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## INTRODUCTION

In 2011 , more Americans connected to the Internet than ever before, although differences continued to exist between those with use and those without. Just as with differences in use, variation in the ways that people were connecting online and the frequency of their use remained prevalent as well.

This report provides household and individual level analysis of computer usage and Internet use. The findings are based on data collected in a July 2011 supplement to the Current Population Survey (CPS), which includes questions about computer ownership, Internet use both inside and outside the home, and the additional devices that people use to go online. The U.S. Census Bureau has asked questions in the CPS about computer use since 1984 and Internet use since $1997 .{ }^{1}$ This narrative report is complemented by a detailed table package that allows users to explore the data in more detail. ${ }^{2}$

In 2011, household respondents were asked how many computers were present in their home. Respondents were also asked whether anyone in their household used the Internet from that home. Later in the survey, respondents were asked about the individual Internet activities of all members of the household, including whether they accessed the Internet, where that use took place, and what types of devices they used. Over time, the Census Bureau has changed the wording

[^0]of many questions in the Computer and Internet Use Supplement. Appendix Table A presents a summary of these changes. ${ }^{3}$

This report begins with a summary of computer and Internet use in American households since 1984, while the second part addresses use specifically in 2011. The final section presents a new "Connectivity Continuum" designed to show variations across an all-inclusive scale of personal technology adoption in the general public.

## HOUSEHOLDS

Computer and Internet use at the household level has changed greatly in recent years (Figure 1). ${ }^{4}$ In 2011, 75.6 percent of households reported having a computer, compared with only 8.2 percent in 1984 (the first year that the Census Bureau asked about computer ownership), and 61.8 percent in 2003 (the last time the Census Bureau asked about computers prior to 2010). ${ }^{5}$ Similar shifts occurred for household Internet use, as 71.7 percent of households reported accessing the Internet in 2011 , up from 18.0 percent in 1997 (the first year the Census Bureau asked about Internet use) and 54.7 percent in 2003 (the first year that more than

[^1]Figure 1.
Household Computer and Internet Use: 1984-2011

*Note: In 2007 and 2009 the Census Bureau did not ask about computer ownership. The estimates presented here for 2007 and 2009 reflect estimates made based on the ratio of computer ownership to Internet use in 2003 and 2010, respectively. Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, selected years.

## 50 percent of households reported accessing the Internet). ${ }^{6}$

Household Internet use has also historically varied across demographics such as race and ethnicity. ${ }^{7}$ In

[^2]2011, 76.2 percent of non-Hispanic White households and 82.7 percent of Asian households reported Internet use at home, compared with 58.3 percent of Hispanic
single race Black, and people who reported the single race Asian. Use of the single-race populations does not imply that it is the preferred method of presenting or analyzing data. Because Hispanics may be any race, data in this report for Hispanics overlap slightly with data for the Black population and the Asian population. Data for the American Indian and Alaska Native and the Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander populations are not shown in this report because of their small sample size in the October 2011 Current Population Survey.
households ${ }^{8}$ and 56.9 percent of Black households (Figure 2). ${ }^{9}$

[^3]Figure 2.
Household Internet Use by Race and Ethnicity: 2000-2011


Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, selected years.

Although disparities in Internet use continued to persist across race and ethnicity groups in 2011, they did appear to be shrinking. For example, in 2000 the differences between household Internet use for White non-Hispanics and both Blacks and Hispanics was about 23 percent. ${ }^{10}$ In 2011 , these differences decreased to about 19 percent between White nonHispanics and both Blacks and Hispanics (Table 1). ${ }^{11}$ In relative

[^4]terms, whereas in 2000 White nonHispanic households were about twice as likely as Black households to report Internet use ( 46.1 percent vs. 23.6 percent), by 2011 White non-Hispanic households were only about 1.3 times as likely as Black households to report the same ( 76.2 percent vs. 56.9 percent).

Although the majority of U.S. households reported having Internet use in the home in 2011, notable differences in Internet use persisted between demographic groups. As Table 1 shows, Internet use was most common in households with householders between 35 and 44 years of age (81.9
percent). ${ }^{12}$ Households with reference persons over the age of 55 reported consistently lower rates of Internet use (61.7 percent), a finding consistent with other years the Census Bureau has asked about Internet activity. Over time, households with highly educated householders have also consistently reported higher rates of Internet use, and in 2011 this was once again the case.

[^5]Table 1.
Household Internet Use by Race and Ethnicity, Education, and Age: 2000-2011
(In thousands)

| Race and ethnicity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Total number of households and percent of households with Internet use |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | White alone, non-Hispanic |  | Black alone |  | Asian alone |  | Hispanic |  |
| 2000. | 78,719 | 46.1 | 13,171 | 23.6 | 3,457 | 56.2 | 9,565 | 23.6 |
| 2001. | 80,734 | 55.2 | 13,304 | 31.1 | 4,081 | 67.5 | 10,476 | 32.2 |
| 2003. | 81,857 | 59.9 | 13,746 | 36.0 | 4,009 | 66.7 | 12,023 | 36.0 |
| 2007. | 83,294 | 66.9 | 14,730 | 45.3 | 4,576 | 75.2 | 13,619 | 43.4 |
| 2009. | 83,810 | 73.3 | 15,254 | 54.5 | 4,625 | 80.5 | 13,799 | 52.8 |
| 2010. | 83,613 | 74.9 | 15,357 | 58.1 | 4,744 | 82.6 | 14,142 | 59.1 |
| 2011. | 83,148 | 76.2 | 15,369 | 56.9 | 4,795 | 82.7 | 14,222 | 58.3 |
| Year | Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total number of households and percent of households with Internet use |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Less than high school |  | High school degree ${ }^{1}$ |  | Some college |  | Bachelors degree or more |  |
| 2000. | 17,402 | 11.7 | 32,278 | 29.9 | 27,883 | 49.0 | 27,684 | 66.0 |
| 2001. | 17,463 | 18.0 | 33,469 | 39.7 | 29,410 | 57.7 | 28,765 | 75.2 |
| 2003. | 16,972 | 20.2 | 34,377 | 43.1 | 30,320 | 62.6 | 31,457 | 78.3 |
| 2007. | 13,978 | 24.0 | 33,099 | 49.5 | 30,434 | 68.9 | 33,302 | 84.0 |
| 2009. | 13,711 | 32.2 | 32,990 | 57.5 | 31,050 | 74.7 | 34,910 | 88.5 |
| 2010. | 13,257 | 35.5 | 33,008 | 60.4 | 31,549 | 77.2 | 35,156 | 89.2 |
| 2011. | 13,183 | 36.9 | 33,060 | 61.2 | 31,586 | 77.3 | 35,301 | 89.9 |
| Year | Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total number of households and percent of households with Internet use |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Under 35 years |  | 35-44 years |  | 45-55 years |  | 55 years and older |  |
| 2001. | 13,892 | 54.0 | 15,066 | 62.7 | 13,418 | 60.9 | 12,655 | 33.9 |
| 2003. | 15,251 | 56.8 | 15,572 | 65.3 | 14,922 | 65.1 | 16,108 | 40.7 |
| 2007. | 16,993 | 57.7 | 16,400 | 71.8 | 17,504 | 70.7 | 21,824 | 50.2 |
| 2009. | 19,150 | 67.0 | 17,249 | 77.8 | 18,982 | 75.8 | 26,558 | 58.2 |
| 2010. | 19,988 | 75.7 | 17,606 | 81.5 | 19,089 | 77.3 | 28,267 | 60.4 |
| 2011. | 19,745 | 75.9 | 17,400 | 81.9 | 19,083 | 77.9 | 29,274 | 61.7 |

${ }^{1}$ This category includes individuals with GEDs.
Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, selected years.

## INDIVIDUALS

Individual Internet use and computer use in 2011 varied by a series of selected characteristics, including age, race and ethnicity, gender, household income, region of residence, employment status, and educational attainment (Table 2). Young people consistently reported both living in households with computers and accessing the Internet from some location. Individuals 18 to 34 years of age, for example, reported living in a home with a computer 82.8 percent of the time and accessing the

Internet 82.0 percent of the time. ${ }^{13}$ At the other end of the spectrum, Americans 65 years of age and older reported living in homes with computers only about 61.8 percent of the time and accessing the Internet about 45.5 percent of the time. This means that nearly four in ten of America's oldest residents did not have a computer in their home, and less than half were accessing the Internet at all.

Differences in computer ownership and Internet use were also present across race and Hispanic-origin

[^6]groups. While about 89.1 percent of Asians and 84.8 percent of nonHispanic Whites reported living in homes with at least one computer, about 68 percent of both Blacks and Hispanics reported the same. ${ }^{14}$ Differences also existed for Internet use, as about 75 percent of both non-Hispanic Whites and Asians reported accessing the Internet from some location, compared with 60.3 percent of Blacks and 54.4 percent of Hispanics. ${ }^{15}$ In summary, about four out of every ten Blacks and almost half of all Hispanics did not use the Internet in 2011.

[^7]Table 2.
Reported Computer and Internet Use, by Selected Individual Characteristics: 2011
(In thousands)

| Selected characteristics | Total | Lives in a home with at least one computer |  | Accesses the Internet from some location |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Individuals 3 years and older | 293,414 | 235,066 | 80.1 | 204,596 | 69.7 |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3-17 years. | 62,138 | 51,720 | 83.2 | 37,419 | 60.2 |
| 18-34 years. | 71,210 | 58,965 | 82.8 | 58,378 | 82.0 |
| 35-44 years. | 39,478 | 33,883 | 85.8 | 32,144 | 81.4 |
| 45-64 years. | 80,947 | 66,016 | 81.6 | 58,630 | 72.4 |
| 65 years and older. | 39,641 | 24,481 | 61.8 | 18,026 | 45.5 |
| Race and Hispanic origin |  |  |  |  |  |
| White alone . . . . . . . . . . | 233,672 | 190,751 | 81.6 | 166,238 | 71.1 |
| White non-Hispanic alone | 190,318 | 161,471 | 84.8 | 142,827 | 75.0 |
| Black alone | 37,117 | 25,337 | 68.3 | 22,370 | 60.3 |
| Asian alone | 13,891 | 12,383 | 89.1 | 10,194 | 73.4 |
| Hispanic (of any race) | 47,114 | 32,032 | 68.0 | 25,648 | 54.4 |
| Sex |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male. | 143,780 | 116,120 | 80.8 | 99,739 | 69.4 |
| Female. | 149,635 | 118,946 | 79.5 | 104,857 | 70.1 |
| Household income |  |  |  |  |  |
| Less than \$25,000. | 70,352 | 39,901 | 56.7 | 35,020 | 49.8 |
| \$25,000-\$49,999. | 76,985 | 58,396 | 75.9 | 49,070 | 63.7 |
| \$50,000-\$99,999. . | 89,514 | 82,408 | 92.1 | 71,509 | 79.9 |
| \$100,000-\$149,000. | 33,157 | 31,862 | 96.1 | 28,810 | 86.9 |
| \$150,000 and more | 23,407 | 22,499 | 96.1 | 20,187 | 86.2 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |
| Northeast. | 52,720 | 43,692 | 82.9 | 37,698 | 71.5 |
| Midwest. | 63,575 | 51,395 | 80.8 | 45,620 | 71.8 |
| South. | 108,353 | 83,546 | 77.1 | 72,694 | 67.1 |
| West | 68,766 | 56,433 | 82.1 | 48,585 | 70.7 |
| Total 15 years and older. | 243,689 | 194,096 | 79.6 | 177,808 | 73.0 |
| Employment status |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employed. . | 140,696 | 121,198 | 86.1 | 114,744 | 81.6 |
| Unemployed. | 14,711 | 11,324 | 77.0 | 11,126 | 75.6 |
| Not in labor force | 88,282 | 61,575 | 69.7 | 51,937 | 58.8 |
| Total 25 years and older. . . . | 201,475 | 158,535 | 78.7 | 142,374 | 70.7 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |
| Less than high school graduate. | 24,960 | 12,703 | 50.9 | 7,864 | 31.5 |
| High school graduate or GED | 61,952 | 43,897 | 70.9 | 36,358 | 58.7 |
| Some college or associate's degree | 53,255 | 44,869 | 84.3 | 42,980 | 80.7 |
| Bachelor's degree or higher. . . . . . . . . . | 61,308 | 57,066 | 93.1 | 55,171 | 90.0 |

Note: The categories in this table are not mutually exclusive.
Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, July 2011.

Previous research has shown that computer ownership and Internet use are both strongly associated with income. ${ }^{16}$ In 2011 , about 96

[^8]percent of individuals living in either households with income of \$100,000 to \$149,999 or \$150,000 or more reported having a computer in their household, compared with 56.7 percent of individuals living in households with annual
income below \$25,000. ${ }^{17}$ Where Internet use was concerned, about 86 percent of high income individuals reported connecting to the

[^9]Internet, compared with 49.8 percent of individuals living in households making less than $\$ 25,000 .{ }^{18}$

Educational attainment was also related to computer and Internet use. For every successive higher level of education, computer ownership increased, from a low of 50.9 percent for individuals with less than a high school degree, to a high of 93.1 percent for those with at least a bachelor's degree. For Internet use, 31.5 percent of non-high school graduates reported connecting to the Internet, compared with 90.0 percent of individuals with at least a bachelor's degree.

## CONNECTIVITY CONTINUUM

Access to computing technology and the Internet is not a simple "yes/no" proposition. As technology has changed and evolved over the years, people have seen an increase in the variation and number of ways they use computers and access the Internet. To explore this phenomenon further, a scale has been developed, designed to place individuals along a "connectivity continuum" of access variations, ranging from people with no Internet connection or computer, to those connecting from multiple locations and devices. ${ }^{19}$

In 2011 , a plurality of Americans connected to the Internet from multiple locations and multiple devices (27.0 percent). These individuals were considered "high connectivity" individuals. The second most common position on the continuum was the opposite extremeindividuals without any computer or Internet activity at all (15.9 percent), or "no connectivity"

[^10]| High Connectivity | - | Internet both inside and outside the home, from multiple devices ( 27.0 percent) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | - | Internet both inside and outside the home, not from multiple devices ( 10.3 percent) |
|  | - | Internet at home only, from multiple devices (12.9 percent) |
|  | - | Internet at home only, not from multiple devices (13.8 percent) |
|  | - | Internet only outside the home, has a computer at home ( 2.6 percent) |
|  | - | Internet only outside the home, no computer at home (3.0 percent) |
|  | - | No Internet use anywhere, has a computer at home (14.4 percent) |
| No Connectivity | - | No Internet use anywhere, no computer use at home (15.9 percent) |

individuals. The remaining 57 percent of Americans were located somewhere between these two extremes.

Table 3 presents the continuum scale tabulated by various social, demographic, and economic characteristics. As can be seen, there are sizeable points of variation along the dimensions previously noted. At the highest end of the scale, certain groups were more likely to report being highly connected. Young people, particularly those between the ages of 18 and 34 , were much more likely to report being highly connected (37.1 percent) ${ }^{20}$ than residents 65 years and older ( 5.6 percent). A strong plurality of Asians (31.7 percent) and non-Hispanic Whites (30.1) were also highly connected, as were individuals with incomes over $\$ 150,000$ (51.8 percent), those with steady employment

[^11](39.6 percent), and those with college degrees ( 47.3 percent). ${ }^{21}$

Among those with no connectivity, the picture was quite different. About 36 percent of individuals aged 65 years and older were in this category, a difference of about 20 percentage points from every other age-based category. Other groups with sizeable proportions of no connectivity included Blacks and Hispanics (about 25 percent each, respectively), individuals living in households making less than $\$ 25,000$ in annual income (35.6 percent), people who were not in the labor force ( 26.3 percent), and individuals with less than a high school degree (44.9 percent). ${ }^{22}$

The degree of connectivity also varied across states (Table 4). Among the areas standing out for their relatively large percentages of highly connected individuals were Colorado (35.8 percent), the
${ }^{21}$ The estimates of high connectivity for Asians and non-Hispanic Whites were not statistically different.
${ }^{22}$ Estimates of "no connectivity" for Hispanics and those not in the labor force were not statistically different, as were the estimates for Hispanics and Blacks.

Table 3.
Connectivity Continuum, by Selected Individual Characteristics: 2011
(In thousands)


[^12] computer to those connecting from multiple locations and devices. The results presented above are inclusive, meaning that they sum to 100 percent for each group. Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, July 2011.

Table 4.

## Connectivity Continuum, by State: 2011

(In thousands)

| Selected characteristics | Total | Percent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | No connection anywhere' |  | No connection at home, but connect somewhere else |  | Connection at home only |  | Connection at home and somewhere else |  |
|  |  | No computer in household | Computer present in household | No computer in household | Computer present in household | Not from multiple devices | From multiple devices | Not from multiple devices | From multiple devices |
| Individuals 3 years and older | 293,414 | 15.9 | 14.4 | 3.0 | 2.6 | 13.8 | 12.9 | 10.3 | 27.0 |
| Alabama | 4,449 | 19.9 | 13.6 | 4.5 | 4.8 | 14.1 | 12.3 | 10.7 | 20.1 |
| Alaska | 664 | 10.4 | 12.6 | 4.3 | 4.4 | 10.7 | 15.5 | 10.8 | 31.3 |
| Arizona | 6,336 | 16.2 | 15.4 | 2.5 | 2.4 | 13.3 | 14.8 | 7.7 | 27.8 |
| Arkansas | 2,708 | 20.8 | 17.9 | 4.0 | 2.6 | 14.0 | 12.3 | 8.4 | 20.1 |
| California | 35,459 | 15.4 | 16.6 | 3.2 | 2.4 | 11.6 | 13.2 | 9.5 | 28.1 |
| Colorado | 4,852 | 11.0 | 10.9 | 2.8 | 2.6 | 13.0 | 12.6 | 11.3 | 35.8 |
| Connecticut | 3,344 | 10.1 | 13.4 | 1.9 | 1.6 | 14.1 | 15.5 | 10.6 | 32.6 |
| Delaware | 850 | 16.6 | 12.8 | 3.0 | 2.5 | 16.2 | 14.9 | 12.1 | 21.9 |
| District of Columbia | 588 | 17.9 | 10.3 | 5.7 | 2.1 | 10.7 | 8.5 | 10.8 | 34.0 |
| Florida | 17,777 | 14.0 | 14.2 | 3.0 | 2.7 | 15.4 | 14.4 | 8.8 | 27.5 |
| Georgia | 9,334 | 16.1 | 14.0 | 3.2 | 3.3 | 13.3 | 13.1 | 9.3 | 27.7 |
| Hawaii | 1,210 | 18.2 | 16.1 | 2.5 | 2.6 | 12.0 | 14.1 | 8.7 | 25.7 |
| Idaho | 1,475 | 11.0 | 15.9 | 2.1 | 3.1 | 16.4 | 18.5 | 10.6 | 22.4 |
| Illinois. | 12,280 | 15.5 | 14.4 | 2.6 | 2.9 | 14.2 | 11.7 | 11.3 | 27.4 |
| Indiana. | 6,121 | 18.7 | 12.9 | 4.3 | 2.5 | 16.4 | 10.1 | 11.5 | 23.6 |
| lowa. | 2,881 | 14.8 | 12.5 | 2.7 | 3.7 | 13.7 | 13.9 | 11.9 | 26.8 |
| Kansas. | 2,653 | 12.6 | 12.4 | 2.9 | 2.7 | 14.7 | 12.8 | 11.2 | 30.7 |
| Kentucky | 4,133 | 19.6 | 14.6 | 2.9 | 2.7 | 14.3 | 11.4 | 11.4 | 23.1 |
| Louisiana. | 4,282 | 19.0 | 14.7 | 4.4 | 2.3 | 12.8 | 13.4 | 8.7 | 24.6 |
| Maine. | 1,252 | 13.5 | 13.1 | 2.7 | 1.9 | 17.7 | 12.2 | 13.3 | 25.6 |
| Maryland | 5,440 | 12.5 | 13.4 | 2.4 | 2.3 | 10.6 | 14.5 | 10.8 | 33.5 |
| Massachusetts. | 6,341 | 12.0 | 13.6 | 2.6 | 1.4 | 14.5 | 14.7 | 12.3 | 28.9 |
| Michigan | 9,438 | 13.5 | 13.2 | 2.7 | 1.8 | 16.5 | 13.5 | 11.6 | 27.2 |
| Minnesota | 5,063 | 9.8 | 11.1 | 2.2 | 2.3 | 14.7 | 13.2 | 13.2 | 33.4 |
| Mississippi. | 2,772 | 26.8 | 14.2 | 4.3 | 4.4 | 10.6 | 11.2 | 8.6 | 19.9 |
| Missouri. | 5,686 | 18.7 | 13.0 | 3.8 | 2.9 | 11.9 | 11.6 | 9.6 | 28.6 |
| Montana. | 933 | 16.5 | 15.8 | 4.9 | 4.5 | 16.3 | 11.7 | 9.6 | 20.7 |
| Nebraska | 1,694 | 14.3 | 11.6 | 3.2 | 3.4 | 15.2 | 10.1 | 11.9 | 30.4 |
| Nevada | 2,519 | 15.3 | 16.5 | 2.6 | 2.4 | 13.1 | 15.9 | 9.4 | 24.9 |
| New Hampshire. | 1,273 | 8.9 | 11.4 | 1.6 | 2.2 | 16.5 | 13.9 | 14.6 | 31.0 |
| New Jersey | 8,261 | 12.3 | 14.2 | 2.1 | 2.0 | 12.6 | 13.4 | 10.7 | 32.6 |
| New Mexico | 1,942 | 21.7 | 17.9 | 3.8 | 4.0 | 10.6 | 9.4 | 11.3 | 21.3 |
| New York | 18,637 | 15.0 | 15.9 | 2.5 | 1.7 | 16.4 | 13.2 | 10.3 | 24.9 |
| North Carolina | 9,005 | 20.4 | 13.4 | 2.8 | 1.9 | 15.4 | 11.2 | 10.0 | 24.9 |
| North Dakota | 612 | 14.5 | 13.7 | 3.0 | 3.2 | 14.9 | 11.3 | 11.9 | 27.5 |
| Ohio. . | 10,967 | 17.0 | 13.5 | 3.0 | 2.7 | 14.8 | 12.9 | 11.0 | 25.1 |
| Oklahoma | 3,496 | 18.0 | 17.4 | 3.1 | 3.3 | 13.8 | 10.5 | 9.6 | 24.2 |
| Oregon. | 3,713 | 10.9 | 12.7 | 3.5 | 3.1 | 12.8 | 15.2 | 11.3 | 30.5 |
| Pennsylvania | 12,004 | 16.3 | 14.2 | 2.4 | 3.1 | 15.9 | 13.2 | 10.1 | 24.8 |
| Rhode Island | 1,008 | 13.6 | 14.2 | 2.4 | 2.2 | 15.9 | 13.2 | 12.4 | 26.2 |
| South Carolina. | 4,344 | 21.6 | 13.5 | 3.8 | 2.4 | 15.9 | 12.3 | 9.7 | 20.8 |
| South Dakota. | 778 | 13.9 | 13.1 | 3.4 | 3.8 | 13.9 | 12.1 | 12.9 | 26.9 |
| Tennessee. | 6,057 | 21.2 | 15.7 | 2.4 | 4.0 | 13.0 | 11.7 | 9.8 | 22.2 |
| Texas. | 23,864 | 20.5 | 15.5 | 4.4 | 3.3 | 10.4 | 11.8 | 8.2 | 25.9 |
| Utah. | 2,693 | 7.5 | 16.3 | 2.4 | 3.0 | 13.4 | 18.1 | 12.1 | 27.3 |
| Vermont. | 599 | 12.1 | 12.3 | 2.8 | 2.9 | 15.1 | 11.2 | 13.9 | 29.7 |
| Virginia. | 7,506 | 16.6 | 13.3 | 2.8 | 2.1 | 13.6 | 11.6 | 11.3 | 28.8 |
| Washington | 6,453 | 9.1 | 10.9 | 2.1 | 2.5 | 16.0 | 13.4 | 13.0 | 33.0 |
| West Virginia | 1,748 | 21.5 | 14.4 | 3.3 | 1.7 | 18.9 | 12.2 | 10.9 | 17.2 |
| Wisconsin | 5,402 | 13.2 | 11.6 | 2.6 | 2.0 | 16.2 | 11.6 | 15.1 | 27.6 |
| Wyoming.... | 517 | 12.7 | 13.0 | 2.5 | 3.6 | 14.8 | 13.5 | 14.7 | 25.1 |

[^13]District of Columbia (34.0 percent), Maryland (33.5 percent), Minnesota (33.4 percent), Washington (33.0 percent), New Jersey ( 32.6 percent), and Connecticut ( 32.6 percent). ${ }^{23}$ At the opposite end of the connectivity continuum, among the states with large percentages of no connectivity were Mississippi (26.8 percent), New Mexico (21.7 percent), South Carolina ( 21.6 percent), West Virginia (21.5 percent), Tennessee (21.2 percent), Arkansas
${ }^{23}$ The states discussed here are not statistically different from one another and may not be statistically different from additional states.
(20.8 percent), and Texas (20.5 percent). ${ }^{24}$

Figure 3 presents estimates of high connectivity for each state, relative to the national average. Again, by high connectivity, we mean Americans who reported connecting to the Internet from multiple devices and locations. In Figure 3, 13 states had percentages of high connectivity statistically above the national average of 27.0 , whereas 17 states had statistically lower percentages of highly connected users. The remaining 21 states

[^14]did not statistically differ from the national average. ${ }^{25}$

The majority of southern states lagged behind the nation in terms of highly connected individuals. The same can be said for segments of other regions, as pockets of the West, Midwest, and Northeast all contained multiple states with low percentages of high connectivity, but in no other region was this phenomenon as consistent as in the South. The Pacific Coast stood out for having large percentages of high connectivity, as Washington, Oregon, California, and Alaska all had significantly large percentages relative to the national average.

[^15]


Figure 4 displays state-level estimates of no connectivity, or individuals who did not connect to the Internet and lived in a home without a computer. Twenty-one states had lower percentages of no connectivity than the national average of 15.9 percent, whereas fourteen states had higher percentages. Once again, the South stands out for having consistently high percentages of individuals with no connectivity. Certain other parts of the country, particularly the Western region and states in New England, showed small concentrations of no connectivity.

In a number of states, the percentage of high connectivity was large, while the percentage of no
connectivity was also small. Alaska, Colorado, Connecticut, Kansas, Maryland, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Oregon, and Washington all had large percentages of high connectivity and small percentages of no connectivity. In a number of other states, the percentage of high connectivity was low, while the percentage of no connectivity was also high. With the exception of Indiana and New Mexico, the remaining eight states that fell into this category were all located in the South. No states had large percentages of both high connectivity and no connectivity, although Idaho stood out for being the only state with small percentages of both high connectivity and no connectivity.

## SMARTPHONES

As computing and Internet technology have evolved, many people have started accessing the Internet via "smartphones," or cellular telephones with additional software capabilities, such as e-mail access or Internet browsers. In addition to asking household respondents whether they used the devices to make phone calls or send text messages, in 2011 the CPS also inquired about using phones to browse the Web, e-mail, use maps, play games, access social networking sites, download applications, listen to music, or take photos and videos

Table 5.
Smartphone Use, by Selected Characteristics: 2011
(In thousands)

| Selected characteristics | Total | Home Internet users |  | Smartphone users ${ }^{1}$ |  | Either ${ }^{2}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Total 15 years and older ${ }^{3}$ | 243,689 | 163,663 | 67.2 | 117,429 | 48.2 | 184,909 | 75.9 |
| Age ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Under 25 years | 42,214 | 29,765 | 70.5 | 28,633 | 67.8 | 36,923 | 87.5 |
| 25-34 years. | 41,408 | 30,839 | 74.5 | 27,896 | 67.4 | 35,683 | 86.2 |
| 35-44 years. | 39,478 | 30,426 | 77.1 | 23,235 | 58.9 | 33,630 | 85.2 |
| 45-54 years. | 43,882 | 31,225 | 71.2 | 19,777 | 45.1 | 33,903 | 77.3 |
| 55 years and over | 76,706 | 41,409 | 54.0 | 17,887 | 23.3 | 44,769 | 58.4 |
| Race and Hispanic origin |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White alone | 195,949 | 134,959 | 68.9 | 93,992 | 48.0 | 150,489 | 76.8 |
| White non-Hispanic alone | 163,475 | 118,471 | 72.5 | 79,439 | 48.6 | 129,451 | 79.2 |
| Black alone | 29,795 | 16,028 | 53.8 | 14,108 | 47.3 | 20,233 | 67.9 |
| Asian alone | 11,237 | 8,801 | 78.3 | 5,793 | 51.6 | 9,322 | 83.0 |
| Hispanic (of any race) | 35,309 | 18,080 | 51.2 | 16,037 | 45.4 | 23,112 | 65.5 |
| Sex of householder |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male. | 118,394 | 81,141 | 68.5 | 57,560 | 48.6 | 90,921 | 76.8 |
| Female. | 125,295 | 82,522 | 65.9 | 59,869 | 47.8 | 93,988 | 75.0 |
| Region of household |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Northeast. | 42,325 | 29,315 | 69.3 | 18,665 | 44.1 | 31,937 | 75.5 |
| Midwest | 53,585 | 36,628 | 68.4 | 24,909 | 46.5 | 40,870 | 76.3 |
| South. | 91,378 | 58,331 | 63.8 | 44,475 | 48.7 | 67,684 | 74.1 |
| West | 56,402 | 39,389 | 69.8 | 29,380 | 52.1 | 44,418 | 78.8 |
| Region of household |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Metropolitan area. | 204,366 | 140,983 | 69.0 | 102,130 | 50.0 | 158,359 | 77.5 |
| Nonmetropolitan area | 39,324 | 22,680 | 57.7 | 15,299 | 38.9 | 26,550 | 67.5 |
| Employment status |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employed. | 146,810 | 111,264 | 75.8 | 85,734 | 58.4 | 124,864 | 85.1 |
| Unemployed. | 16,484 | 10,461 | 63.5 | 8,148 | 49.4 | 12,514 | 75.9 |
| Not in labor force | 80,395 | 41,938 | 52.2 | 23,548 | 29.3 | 47,532 | 59.1 |
| Total 25 years and older.. | 201,475 | 133,898 | 66.5 | 88,796 | 44.1 | 147,986 | 73.5 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Less than high school graduate. | 22,957 | 5,806 | 25.3 | 4,711 | 20.5 | 8,077 | 35.2 |
| High school graduate or GED | 57,911 | 30,590 | 52.8 | 18,564 | 32.1 | 35,593 | 61.5 |
| Some college or associate degree | 56,247 | 41,319 | 73.5 | 27,405 | 48.7 | 45,730 | 81.3 |
| Bachelor's degree or higher. . . . . . | 64,360 | 56,183 | 87.3 | 38,115 | 59.2 | 58,586 | 91.0 |

[^16](i.e., the uses that make the phones "smart"). ${ }^{26}$

Nationally, about 48 percent of individuals 15 years old and above reported using a smartphone
${ }^{26}$ The household respondent refers to the individual who answered the survey questions. Data on smartphones were derived from questions asked only of household respondents and then weighted to reflect the total population 15 years and above.
(Table 5). In some ways, smartphone use mirrored the previous sections addressing household and individual Internet use, as users were once again likely to be young, employed, and highly educated. ${ }^{27}$ However, race and ethnicity did not

[^17]seem to be a particularly strong factor in terms of smartphone use.

Although smartphone use was significantly higher for Asian respondents (51.6 percent), reported rates for White non-Hispanics and Blacks were not statistically different from one another (about 48 percent each, respectively). Additionally,

although White non-Hispanics did report smartphone use at a rate slightly higher than Hispanics (45.4 percent), the reported usage rates for Blacks and Hispanics were not statistically different from one another.

When compared to percentages of home Internet use, smartphones appear to be leveling the Internet use disparities traditionally present for race and ethnicity groups. While 27 percentage points separated the highest and lowest reported rates of home Internet use (Asians 78.3 percent and Hispanics 51.2 percent), a smaller gap of 18 percentage points emerged once smartphone use was factored into overall connectivity rates (Asians 83.0 percent and Hispanics 65.5 percent).

At least one driver of smartphone use is the ability to access mobile telecommunications technology, such as high speed " 3 G " or " 4 G " data networks. As Table 5 shows, the percentage of smartphone users in metropolitan areas (50.0 percent) was significantly higher than for nonmetropolitan areas (38.9 percent), a difference at least somewhat attributable to these high-speed data networks being more readily available in urban areas.

Figure 5 displays smartphone percentages by state and a clear geographic pattern emerges. While many states in the Southeastern and Northeastern parts of the country (along with certain areas in the

Midwest) had smartphone usage below the national average of 48.2 percent, the vast majority of states west of the Mississippi River had smartphone usage rates either statistically higher or not statistically different from the national average

## SUMMARY

In 2011, more Americans connected to the Internet than ever before, although differences continued to exist between those with use and those without. Despite overall increases in computer and Internet use across most households, certain types of individuals remained more likely to report using a computer and connecting to the Internet. These included
young people, White non-Hispanics and Asians, individuals living in households with high incomes, and those with college educations.

Overall, in 2011 a plurality of Americans were "highly connected" individuals (27.0 percent). At the other extreme, about 16 percent of Americans reported "no connectivity" at all. These no-connectivity individuals were disproportionately old, Black and/or Hispanic, low income, and poorly educated.

The use of smartphones also varied according to a number of population characteristics, as users of these devices tended to be young, employed, highly educated, and living in metropolitan areas. Race and ethnicity did not seem to be a particularly strong factor in terms of smartphone use, and smartphone rates were disproportionately low in the eastern part of the country and consistently high west of the Mississippi River.

## SOURCE AND ACCURACY OF THE DATA

The population represented (the population universe) in the Computer and Internet Supplement to the July 2011 CPS is the civilian noninstitutionalized population living in the United States.

Statistics from sample surveys are subject to sampling error and nonsampling error. All comparisons presented in this report have taken sampling error into account and are significant at the 90 percent confidence level. Nonsampling error in
surveys is attributable to a variety of sources, such as survey design, respondent question interpretation, respondent willingness and ability to provide correct and accurate answers, and post survey practices like question coding and response classification. To minimize these errors, the Census Bureau employs quality control procedures in sample selection, the wording of questions, interviewing, coding, data processing, and data analysis.

The CPS weighting procedure uses ratio estimation to adjust sample estimates to independent estimates of the national population by age, race, sex, and Hispanic origin.

This weighting partially corrects for bias due to undercoverage, but biases may still be present when people are missed by the survey who differ from those interviewed in ways other than age, race, sex, and Hispanic origin. We do not precisely know the effect of this weighting procedure on other variables in the survey. All of these considerations affect comparisons across different surveys or data sources.

Further information on the source of the data and accuracy of the estimates, including standard errors and confidence intervals, can be found at <www.census.gov /apsd/techdoc/cps/cpsjull1.pdf> or by contacting the Demographic Statistical Methods Division via Internet e-mail at <dsmd.source .and.accuracy@census.gov>.

## MORE INFORMATION

Detailed tabulations are available that provide demographic characteristics of the population on computer and Internet use. The electronic versions of these tables and this report are available on the Internet at the Census Bureau's Computer and Internet Use Web site (<www.census.gov/hhes /computer/>).

## CONTACT

Contact the U.S. Census Bureau Customer Services Center toll free at 1-800-923-8282 or visit <ask.census.gov> for further information.

## SUGGESTED CITATION

File, Thom. 2013. "Computer and Internet Use in the United States." Current Population Survery Reports, P20-568. U.S. Census Bureau, Washington, DC.

## USER COMMENTS

The Census Bureau welcomes the comments and advice of data and report users. If you have any suggestions or comments, please write to:

Chief, Social, Economic, and Housing Statistics Division U.S. Census Bureau Washington, DC 20233-8500.

Appendix Table A.
Computer and Internet Use Questionnaire Changes Overtime: 1984-2012

| Characteristics | Year and month of supplement |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{array}{r} 2012 \\ \text { October } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2011 \\ \text { July } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2010 \\ \text { October } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2009 \\ \text { October } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2007 \\ \text { October } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2003 \\ \text { October } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2001 \\ \text { September } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2000 \\ \text { August } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1997 \\ \text { October } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1993 \\ \text { October } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1989 \\ \text { October } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1984 \\ \text { October } \end{array}$ |
| Household computer use |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year newest computer obtained |  | $x$ |  |  |  | x | x | x | x | x | x | X |
| Is there a computer in the household |  |  |  |  |  | x | x | x | x | x | x | x |
| Number of computers in the household | x | x |  |  |  | x | x | $x$ | x | x |  |  |
| Is the newest computer owned or leased |  |  |  |  |  |  | x | $x$ |  |  |  |  |
| Characteristics of newest computer |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | x | $x$ | x |  |
| Has there ever been computer use in the home |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $x$ |  |  |  |  |
| Is there a Web TV in the home |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | x |  |  |  |  |
| What type of computer is in the home. |  |  | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Household Internet use |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Is there Internet use at home | $x$ | $x$ | x | x | x | $x$ | x | x |  |  |  |  |
| What type of Internet connection is there at home | x | x | x | x | x | $x$ | x | x |  |  |  |  |
| Reason for no Internet (if applicable) | x | x | x |  |  | x | x | $x$ |  |  |  |  |
| Reason for no high-speed connection (if applicable). | x | x | x | x |  | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Has there ever been Internet use at home | x | x |  |  |  | x | x | $x$ |  |  |  |  |
| Cost concerns contributing to lack of Internet (if applicable) | x | x | $x$ |  |  |  |  | x |  |  |  |  |
| Does connection involve a long distance telephone call. |  |  |  |  |  |  | x | x |  |  |  |  |
| Internet as part of a "bundle" package. |  | $x$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| What other bundled services are provided |  | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| How much does your Internet cost per month. |  | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Have you ever switched providers and why. |  | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Most important factor regarding Internet service. |  | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Access with or without a paid subscription . . . . |  |  | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| What other media are used at home . |  |  |  |  |  | $x$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Is there a wireless network |  |  |  |  |  | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Is there some other device used to connect |  |  |  |  |  |  | x |  |  |  |  |  |
| Internet pricing and payment. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $x$ |  |  |  |  |
| What type of Internet service provider is used |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | x |  |  |  |  |
| Individual computer use |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Where do individuals use computers (home, school, work, etc.) |  |  |  |  |  | $x$ | x |  |  | x | x | x |
| What are computers being used for at these locations |  |  |  |  |  | x | x |  |  | x | x | x |
| Frequency of individual computer use. . . . . . . . . |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | x | x | x | x |
| What children under 18 use computers at school . |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | x |  |  |  |  |
| Individual Internet use |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Who in the household uses the Internet at home. | $x$ | $x$ | x | $x$ |  | $x$ | $x$ | $x$ | $x$ |  |  |  |
| Where outside the home is Internet used (if applicable) | x | x | x |  |  | $x$ | x |  |  |  |  |  |
| What is the Internet used for at home . . |  |  |  |  |  | x | x | x | x |  |  |  |
| Who in household uses the Internet outside the home | x | x | x |  |  |  |  | x |  |  |  |  |
| What is Internet used for outside the home. |  |  |  |  |  | $x$ | x | x | $x$ |  |  |  |
| Who accesses from any location. |  |  |  | x | $x$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| How was the Internet used in the last year |  |  |  |  |  | $x$ | x |  |  |  |  |  |
| What devices do individuals use to access the Internet. |  | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Main devices used for household Internet use |  |  |  |  |  | $x$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Primary respondent questions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Concern with providing personal information over Internet. |  |  |  |  |  | x | x | x |  |  |  |  |
| Concern with children being exposed to material online |  |  |  |  |  | $x$ | x | $x$ |  |  |  |  |
| Cellular/smartphone use and for what purpose (if applicable) | x | $x$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reliance on Internet (if applicable) | $x$ | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Frequency of Internet use . |  | x |  |  |  | $x$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Concern with providing personal information over Internet. |  | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Specific Internet related activities |  | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Concern with Internet safety . |  | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Methods used to ensure child safety online |  | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sources of news and information . . . . . . . |  | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sources of online news and information |  | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Note: This table provides a summary of general concepts addressed in the CPS Computer and Internet Supplements. Over time, the exact wording of specific questions has occasionally changed and this table should be used for general guidance only. An " $x$ " next to a question characteristic implies that this concept was measured in a specific year, but in some instances the exact question wording is not precisely the same across all marked years. Data users interested in making direct comparative statements about computer or Internet use supplements should consult the Current Population Survey technical documentation at <www.census.gov/cps/methodology/techdocs.html>, or contact the Census Bureau's Education and Social Stratification Branch at 301-763-2464.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 1984, 1989, 1993, 1997, 2000, 2001, 2003, 2007, 2009, 2010, $2011,2012$.


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ People in the military, U.S. citizens living abroad, and people in institutionalized housing, such as correctional institutions and nursing homes, were not included in the surveys discussed in this report. ${ }^{2}$ Additional historical computer and Internet data, as well as detailed tables addressing the topics discussed in this research, are available at <www.census.gov/hhes/computer/>.

[^1]:    ${ }^{3}$ Beginning in 2013, the Census Bureau will begin asking a series of Internet-related questions on the American Commmunity Survey (ACS). For more information on the ACS, please visit <www.census.gov/acs /www/>.
    ${ }^{4}$ The estimates in this report (which may be shown in maps, 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. Unless otherwise noted, all comparative statements have undergone statistical testing and are significant at the 90 percent confidence level.
    ${ }^{5}$ Please see footnote 9 for a fuller discussion about comparing 2010 and 2011 estimates.

[^2]:    ${ }^{6}$ Changes between 2010 and 2011 were smaller than in some of the previous years, in part due to question wording and other instrument changes. See Appendix A for a summary of these changes.
    ${ }^{7}$ Federal surveys now give respondents the option of reporting more than one race. Therefore, two basic ways of defining a race group are possible. A group such as Asian may be defined as those who reported Asian and no other race (the race-alone or singlerace concept) or as those who reported Asian regardless of whether they also reported another race (the race-alone-or-in-combination concept). The body of this report (text, figures, and text tables) shows data for people who reported they were the single race White and not Hispanic, people who reported the

[^3]:    ${ }^{8}$ In 2011, reported household Internet use for Blacks and Hispanics were not statistically different.
    ${ }^{9}$ Readers will note that the overall rate of household computers failed to increase between 2010 and 2011 data points, the only period in our research where a significant increase failed to occur. There are a number of possible explanations for this seemingly counterintuitive result. First, the period between the 2010 and 2011 was by far the shortest gap in the CPS Computer and Internet time series. Additionally, questions were changed in substantive ways in 2011 that may have impacted the data in unforeseen ways (see Appendix A). Also, between October 2010 and July 2011, the number of American households actually decreased according to CPS estimates, by a total of about 300,000 households. Although explaining this additional phenomenon remains outside the scope of this particular research, the mere fact that the household base decreased between these periods is cause for caution when attempting to substantively interpret any household level change.

[^4]:    ${ }^{10}$ The differences of about 23 percent between White non-Hispanics and both Blacks and Hispanics were not statistically different from one another.
    ${ }^{11}$ The differences of about 19 percent between White non-Hispanics and both Blacks and Hispanics were not statistically different from one another.

[^5]:    12 The householder refers to the person (or one of the persons) in whose name the housing unit is owned or rented (maintained) or, if there is no such person, any adult member, excluding roomers, boarders, or paid employees. If the house is owned or rented jointly by a married couple, the householder may be either the husband or the wife. The person designated as the householder is the "reference person" to whom the relationship of all other household members, if any, is recorded.

[^6]:    ${ }^{13}$ The percent of individuals 18-34 years of age accessing the Internet ( 82.0 percent) was not statistically different than percent of $35-44$ year olds accessing the Internet (81.4). The percent of individuals 18-34 years of age living in a household with a computer (82.8 percent) was not statistically different from the percent of 3-17 year olds (83.2) reporting the same.

[^7]:    ${ }^{14}$ The estimates for Blacks and Hispanics living in homes with a computer (both about 68 percent) are not significantly different.
    ${ }^{15}$ The estimates for non-Hispanic Whites and Asians accessing the Internet (about 75 percent) are not significantly different.

[^8]:    ${ }^{16}$ See <www.census.gov/prod/2005pubs /p23-208.pdf> and <http://pewinternet .org/Reports/2012/Digital-differences /Main-Report/Internet-adoption-over-time .aspx> for two examples.

[^9]:    ${ }^{17}$ The computer estimates for individuals in households with incomes of $\$ 100,000$ to \$149,999 and individuals in households with incomes above $\$ 150,000$ were not significantly different.

[^10]:    18 The Internet estimates for individuals in households with incomes of $\$ 100,000$ to \$149,999 and individuals in households with incomes above $\$ 150,000$ were not significantly different.
    ${ }^{19}$ This scale is highly subjective in nature and should be interpreted as such.

[^11]:    ${ }^{20}$ The estimate for highly connected people aged 18-34 (37.1 percent) was not significantly different from the estimate for those aged 35-44.

[^12]:    ${ }^{1}$ The connectivity continuum scale is designed to place individuals along a range of connectivity outcomes, ranging from people with no Internet connection or

[^13]:    ${ }^{1}$ The connectivity continuum scale is designed to place individuals along a range of connectivity outcomes, ranging from people with no Internet connection or computer to those connecting from multiple locations and devices. The results presented above are inclusive, meaning that they sum to 100 percent for each group. Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, July 2011.

[^14]:    ${ }^{24}$ The estimate of no connectivity for Mississippi is significantly different from all other states, but the remaining listed states discussed here are not significantly different from each other, nor are they significantly different from additional states that are not specifically discussed here.

[^15]:    ${ }^{25}$ All comparative statements about these maps have undergone statistical testing and are significant at the 90 percent confidence level.

[^16]:    ${ }^{1}$ Smartphone use includes anyone who reported using their phone to browse the Web, e-mail, use maps, play games, access social networking sites, download apps, listen to music, or take photos and videos.
    ${ }^{2}$ This includes the number and percentage of individuals who either use the Internet at home, use a smartphone, or both.
    ${ }^{3}$ Data in this table are from questions asked only of household respondents and then weighted to reflect the total population.
    ${ }^{4}$ Because household respondents tended to be older, the data for those below the age of 25 had more variability than for older respondents. The estimates in this section for those under 25 should therefore be interpreted with caution.

    Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, July 2011.

[^17]:    ${ }^{27}$ The estimates of smartphone use for individuals under 25 years old and people 25 to 34 were not statistically different.

