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2004 | Margin of error <br> ( $\pm$ | 2005 | Margin of error $( \pm)$ | 2006 | Margin of error <br> ( $\pm$ | 2007 | Margin of error $( \pm)$ | 2009 | Margin of error <br> $( \pm)$ |
| Total number of recipients (in thousands). . . . . . . . . <br> As percent of the population | 41,841 17.1 | 658 0.3 | 42,313 17.8 | 717 0.3 | 31,612 17.8 | 926 0.5 | 42,837 17.4 | 1,077 0.4 | 44,822 18.6 | 691 0.3 |
| Race and Hispanic origin ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White | 13.7 | 0.3 | 14.3 | 0.3 | 14.1 | 0.5 | 13.9 | 0.4 | 15.2 | 0.3 |
| Non-Hispanic | 10.8 | 0.3 | 11.1 | 0.3 | 10.6 | 0.5 | 10.6 | 0.4 | 11.8 | 0.3 |
| Black | 37.1 | 1.0 | 38.3 | 1.1 | 38.1 | 1.8 | 36.8 | 1.6 | 38.9 | 1.0 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 15.7 | 1.4 | 17.7 | 1.7 | 18.0 | 2.8 | 17.3 | 2.3 | 14.9 | 1.4 |
| Hispanic. | 30.1 | 0.9 | 31.2 | 1.0 | 31.5 | 1.5 | 30.2 | 1.4 | 33.0 | 0.9 |
| Non-Hispanic. | 15.0 | 3.0 | 15.6 | 0.3 | 15.3 | 0.5 | 15.2 | 0.4 | 16.0 | 0.3 |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Under 18 years | 31.9 | 0.7 | 32.4 | 0.7 | 32.0 | 1.2 | 31.8 | 1.1 | 34.6 | 0.7 |
| 18 to 64 years | 11.7 | 0.3 | 12.5 | 0.3 | 12.6 | 0.6 | 12.2 | 0.5 | 13.7 | 0.3 |
| 65 years and older. | 13.9 | 0.7 | 15.3 | 0.8 | 15.6 | 1.3 | 15.1 | 1.1 | 12.6 | 0.7 |
| Sex |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male. | 15.1 | 0.4 | 15.8 | 0.4 | 15.9 | 0.7 | 15.5 | 0.6 | 16.6 | 0.4 |
| Female. | 19.0 | 0.4 | 19.7 | 0.4 | 19.5 | 0.7 | 19.2 | 0.6 | 20.4 | 0.4 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Less than high school graduate. | 30.4 | 1.4 | 33.4 | 1.3 | 34.7 | 2.4 | 33.0 | 2.2 | 33.1 | 1.1 |
| High school graduate, no college | 15.1 | 0.6 | 17.1 | 0.6 | 17.9 | 1.0 | 18.2 | 0.9 | 17.8 | 0.6 |
| One or more years of college | 6.9 | 0.3 | 7.4 | 0.3 | 7.3 | 0.5 | 7.1 | 0.4 | 7.8 | 0.3 |
| Disability status (people 15 to 64 years old) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| With a work disability. | 41.4 | 1.3 | 42.7 | 1.4 | 41.9 | 2.2 | 43.7 | 2.3 | 42.6 | 1.3 |
| With no work disability. | 9.0 | 0.3 | 9.4 | 0.3 | 9.4 | 0.5 | 9.4 | 0.5 | 11.0 | 0.3 |
| Residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Metropolitan. | 16.6 | 0.3 | 17.2 | 0.3 | 17.1 | 0.6 | 16.9 | 0.5 | 18.0 | 0.3 |
| Nonmetropolitan | 19.7 | 0.7 | 20.5 | 0.8 | 20.7 | 1.2 | 19.6 | 1.0 | 21.6 | 0.7 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Northeast. | 18.7 | 0.6 | 19.1 | 0.7 | 20.5 | 1.2 | 19.7 | 1.1 | 19.5 | 0.7 |
| Midwest | 14.3 | 0.5 | 14.9 | 0.6 | 14.6 | 1.0 | 13.6 | 0.8 | 16.5 | 0.6 |
| South . | 17.8 | 0.5 | 18.5 | 0.5 | 18.1 | 0.9 | 17.8 | 0.7 | 18.8 | 0.5 |
| West | 17.5 | 0.6 | 18.7 | 0.6 | 17.9 | 1.0 | 18.6 | 0.9 | 19.5 | 0.6 |
| Family status |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| In families | 17.3 | 0.3 | 17.9 | 0.3 | 17.8 | 0.6 | 17.4 | 0.5 | 19.0 | 0.3 |
| Married-couple families | 10.6 | 0.3 | 11.3 | 0.3 | 11.6 | 0.5 | 11.1 | 0.4 | 12.3 | 0.3 |
| Male householder, no wife present | 24.2 | 1.5 | 25.1 | 1.7 | 23.8 | 2.8 | 23.8 | 2.5 | 26.5 | 1.5 |
| Female householder, no husband present. | 45.1 | 0.9 | 45.5 | 1.0 | 44.4 | 1.7 | 44.6 | 1.5 | 46.3 | 1.0 |
| Unrelated individuals . . . . . . . . . . . | 15.9 | 0.6 | 17.2 | 0.7 | 17.8 | 1.4 | 17.3 | 1.1 | 16.4 | 0.7 |
| Employment and labor force statistics (people 18 and older) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employed full-time ${ }^{3}$ | 4.5 | 0.2 | 4.9 | 0.3 | 5.0 | 0.5 | 5.1 | 0.4 | 5.1 | 0.3 |
| Employed part-time | 12.9 | 0.7 | 13.8 | 0.8 | 13.8 | 1.4 | 12.6 | 1.2 | 14.2 | 0.7 |
| Unemployed. | 24.8 | 2.2 | 29.9 | 2.8 | 31.2 | 5.2 | 28.8 | 4.4 | 28.3 | 1.7 |
| Not in labor force | 23.1 | 0.6 | 24.4 | 0.7 | 24.4 | 1.1 | 24.0 | 1.0 | 23.3 | 0.6 |
| Marital status (people 18 and older) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Married | 6.6 | 0.3 | 7.2 | 0.3 | 7.6 | 0.5 | 7.0 | 0.4 | 7.9 | 0.3 |
| Separated, divorced, or widowed | 20.4 | 0.8 | 21.7 | 0.8 | 21.0 | 1.4 | 21.3 | 1.2 | 20.3 | 0.8 |
| Never married . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 19.0 | 0.7 | 19.9 | 0.8 | 19.8 | 1.2 | 19.4 | 1.1 | 21.2 | 0.7 |

See footnotes at end of table.

Appendix Table A-1.
Average Monthly Participation Rates for Any Major Means-Tested Program by Selected Characteristics: 2004-2007 and 2009—Con.
(In percent)

| Characteristic | Participation rates in any means-tested program ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2004 | Margin of error <br> ( $\pm$ | 2005 | Margin of error ( $\pm$ | 2006 | Margin of error ( $\pm$ ) | 2007 | Margin of error ( $\pm$ | 2009 | Margin of error <br> $\pm)$ |
| Family income-to-poverty ratio ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Under 1.00. | 56.2 | 0.9 | 57.4 | 1.0 | 56.0 | 1.8 | 54.9 | 1.5 | 56.1 | 0.9 |
| 1.00 and over. . . . . . . . . . . . | 10.7 | 0.2 | 11.5 | 0.3 | 11.8 | 0.5 | 11.3 | 0.4 | 11.4 | 0.3 |

${ }^{1}$ Major means-tested programs include Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), General Assistance (GA), Supplemental Security Income (SSI), Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), Medicaid, and housing assistance.
${ }^{2}$ Hispanics may be any race.
${ }^{3}$ Full-time and part-time employment reflect the monthly employment status.
${ }^{4}$ Family income-to-poverty threshold ratio reflects the monthly poverty status. A ratio of under 1.00 indicates that a person is in poverty, whereas a ratio of higher than or equal to 1.00 indicates that a person is not in poverty.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP), 2004 Panel, waves 1-12, and 2008 Panel, waves 2-5.

Appendix Table A-2.
Average Monthly Program Participation Rates for Temporary Assistance for Needy Families or General Assistance by Selected Characteristics: 2004-2007 and 2009
(In percent)

| Characteristic | Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)/ General Assistance (GA) participation rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2004 | Margin of error | 2005 | Margin of error | 2006 | Margin of error | 2007 | Margin of error <br> ( $\pm$ | 2009 | Margin of error |
| Total number of recipients (in thousands). ......... <br> As percent of the population | 3,272 1.3 | 200 0.1 | 2,840 1.2 | 203 <br> 0.1 | 2,012 1.1 | 249 0.1 | 2,588 1.1 | 289 <br> 0.1 | 2,937 1.2 | 194 0.1 |
| Race and Hispanic origin ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White. | 0.9 | 0.1 | 0.8 | 0.1 | 0.7 | 0.1 | 0.6 | 0.1 | 0.7 | 0.1 |
| Non-Hispanic | 0.6 | 0.1 | 0.6 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.5 | 0.1 |
| Black........ | 3.9 | 0.4 | 3.2 | 0.4 | 3.2 | 0.7 | 3.6 | 0.6 | 4.2 | 0.4 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 1.1 | 0.4 | 1.3 | 0.5 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 1.4 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.3 |
| Hispanic. | 2.8 | 0.3 | 2.4 | 0.3 | 2.3 | 0.5 | 1.7 | 0.4 | 2.2 | 0.3 |
| Non-Hispanic. | 1.1 | 0.1 | 1.0 | 0.1 | 0.9 | 0.1 | 0.9 | 0.1 | 1.0 | 0.1 |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Under 18 years | 3.6 | 0.3 | 3.2 | 0.3 | 3.1 | 0.5 | 2.8 | 0.4 | 3.3 | 0.3 |
| 18 to 64 years | 0.7 | 0.1 | 0.6 | 0.1 | 0.6 | 0.1 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 0.6 | 0.1 |
| 65 years and older. | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Sex |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male. | 1.1 | 0.1 | 1.0 | 0.1 | 0.9 | 0.2 | 1.0 | 0.2 | 1.1 | 0.1 |
| Female. | 1.5 | 0.1 | 1.4 | 0.1 | 1.3 | 0.2 | 1.1 | 0.2 | 1.4 | 0.1 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Less than high school graduate. | 1.4 | 0.3 | 1.3 | 0.3 | 1.3 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 1.4 | 0.3 |
| High school graduate, no college | 0.7 | 0.1 | 0.7 | 0.1 | 0.7 | 0.2 | 0.7 | 0.2 | 0.7 | 0.1 |
| One or more years of college | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.1 |
| Disability status (people 15 to 64 years old) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| With a work disability. | 2.3 | 0.4 | 2.3 | 0.4 | 2.2 | 0.7 | 1.9 | 0.6 | 1.8 | 0.3 |
| With no work disability. | 0.6 | 0.1 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 0.6 | 0.1 |
| Residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Metropolitan. | 1.4 | 0.1 | 1.2 | 0.1 | 1.2 | 0.2 | 1.1 | 0.1 | 1.3 | 0.1 |
| Nonmetropolitan | 1.1 | 0.2 | 1.1 | 0.2 | 0.9 | 0.3 | 1.0 | 0.3 | 1.0 | 0.2 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Northeast. | 2.1 | 0.2 | 1.9 | 0.3 | 1.5 | 0.4 | 0.9 | 0.3 | 1.6 | 0.2 |
| Midwest | 1.2 | 0.2 | 1.0 | 0.2 | 1.1 | 0.3 | 1.0 | 0.2 | 1.2 | 0.2 |
| South. | 0.8 | 0.1 | 0.7 | 0.1 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.7 | 0.1 |
| West | 1.7 | 0.2 | 1.7 | 0.2 | 1.6 | 0.3 | 1.9 | 0.3 | 1.9 | 0.2 |
| Family status |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| In families | 1.5 | 0.1 | 1.3 | 0.1 | 1.3 | 0.2 | 1.2 | 0.1 | 1.4 | 0.1 |
| Married-couple families | 0.6 | 0.1 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 0.5 | 0.1 |
| Male householder, no wife present | 1.3 | 0.4 | 1.1 | 0.4 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.9 | 0.5 | 1.3 | 0.4 |
| Female householder, no husband present. | 5.9 | 0.4 | 5.0 | 0.4 | 4.9 | 0.8 | 4.4 | 0.6 | 5.4 | 0.4 |
| Unrelated individuals . . . . . . . . | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 |
| Employment and labor force statistics (people 18 and older) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employed full-time ${ }^{2}$ | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Employed part-time | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.1 |
| Unemployed. . . . . | 2.3 | 0.8 | 2.6 | 1.0 | 2.6 | 1.8 | 1.8 | 1.3 | 2.0 | 0.5 |
| Not in labor force. | 1.2 | 0.2 | 1.1 | 0.2 | 1.0 | 0.3 | 1.0 | 0.2 | 1.1 | 0.2 |
| Marital status (people 18 and older) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Married . . . . . . . . . | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Separated, divorced, or widowed | 0.8 | 0.2 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.7 | 0.2 |
| Never married | 1.1 | 0.2 | 1.0 | 0.2 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 1.3 | 0.2 |

See footnotes at end of table.

Appendix Table A-2.
Average Monthly Program Participation Rates for Temporary Assistance for Needy Families or General Assistance by Selected Characteristics: 2004-2007 and 2009-Con.
(In percent)

| Characteristic | Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)/ <br> General Assistance (GA) participation rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2004 | Margin of error ( $\pm$ | 2005 | Margin of error ( $\pm$ | 2006 | Margin of error ( $\pm$ | 2007 | Margin of error $\pm)$ | 2009 | Margin of error $\pm)$ |
| Family income-to-poverty ratio ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Under 1.00. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 6.8 | 0.5 | 6.0 | 0.5 | 5.7 | 0.8 | 5.4 | 0.7 | 5.4 | 0.4 |
| 1.00 and over. | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.1 |

${ }^{1}$ Hispanics may be any race.
${ }^{2}$ Full-time and part-time employment reflect the monthly employment status.
${ }^{3}$ Family income-to-poverty threshold ratio reflects the monthly poverty status. A ratio of under 1.00 indicates that a person is in poverty, whereas a ratio of higher than or equal to 1.00 indicates that a person is not in poverty.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP), 2004 Panel, waves 1-12, and 2008 Panel, waves 2-5.

Appendix Table A-3.
Average Monthly Program Participation Rates for Supplemental Security Income by Selected Characteristics: 2004-2007 and 2009
(In percent)

| Characteristic | Supplemental Security Income (SSI) participation rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2004 | Margin of error <br> ( $\pm$ | 2005 | Margin of error <br> ( $\pm$ | 2006 | Margin of error ( $\pm$ | 2007 | Margin of error <br> ( $\pm$ | 2009 | Margin of error |
| Total number of recipients (in thousands). | 6,008 | 270 | 6,354 | 301 | 4,848 | 384 | 6,412 | 451 | 6,387 | 285 |
| As percent of the population | 2.5 | 0.1 | 2.7 | 0.1 | 2.7 | 0.2 | 2.6 | 0.2 | 2.6 | 0.1 |
| Race and Hispanic origin ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White. | 1.9 | 0.1 | 2.1 | 0.1 | 2.1 | 0.2 | 2.0 | 0.2 | 2.1 | 0.1 |
| Non-Hispanic | 1.7 | 0.1 | 1.9 | 0.1 | 1.8 | 0.2 | 1.8 | 0.2 | 1.9 | 0.1 |
| Black........ | 5.7 | 0.5 | 6.0 | 0.5 | 6.4 | 0.9 | 5.7 | 0.8 | 6.2 | 0.5 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 3.0 | 0.7 | 3.3 | 0.8 | 4.3 | 1.5 | 3.7 | 1.2 | 3.2 | 0.7 |
| Hispanic. | 3.1 | 0.3 | 3.4 | 0.4 | 3.4 | 0.6 | 3.2 | 0.5 | 3.0 | 0.3 |
| Non-Hispanic. | 2.4 | 0.1 | 2.6 | 0.1 | 2.6 | 0.2 | 2.5 | 0.2 | 2.6 | 0.1 |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Under 18 years | 1.5 | 0.2 | 1.4 | 0.2 | 1.3 | 0.3 | 1.3 | 0.3 | 1.6 | 0.2 |
| 18 to 64 years | 2.4 | 0.1 | 2.7 | 0.2 | 2.8 | 0.3 | 2.7 | 0.2 | 2.7 | 0.2 |
| 65 years and older. | 4.5 | 0.4 | 5.0 | 0.5 | 5.2 | 0.8 | 4.5 | 0.7 | 4.3 | 0.4 |
| Sex |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male. | 2.1 | 0.1 | 2.3 | 0.2 | 2.3 | 0.3 | 2.2 | 0.2 | 2.4 | 0.2 |
| Female. | 2.8 | 0.2 | 3.1 | 0.2 | 3.2 | 0.3 | 3.0 | 0.2 | 2.9 | 0.2 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Less than high school graduate. | 8.8 | 0.7 | 9.5 | 0.8 | 10.1 | 1.5 | 9.9 | 1.4 | 9.3 | 0.7 |
| High school graduate, no college | 3.4 | 0.3 | 4.2 | 0.3 | 4.4 | 0.6 | 4.4 | 0.5 | 3.8 | 0.3 |
| One or more years of college | 1.2 | 0.1 | 1.4 | 0.1 | 1.6 | 0.2 | 1.4 | 0.2 | 1.4 | 0.1 |
| Disability status (people 15 to 64 years old) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| With a work disability. | 18.5 | 1.0 | 19.4 | 1.1 | 20.0 | 1.9 | 20.6 | 1.7 | 19.7 | 1.0 |
| With no work disability. | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.1 |
| Residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Metropolitan. | 2.4 | 0.1 | 2.6 | 0.1 | 2.6 | 0.2 | 2.5 | 0.2 | 2.6 | 0.1 |
| Nonmetropolitan | 2.8 | 0.3 | 3.1 | 0.3 | 3.2 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 2.8 | 0.3 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Northeast. | 3.1 | 0.3 | 3.3 | 0.3 | 3.3 | 0.5 | 3.4 | 0.5 | 3.3 | 0.3 |
| Midwest | 1.8 | 0.2 | 1.9 | 0.2 | 1.9 | 0.4 | 1.8 | 0.3 | 2.1 | 0.2 |
| South. | 2.7 | 0.2 | 3.0 | 0.2 | 2.9 | 0.4 | 2.7 | 0.3 | 2.7 | 0.2 |
| West | 2.1 | 0.2 | 2.5 | 0.3 | 2.7 | 0.4 | 2.6 | 0.4 | 2.6 | 0.2 |
| Family status |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| In families | 1.9 | 0.1 | 2.1 | 0.1 | 2.0 | 0.2 | 2.0 | 0.2 | 2.1 | 0.1 |
| Married-couple families | 1.1 | 0.1 | 1.2 | 0.1 | 1.3 | 0.2 | 1.3 | 0.2 | 1.3 | 0.1 |
| Male householder, no wife present | 3.8 | 0.7 | 4.3 | 0.8 | 4.6 | 1.4 | 4.3 | 1.2 | 3.5 | 0.6 |
| Female householder, no husband present. | 5.3 | 0.4 | 5.3 | 0.5 | 4.9 | 0.8 | 4.8 | 0.6 | 5.1 | 0.4 |
| Unrelated individuals . . . . . . . . | 5.2 | 0.4 | 5.7 | 0.4 | 5.9 | 0.9 | 5.6 | 0.6 | 5.4 | 0.4 |
| Employment and labor force statistics (people 18 and older) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employed full-time ${ }^{2}$ | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Employed part-time | 1.3 | 0.2 | 1.5 | 0.3 | 1.6 | 0.5 | 1.6 | 0.4 | 1.2 | 0.2 |
| Unemployed. . . . . | 2.0 | 0.7 | 2.0 | 0.9 | 2.4 | 1.7 | 2.5 | 1.5 | 1.2 | 0.4 |
| Not in labor force. | 7.7 | 0.4 | 8.6 | 0.4 | 8.6 | 0.7 | 8.1 | 0.6 | 8.1 | 0.4 |
| Marital status (people 18 and older) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Married . . . . . . . . . | 1.0 | 0.1 | 1.2 | 0.1 | 1.4 | 0.2 | 1.2 | 0.2 | 1.2 | 0.1 |
| Separated, divorced, or widowed | 6.0 | 0.4 | 6.5 | 0.5 | 6.1 | 0.8 | 6.0 | 0.7 | 5.9 | 0.5 |
| Never married . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 4.4 | 0.4 | 4.8 | 0.4 | 5.2 | 0.7 | 4.9 | 0.6 | 4.7 | 0.4 |

See footnotes at end of table.

Appendix Table A-3.
Average Monthly Program Participation Rates for Supplemental Security Income by Selected Characteristics: 2004-2007 and 2009—Con.
(In percent)

| Characteristic | Supplemental Security Income (SSI) participation rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2004 | Margin of error ( $\pm$ | 2005 | Margin of error ( $\pm$ | 2006 | Margin of error ( $\pm$ | 2007 | Margin of error ( $\pm$ | 2009 | Margin of error $\pm$ |
| Family income-to-poverty ratio ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Under 1.00. | 7.7 | 0.5 | 8.0 | 0.6 | 7.8 | 1.0 | 7.2 | 0.8 | 5.9 | 0.4 |
| 1.00 and over. . . . . . . . . . . . . | 1.6 | 0.1 | 1.8 | 0.1 | 1.9 | 0.2 | 1.9 | 0.2 | 2.0 | 0.1 |

${ }^{1}$ Hispanics may be any race.
${ }^{2}$ Full-time and part-time employment reflect the monthly employment status.
${ }^{3}$ Family income-to-poverty threshold ratio reflects the monthly poverty status. A ratio of under 1.00 indicates that a person is in poverty, whereas a ratio of higher than or equal to 1.00 indicates that a person is not in poverty.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP), 2004 Panel, waves 1-12, and 2008 Panel, waves 2-5.

Appendix Table A-4.
Average Monthly Program Participation Rates for Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) by Selected Characteristics: 2004-2007 and 2009
(In percent)

| Characteristic | SNAP participation rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2004 | Margin of error ( $\pm$ | 2005 | Margin of error ( $\pm$ | 2006 | Margin of error ( $\pm$ | 2007 | Margin of error ( $\pm$ | 2009 | Margin of error ( $\pm$ |
| Total number of recipients (in thousands) | 18,283 | 459 | 18,755 | 504 | 13,847 | 638 | 19,131 | 759 | 25,254 | 544 |
| As percent of the population | 7.5 | 0.2 | 7.9 | 0.2 | 7.8 | 0.4 | 7.8 | 0.3 | 10.5 | 0.2 |
| Race and Hispanic origin ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White . | 5.5 | 0.2 | 5.8 | 0.2 | 5.7 | 0.3 | 5.8 | 0.3 | 8.1 | 0.2 |
| Non-Hispanic | 4.2 | 0.2 | 4.4 | 0.2 | 4.0 | 0.3 | 4.2 | 0.3 | 6.3 | 0.2 |
| Black | 20.2 | 0.8 | 20.9 | 0.9 | 20.4 | 1.5 | 19.8 | 1.3 | 26.0 | 0.9 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 3.8 | 0.8 | 4.7 | 0.9 | 5.6 | 1.7 | 5.1 | 1.4 | 5.4 | 0.9 |
| Hispanic. | 12.9 | 0.6 | 13.9 | 0.7 | 13.9 | 1.2 | 13.5 | 1.0 | 18.3 | 0.7 |
| Non-Hispanic. | 6.6 | 0.2 | 6.9 | 0.2 | 6.7 | 0.4 | 6.8 | 0.3 | 9.0 | 0.2 |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Under 18 years | 13.4 | 0.5 | 14.0 | 0.5 | 13.7 | 0.9 | 13.7 | 0.8 | 18.6 | 0.6 |
| 18 to 64 years | 5.7 | 0.2 | 6.2 | 0.2 | 6.1 | 0.4 | 6.1 | 0.3 | 8.5 | 0.3 |
| 65 years and older. | 4.1 | 0.4 | 4.5 | 0.5 | 4.8 | 0.8 | 4.7 | 0.7 | 5.3 | 0.4 |
| Sex |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male. | 6.2 | 0.2 | 6.5 | 0.3 | 6.4 | 0.5 | 6.4 | 0.4 | 9.0 | 0.3 |
| Female. | 8.7 | 0.3 | 9.2 | 0.3 | 9.1 | 0.5 | 9.1 | 0.5 | 11.9 | 0.3 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Less than high school graduate. | 15.1 | 0.8 | 16.9 | 1.1 | 17.8 | 1.9 | 16.7 | 1.7 | 20.2 | 1.0 |
| High school graduate, no college | 6.7 | 0.4 | 7.6 | 0.4 | 7.9 | 0.7 | 8.6 | 0.7 | 10.4 | 0.5 |
| One or more years of college | 2.9 | 0.2 | 3.1 | 0.2 | 3.0 | 0.3 | 2.9 | 0.3 | 4.4 | 0.2 |
| Disability status (people 15 to 64 years old) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| With a work disability. | 19.5 | 1.0 | 20.5 | 1.1 | 20.4 | 1.9 | 21.3 | 1.7 | 24.3 | 1.1 |
| With no work disability. | 4.3 | 0.2 | 4.5 | 0.2 | 4.5 | 0.4 | 4.4 | 0.3 | 6.8 | 0.2 |
| Residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Metropolitan. | 7.0 | 0.2 | 7.4 | 0.2 | 7.3 | 0.4 | 7.3 | 0.3 | 9.9 | 0.2 |
| Nonmetropolitan | 9.6 | 0.5 | 10.1 | 0.6 | 10.0 | 0.9 | 9.6 | 0.8 | 13.1 | 0.6 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Northeast. | 7.6 | 0.4 | 7.7 | 0.5 | 8.3 | 0.8 | 8.0 | 0.7 | 10.1 | 0.5 |
| Midwest | 6.9 | 0.4 | 7.3 | 0.4 | 7.1 | 0.7 | 7.1 | 0.6 | 10.0 | 0.5 |
| South. | 9.0 | 0.3 | 9.7 | 0.4 | 9.4 | 0.6 | 8.8 | 0.5 | 11.7 | 0.4 |
| West | 5.6 | 0.3 | 5.9 | 0.4 | 5.5 | 0.6 | 6.6 | 0.6 | 9.2 | 0.4 |
| Family status |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| In families | 7.7 | 0.2 | 8.1 | 0.2 | 7.7 | 0.4 | 7.9 | 0.3 | 10.9 | 0.3 |
| Married-couple families | 3.5 | 0.2 | 3.8 | 0.2 | 4.0 | 0.3 | 3.5 | 0.3 | 5.9 | 0.2 |
| Male householder, no wife present | 9.7 | 1.0 | 10.4 | 1.2 | 8.5 | 1.8 | 10.4 | 1.8 | 15.4 | 1.3 |
| Female householder, no husband present | 25.7 | 0.8 | 26.5 | 0.9 | 25.9 | 1.5 | 27.2 | 1.4 | 31.4 | 0.9 |
| Unrelated individuals. | 6.5 | 0.4 | 7.0 | 0.5 | 6.6 | 0.9 | 7.0 | 0.7 | 8.6 | 0.5 |
| Employment and labor force statistics (people 18 and older) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employed full-time ${ }^{2}$ | 1.9 | 0.2 | 2.1 | 0.2 | 2.2 | 0.3 | 2.3 | 0.3 | 3.0 | 0.2 |
| Employed part-time | 5.8 | 0.5 | 6.1 | 0.6 | 6.1 | 1.0 | 5.6 | 0.8 | 8.4 | 0.6 |
| Unemployed. | 14.8 | 0.8 | 18.1 | 2.3 | 18.8 | 4.4 | 17.9 | 3.7 | 21.1 | 1.6 |
| Not in labor force . | 10.3 | 0.4 | 11.0 | 0.5 | 10.8 | 0.8 | 10.9 | 7.0 | 12.9 | 0.5 |
| Marital status (people 18 and older) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Married . . . . . . . . . . | 2.9 | 0.2 | 3.2 | 0.2 | 3.4 | 0.4 | 3.1 | 0.3 | 4.6 | 0.2 |
| Separated, divorced, or widowed | 9.2 | 0.5 | 9.7 | 0.6 | 9.3 | 1.0 | 10.0 | 0.9 | 12.1 | 0.6 |
| Never married . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 8.7 | 0.5 | 9.3 | 0.5 | 8.8 | 0.9 | 9.1 | 0.8 | 12.2 | 0.6 |

See footnotes at end of table.

Appendix Table A-4.
Average Monthly Program Participation Rates for Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) by Selected Characteristics: 2004-2007 and 2009-Con.
(In percent)

| Characteristic | SNAP participation rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2004 | Margin of error ( $\pm$ ) | 2005 | Margin of error ( $\pm$ | 2006 | Margin of error ( $\pm$ ) | 2007 | Margin of error ( $\pm$ | 2009 | Margin of error ( $\pm$ |
| Family income-to-poverty ratio ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Under 1.00. . | 36.6 | 0.9 | 37.8 | 1.0 | 36.5 | 1.7 | 36.0 | 1.5 | 41.3 | 0.9 |
| 1.00 and over. . . . . . . . . . . . . | 2.7 | 0.1 | 3.1 | 0.1 | 3.3 | 0.3 | 3.2 | 0.2 | 4.6 | 0.2 |

${ }^{1}$ Hispanics may be any race.
${ }^{2}$ Full-time and part-time employment reflect the monthly employment status.
${ }^{3}$ Family income-to-poverty threshold ratio reflects the monthly poverty status. A ratio of under 1.00 indicates that a person is in poverty, whereas a ratio of higher than or equal to 1.00 indicates that a person is not in poverty

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP), 2004 Panel, waves 1-12, and 2008 Panel, waves 2-5.

Appendix Table A-5.
Average Monthly Program Participation Rates for Medicaid by Selected Characteristics: 2004-2007 and 2009
(In percent)

| Characteristic | Medicaid participation rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2004 | Margin of error | 2005 | Margin of error | 2006 | Margin of error | 2007 | Margin of error | 2009 | Margin of error |
| Total number of recipients (in thousands). . . . . . . . . <br> As percent of the population | 34,212 14.0 | 606 0.2 | 34,295 14.4 | 658 0.3 | 25,737 14.5 | 847 0.5 | 34,528 14.0 | 986 0.4 | 33,606 13.9 | 615 0.3 |
| Race and Hispanic origin ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White . | 11.3 | 0.3 | 11.7 | 0.3 | 11.7 | 0.5 | 11.4 | 0.4 | 11.5 | 0.3 |
| Non-Hispanic | 8.9 | 0.2 | 9.1 | 0.3 | 8.8 | 0.5 | 8.7 | 0.4 | 8.8 | 0.3 |
| Black | 29.5 | 0.9 | 30.1 | 1.0 | 29.8 | 1.7 | 28.3 | 1.5 | 28.3 | 1.0 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 13.6 | 1.4 | 15.8 | 1.6 | 15.8 | 2.6 | 15.3 | 2.2 | 12.2 | 1.3 |
| Hispanic. | 24.6 | 0.8 | 25.2 | 0.9 | 25.4 | 1.5 | 24.4 | 1.3 | 25.5 | 0.8 |
| Non-Hispanic. | 12.3 | 0.3 | 12.7 | 0.3 | 12.5 | 0.5 | 12.2 | 0.4 | 11.8 | 0.3 |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Under 18 years | 28.8 | 0.6 | 28.4 | 0.7 | 27.7 | 1.2 | 26.9 | 1.0 | 30.8 | 0.7 |
| 18 to 64 years | 8.6 | 0.3 | 9.3 | 0.3 | 9.6 | 0.5 | 9.2 | 0.4 | 8.7 | 0.3 |
| 65 years and older. | 10.9 | 0.6 | 12.2 | 0.7 | 12.7 | 1.2 | 12.6 | 1.0 | 8.4 | 0.5 |
| Sex |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male. | 12.3 | 0.3 | 12.8 | 0.4 | 12.8 | 0.6 | 12.4 | 0.5 | 12.5 | 0.3 |
| Female. | 15.5 | 0.4 | 16.0 | 0.4 | 16.0 | 0.7 | 15.6 | 0.6 | 15.3 | 0.4 |
| Educational attainment <br> Less than high school graduate. | 23.3 | 1.0 | 26.0 | 1.2 | 27.3 | 2.3 | 25.9 | 2.0 | 21.7 | 1.0 |
| High school graduate, no college | 11.1 | 0.5 | 12.8 | 0.5 | 13.9 | 0.9 | 14.1 | 0.8 | 11.1 | 0.5 |
| One or more years of college | 5.0 | 0.2 | 5.5 | 0.3 | 5.6 | 0.5 | 5.4 | 0.4 | 4.9 | 0.2 |
| Disability status (people 15 to 64 years old) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| With a work disability. | 35.2 | 1.2 | 36.8 | 1.3 | 38.6 | 2.3 | 39.6 | 2.0 | 32.7 | 1.2 |
| With no work disability. | 6.3 | 0.2 | 6.5 | 0.3 | 6.6 | 0.4 | 6.2 | 0.4 | 6.8 | 0.2 |
| Residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Metropolitan. | 13.5 | 0.3 | 14.0 | 0.3 | 14.0 | 0.5 | 13.6 | 0.4 | 13.6 | 0.3 |
| Nonmetropolitan | 16.3 | 0.6 | 16.4 | 0.7 | 16.7 | 1.1 | 15.6 | 0.9 | 15.6 | 0.7 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Northeast. | 15.1 | 0.6 | 15.8 | 0.7 | 16.8 | 1.1 | 16.2 | 1.0 | 15.6 | 0.6 |
| Midwest | 11.7 | 0.5 | 12.0 | 0.5 | 11.8 | 0.9 | 10.9 | 0.8 | 12.2 | 0.5 |
| South. | 14.1 | 0.4 | 14.2 | 0.5 | 14.2 | 0.8 | 13.9 | 0.7 | 13.0 | 0.4 |
| West | 15.1 | 0.5 | 16.0 | 0.6 | 15.5 | 1.0 | 15.5 | 0.9 | 15.8 | 0.6 |
| Family status |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| In families | 14.4 | 0.3 | 14.7 | 0.3 | 14.7 | 0.6 | 14.1 | 0.4 | 14.6 | 0.3 |
| Married-couple families | 9.0 | 0.3 | 9.4 | 0.3 | 9.7 | 0.5 | 9.4 | 0.4 | 9.4 | 0.3 |
| Male householder, no wife present | 20.1 | 1.4 | 21.0 | 1.6 | 20.1 | 2.6 | 19.5 | 2.3 | 19.8 | 1.4 |
| present | 36.9 | 0.9 | 36.5 | 1.0 | 35.4 | 1.7 | 34.1 | 1.4 | 36.2 | 0.9 |
| Unrelated individuals. | 11.6 | 0.6 | 13.1 | 0.7 | 14.3 | 1.3 | 13.5 | 1.0 | 10.6 | 0.5 |
| Employment and labor force statistics (people 18 and older) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employed full-time ${ }^{2}$ | 2.6 | 0.2 | 2.9 | 0.2 | 3.0 | 0.4 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 2.4 | 0.2 |
| Employed part-time | 9.1 | 0.6 | 9.9 | 0.7 | 10.3 | 1.2 | 9.4 | 1.0 | 8.4 | 0.6 |
| Unemployed. | 16.7 | 1.9 | 20.1 | 2.4 | 22.2 | 4.7 | 20.5 | 3.9 | 16.0 | 1.4 |
| Not in labor force | 18.7 | 0.6 | 20.2 | 0.6 | 20.5 | 1.1 | 20.2 | 0.9 | 16.6 | 0.6 |
| Marital status (people 18 and older) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Married | 4.7 | 0.2 | 5.2 | 0.3 | 5.6 | 0.5 | 5.3 | 0.4 | 4.6 | 0.2 |
| Separated, divorced, or widowed | 15.1 | 0.7 | 16.7 | 0.8 | 16.3 | 1.3 | 16.4 | 1.1 | 13.0 | 0.6 |
| Never married . | 14.5 | 0.6 | 15.4 | 0.7 | 15.8 | 1.1 | 15.2 | 1.0 | 14.4 | 0.6 |

See footnotes at end of table.

Appendix Table A-5.
Average Monthly Program Participation Rates for Medicaid by Selected Characteristics: 2004-2007 and 2009-Con.
(In percent)

| Characteristic | Medicaid participation rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2004 | Margin of error ( $\pm$ | 2005 | Margin of error $\qquad$ | 2006 | Margin of error ( $\pm$ | 2007 | Margin of error ( $\pm$ | 2009 | Margin of error $\pm)$ |
| Family income-to-poverty ratio ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Under 1.00. | 46.1 | 0.9 | 46.2 | 1.1 | 44.9 | 1.8 | 43.1 | 1.5 | 42.5 | 0.9 |
| 1.00 and over. | 8.7 | 2.0 | 9.3 | 0.2 | 9.7 | 0.4 | 9.3 | 0.4 | 8.5 | 0.2 |

${ }^{1}$ Hispanics may be any race.
${ }^{2}$ Full-time and part-time employment reflect the monthly employment status.
${ }^{3}$ Family income-to-poverty threshold ratio reflects the monthly poverty status. A ratio of under 1.00 indicates that a person is in poverty, whereas a ratio of higher than or equal to 1.00 indicates that a person is not in poverty.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP), 2004 Panel, waves 1-12, and 2008 Panel, waves 2-5.

Appendix Table A-6.
Average Monthly Program Participation Rates for Housing Assistance by Selected Characteristics: 2004-2007 and 2009
(In percent)


See footnotes at end of table.

Appendix Table A－6．
Average Monthly Program Participation Rates for Housing Assistance by Selected Characteristics：2004－2007 and 2009—Con．
（In percent）

| Characteristic | Housing assistance participation rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2004 | Margin of error （ $\pm$ | 2005 | Margin of error （ $\pm$ | 2006 | Margin of error （ $\pm$ | 2007 | Margin of error （ $\pm$ | 2009 | Margin of error （ $\pm$ |
| Family income－to－poverty ratio ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Under 1．00． | 17.4 | 0.7 | 16.6 | 0.8 | 16.8 | 1.3 | 15.4 | 1.1 | 14.8 | 0.7 |
| 1.00 and over．．．．．．．．．．．．．． | 2.0 | 0.1 | 2.1 | 0.1 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 1.9 | 0.2 | 2.2 | 0.1 |

${ }^{1}$ Hispanics may be any race．
${ }^{2}$ Full－time and part－time employment reflect the monthly employment status．
${ }^{3}$ Family income－to－poverty threshold ratio reflects the monthly poverty status．A ratio of under 1.00 indicates that a person is in poverty，whereas a ratio of higher than or equal to 1.00 indicates that a person is not in poverty

Source：U．S．Census Bureau，Survey of Income and Program Participation（SIPP）， 2004 Panel，waves 1－12，and 2008 Panel，waves 2－5．
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[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Means-tested programs are those that require the income and/or assets of an individual or family to fall below specified thresholds in order to qualify for benefits. There may be additional eligibility requirements to receive these programs, which provide cash and noncash assistance to eligible individuals and families.
    ${ }^{2}$ The Food Stamp Program was renamed the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) in 2008.
    ${ }^{3}$ This program, which in SIPP includes the State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP), is different from Medicare, which provides health insurance coverage to people 65 years and older, to people under 65 with certain disabilities, and to people of any age with end stage renal disease.

[^1]:    ${ }^{4}$ The 2004 Panel followed the same individuals over a period of 48 months from October 2003 to December 2007, and the 2008 Panel is currently scheduled to follow the same individuals over a period of 68 months from May 2008 to March 2014. The data in this report were collected from February 2004 through January 2008 in all 12 waves of the 2004 SIPP and from February 2009 through April 2010 in waves 2-5 of the 2008 SIPP. The population represented (the population universe) is the civilian, noninstitutionalized population living in the United States. The sample of households in SIPP is divided into four interview groups, called rotation groups. Each month, one of the four rotation groups is interviewed about the previous four months (the reference period). For individuals interviewed in rotations 1, 2 , and 3 of the 2004 SIPP, monthly data were not collected for all months at the end of 2007. Data are available for January 2004 through September 2007 for individuals interviewed in the first rotation group, for January 2004 through October 2007 for individuals interviewed in the second rotation group, and for January 2004 through November 2009 for individuals interviewed in the third rotation group. Only those individuals interviewed in the fourth rotation group of the 2004 SIPP have data for January 2004 through December 2007. In the 2008 SIPP, all rotation groups have data for January 2009 through December 2009. For more detail on the interview procedures, interview waves, or rotation groups, see Chapter 2 of the SIPP User's Guide at <www.census.gov/sipp/usrguide/ch2_nov20 .pdf>.

[^2]:    ${ }^{5}$ The longitudinal estimates presented here are based on people who were interviewed in all waves of the reference period or for whom imputed information exists. Efforts were made during the life of the panel to ensure that the sample remained representative of the civilian, noninstitutionalized population of the United States by attempting to follow people who moved to a new address. If the people included in the estimates have different experiences in program participation than those who did not respond initially, left the sample, or missed two or more consecutive waves, these longitudinal estimates may be biased.

[^3]:    ${ }^{6}$ Estimates in this report (which may be shown in text, figures, and tables) are based on responses from a sample of the population and may differ from actual values because of sampling variability or other factors. As a result, apparent differences between the estimates for two or more groups may not be statistically significant. All comparative statements have undergone statistical testing and are significant at the 90 percent confidence level unless otherwise noted.

[^4]:    ${ }^{1}$ A person is a program participant if he or she receives benefits from the program or is covered under the allotment of someone else's benefits. For example, in a given month, two people in a household received SNAP benefits and two additional people in the household are covered by the benefit. In this case, the number of people from that household who participated in SNAP for that month would be counted as "four."
    ${ }^{2}$ Data are not available for calendar year 2008 because data from the 2008 SIPP Panel are not available for the entire period.
    ${ }^{3}$ In 2006, the sample for the 2004 SIPP panel was reduced by 50 percent to account for a budget shortfall. For this reason, only calendar years 2004 and 2005 are included in this analysis.

[^5]:    ${ }^{7}$ The poverty threshold for a family of three with one child was $\$ 15,205$ in 2004, $\$ 16,689$ in 2007, and $\$ 17,268$ in 2009. Data on poverty thresholds by family size and number of children under 18 years for the reported years are available at <www.census .gov/hhes/www/poverty/data/threshld /index.html>.
    ${ }^{8}$ For those individuals not in poverty, the average monthly participation rates increased from 2004 to 2005, with no subsequent changes from 2006 to 2009.

[^6]:    ${ }^{9}$ Because Hispanics can be any race, in this report data for Hispanics overlaps with data for the Black population. Based on data in the 2004 SIPP Panel and using the panel weight, 3.4 percent of the Black population was Hispanic. For the 2008 SIPP Panel, 2.6 percent of the Black population was Hispanic. For this report, data for American Indian and Alaska Natives are not presented due to small sample sizes.

[^7]:    Note: For concept definitions, see Text Box, "Program Participation."
    Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP), 2004 Panel, waves 1-12, and 2008 Panel, waves 2-5.

[^8]:    ${ }^{11}$ In this report, male-householder families and female-householder families are those with no spouse present.

[^9]:    Note: For concept definitions, see Text Box, "Program Participation."
    Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP), 2004 Panel, waves 1-12, and 2008 Panel, waves 2-5.

[^10]:    ${ }^{12}$ Individuals who were not working and on layoff from a job or were not working and looking for a job were considered unemployed. People who were jobless and not on layoff from a job or were jobless and not looking for work were identified as not in the labor force.

[^11]:    ${ }^{13}$ Median monthly benefit amounts include TANF/GA, SSI, and SNAP. The Consumer Price Index (CPI-U) compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics is used to express the 2004 through 2007 monthly benefit amounts in 2007 dollars.

[^12]:    ${ }^{14}$ For a more detailed discussion of SIPP sampling and weighting, see <www.sipp .census.gov/sipp/sam_and_wt.html>.

