Sources of Health Insurance and Characteristics of the Uninsured: Analysis of the March 2003 Current Population Survey

by Paul Fronstin, EBRI

- This Issue Brief provides historic data through 2002 on the number and percentage of nonelderly Americans with and without health insurance. It discusses trends in coverage for the 1987–2002 period and highlights characteristics that typically indicate whether an individual is insured. Based on EBRI estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau’s March 2003 Current Population Survey (CPS), it represents 2002 data.

- The percentage of the nonelderly American population (under age 65) with health insurance coverage declined in 2002 to a post-1987 low of 82.7 percent. Declines in health insurance coverage have been recorded in all but three years since 1987, when 29.5 million nonelderly Americans were uninsured; in 2002, the uninsured population was 43.3 million.

- The main reason for the increase in the number of uninsured Americans in 2002 was the weak economy coupled with the rising cost of providing health benefits. Fewer workers and their families were covered by employment-based health benefits. The segment of the American population with employment-based health coverage dropped from 70.1 percent in 1987 to 64.2 percent in 2002. In 2001 and 2002, both the number and percentage of Americans covered by health insurance declined.

- The largest public program, state-administered Medicaid, increased enrollment by 1.6 million from 2001 to 2002, to cover 11.9 percent of the nonelderly population. That figure is significantly above the 8.7 percent level in 1987 but below the high of 12.9 percent in 1993.

- Public-sector health coverage increased to 15.9 percent of the nonelderly population in 2002, and remains above the pre-1990 low of 13.3 percent.

- Individually purchased health coverage rose slightly, from 6.6 percent in 2001 to 6.7 percent in 2002, yet remains less popular than it was in 1987. This type of health insurance coverage recorded a high of 7.7 percent in 1993. The number of people with such coverage rose from 15 million in 1987 to 16.8 million in 2002.

- No type of health insurance coverage has recorded an unbroken trend since 1987. There were crosscurrents: Employment-based coverage declined significantly enough in the 1987–1993 period to overwhelm growth in public programs. In the next six years, the dynamic reversed, as public programs declined more quickly than growth in employment-based coverage. Public programs declined as the poverty population dropped during an economic boom that pulled the poor into the work force while welfare reform pushed them in the same direction.
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Introduction

In 2002, continuing a trend that has occurred during most years since 1987, the percent-
age of nonelderly Americans with health insurance decreased: 82.7 percent of Americans were covered in 2002, down from 83.5 percent in 2001 (calculated from Figure 1). More than 206 million Americans had insurance coverage in 2002, while 43.3 million were uninsured. The percentage of nonelderly Americans without health insurance coverage increased from 16.5 percent in 2001 to 17.3 percent in 2002 (Figure 1).

The main reason for the increase in the number of uninsured Americans in 2002 was the weak economy coupled with the rising cost of providing health benefits. Fewer workers and their families were covered by employment-based health benefits. In 2002, the per-
cent-age of nonelderly Americans covered by employment-
ated health benefits declined to 64.2 percent from 65.6 percent in 2001 and more than 67 percent in 2000 (Figure 1).

While the majority of Americans insured in 2002 received coverage through an employment-based health plan, 40 million were covered by public programs, and an additional 16.8 million purchased policies directly from an insurer. Nearly 30 million Americans participated in the Medicaid or State Children’s Health Insurance Program (S-CHIP), and 6.9 million received their health insurance through the Tricare and CHAMPVA programs and other government programs for retired military and their families.

This Issue Brief examines the status of health insurance coverage in the United States. The data are based primarily on the March 2003 Current Population Survey (CPS), with some analysis based on other CPS surveys. The report focuses on the nonelderly population (under age 65) because this group can receive health insurance coverage from a number of different sources. By contrast, Medicare covers nearly all of the elderly population. The next section discusses recent trends in health insurance coverage and some of their causes. The following section discusses the determinants of having employment-based or other types of health insurance coverage. The section after that discusses the uninsured population and the factors associated with being uninsured, and is followed by a section examining policy implications. The final section presents conclusions. Data sources are discussed in the appendix.

Trends

The percentage of Americans without health insurance coverage has increased significantly since 1987 for a number of reasons. Between 1987 and 1993, for example, the increase in the uninsured can be attributed to the erosion of employment-based health benefits. This decline overwhelmed the growth in public programs. By contrast, between 1993 and 1999, the dynamic reversed and the growth in employment-based coverage was overshadowed by a reduction in those covered by public programs.

For example, between 1993 and 2000, the percent-
age of nonelderly Americans covered by Medicaid declined from 12.9 percent to 10.4 percent as former welfare recipients entered the work force, encouraged by the carrot of a booming economy and the stick of benefit limits imposed by welfare reform.

Similarly, the percentage of nonelderly Americans covered by Tricare or CHAMPVA declined from 3.8 percent to 2.6 percent between 1994 and 2000 in large part due to downsizing in the military.

By contrast, the S-CHIP program is having a positive impact on coverage rates for children. Between 1998 and 2002, the percentage of children covered by Medicaid or S-CHIP increased from 20 percent to nearly 24 percent (Figure 2). Between 1998 and 2000, the percentage of children covered by employment-based
Figure 1
NONELDERLY AMERICANS WITH SELECTED SOURCES OF HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE, 1987–2002

| Note: Details may not add to totals because individuals may receive coverage from more than one source. |
| a Tricare (formerly known as CHAMPUS) is a program administered by the Department of Defense for military retirees as well as families of active duty, retired, and deceased service members. CHAMPVA, the Civilian Health and Medical Program for the Department of Veterans Affairs, is a health care benefits program for disabled dependents of veterans and certain survivors of veterans. |
| b Results are based on Census 1990-based weights. |
| c Results are based on Census 2000-based weights. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>214.4</td>
<td>216.6</td>
<td>218.5</td>
<td>220.6</td>
<td>222.9</td>
<td>225.5</td>
<td>228.0</td>
<td>229.9</td>
<td>231.9</td>
<td>234.0</td>
<td>236.2</td>
<td>238.6</td>
<td>240.7</td>
<td>242.8</td>
<td>244.8</td>
<td>247.5</td>
<td>250.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment-based coverage</td>
<td>150.3</td>
<td>151.2</td>
<td>151.7</td>
<td>149.6</td>
<td>149.5</td>
<td>147.8</td>
<td>146.7</td>
<td>148.1</td>
<td>149.7</td>
<td>151.7</td>
<td>152.6</td>
<td>156.7</td>
<td>160.3</td>
<td>162.4</td>
<td>164.4</td>
<td>162.3</td>
<td>161.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own name</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>84.8</td>
<td>84.1</td>
<td>82.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent coverage</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>78.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individually Purchased</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tricare/CHAMPVAa</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Health Insurance</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment-based coverage</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>64.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own name</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent coverage</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individually Purchased</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tricare/CHAMPVAa</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Health Insurance</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Details may not add to totals because individuals may receive coverage from more than one source.

Figure 2

| a Tricare (formerly known as CHAMPUS) is a program administered by the Department of Defense for military retirees as well as families of active duty, retired, and deceased service members. CHAMPVA, the Civilian Health and Medical Program for the Department of Veterans Affairs, is a health care benefits program for disabled dependents of veterans and certain survivors of veterans. |
| b Results are based on Census 1990-based weights. |
| c Results are based on Census 2000-based weights. |
health benefits increased, while it declined between 2000 and 2002. Overall, the percentage of children without health insurance coverage declined from 14 percent in 1998 to 11.6 percent in 2002.

Between 1994 and 2000, the percentage of nonelderly Americans covered by employment-based health benefits increased (Figure 1). In 1994, 64.4 percent of nonelderly Americans had employment-based health benefits. By 2000, 67.3 percent were covered. At the same time, the percentage with Medicaid coverage declined from 12.7 percent to 10.4 percent. These trends, however, mask important differences among various groups in the U.S. population. For example, the increase in employment-based health benefits was limited to children between 1994 and 1997; during that period, the percentage of children covered by an employment-based health plan increased from 58.8 percent to 60.4 percent (Figure 2), while for adults it was virtually unchanged (Figure 3). In contrast, between 1997 and 2000, the percentage of adults with employment-based health benefits increased from 67.1 percent to 69.1 percent (Figure 3).

Fronstin (1999b) has shown why the likelihood of a child being covered by employment-based health benefits increased. The study found that the percentage of children with a working parent increased, the percentage of children in families with incomes below the poverty level decreased, and more children had a working parent employed in a large firm. The increase in employment-based coverage among children during this period can in part be attributed to an increase in the number of adult women working. Figure 4 shows how the percentage of women ages 18–45 in families receiving public assistance or welfare income declined, while employment increased.

Between 1994 and 1997, the percentage of working adults with employment-based health benefits held steady at roughly 73 percent (Figure 5). During this period, the cost of providing health benefits to employees was flat. Between 1997 and 2000, the percentage of working adults with employment-based health insurance increased from 73.1 percent to 74.7 percent. This occurred in part because the percentage of small firms offering health benefits increased (Gabel et al., 2001), despite the rising cost of health benefits, especially among small firms (Figure 6). It is also likely that the changing composition of the labor force accounted for some of the increase in the percentage of workers covered by employment-based health benefits. For example, the percentage of workers who were self-employed declined between 1997 and 2000, as did the
Figure 4

PERCENTAGE OF WOMEN AGES 18–45 WHO ARE IN FAMILIES WITH WELFARE INCOME OR WHO ARE EMPLOYED, 1994–2002


Figure 5

PERCENTAGE OF WORKERS, AGES 18–64, WITH EMPLOYMENT-BASED HEALTH BENEFITS, MEDICAID, AND WITHOUT HEALTH INSURANCE, 1987–2002


\[a\] Results are based on Census 1990-based weights.

\[b\] Results are based on Census 2000-based weights.
Figure 6

**Premium Increases by Firm Size, 1988–2002**

![Graph showing premium increases by firm size from 1988 to 2002. The chart indicates that premium increases were relatively low from 1988 to 1993, rising sharply from 1993 to 1996, and then declining again to 1998. Premium increases for small firms (3–199 workers) and all firms are shown.](image)

Source: KFF/HRET Survey of Employer-Sponsored Health Benefits.

Figure 7

**Percentage of Workers Who Are Self-Employed, Employed in Large Firms, or Employed Part Time, 1994–2002**

![Graph showing percentage of workers engaged in various employment statuses from 1994 to 2002. The chart indicates that the percentage of self-employed workers has remained relatively stable, while the percentage employed by firms with 100 or more workers has increased, and the percentage employed part time has decreased.](image)

percentage of workers employed on a part-time basis (Figure 7).

The increase in the percentage of Americans with employment-based health benefits between 1997 and 2000 has several explanations. A strong economy and low unemployment rates caused more employers to provide health benefits in order to attract and retain workers, and also may have resulted in more workers being able to afford health insurance. On the other hand, the cost of providing health benefits to workers was increasing faster than inflation, and this trend accelerated in 1999 and 2000.

In the late 1980s and early 1990s, the percentage of Americans covered by employment-based health benefits declined largely because of rising costs. In the late 1980s, the cost increased an average of between 15 percent and 20 percent in some years. However, between 1994 and 1997, health care costs barely changed. In 1998, they started to increase again, but the increase does not appear to have affected the percentage of Americans with employment-based health benefits during this period, although it also could be argued that the percentage of Americans with employment-based health benefits would have increased even faster had it not been for the rising costs.

Beginning in 2001, rising health benefit costs coupled with the weak economy began to have an effect on health insurance coverage. According to one survey, the cost of providing health benefits increased nearly 11 percent in 2001 and 12.9 percent in 2002, still well below the increases in the late 1980s (Figure 6). As a result, between 2000 and 2002, the percentage of nonelderly Americans with employment-based health benefits declined from 67.1 percent to 64.2 percent.

Determinants of Coverage

Full-time, full-year workers, public-sector employees, workers employed in manufacturing, managerial and professional workers, and individuals living in high-income families are most likely to have employment-based health benefits. Poor families are most likely to be covered by public health insurance such as Medicaid or S-CHIP.

Employment status is the most important determinant of health insurance coverage. Roughly two-thirds of the nonelderly population have employment-based health benefits. This coverage can be obtained either directly through one’s employer, union, or previous employer, or indirectly through an employed person in one’s family.6

Large employers that provide access to group health insurance often are able to provide health benefits at lower cost than small employers, because they are subject to less adverse selection and their administrative costs and marketing costs are lower. But the larger firms often provide broader coverage and thus ultimately pay more per worker covered.

Furthermore, the nature of employment, the industry, and the firm’s size often determine the cost and extent of coverage. Workers in large firms are more likely to be covered than those in small firms.

In 2002, 64.2 percent of the nonelderly were covered by employment-based health benefits (Figure 1). Workers were much more likely to have employment-based health benefits than nonworkers, who typically receive such coverage through spouses or parents (Figure 8). More than 72 percent of workers had employment-based health benefits, compared with 40.3 percent of nonworkers. In addition, 74.5 percent of individuals in families headed by full-year, full-time workers had employment-based health benefits, compared with 42.8 percent of those in families headed by other
workers, and 20.3 percent of individuals in families headed by nonworkers.

Workers employed in the public sector and in manufacturing were more likely to have employment-based health benefits in their own name than other workers (Figure 9). More than 25 percent of self-employed workers and nearly 29 percent of private-sector workers in firms with fewer than 10 employees had employment-based health benefits in their own name in 2002, compared with 67.1 percent of private-sector workers in firms with 1,000 or more employees (Figure 10).

Occupation also has an impact. More than 67 percent of workers in managerial and professional occupations had employment-based health benefits in their own name, compared with 36 percent among workers in service occupations (Figure 11). In addition, hours worked and weeks worked have a strong impact on the likelihood that a worker has employment-based health benefits. More than 67 percent of workers employed full time and full year had employment-based health benefits from their own employer, compared with 23.7 percent among part-time, full-year employees; 41.4 percent among full-time, part-year employees; and 14.5 percent among part-time, part-year employees (Figure 12).

In general, individuals with high levels of income are more likely to be covered by employment-based health benefits. In 2002, 12 percent of individuals in families with annual income below $5,000 had employment-based health benefits, compared with 83.7 percent of those in families with annual income of $50,000 or more (Figure 13).

Although public programs cover many individuals in poor families, most were not covered. In 2002, 46 percent of the nonelderly with family incomes below $10,000 were not covered by public health insurance (Figure 14).
Access to Coverage

Access to coverage is also a major determinant of whether a worker has health benefits. Data from the February 2001 supplement to the CPS indicate that only 13 percent of uninsured workers are eligible to take health benefits from their own employer (Figure 15).7 Twenty percent of uninsured workers are employed by a firm that offers health benefits to some workers, but the worker is not eligible. The remainder are employed by firms that do not offer health benefits.

Among the 13 percent of uninsured workers eligible for health benefits, two-thirds report they decline it because of the cost (Figure 16). Only 6 percent report that they declined it because they did not think they needed coverage. Among uninsured workers not eligible for health benefits, most either did not work enough hours or weeks (35 percent) or were contract or temporary workers (51 percent) (Figure 17). Only 6 percent were subject to and had not met the waiting period.

Many factors influence whether an individual has any insurance coverage. This section presents data on the characteristics of the uninsured population.

Location

The proportion of the nonelderly population with and without health insurance varies by location. In 10 states, at least 20 percent of the population was uninsured in 2002 (Figure 18). These states are generally in the south central United States (Figure 19). In many of these states, a smaller proportion of the population was
eligible for employment-based health benefits and/or a larger proportion was eligible for publicly financed health programs than the national average. Both lower average income and higher unemployment rates may contribute to this difference. In addition, many of these states have a higher concentration of racial and ethnic groups that are less likely to be covered by health insurance.8

States with a low percentage of uninsured individuals include Minnesota, Iowa, Wisconsin, New Hampshire, and Delaware.

Citizenship

Citizenship is a primary factor in the likelihood of an individual having coverage and in the source of that coverage. More than 45 percent of nonelderly noncitizens were uninsured in 2002, compared with 14.9 percent of citizens (Figure 20). In Texas and Oregon, nearly 62 percent of the noncitizen population was uninsured, while in California, 43.5 percent was uninsured, and in North Carolina, 56.8 percent was uninsured. High uninsured rates may reflect the fact that a higher proportion of noncitizens than citizens were in low-income families, were likely to be nonworkers, or were likely to work in small firms.
Employment

Eighty-three percent of the uninsured lived in families headed by workers in 2002. Most people (90 percent) live in families headed by workers, including one-person families (Figure 8).

Industry

Workers employed in agriculture, forestry, fishing, mining, and construction were also disproportionately more likely to be uninsured, with about one-third being uninsured. Uninsured workers were most likely to be employed in the wholesale and retail trade or service industry, which collectively account for over 60 percent of employment (Figure 9). This compares to 14.4 percent uninsured among workers in the manufacturing sector, 17.6 percent in wholesale and retail trade, and 22 percent in the service sector.

Firm Size

More than 60 percent of all uninsured workers were either self-employed or working in private-sector firms with fewer than 100 employees in 2002 (Figure 10). More than 26 percent of self-employed workers were uninsured, compared with 18.1 percent of all workers. More than 34 percent of workers in private-sector firms with fewer than 10 employees were uninsured, compared with 12.6 percent of workers in private-sector firms with 1,000 or more employees.

Occupation

The uninsured are concentrated disproportionately in service sector occupations or blue-collar jobs. In 2002, 15 percent of workers were employed in blue-collar-type jobs, that is jobs in farming, fishing, forestry, construction, extraction, maintenance, production, transportation, and material moving, yet 24 percent of uninsured workers were in these types of jobs (Figure 11).

### Figure 11

**Workers Ages 18–64 With Selected Sources of Health Insurance, by Occupation, 2002**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Employment-Based Coverage</th>
<th>Individually Purchased</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Uninsured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total (millions)</td>
<td>Own name (millions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>142.1</td>
<td>102.8</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial and professional specialty</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service occupations</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and office occupations</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming, fishing, and forestry</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction, extraction, and maintenance</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production, transportation, and material moving</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Employment-Based Coverage</th>
<th>Individually Purchased</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Uninsured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total (percentage within coverage category)</td>
<td>Own name (percentage within coverage category)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial and professional specialty</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service occupations</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and office occupations</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming, fishing, and forestry</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction, extraction, and maintenance</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production, transportation, and material moving</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Employment-Based Coverage</th>
<th>Individually Purchased</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Uninsured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total (percentage within industry category)</td>
<td>Own name (percentage within industry category)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial and professional specialty</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>83.7%</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service occupations</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and office occupations</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming, fishing, and forestry</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction, extraction, and maintenance</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production, transportation, and material moving</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Details may not add to totals because individuals may receive coverage from more than one source.
Hours of Work

Part-time or part-year workers accounted for 31.3 percent of the employed population, but accounted for 43.6 percent of uninsured workers (Figure 12).

Income

The uninsured tend to be members of low-income families. In 2002, 36.4 percent of the uninsured were in families with annual incomes of less than $20,000 (Figure 13). More than 40 percent of individuals in families with incomes less than $5,000 were uninsured, compared with 8.4 percent of those in families with annual incomes of $50,000 or more. Generally, as income increases, the percentage of the population without health insurance decreases as the percentage covered by employment-based benefits increases more than the percentage covered by publicly financed health insurance programs decreases.

Workers with low earnings are much more likely to be uninsured than those with high earnings. More than 30 percent of workers with earnings of less than $20,000 were uninsured, compared with 5.7 percent of workers with earnings of $50,000 or more (Figure 21). Low-income workers are employed generally in industries that are less likely to offer health benefits, may have a weaker (or temporary) attachment to the work force, and have less disposable income to allocate to the purchase of health benefits.

Race and Ethnic Origin

While 66 percent of the nonelderly population is white, whites comprised 48 percent of the uninsured. Individuals of Hispanic origin were more likely to be uninsured than other groups (34.1 percent) (Figure 14). This may be due in part to the fact that 52 percent of the Hispanic population reported income of less than 200 percent of the federal poverty level. Also, a higher proportion of Hispanics are immigrants and may work for small firms or be employed on a part-time or part-year basis. However, even at high income levels, Hispanics generally were more likely to be uninsured than other racial groups and were less likely to have employment-based health benefits. Citizenship may also be a factor here.

Family Type

Single individuals and individuals in single-parent families were more likely to be uninsured than married couples (Figure 22). Among the reasons for this are that married couples tend to have higher income levels. When both adults are employed, the odds of having access to employment-based health benefits are greater.
Age

Individuals ages 55–64 were less likely to be uninsured (12.9 percent), and individuals ages 21–24 were more likely to be uninsured (33.9 percent), than those in all other age groups in 2002 (Figure 23). Young adults are often more likely to be uninsured because they are no longer covered by a family policy and may not have established themselves as permanent members of the work force. Some young adults may also have lost access to Medicaid, which covered them up through age 18. Many in this age group may think that they do not need health insurance because the likelihood of encountering a high-cost medical event is very low. In addition, young workers may be ineligible for employment-based health benefits because of waiting periods imposed prior to eligibility.

Children

More than 11 percent of all children—or 8.5 million children—were uninsured in 2002 (Figure 24). Sixty-five percent of all uninsured children were in families with incomes below 200 percent of the poverty level. More than 21 percent of children whose family head did not work were uninsured (Figure 25). Most uninsured children were in families whose head was employed year-round, either full time or part time (71 percent) (Figure 26). In families where the head worked part time or experienced some unemployment the probability of being uninsured was even higher (Figure 25).
Figure 14

NONELDERLY POPULATION WITH SELECTED SOURCES OF HEALTH INSURANCE, BY RACE AND FAMILY POVERTY STATUS, 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race and Family Poverty Status</th>
<th>Employment-Based Coverage</th>
<th>Individually Purchased</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Medicaid</th>
<th>Uninsured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Own name</td>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>250.8</td>
<td>161.0</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0–99% of poverty</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%–149% of poverty</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150%–199% of poverty</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200% of poverty or more</td>
<td>176.6</td>
<td>139.2</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>165.8</td>
<td>119.0</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0–99% of poverty</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%–149% of poverty</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150%–199% of poverty</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200% of poverty or more</td>
<td>130.7</td>
<td>107.0</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0–99% of poverty</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%–149% of poverty</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150%–199% of poverty</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200% of poverty or more</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0–99% of poverty</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%–149% of poverty</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150%–199% of poverty</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200% of poverty or more</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0–99% of poverty</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%–149% of poverty</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150%–199% of poverty</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200% of poverty or more</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Employment-Based Coverage</th>
<th>Individually Purchased</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Medicaid</th>
<th>Uninsured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Own name</td>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0–99% of poverty</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%–149% of poverty</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150%–199% of poverty</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200% of poverty or more</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0–99% of poverty</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%–149% of poverty</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150%–199% of poverty</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200% of poverty or more</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>81.9</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0–99% of poverty</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>56.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%–149% of poverty</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150%–199% of poverty</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200% of poverty or more</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0–99% of poverty</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>44.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%–149% of poverty</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150%–199% of poverty</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200% of poverty or more</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0–99% of poverty</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%–149% of poverty</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150%–199% of poverty</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200% of poverty or more</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Details may not add to totals because individuals may receive coverage from more than one source.
Figure 15
**UNINSURED WORKERS, BY WORKER ELIGIBILITY, WAGE AND SALARY WORKERS AGES 18–64, 2001**

- **Eligible for Health Benefits**
  - 13%
- **Not Eligible for Health Benefits**
  - 20%
- **Employer Does Not Offer Health Benefits**
  - 67%


Figure 16
**REASONS ELIGIBLE WORKERS ARE UNINSURED, 2001**

- **Don't Know**
  - 28%
- **Cost**
  - 66%
- **Don't Need Insurance**
  - 6%


Figure 17
**REASONS NONELIGIBLE WORKERS ARE UNINSURED, 2001**

- **Contract or Temporary Worker**
  - 51%
- **Waiting Period Not Met**
  - 6%
- **Too Few Hours or Weeks**
  - 33%
- **Don't Know**
  - 10%

Figure 18

Nonelderly Population With Selected Sources of Health Insurance, by Region and State, 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region and State</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Employment-Based Coverage</th>
<th>Individually</th>
<th>Public</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Own name</td>
<td>Dependent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(millions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>250.8</td>
<td>161.0</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>78.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New England</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Atlantic</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East North Central</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West North Central</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

continued on next page
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region and State</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Own name</th>
<th>Dependent</th>
<th>Purchased</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Medicaid</th>
<th>Uninsured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New England</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>71.5%</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East North Central</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Middle Atlantic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Atlantic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>66.1%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>West Atlantic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>63.1%</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mountain</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pacific</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Details may not add to totals because individuals may receive coverage from more than one source.
Americans without health insurance are a concern for a number of reasons. First, individuals without health insurance are less likely to receive basic health care services. The uninsured report having fewer ambulatory visits than individuals with health insurance, and, as a result, are more likely to seek care in a more costly emergency room setting. This population’s overall health status may be lower, and individuals’ overall productivity may be lower (Fronstin and Holtmann, 2000). Historically, providers of health care, especially hospitals but also physicians, have not been paid for care provided to uninsured individuals, and have tried to shift the cost of that care to other payers.

But the movement toward a more competitive health care market has undermined this strategy. As a result, Cunningham et al. (1999) found that physicians involved with managed care plans and those who practice in areas of high managed care penetration tend to provide less uncompensated care. This trend could put increased pressure on the public sector to subsidize providers.

A recent Institute of Medicine report provides detailed information on the cost of the uninsured on society (Institute of Medicine, 2003). According to the report, society is affected in a number of ways. There is lost work-place productivity. There is lost health and longevity, financial risk, uncertainty and anxiety. And there are financial stresses and instability for health care providers and institutions in communities with relatively high uninsured rates. Overall, the mortality rate is 25 percent higher among the uninsured than it is among the insured. In addition, uninsured children are at greater risk of suffering delays in development that may affect their educational achievements and prospects later in life. Overall, the report suggests that the aggregate, annualized cost of diminished health and shorter life spans of uninsured Americans is between $65 billion and $135 billion.

While the combination of a growing economy in the 1990s and the lowest unemployment rates in more than 25 years increased insurance in 1999 and 2000, the more recent weakened economy, rising unemployment, and increasing cost of providing health benefits have
contributed to the erosion of employment-based health benefits and the increase in the uninsured between 2000 and 2002. If current economic conditions persist or worsen, coupled with the rising cost of providing health benefits, they will likely continue to result in fewer Americans with employment-based health benefits and more Americans without health insurance coverage. Should the uninsured population continue to increase by 0.8 percentage points as it did between 2001 and 2002, 50 million nonelderly Americans would be uninsured by 2005 and 63 million would be uninsured by 2010 (Figure 27). Should the uninsured represent 20 percent of the nonelderly population, 51 million Americans would be uninsured by 2005. If the uninsured represented 25 percent of the population, 38 million would still be uninsured in 2005 and 29 million would be uninsured by 2010.

Ultimately, the challenge is how to substantially reduce the number and percentage of uninsured and maintain such reductions through economic and other cycles. A number of proposals to reduce the number of uninsured Americans.

### Figure 20

**Nonelderly Population With and Without Health Insurance, by Region, State, and Citizenship, 2002 (in Regions and States With 75,000 or More Noncitizens)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region and State</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Percentage Noncitizens</th>
<th>Total Insured</th>
<th>Noncitizen Insured</th>
<th>Total Uninsured</th>
<th>Noncitizen Uninsured</th>
<th>Percentage Uninsured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(millions)</td>
<td>(percentage)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>250.8</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>207.5</td>
<td>169.4</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>14.9% 45.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New England</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.2 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Atlantic</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.4 1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.2 0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.9 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.3 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East North Central</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.9 0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.3 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West North Central</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.7 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Atlantic</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>6.6 1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.5 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.8 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.0 0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East South Central</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.0 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West South Central</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>5.8 1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.5 0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.6 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.6 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>5.4 2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.7 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>4.0 2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 21
PERCENTAGE UNINSURED AMONG WORKERS AGES 18–64, BY TOTAL EARNINGS, 2002


Figure 22
PERCENTAGE UNINSURED AMONG THE NONELDERLY POPULATION, BY FAMILY TYPE, 2002

Americans without health insurance coverage have been offered in the past. While they often recognize that the bulk of uninsured Americans are either children, workers with lower incomes, or workers employed by small firms, most proposed strategies to deal with these populations being considered by public officials are incremental, and are unlikely individually to have a substantial impact on the number of uninsured Americans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender and Age</th>
<th>Employment-Based Coverage</th>
<th>Individually Purchased</th>
<th>Public</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Own name</td>
<td>Dependent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>177.5</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 18–20</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 21–24</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 25–34</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 35–44</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 45–54</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 55–64</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 18–20</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 21–24</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 25–34</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 35–44</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 45–54</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 55–64</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>90.4</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 18–20</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 21–24</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 25–34</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 35–44</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 45–54</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 55–64</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note: Details may not add to totals because individuals may receive coverage from more than one source.
This Issue Brief has provided data on recent trends in health benefits, a summary of the characteristics of people with and without health insurance, and the sources of the health insurance, from the March 2003 CPS. The data and issues discussed are important not only to policymakers but also to all employers because health insurance is the benefit most valued by workers and their families. Sixty percent of workers responding to a recent survey rated employment-based health benefits as the most important benefit (Christensen, 2002). Health benefits provide Americans workers and their families with financial security against losses that can accompany unexpected serious illness or injury. Employers offer health insurance as an employee benefit for a number of reasons—to promote health and increase worker productivity, as well

### Figure 24
**Children With Selected Sources of Health Insurance, by Poverty Level and Age, 2002**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poverty Level and Age</th>
<th>Total Coverage</th>
<th>Individually Purchased</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Medicaid</th>
<th>Uninsured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(millions)</td>
<td>(millions)</td>
<td>(percentage within age and poverty categories)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under age 6</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–12</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13–17</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–12</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13–17</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–12</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13–17</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–12</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13–17</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–12</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13–17</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under age 6</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>59.9%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–12</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13–17</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under age 6</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–12</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13–17</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–12</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13–17</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%–149% of Poverty</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under age 6</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–12</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13–17</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0–99% of Poverty</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under age 6</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–12</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13–17</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150%–199% of Poverty</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under age 6</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–12</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13–17</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%–149% of Poverty</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under age 6</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–12</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13–17</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200% or More of Poverty</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under age 6</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–12</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13–17</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under age 6</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–12</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13–17</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Details may not add to totals because individuals may receive coverage from more than one source.
as to provide financial security. Health benefits also are a form of compensation used to recruit and retain workers. There also may be a “business case” for health benefits, meaning employers may want to offer them if a compensation package comprised of both wages and health benefits is more profitable than providing wages alone.

This Issue Brief finds that many factors affect the likelihood of an individual having health insurance and the source of that coverage. These factors include the strength of the economy, demographics and employment characteristics, and often vary by location. For example, work status and income play a dominant role in determining an individual’s likelihood of having health insurance. In addition, age, gender, firm size, hours of work, and industry are all important determinants of an individual’s likelihood of having coverage; however, these variables are also closely linked to employment status.
Variations by race, ethnicity, and citizenship also are closely linked to employment status and income. Recent trends in coverage also have been presented. The data indicate that while the percentage of Americans who were uninsured was in fact declining between the late 1990s and 2000, it is now increasing again. As a result, there were more than 43 million Americans without health insurance coverage in 2002, up from 39.4 million as recently as 2000. While an increasing percentage of Americans were covered by employment-based health benefits between 1994 and 2000, this trend has not continued because of the combination of a weak economy and rising health benefit costs. Research illustrates the advantages to consumers of having health insurance and the benefits to employers of offering it. In general, the availability of health insurance allows consumers to avoid unnecessary pain and suffering and improves the quality of life, and employers offering benefits report that has a positive impact on worker recruitment, retention, health status, and productivity (Fronstin and Helman, 2000). Ultimately, the challenge is how to reduce substantially the number and percentage of the uninsured.

The data presented in this Issue Brief come from the March Supplement to the Current Population Survey (CPS), conducted by the Census Bureau (part of the U.S. Department of Commerce) for the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS, part of the U.S. Department of Labor) every month for more than 50 years. It is the primary source of data on labor force characteristics of the U.S. civilian noninstitutionalized population. It is also the official source of data on unemployment rates, poverty, and income in the United States. Approximately 50,000 households, representing over 130,000 individuals, are interviewed each month.

Households are scientifically selected on the basis of geographic region of residence to collect data representative of the nation, individual states, and other specified areas. Eight panels are used to rotate the sample each month. This improves the reliability of estimates of month-to-month and year-to-year changes. A sample...
unit is interviewed for four consecutive months, and then is interviewed again for the same four months a year later. The unit is not interviewed during the eight months in between.

Theoretically, individuals can be followed over time. For example, approximately 50 percent of the sample interviewed in January of 1999 will have been re-interviewed in January 2000. But in practice, the survey does not re-interview individuals: Instead, the survey re-interviews the occupants of the households that were selected for inclusion in the sample. If the occupants of a household change over the course of the eight interviews, the new occupants in the household will take the place of the former occupants for the remaining interviews.

The first- and the fifth-month interviews are almost always conducted in person by an interviewer. More than 90 percent of the interviews conducted in months two through four and six through eight are conducted by telephone. Interviewers continue to visit households without telephones, with poor English-language skills, or that decline a telephone interview. Interviewers usually obtain responses from more than 93 percent of their eligible cases. The response rate varies by type of area and the mix of telephone versus personal-visit interviews.

Since 1980, the supplement to the March CPS has included questions on health insurance coverage. Separate questions are asked about employment-based health insurance, health insurance purchased directly from an insurer, insurance from a source outside of the household, Medicare, Medicaid, Tricare, CHAMPVA, Indian Health Service, or other state-specific health programs for low-income uninsured individuals. These questions are asked of the household respondent, and potentially could miss nonrespondents, but the CPS also follows each question with a question about who else in the household is covered by the health plan.

Until recently, a question about being uninsured was never asked. Estimates of the uninsured were calculated as a residual; that is, persons were counted as being uninsured if they did not report having any type of health insurance coverage.

The questions on health insurance refer to the previous year. For example, in March 2001, interviewers asked about health insurance coverage during 2000. Assuming that respondents answered the questions correctly, the uninsured estimate should represent the number of people who were uninsured for the entire previous calendar year. One measurement issue that arises in this structure is that individuals potentially are asked to recall the type of health insurance they had 14 months prior to being interviewed. A second issue is that some individuals do not understand the question and report the type of health insurance they have as of the interview date. Third, the CPS may not be picking up all Medicaid recipients because some states do not call the program Medicaid. In fact, there is strong evidence that the CPS under-reports Medicaid coverage, based on comparisons of these data with enrollment and participation data provided by the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS), the federal agency primarily responsible for administering Medicaid.

Because respondents are asked to provide information about all sources of health insurance coverage during the previous calendar year, some individuals reported having health insurance coverage from more than one source. It is not possible to determine when during the calendar year an individual was covered by multiple sources of health insurance. While these plans may have been held simultaneously, they were more likely held at different points during the year.

The CPS has undergone a number of changes over the years that affect the comparability of data in the time series. The remainder of this section discusses those changes.

In March 1988, the CPS questionnaire was substantially changed. Among the changes that were made, questions were added that inevitably picked up more people with health insurance coverage and reduced the number of uninsured in the survey (Moyer, 1989; and Swartz and Purcell, 1989). Prior to the March 1988 CPS, only employed persons were asked about employment-
### Figure A.1
CHANGE IN THE NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF NONELDERLY AMERICANS WITH SELECTED SOURCES OF HEALTH INSURANCE DUE TO CHANGE IN CPS METHODOLOGY FOR COUNTING THE UNINSURED, 1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Millions of Americans by Coverage Type</th>
<th>Percentage of Americans by Coverage Type</th>
<th>Change in Estimate Due to New Methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Old Methodology</td>
<td>New Methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>240.7</td>
<td>240.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment-Based Coverage</td>
<td>158.4</td>
<td>160.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own name</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>81.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent coverage</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>78.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individually Purchased</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tricare/CHAMPVA&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Health Insurance</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note: Details may not add to totals because individuals may receive coverage from more than one source.

<sup>a</sup> Tricare (formerly known as CHAMPUS) is a program administered by the Department of Defense for military retirees as well as families of active duty, retired, and deceased service members. CHAMPVA, the Civilian Health and Medical Program for the Department of Veterans Affairs, is a health care benefits program for disabled dependents of veterans and certain survivors of veterans.

### Figure A.2
CHANGE IN THE NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF NONELDERLY AMERICANS WITH SELECTED SOURCES OF HEALTH INSURANCE DUE TO INTRODUCTION OF CENSUS 2000-BASED WEIGHTS, 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Millions of Americans by Coverage Type</th>
<th>Change in Population Estimate Due to New Weights</th>
<th>Percentage of Americans by Coverage Type</th>
<th>Change in Insurance Status Estimate Due to New Weights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Census 1990-Based Weights</td>
<td>Census 2000-Based Weights</td>
<td>Census 1990-Based Weights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>242.8</td>
<td>244.8</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment–Based Coverage</td>
<td>163.4</td>
<td>164.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own Name</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>84.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Coverage</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>−0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individually Purchased</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>−0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tricare/CHAMPVA&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>−0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Health Insurance</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note: Details may not add to totals because individuals may receive coverage from more than one source.

<sup>a</sup> Tricare (formerly known as CHAMPUS) is a program administered by the Department of Defense for military retirees as well as families of active duty, retired, and deceased service members. CHAMPVA, the Civilian Health and Medical Program for the Department of Veterans Affairs, is a health care benefits program for disabled dependents of veterans and certain survivors of veterans.
based health insurance. Starting with the March 1988 CPS, all persons ages 15 and older were asked about employment-based coverage. This change resulted in the identification of coverage for persons (and their families) covered by former employers through either retiree health benefits or COBRA (the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985).

Another major change in March 1988 affected the health insurance coverage of children. Questions were added about coverage from sources outside the household. Imputation methods for children’s coverage were also revised to collect more accurate information about coverage type and policyholder. An additional set of questions was added to get more accurate information about children on Medicaid and those covered by a plan purchased directly from an insurer. Finally, weighting, programming, and processing improvements were made to the survey (Levit et al., 1992).

In March 1995, the CPS questionnaire was revised again. The Census Bureau utilized a more detailed set of health insurance questions designed to take advantage of computer-assisted survey interviewing collection (CASIC) technology. The order of the questions was changed, and the wording in some of the questions was changed. In addition, the sampling frame was changed, potentially complicating comparability of the estimates prior to March 1995 with those starting in or after March 1995. The new questions appear to have affected responses regarding the total number of respondents covered by employment-based health insurance coverage, individually purchased coverage, Tricare, and CHAMPVA. Questions on Medicare and Medicaid were also revised, but because estimates of Medicare and Medicaid from the CPS do not vary much from year to year even when the survey is unchanged, it is difficult to know how much the estimates were affected by changes to the survey and how much represents true changes. The longer-term trends in coverage are likely to be representative of the true change, because the estimates do not change much from year to year. Swartz (1997) documents these data issues in greater detail.

In order to compare the March 1995 CPS and later years with earlier years in this paper, data from the March 1988 CPS through March 1994 CPS have been adjusted to reflect two changes that occurred with the change between the March 1994 CPS and March 1995 CPS. First, the data analyzed prior to March 1995 have been re-weighted to reflect the revised sampling framework that occurred in the mid-1990s. Second, the data on employment-based health insurance coverage and individually purchased coverage have been adjusted in response to the reallocation of coverage from individually purchased coverage to employment-based coverage between the March 1994 CPS and the March 1995 CPS.

In March 1998, the Census Bureau made another change in the CPS by modifying its definition of the population with Medicaid coverage. Previously, an individual reporting coverage from the Indian Health Service (IHS) only was counted as part of the Medicaid population. Beginning with the March 1998 CPS, individuals covered solely by IHS are counted as uninsured. This methodological change affected roughly 300,000 individuals. If this change had not taken place, the Medicaid population would have fallen by 0.9 percentage points between 1996 and 1997, instead of by 1.1 percentage points, and the uninsured would have increased to only 18.1 percent instead of 18.3 percent. Overall, this was a minor change to the uninsured estimates in the CPS.

In March 2000, the Census Bureau added a question to the CPS to verify whether or not a person was uninsured. In essence, anyone who did not report any health insurance coverage during 2000 was asked an additional question about whether they were uninsured. Those who reported that they had coverage were then asked about the type of coverage. The verification questions resulted in the Census Bureau providing a “corrected” estimate for the uninsured in 1999. As shown in table A.1, prior to the correction, 17.5 percent of the nonelderly population, representing 42.1 million Americans, were estimated to be uninsured in 1999. The verification questions resulted in a 7.4 percent decline in
the number and percentage of nonelderly Americans without health insurance coverage in 1999. Most of the persons who would have been counted as uninsured under the old methodology are now counted as having either employment-based health insurance or having purchased health insurance directly from an insurer. Hence, the corrected estimate for the uninsured in 1999 is 16.2 percent, or 39 million, down from 17.5 percent, or 42.1 million.\(^\text{12}\)

The verification questions were not asked prior to the March 2000 CPS. As a result, data prior to 1999 are not directly comparable to data after 1999. In order to provide roughly comparable estimates over time, the estimates of health insurance coverage for 1987–1998 in this paper have been recalculated using the one-time percentage change in the 1999 health insurance coverage estimates shown in Figure A.1.

In 2001, two changes were made to the CPS. First, the sample was expanded to improve state estimates of S-CHIP enrollees. Overall this change increased the uninsured estimate from 14 percent of the population to 14.1 percent, which accounted for an increase of nearly 200,000 persons uninsured (Mills, 2002). However, the change in the uninsured percentage varied significantly from state to state, ranging from a 1.8 percentage point increase in Connecticut to a 2 percentage point decline in Vermont. The Census Bureau also introduced Census 2000-based weights starting with the March 2002 CPS and provided new estimates for the March 2000 and March 2001 CPS that are based on the new weights. When using the Census 1990-based weights for the March 2001 CPS, 15.8 percent of the nonelderly population, or 38.4 million people, were uninsured (Figure A.2). However, when using the Census 2000-based weights, 16.1 percent of the nonelderly population is estimated to be uninsured, representing 39.4 million people.

**Duration of Coverage**

Data from the March CPS do not allow researchers to determine the length of time that an individual is insured or uninsured. The Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP), another survey conducted by the Census Bureau, allows longitudinal analysis of the uninsured. Copeland (1998) found that 37 percent of the uninsured population was uninsured for one to four months, 22 percent was uninsured for five to eight months, 9 percent was uninsured for nine to 11 months, and 33 percent was uninsured for 12 months or longer. Similarly, Bennefield (1998) found that 29 percent of all uninsured spells lasted 5.3 months or longer. These data would seem to indicate that even though many individuals may lose health insurance during any given month, the majority remain uninsured for a short time, and may even be eligible for coverage under COBRA or various state continuation-of-coverage laws.
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Endnotes

(S-Chip). Medicaid and S-Chip (and Medicare) estimates are under-reported in the CPS, according to comparisons of these data with enrollment and participation data provided by the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS). See Mills (2002).

2 Tricare (formerly known as CHAMPUS) is a program administered by the Department of Defense for military retirees as well as families of active duty, retired, and deceased service members. CHAMPVA, the Civilian Health and Medical Program for the Department of Veterans Affairs, is a health care benefits program for disabled dependents of veterans and certain survivors of veterans.

3 The uninsured estimates from the March CPS are supposed to represent the percentage of Americans without health insurance coverage during an entire calendar year. However, based on comparisons with other surveys, many researchers concur that the uninsured estimate from the CPS is closer to a point-in-time estimate than a calendar year estimate. If the CPS is a point-in-time estimate and not a calendar year, it would mean that the data from the March 2003 CPS represent the number of uninsured during March 2003 instead of during the previous calendar year. More information about the CPS, and other surveys that collect data on the uninsured, can be found in Paul Fronstin, “Counting the Uninsured: A Comparison of National Surveys,” EBRI Issue Brief, no. 225 (Employee Benefit Research Institute, September 2000). See also U.S. Congressional Budget Office, How Many People Lack Health Insurance and For How Long? www.cbo.gov/showdoc.cfm?index=4211&sequence=0 (Last reviewed October 2003).

4 See Fronstin and Snider (1996/97) for an analysis of the decline in employment-based health insurance between 1988 and 1993.

5 Expansion in S-Chip during the late 1990s may have offset the decline in Medicaid coverage.

6 In this report, individuals who receive coverage directly through their employer, union, or a previous employer are categorized as having coverage in their own name. Individuals who receive employment-based coverage indirectly are categorized as having dependent coverage.

7 The percentage of uninsured workers eligible for health benefits through a family member is not included in this estimate.

8 See Fronstin (2000b).

9 Both Fronstin (1999a) and Cooper and Schone (1997) found that young workers are less likely than older workers to be covered by employment-based health benefits even when a plan is offered to them.

10 Krauss et al. (1999) found that 55.7 percent of the uninsured had at least one ambulatory medical care visit in 1996, compared with 76.2 percent of individuals with only public insurance and 77.2 percent of individuals with any private insurance. They also found that among persons with at least one visit, the uninsured had an average of 5.1 visits, compared with 8.7 visits by persons with only public insurance and 6.5 visits by those with any private insurance. Another study found that among persons visiting a health care provider, 17 percent of the uninsured received health care in an emergency room, compared with 9 percent of the privately insured (Cunningham and Whitmore, 1998). Furthermore, Fronstin (1998 and 2000a) found that 22 percent of the uninsured were in a family where someone had difficulty obtaining needed care, compared with 10–11 percent of the insured population, mainly because they could not afford health care.
Traditionally, cost shifting occurs when a health care provider raises its prices to one set of payers because it lowered them to another set (Morrisey, 1996).

See Nelson and Mills (2001) for additional information about the verification questions.
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