CORNELL
UNIVERSITY

Rehabilitation Research and Training Center
for Economic Research on Employment
Policy for Persons with Disabilities

Economics of Disability
Research Report #1:

Estimates of the Prevalence of Disability in the United States by State, 1981 through 1999

Prepared by:

Andrew J. Houtenville, Ph.D.

Cornell University

For further information about this paper contact:
Andrew J. Houtenville, Ph.D.
Rehabilitation Research and Training Center for
Economic Research on Employment Policy for People with Disabilities
Cornell University
Ithaca, NY 14853-3901
ajh29@cornell.edu

This paper is being distributed by Rehabilitation Research and Training Center for Economic Research on Employment Policy for Persons with Disabilities at Cornell University.

This center is funded to Cornell University, in collaboration with The Lewin Group (Falls Church, VA), by the U.S. Department of Education, National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research (*Grant No. H133B980038)*.

This research is funded by the United States Department of Education, National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research, cooperative agreement No. 13313980038. It does not necessarily reflect the view of the National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research.

The author thanks Richard V. Burkhauser for his helpful comments.

The Co-Principal Investigators are:
Susanne M. Bruyère—*Director, Program on Employment and Disability, ILR Extension, Cornell University*

Richard V. Burkhauser—*Sarah Gibson Blanding Professor and Chair, Department of Policy Analysis and Management, College of Human Ecology, Cornell University*

David C. Stapleton—*Senior Vice President and Director of Applied Economics with The Lewin Group*

Economics of Disability Research Report #1:

Estimates of the Prevalence of Disability in the United States by State, 1981 through 1999

Andrew J. Houtenville, Ph.D.
Rehabilitation Research and Training Center
School of Industrial and Labor Relations
Cornell University

This research is funded by the United States Department of Education, National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research, cooperative agreement No. 13313980038. It does not necessarily reflect the view of the National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research. The author thanks Richard V. Burkhauser for his helpful comments.

ABSTRACT

This report uses data from the March Current Population Survey to estimate the prevalence of disability among the non-institutionalized working-age (aged 25 through 61) civilian population in the United States, and for each state and the District of Columbia for the years 1981 through 1999. Two definitions of disability that are commonly used in the literature—*work limitation* and *work disability*—are utilized. The prevalence of *work limitation* and *work disability* varies greatly across states and over time. However, rankings by state and variation in prevalence over time are not dramatically affected by choice of definition.

INTRODUCTION

Working-age people (aged 25 through 61) are a heterogeneous group. State governments are able to track those people with disabilities who participate in categorical programs for those with disabilities, e.g., Supplemental Security Income, Social Security Disability Insurance, state vocational rehabilitation services. But states are much less able to track their populations with disabilities who are not currently receiving state services. Yet it is important that states be able to identify both groups to determine the population that might be categorically eligible for state and federal initiatives targeted on the working-age population with disabilities. Hence it is valuable to know the prevalence of disability among working-age people in a state in a given year. Furthermore, it is useful to track this population over time to allow state governments to better understand the changing population they serve and, if necessary, to reallocate their resources accordingly. By making such information available for all states, individual state governments can then compare their population with disabilities to those of other states. More importantly, they can better compare the size and scope of their programs targeted on those with disabilities to those of other states. For instance, with such information state vocational rehabilitation agencies could compare the number of people they serve to the estimated number of working-age persons with disabilities in their state. Using this number, they could then compare their service delivery rate to that of other states.

In a similar manner, advocates for persons with disabilities will find such data useful in making comparisons over time and across states in their effort to change not only government policy but also the practices of private business. For example, in an effort to persuade businesses to increase access and/or marketing toward persons with disabilities, advocates can show both

state government and private businesses the size of the population with disabilities within their states and how it is changing over time.

The purpose of this report is to provide estimates of the percentage of the non-institutionalized working-age (aged 25 through 61) civilian population with disabilities for the United States, and for each state and the District of Columbia, from 1981 through 1999 using the March Supplement of the Current Population Survey (CPS). Brief summaries of state rankings and changes over time are provided. The appendix provides instructions on how to calculate the number of non-institutionalized working-age civilians with disabilities. Estimated coefficients of variation (relative standard errors) and sample sizes are discussed. These estimated coefficients of variation are used to judge the accuracy of the estimated percentage of the non-institutionalized working-age civilian population with disabilities. The appendix also provides information for those wishing to average or compare these estimates for consecutive years.

DATA SOURCE

The CPS is a monthly survey of the non-institutionalized population of the United States, conducted by the Bureau of the Census on behalf of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Information is collected from approximately 50,000 households (about 150,000 individuals) on labor force characteristics (e.g., employment, earnings, hours of work). One person in the household answers questions for all household members.

In March of each year, the CPS basic monthly survey is supplemented with the Annual Demographic Survey, also known as the March Supplement or the March Income Supplement. This supplement focuses on sources of income, government program participation, previous employment, insurance, and a variety of demographic characteristics. In 1981, the March Supplement was expanded to include several questions about disability and income derived from

disability programs and insurance. The CPS and the March Supplement are used extensively by government agencies, academic researchers, policy makers, journalists, and the general public to evaluate government programs, economic well-being and behavior of individuals, families and households.[1]

A major advantage of using the CPS to track the population with disabilities is its large sample size. Because the CPS samples approximately 150,000 people, it is possible to track this population at both the national and state level.[2] The March CPS also provides a relatively consistent set of questions on disability from year to year. Since 1981 the March CPS has asked the household respondent who, if anyone, has "a health problem or disability which prevents them from working or which limits the kind or amount of work they can do." However, other aspects of the survey have changed. In 1994 the CPS moved to fully computer-assisted survey interviews, and sample weights based on the 1980 Census were replaced with sample weights based on the 1990 Census.[3] The Monthly Basic Survey was also revised and three new disability questions were added. It is possible that these changes affected the relative measurement of the population with disabilities over time.

RESULTS

Unlike most other demographic characteristics, there is no universally accepted definition of disability. Nagi (1991) distinguishes three components of disability. The first component is the presence of a *pathology*—a physical or mental disorders or interruption of a normal process, or both. This leads to the second component, *impairment*, which Nagi defines as a physiological, anatomical, or mental loss or abnormality that limits a person's capacity and level of function. The final component of disability is the *inability to perform or a limitation in performing socially expected roles and tasks.* Market work is a socially expected role. Hence, those who are

unable to perform or are limited in their ability to work are considered to have a disability. While the relative importance of environment on a person's ability to perform a socially expected task in this definition is controversial, the basic conceptualization is a useful one.

Table 1 provides estimated percentages of non-institutionalized working-age civilians with a disability in the United States from 1981 through 1999 using two operational definitions of disability that are both consistent with Nagi's conceptualization. Both definitions are based on questions in the CPS. The first row of Table 1 provides estimated percentages of non-institutionalized working-age civilians with a *work limitation* in the United States. Persons with a *work limitation* are defined as those who report having (or are reported by the household's respondent to have) "a health problem or disability which prevents them from working or which limits the kind or amount of work they can do."[4]

Clearly, this definition does not completely capture the Nagi conceptualization of disability, although it does put disability in the social context of work. (It is for this reason that this report focuses on the working-age population, aged 25 through 61.) This simple definition of disability is not directly affected by program participation. This measure of disability is commonly used in the economics literature (see Bound and Burkhauser, 1999). Most recently, Burkhauser, Daly and Houtenville (2000) use this definition to estimate the employment and economic well-being of the non-institutionalized working-age civilian population with a disability. The work limitation concept of disability can also be found in many national surveys (e.g., National Health Interview Survey, Survey of Income and Program Participation, Panel Study of Income Dynamics) that have been used to measure the working-age population with disabilities. Using this definition, the percentage of non-institutionalized working-age civilians

with a disability in the United States between 1981 and 1999 ranged from a low of 7.2 percent in 1988 to a high of 8.4 percent in 1994 (Table 1, row 1).

The second row of Table 1 provides the estimated percentage of non-institutionalized working-age civilians with a *work disability* in the United States. This is a more all encompassing operationalization of the Nagi definition. Persons with a *work disability* are those who participate in disability-related government programs and/or have work restrictions due to health or disability. Specifically, persons with a *work disability* fall into one of the following categories, each of which is related to a question on the CPS: (1) they have a *work limitation*, (2) they did not work in the previous year because they were ill or disabled and unable to work, (3) they retired or left a job for health reasons, (4) they received veterans' benefits due to a service-contracted disability in the previous year, (5) they received workers' compensation benefits or other benefits in the previous year as a result of job-related injury or illness, (6) they received Supplemental Security Income benefits and were less than 65 years old in the previous year, and/or (7) they received Medicare and were less than 65 years in the previous year.[5] By definition the prevalence of *work disability* will always be as high or higher than the prevalence of *work limitation* since having a *work limitation* is just one of several possible reasons for having a *work disability.*

Using *work disability* to operationalize the Nagi conceptualization captures a broader population with disabilities in the CPS data. Bennefield and McNeil (1989) and Burkhauser, Haveman and Wolfe (1993) use a definition similar to *work disability* to look at the economic well-being of people with a disability. A shortcoming of using *work disability* to define disability is that changes in public policy that increase or decrease program participation will change the number of persons with a *work disability.* Using this definition, the percentage of

non-institutionalized working-age civilians with a disability in the United States between 1981 and 1999 ranged from a low of 10.1 percent in 1988 and 1989 to a high of 11.5 percent in 1994 (Table 1, row 2).

It is important to note that respondents' self-perception of disability as captured by either of these two measures can be influenced by social context (accommodations and restrictions). For instance, self-reports of *work limitation* may change over time, even holding the underlying health conditions constant, because access to accommodation may change over time and change one's self-perception of *work limitation*. See Kirchner (1996) for a fuller discussion of this issue and the uses of the CPS to analyze "access-oriented" policies.

While by definition the prevalence of disability captured in Table 1 using the *work disability* measure of disability is higher than when using the *work limitation* definition, the trends in both measures are similar. To illustrate, row three of Table 1 shows the percentage point difference in the prevalence using the two measures, and row four shows the percentage change between *work limitations* and *work disabilities.*[6]

Table 2 provides the estimated percentage of non-institutionalized working-age civilians with a *work limitation* for each state and the District of Columbia from 1981 through 1999. The prevalence of *work limitation* varies greatly across states and over time, from a low of 3.5 percent in Connecticut in 1990 to a high of 17.0 percent in West Virginia in 1997. The range is larger across states than it is over time.

Table 3 facilitates comparisons across states by showing the percentage of those with a *work limitations* averaged over all years, 1981 through 1999. The states are ranked and listed in descending order. The average annual estimated percentage of those with a *work limitation* ranges from 12.2 percent for West Virginia to 5.7 percent for New Jersey. The highest five

states are West Virginia, Arkansas, Kentucky, Tennessee, and Mississippi, while the lowest five states are Hawaii, Utah, Nebraska, Connecticut, and New Jersey. These findings are consistent with those of McCoy and Weems (1989) who found the highest rates of Supplemental Security Income and Social Security Disability Insurance receipt occurred in the "disability belt" of Appalachia and the lower Mississippi Valley. LaPlante (1993) reports a similar finding using the 1980 and 1990 Census.

Table 3 also illustrates changes in the prevalence of *work limitations* over time. It shows the percentage of the working-age civilian population with a *work limitation* averaged over the first five years of available data, 1981 through 1985, and over the last five years, 1995 through 1999. Corresponding state rankings are provided. The top five states are remarkably stable: West Virginia, Arkansas and Tennessee are among the top five states in both the first five-year span and the last five-year span.[7] The District of Columbia and Mississippi are ranked in the top five in the first five-year span and are replaced by Maine and Kentucky in the last five-year span.

The last two columns of Table 3 contain the percentage change from the first five-years to the last five-years and the corresponding state rankings. Percentage change expresses the change in prevalence in terms relative to the magnitude of prevalence, which allows changes in high prevalence states to be compared to changes in low prevalence states.[8] According to these calculations, Kentucky has the largest percentage increase—the prevalence of *work limitation* in 1995 through 1999 is 34.4 percent larger than in 1981 through 1985. Kansas, Wyoming, Massachusetts, and Maine follow Kentucky. Hawaii has the largest percentage decrease—the prevalence of *work limitation* in 1995 through 1999 is 20.6 percent smaller than in 1981 through 1985. Minnesota, Delaware, Mississippi, and Arizona follow Hawaii. The smallest percentage changes are in Florida, Washington, and New Mexico, between 1 and -1 percent.

Tables 4 and 5 repeat the same exercise as Tables 2 and 3 but use the *work disability* definition. The state ranking and changes in the prevalence of disability over time in Tables 4 and 5 are very similar to those in Tables 2 and 3.[9] The estimated percentages of non-institutionalized working-age civilians with a *work disability* range from a low of 5.8 percent in Connecticut in 1990 to a high of 19.5 percent in West Virginia in 1997 (Table 4). These are the same states and years cited as the high and low in Table 2.

Table 5 shows that the average annual estimated percentage of non-institutionalized working-age civilians with a *work disability* from 1981 to 1999 ranges from 15.5 percent for West Virginia to 8.2 percent for Connecticut. The highest five states—West Virginia, Arkansas, Kentucky, Tennessee, and Mississippi—are the same highest five states with the *work limitation* definition, while the lowest five states are now North Dakota, Utah, Nebraska, New Jersey, and Connecticut

Table 5 captures change in the prevalence of *work disability* over time. West Virginia, Arkansas, Tennessee, and Mississippi are among the top five states in both the first five-year span and the last five-year span. Rhode Island, ranked in the top five in the first five-year span, is replaced by Kentucky in the last five-year span.

The last two columns of Table 5 contain the percentage change from the first-five years to the last five years and the corresponding state rankings. Kansas has the largest percentage increase—the prevalence of *work disability* in 1995 through 1999 is 29.9 percent larger than in 1981 through 1985. Kentucky, Oklahoma, Montana and Maine follow Kansas. Hawaii has the largest percentage decrease—21.6 percent smaller in 1995 through 1999 than in 1981 through 1985. Rhode Island, Oregon, Michigan, and Arizona follow Hawaii. The smallest absolute

changes are in Georgia, Mississippi, Delaware, Maryland, and New Jersey who have percentage changes between 1 and -1 percent.

CONCLUSION

The prevalence of disability over the last two decades (1981 through 1999) for the United States, and for each state and the District of Columbia has varied widely using either a *work limitation* or a *work disability* definition of disability. Determining the percentage of the population with disabilities is the first step in evaluating the employment and economic well-being of this population across states and over time.

APPENDIX

The number of non-institutionalized working-age civilians with a *work limitation* or with a *work disability* can be calculated using Appendix Table 1 and Tables 2 and 4. Appendix Table 1 contains the estimated non-institutionalized working-age civilian population (regardless of disability status) for the United States, and for each state and the District of Columbia from 1981 through 1999 (in thousands). These are the denominators of the estimated percentages presented in Tables 2 and 4.

For example, the estimated non-institutionalized working-age civilian population with a *work limitation* for New York 1981 is 530,808 persons. This number is obtained by multiplying the estimated percentage of non-institutionalized working-age civilians with a *work limitation* in New York in 1981 (Table 2) by the estimated number of non-institutionalized working-age civilians (in thousands) in New York in 1981 (Appendix Table 1) and then multiplying by 10 (i.e., $6.8 \times 7{,}806 \times 10 = 530{,}808$).

Appendix Tables 2 and 3 contain the estimated coefficients of variation (CV, also known as relative standard error) that correspond to the estimated percentages in Tables 2 and 4, respectively. Estimated CVs are used to judge the precision of the estimates. How precisely an estimated value reflects the actual value is based on the amount of sampling error and non-sampling error. Non-sampling error is due to such things as differences in interpreting survey questions, incorrect recording of survey responses, or the design of the survey. Sampling error exists because the sample being used to calculate the estimated value may not accurately represent the population. An estimated CV is a measure of the amount of sampling error and is calculated by dividing the estimated standard error of the estimated percentage by the estimated percentage and multiplying by 100 (Hamburg 1985). The formula is

$$CV_{P_i} = \frac{s_{P_i}}{P_i} \times 100,$$

where P_i is the estimated percentage in state *i*, s_{P_i} is the estimated standard error of P_i, and CV_{P_i} is the estimated coefficient of variation of P_i. Smaller estimated CVs indicate smaller sampling error and thus more precise estimates. A rule of thumb is that an estimated CV of more than 30 indicates low statistical accuracy. This did not occur in any instance. The highest estimated CV is 22.3 for the estimated percentage of non-institutionalized working-age civilians with a *work limitation* in Connecticut for 1990.

The estimated standard error of the estimated percentages is calculated following the guidelines of the Census Bureau:

$$s_{P_i} = \sqrt{(bf_i / n)P_i(100 - P_i)},$$

where P_i is the estimated percentage for state *i*; *b* and f_i are the parameters calculated to adjust for the non-random nature of the CPS sample (f_i is state-specific); *n* is the estimated number of people in the denominator of P_i (the estimated populations in Appendix Table 1). Following LaPlante (1993), the adjustment factor (*b*) for estimating employment characteristics is used for estimating standard error for the estimated percentage with a disability and is equal to 2,485 for the 1990 March CPS. See U.S. Bureau of the Census (1998) for the state-specific adjustment factors (f_i) and more detail on estimating standard errors for statistics from the CPS.

The accuracy of an estimated value is linked to the number of people used to calculate the estimated value. Appendix Table 4 contains the sample sizes used to calculate the estimated percentages in Tables 1, 2, and 4. Note that the estimated percentage with a *work limitation* and the estimated percentage with a *work disability* for a given location use the same sample size

because both are based on the same sample. This is similar to the estimated population in Appendix Table 1. The estimated population is the weighted sample size. The Census Bureau provides weights that allow for population estimates. A sample member's weight is roughly interpreted as the number of persons in the United States population that he or she represents. Summing the sample weights of sample members is an estimate of the population. For example, the estimated number of non-institutionalized working-age civilians for Alabama in 1981 (1,676,000, taken from Appendix Table 1) is the sum of these weights for the 1,232 non-institutionalized working-age civilians from Alabama in the 1981 March CPS.

Averaging estimated percentages over consecutive years and subtracting estimated percentage of one year from to the next year are straightforward exercises. However, determining the statistical accuracy of the resulting average or difference is not straightforward. The design of the CPS causes a problem. In the March CPS of any given year, approximately half of the households were surveyed the prior March, while the remaining households are eligible to be surveyed the following March. See Census Bureau (1998) for more information. The estimated standard errors of an average or a difference must be adjusted to account for correlation across consecutive years. For example, an individual's responses in March 1998 are correlated with his or her responses in March 1999. Roughly speaking, the estimated standard errors are measures of the variation, and the correlation across years must be taken into consideration. Following Census Bureau guidelines, the formula for the estimated CV for the difference in estimated percentages between 1990 and 1989 is

$$CV_{P_{90}-P_{89}} = \frac{\sqrt{(s_{90})^2 + (s_{89})^2 - 2\, r_{90,89}\, s_{90}\, s_{89}}}{(P_{90} - P_{89})},$$

where P_{89} is the estimated percentage for state *i* in 1989, s_{89} is the estimated standard error for P_{89}, $r_{90,89}$ is the estimated correlation coefficient between 1989 and 1990. The estimated CV for the average of estimated percentages for 1990 and 1989 is

$$CV_{(P_{90}+P_{89})/2} = \frac{\sqrt{(s_{90})^2 + (s_{89})^2 + 2\, r_{90,89}\, s_{90}\, s_{89}}}{(P_{90} + P_{89})}.$$

Appendix Table 5 contains estimated correlation coefficients ($r_{year_2, year_1}$) for the United States, which can be used to approximate $r_{year_2, year_1}$ for a given state. The estimated standard errors (s_{90}) can be obtained by multiplying the estimated coefficient of variation (CV_{90}) by the estimated percentage (CV_{90}) and then dividing by 100. The general formula for averaging over more than two consecutive years is

$$CV_{\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T} P_t} = \frac{\sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^{T} s_t^2 + 2\sum_{t=1}^{T-1} r_{t,t+1} s_t s_{t+1}}}{\sum_{t=1}^{T} P_t},$$

where *T* is the number of years. For example, the estimated percentage of non-institutionalized working-age civilian with a *work limitation* averaged over 1981 through 1983 is 12.3 percent for West Virginia. The estimated coefficient of variation for this estimated percentage is

$$\frac{\sqrt{\left(\frac{10.3*11.7}{100}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{7.6*12.5}{100}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{7.4*12.8}{100}\right)^2 + 2*0.552*\left(\frac{10.3*11.7}{100}\right)*\left(\frac{7.6*12.5}{100}\right) + 2*0.563*\left(\frac{7.6*12.5}{100}\right)*\left(\frac{7.4*12.8}{100}\right)}}{(11.7 + 12.5 + 12.8)/100},$$

which is equal to 6.35. The numbers in this formula are available in Table 2 and Appendix Tables 2 and 5.

ENDNOTES

1. For a more in depth history of the CPS, see U.S. Bureau of the Census (1998) or http://www.bls.census.gov/cps/.

2. See LaPlante (1993) for a fuller discussion of the statistical accuracy of CPS estimates of state populations with disabilities in comparison to estimates from the Decennial Census and the National Health Interview Survey.

3. Ryscavage (1995) found that these changes influenced the estimation income inequality in the United States.

4. *Work limitation* is based on the following questions: (62A) Does anyone in this household have a health problem or disability which prevents them from working or which limits the kind or amount of work they can do? (62B) If yes to 62A., who is that? (Anyone else?) These questions are from the 1981 survey. The wording of the question reveals the fact that a single household member answers the survey for all household members. The Census Bureau recodes the survey to the individual level, so researchers can generate statistics for individuals.

5. *Work disability* is based on *work limitation* and the following questions. These questions are taken directly from the 1981 survey. (32) What was the main reason... did not work in 1980 (last year)? Was he...ill or disabled and unable to work? Taking care of home or family? Going to school? Could not find work? In the Armed Forces? Retired? Doing something else? (63A) Is there anyone in this household who ever retired or left a job for health reasons? (63B) Who is that? Anyone else? (60C) What type of Veterans' payments did ... receive? Service-contracted disability? Survivor benefits? Veterans' pension? Educational assistance? Other Veterans' payments? (52A) During 1980 did ... receive any Workers' Compensation payments or other payments as a result of job related injury or illness? Exclude sick pay and disability retirement. (57) During 1980 did anyone in this household receive: (57A) Any SSI payments, that is, Supplemental Security Income? (57B) If yes to 57A, who received SSI? (74) There are several government programs which provide medical care or help pay medical bills. During 19XX was anyone in this household covered by: (74A) Medicare (for the disabled and elderly)? (74B) If yes to 74A, who was that? (Anyone else?)

6. The percentage point difference in the prevalence of *work disability* minus the prevalence of *work limitation*. The percentage change is percentage point difference divided by the average of the two prevalences multiplied by 100. The difference between the two measures is in part due to the fact that *work limitation* is reported at the time of the survey while many of the other categories of *work disability* are categories reported for the previous year. For example, people may receive workers' compensation in the previous year and no longer have a *work limitation* at the time of the survey.

7. The estimated correlation of the prevalence of *work limitation* in the first five-year span and last five-year span is remarkably high, 0.80. This suggests the state level conditions that are conducive to *work limitations* are persistent over time and/or that geographic mobility among people with a *work limitation* is small.

8. Specifically, the percentage change is calculated by subtracting the prevalence in the last five-year span from the first five-year span and then dividing that difference by the average of two prevalences. The formula for a percentage change is

$$\frac{P_{1981/85} - P_{1995/99}}{\frac{P_{1981/85} + P_{1995/99}}{2}} * 100$$

where for example $P_{1981/1985}$ is the estimated percentage with a *work limitation* averaged over 1981 through 1985.

9. The estimated correlation of the prevalence of *work limitation* averaged over 1981 through 1999 and the prevalence of *work disability* averaged over 1981 through 1999 is 0.985. This high degree of correlation suggests that there is very little difference between the ranking of states using *work limitation* and using *work disability.* The estimated correlation between the percentage changes presented in Tables 3 and 5 for the prevalence of *work limitation* and the prevalence of *work disability* is 0.892. This high correlation suggests very little difference between the changes in the populations with a *work limitation* and with a *work disability.*

REFERENCES

Bennefield, Robert L., and McNeil, John M. 1989. "Labor Force Status and Other Characteristics of Persons with a Work Disability: 1981 to 1988." *Current Population Report* P-23(160).

Bound, John and Richard V. Burkhauser. 1999. "Economic Analysis of Transfer Programs Targeted on People with Disabilities." In Orley C. Ashenfelter and David Card (eds.), *Handbook of Labor Economic*s, Volume 3C. Amsterdam: Elsevier Science, pp. 3417-3528.

Burkhauser, Richard V., Mary C. Daly, and Andrew J. Houtenville. 2000. "How Working-age People with Disabilities Fared Over the 1990s Business Cycle." Ithaca, NY: Research and Rehabilitation Training Center for Economic Research on Employment Policy for Persons with Disabilities, Cornell University.

Burkhauser, Richard V., Robert H. Haveman, and Barbara L. Wolfe. 1993. "How People with Disabilities Fare When Public Policies Change." *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 12(2): 251-69.

Hamburg, Morris. 1985. *Basic Statistics*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanivich.

Hanson, Robert L. 1978. *The Current Population Survey, Design and Methodology, Technical Paper 40.* Washington, D.C.: Department of Commerce.

Kirchner, Corinne. 1996. "Looking Under the Street Lamp." *Journal of Disability Policy Studies* 7(1): 78-90.

LaPlante, Mitchell P. 1993. "State Estimates of Disability in America". *Disability Statistics Report, Number 3.* Washington, DC: National Institute of Disability and Rehabilitation Research.

McCoy, J.L. and Weems, K. 1999. "Disabled-Worker Beneficiaries and Disabled SSI Recipients: A Profile of Demographics and Program Characteristics." *Social Security Bulletin* 52(5): 16-28.

Nagi, Saad. 1991. "Disability Concepts Revisited: Implications to Prevention." In A.M. Pope and A.R. Tarlove (eds.), *Disability in America: Toward A National Agenda for Prevention.* Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Ryscavage, Paul. 1995. "A Surge in Growing Income Inequality?" *Monthly Labor Review* 118(8): 51-61.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. 1998. *Current Population Survey, March 1998.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Commerce.

Table 1. Estimated Percentage of Non-Institutionalized Civilians Aged 25 through 61 with a Disability in the United States for Survey Years 1981 through 1999 using Alternative Definitions of Disability

	Survey Year																		
Definition	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985[a]	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994[a]	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
Work Limitation[b]	7.9	7.9	7.5	7.6	7.8	7.7	7.7	7.2	7.2	7.4	7.5	7.6	7.8	8.4	8.3	8.3	8.3	8.1	7.9
Work Disability[c]	10.8	10.8	10.3	10.2	10.2	10.3	10.1	10.1	10.1	10.2	10.6	10.7	10.7	11.5	11.3	11.3	11.3	11.0	10.8
Percentage Point Difference[d]	3.0	2.9	2.8	2.6	2.4	2.5	2.4	2.9	2.9	2.8	3.1	3.0	2.9	3.1	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.9	2.9
Percentage Change[e]	31.5	30.6	31.6	29.3	26.4	28.2	27.5	33.5	33.2	32.2	34.5	32.9	31.6	31.6	30.5	30.9	30.9	30.6	30.6

Source: Author's calculations using the March Current Population Survey, 1981 through 1999.

[a] In April of survey year 1984, sample weights based on the 1970 Census were replaced with sample weights based on the 1980 Census and the sample design was changed to increase the accuracy of state estimates. In survey year 1994 there were several changes in the CPS. It moved fully to computer-assisted survey interviews. Sample weights based on the 1980 Census were replaced with sample weights based on the 1990 Census. The Monthly Basic Survey was revised, and three new disability questions were added. It is possible that these changes affected the measurement of the population with a disability either through changes in the sample weights or in the way respondents answered disability questions.

[b] Persons with a *work limitation* are defined as those who report having (or are reported by the household's respondent as having), at the time of the survey, "a health problem or disability which prevents them from working or which limits the kind or amount of work they can do."

[c] Persons with a *work disability* fall into one of the following categories, each of which is related to a question on the CPS: (1) they have a work limitation, (2) they did not work in the previous year because they were ill or disabled and unable to work, (3) they retired or left a job for health reasons, (4) they received veterans' benefits due to a service-contracted disability in the previous year, (5) they received workers' compensation benefits or other benefits in the previous year as a result of job-related injury or illness, (6) they received Supplemental Security Income benefits and were less than 65 years old in the previous year, and/or (7) they received Medicare and were less than 65 years in the previous year.

[d] The percentage point difference in the prevalence of work disability minus the prevalence of work limitation. The difference between the two measures is in part due to the fact that work limitation is reported at the time of the survey while many of the other categories of work disability are categories reported for the previous year. For example, people may receive workers' compensation in the previous year and no longer have a work limitation at the time of the survey.

[e] The percentage change is the percentage point difference divided by the average of the two prevalences multiplied by 100.

Table 2. Estimated Percentage of Non-Institutionalized Civilians Aged 25 through 61 with a Work Limitation for the United States, and for Each State and the District of Columbia, Survey Years 1981 through 1999[a]

	Survey Year																		
Location	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985[b]	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994[b]	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
United States	7.9	7.9	7.5	7.6	7.8	7.7	7.7	7.2	7.2	7.4	7.5	7.6	7.8	8.4	8.3	8.3	8.3	8.1	7.9
Alabama	10.0	9.0	7.4	8.7	7.4	9.0	8.7	7.9	7.9	9.9	10.4	10.7	8.3	13.1	9.6	10.7	11.0	10.7	9.9
Alaska	7.1	5.9	5.7	5.1	4.7	4.6	7.3	5.4	5.6	5.0	5.3	6.5	5.2	7.2	7.0	6.5	7.2	8.5	6.9
Arizona	8.3	8.5	9.5	8.6	7.2	8.8	9.5	7.2	6.2	7.7	6.1	6.5	8.9	8.5	7.3	7.4	9.8	7.2	5.8
Arkansas	13.3	12.6	12.2	11.1	11.7	12.5	12.5	11.2	10.1	8.6	9.4	10.4	10.8	12.0	9.2	13.6	12.4	12.7	11.3
California	7.3	8.4	7.6	7.0	7.6	7.6	7.4	7.0	6.8	7.0	7.1	6.6	7.9	7.6	7.7	7.6	7.5	7.4	7.2
Colorado	4.7	5.7	6.8	6.1	7.2	4.6	8.4	7.5	7.2	7.8	6.2	8.6	8.4	5.5	6.3	7.9	6.7	6.7	7.6
Connecticut	6.2	4.8	5.4	5.3	6.5	5.7	4.2	5.7	6.1	3.5	4.7	6.0	6.1	7.3	4.9	4.7	5.8	8.0	9.2
Delaware	8.8	9.9	6.8	5.3	7.5	6.6	6.3	5.2	7.0	6.9	5.3	6.2	7.1	6.4	7.9	7.5	6.7	6.1	5.6
District of Columbia	10.0	8.2	8.7	10.2	10.0	7.8	7.8	8.2	7.2	8.0	10.6	7.8	7.9	8.3	8.7	10.2	10.4	6.6	8.5
Florida	7.7	8.9	9.4	9.1	8.6	8.2	7.6	7.6	7.7	7.2	7.2	8.5	7.2	8.4	9.2	8.9	9.2	8.3	8.6
Georgia	11.2	8.6	8.3	8.0	10.1	10.5	9.8	9.0	9.0	9.1	7.9	9.1	9.2	8.8	9.7	10.2	8.3	7.8	9.0
Hawaii	7.6	7.0	6.6	7.0	7.1	6.4	7.5	4.2	4.0	6.0	4.5	6.2	7.0	6.7	6.6	4.6	6.1	6.7	4.7
Idaho	8.2	7.2	8.3	9.2	8.9	9.6	8.1	8.6	7.2	8.3	8.0	8.6	7.1	5.5	8.4	9.5	7.7	9.2	5.9
Illinois	6.8	6.5	5.8	6.5	6.7	5.8	6.3	6.4	6.1	6.7	6.9	5.8	7.5	7.8	7.6	6.9	7.5	7.3	7.0
Indiana	6.3	7.9	7.4	7.2	6.6	7.4	8.5	7.2	5.9	5.7	6.3	6.9	5.9	6.6	9.3	7.5	7.4	7.1	7.5
Iowa	7.2	6.6	5.5	5.2	5.8	7.1	7.5	5.9	4.8	6.6	6.2	6.1	7.2	7.2	7.6	6.3	6.3	6.3	5.7
Kansas	7.1	5.3	5.3	5.7	4.8	6.4	5.6	5.1	4.8	6.3	5.2	5.0	5.9	7.6	6.8	8.2	7.9	8.3	7.3
Kentucky	8.6	10.6	8.9	8.3	8.1	9.3	9.8	9.9	10.4	10.0	13.6	12.8	12.4	13.0	14.4	14.0	10.6	11.6	12.2
Louisiana	9.6	10.9	9.2	8.3	8.9	10.8	10.4	10.3	10.5	10.5	8.9	7.8	9.5	14.4	9.9	10.9	10.3	8.2	9.9
Maine	8.6	7.6	7.7	8.6	8.4	10.0	9.7	10.1	9.3	7.9	7.1	8.8	11.2	10.2	13.2	9.2	9.5	11.4	9.8
Maryland	6.2	6.2	6.6	6.2	7.5	6.1	5.7	5.0	7.2	5.8	5.8	6.1	5.3	9.5	6.7	6.7	6.2	5.4	6.0
Massachusetts	6.8	6.7	5.4	6.1	6.3	7.2	5.4	6.1	6.5	7.2	8.2	7.3	6.8	7.0	8.0	9.2	8.5	9.0	6.9
Michigan	8.3	8.8	8.7	10.1	10.6	9.9	9.5	8.3	8.7	9.6	8.9	8.9	8.8	9.3	9.0	8.6	9.0	8.8	8.0
Minnesota	6.7	6.1	6.8	7.0	7.5	7.6	7.8	7.7	5.9	6.7	6.9	8.8	7.4	8.4	6.2	5.1	6.7	6.2	5.8
Mississippi	12.2	10.5	10.2	10.8	12.0	9.3	9.9	10.1	11.1	10.6	12.4	12.0	9.8	9.8	9.5	10.1	10.3	10.2	9.1
Missouri	7.8	8.1	7.5	7.8	8.0	8.0	7.7	7.6	7.8	7.4	8.3	7.1	8.6	7.7	10.4	6.4	8.8	8.9	7.8
Montana	6.8	5.2	8.5	9.6	7.4	9.9	8.8	10.0	9.4	8.5	8.1	9.0	7.9	8.6	8.3	9.9	9.9	9.8	10.2
Nebraska	6.7	6.1	5.8	6.3	5.8	3.9	5.4	5.6	5.2	4.7	6.4	5.7	5.0	5.6	5.4	6.8	7.0	7.3	6.2
Nevada	7.5	4.8	5.7	5.5	6.3	6.5	5.3	8.2	6.5	4.7	5.9	7.7	6.5	8.3	7.0	7.0	5.9	6.3	6.3
New Hampshire	5.0	8.9	7.6	7.1	6.3	5.1	7.1	5.0	6.5	6.1	6.2	6.8	7.5	8.1	7.1	7.9	10.1	7.9	7.6

Continued

Table 2. Continued

Location	Survey Year																		
	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985[b]	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994[b]	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
New Jersey	5.8	7.6	6.7	5.3	6.1	6.1	6.4	5.4	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.6	5.2	6.1	6.1	5.7	6.8	5.8	5.7
New Mexico	8.8	12.2	8.6	9.0	8.1	6.8	8.9	7.9	8.2	8.7	8.6	7.9	10.2	11.5	9.1	10.1	10.2	8.9	8.1
New York	6.8	7.5	6.4	7.3	7.8	7.1	6.2	6.3	6.9	6.5	7.2	6.7	7.4	8.1	8.0	8.0	8.3	8.2	9.1
North Carolina	8.8	10.3	9.1	8.1	8.6	8.8	7.5	7.5	7.5	8.0	7.5	7.8	8.0	9.3	9.3	9.0	7.8	9.0	8.7
North Dakota	6.6	6.7	5.1	6.0	6.0	6.1	6.0	6.6	6.2	7.7	7.5	6.5	5.0	5.7	5.7	4.9	6.2	6.5	6.5
Ohio	8.9	8.3	7.7	8.8	8.5	7.4	7.3	7.0	7.6	7.8	7.8	8.1	7.4	8.4	8.2	9.4	8.5	7.9	9.3
Oklahoma	8.3	8.5	8.4	7.9	6.6	8.0	7.6	5.7	9.5	8.6	8.9	9.9	7.7	10.4	9.3	9.5	9.1	10.6	10.6
Oregon	9.9	9.1	8.2	9.0	8.0	8.0	8.2	9.8	10.0	7.4	9.1	10.1	8.7	7.0	7.5	9.1	9.1	7.9	7.4
Pennsylvania	9.5	8.1	6.9	8.7	8.9	8.3	8.6	7.2	7.2	6.6	7.3	8.5	8.7	7.9	9.1	9.2	9.5	8.5	8.4
Rhode Island	10.6	9.0	9.5	9.5	8.4	8.7	6.8	7.7	8.1	6.1	7.5	7.8	8.6	7.5	8.2	10.8	9.0	9.0	7.7
South Carolina	8.4	7.2	7.7	8.0	8.6	8.9	9.5	7.3	6.9	10.0	9.1	10.0	9.6	9.0	11.1	9.6	7.9	8.5	9.7
South Dakota	5.1	6.1	7.9	5.5	5.8	8.0	5.6	5.8	6.0	7.1	7.4	7.4	9.2	7.8	7.0	7.2	7.2	7.6	7.1
Tennessee	7.5	8.9	11.8	10.3	10.3	12.7	12.2	9.3	10.4	10.1	8.8	10.7	13.4	13.5	11.8	10.6	14.2	11.3	8.6
Texas	7.4	6.0	6.1	7.0	6.5	6.4	7.4	7.2	6.9	7.5	6.8	7.5	6.5	7.6	7.1	7.3	6.2	7.5	7.1
Utah	6.0	6.2	6.8	5.6	6.1	6.2	4.9	4.1	5.3	6.8	4.9	5.4	4.8	7.0	6.6	6.6	5.6	6.7	5.8
Vermont	9.5	7.6	7.4	7.6	6.9	6.8	7.8	7.2	6.6	6.0	8.1	9.9	9.5	9.4	8.1	7.0	8.4	9.5	7.3
Virginia	8.0	6.8	7.3	5.3	7.2	7.4	7.0	7.4	6.8	7.3	7.3	7.4	6.2	5.9	7.6	9.3	9.0	8.3	6.9
Washington	11.2	8.1	7.8	7.0	7.7	9.4	9.5	7.1	5.6	7.7	10.2	8.3	6.0	8.0	9.9	8.8	8.8	6.5	8.1
West Virginia	11.7	12.5	12.8	12.4	11.0	9.4	9.7	10.7	11.0	11.6	9.9	10.9	13.5	14.4	14.9	13.8	17.0	13.3	12.2
Wisconsin	6.6	7.1	6.3	6.7	7.2	5.1	5.5	5.2	6.2	7.4	6.5	6.1	7.9	8.2	6.7	6.4	7.6	8.5	7.9
Wyoming	5.7	5.7	6.4	5.7	6.3	8.4	8.1	8.2	8.1	7.9	6.1	8.4	7.1	7.6	7.0	8.5	9.1	7.5	7.9

Source: Author's calculations using the March Current Population Survey, 1981 through 1999.

[a] Persons with a *work limitation* are defined as those who report having (or are reported by the household's respondent as having), at the time of the survey, "a health problem or disability which prevents them from working or which limits the kind or amount of work they can do."

[b] In April of survey year 1984, sample weights based on the 1970 Census were replaced with sample weights based on the 1980 Census and the sample design was changed to increase the accuracy of state estimates. In survey year 1994 there were several changes in the CPS. It moved fully to computer-assisted survey interviews. Sample weights based on the 1980 Census were replaced with sample weights based on the 1990 Census. The Monthly Basic Survey was revised, and three new disability questions were added. It is possible that these changes affected the measurement of the population with a disability either through changes in the sample weights or in the way respondents answered disability

Table 3. Estimated Percentages of Non-Institutionalized Civilians Aged 25 through 61 with a Work Limitation for the United States, and for Each State and the District of Columbia Averaged over Various Periods , Percentage Changes for these Periods, and Corresponding State Rankings[a]

	Period							
	Survey Years 1981-1999[b]		Survey Years 1981-1985[b]		Survey Years 1995-1999[b]		Survey Years 1981-1985 to 1995-1999	
Location	Average	Rank[c]	Average	Rank[c]	Average	Rank[c]	Percentage Change[d]	Rank[c]
United States	7.8	-	7.7	-	8.2	-	5.6 *	-
West Virginia	12.2	1	12.1	2	14.2	1	16.5 *	12
Arkansas	11.5	2	12.2	1	11.8	3	-2.6	38
Kentucky	11.0	3	8.9	12	12.6	2	34.4 *	1
Tennessee	10.9	4	9.8	4	11.3	4	14.6	16
Mississippi	10.5	5	11.2	3	9.8	8	-12.5	48
Louisiana	10.0	6	9.4	7	9.9	7	5.1	28
Alabama	9.5	7	8.5	15	10.4	6	19.9 *	9
Maine	9.4	8	8.2	21	10.6	5	26.3 *	5
Georgia	9.1	9	9.3	10	9.0	13	-2.9	40
New Mexico	9.0	10	9.3	8	9.3	12	-0.5	34
Michigan	9.0	11	9.3	9	8.7	19	-6.9	45
South Carolina	8.8	12	8.0	22	9.4	11	15.9	13
Montana	8.7	13	7.5	28	9.6	10	24.7 *	6
District of Columbia	8.7	14	9.4	5	8.9	16	-5.9	44
Oklahoma	8.7	15	7.9	23	9.8	9	21.4 *	8
Oregon	8.6	16	8.9	13	8.2	25	-7.7	46
Rhode Island	8.5	17	9.4	6	8.9	14	-4.9	42
North Carolina	8.5	18	9.0	11	8.8	18	-2.5	37
Florida	8.3	19	8.8	14	8.8	17	1.0	32
Pennsylvania	8.3	20	8.4	17	8.9	15	5.8	27
Washington	8.2	21	8.4	19	8.4	22	0.8	33
Ohio	8.1	22	8.5	16	8.7	20	2.5	30
Idaho	8.1	23	8.4	20	8.1	27	-2.8	39
Missouri	8.0	24	7.8	24	8.5	21	7.7	23
Vermont	7.9	25	7.8	25	8.1	29	3.4	29
Arizona	7.8	26	8.4	18	7.5	33	-11.5	47
California	7.4	27	7.6	27	7.5	34	-2.1	36
New York	7.3	28	7.1	29	8.3	24	15.1 *	14
Wyoming	7.3	29	6.0	47	8.0	30	29.0 *	3
Virginia	7.3	30	6.9	33	8.2	26	16.9	10
Indiana	7.1	31	7.1	30	7.8	31	9.0	21
Massachusetts	7.1	32	6.3	40	8.3	23	28.1 *	4
New Hampshire	7.1	33	7.0	32	8.1	28	15.1	15
Texas	7.0	34	6.6	36	7.0	40	6.3	25
Minnesota	6.9	35	6.8	34	6.0	49	-13.2	50
South Dakota	6.9	36	6.1	44	7.2	38	16.6	11
Colorado	6.8	37	6.1	43	7.1	39	14.5	17
Delaware	6.8	38	7.7	26	6.8	41	-12.5	49
Wisconsin	6.8	39	6.8	35	7.4	35	9.0	20
Illinois	6.7	40	6.4	38	7.3	36	12.1 *	19

Continued

Table 3. Continued

	Period							
	Survey Years 1981-1999[b]		Survey Years 1981-1985[b]		Survey Years 1995-1999[b]		Survey Years 1981-1985 to 1995-1999	
Location	Average	Rank[c]	Average	Rank[c]	Average	Rank[c]	Percentage Change[d]	Rank[c]
Nevada	6.4	41	6.0	48	6.5	43	8.7	22
Iowa	6.4	42	6.1	46	6.4	45	5.8	26
Maryland	6.3	43	6.5	37	6.2	47	-5.1	43
Kansas	6.2	44	5.6	51	7.7	32	31.0 *	2
North Dakota	6.2	45	6.1	45	5.9	50	-2.1	35
Alaska	6.1	46	5.7	49	7.2	37	23.7 *	7
Hawaii	6.1	47	7.1	31	5.7	51	-20.6 *	51
Utah	5.9	48	6.2	41	6.2	46	1.3	31
Nebraska	5.8	49	6.1	42	6.5	42	6.4	24
Connecticut	5.8	50	5.6	50	6.5	44	14.0	18
New Jersey	5.7	51	6.3	39	6.0	48	-4.6	41

Source: Author's calculations using the March Current Population Survey, 1981 through 1999.

[a] Persons with a *work limitation* are defined as those who report having (or are reported by the household's respondent as having), at the time of the survey, "a health problem or disability which prevents them from working or which limits the kind or amount of work they can do."

[b] In April of survey year 1984, sample weights based on the 1970 Census were replaced with sample weights based on the 1980 Census and the sample design was changed to increase the accuracy of state estimates. In survey year 1994 there were several changes in the CPS. It moved fully to computer-assisted survey interviews. Sample weights based on the 1980 Census were replaced with sample weights based on the 1990 Census. The Monthly Basic Survey was revised, and three new disability questions were added. It is possible that these changes affected the measurement of the population with a disability either through changes in the sample weights or in the way respondents answered disability questions.

[c] Looking at the percentages, some states appear to be tied and thus should have the same rank. However, the rankings are based on three decimal places. There were no ties.

[d] The percentage change is the difference between the two averages divided by the average of the two averages multiplied by 100. Asterisks (*) note locations where the absolute change in the percentage with disabilities from period to period is statistically different from zero, assuming a 90 percent confidence level.

Table 4. Estimated Percentage of Non-Institutionalized Civilians Aged 25 through 61 with a Work Disability for the United States, and for Each State and the District of Columbia, Survey Years 1981 through 1999[a]

	Survey Year																		
Location	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985[b]	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994[b]	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
United States	10.8	10.8	10.3	10.2	10.2	10.3	10.1	10.1	10.1	10.2	10.6	10.7	10.7	11.5	11.3	11.3	11.3	11.0	10.8
Alabama	12.4	11.7	9.3	10.8	10.0	11.0	10.7	10.6	11.4	13.2	14.7	12.5	11.0	17.4	12.5	14.2	12.3	13.5	11.2
Alaska	10.7	10.2	8.9	8.2	8.5	7.2	9.6	7.8	8.6	7.3	8.3	10.1	9.0	10.6	9.9	10.2	10.0	12.9	10.6
Arizona	11.2	12.1	11.5	10.2	10.0	11.9	10.9	10.2	7.9	10.4	8.7	9.1	11.6	11.3	9.8	10.6	12.1	11.5	9.0
Arkansas	16.0	15.5	15.4	15.2	14.1	14.7	15.8	14.3	12.3	11.0	12.4	13.6	13.9	16.0	11.7	16.7	16.3	17.3	13.3
California	11.1	12.3	10.9	10.0	10.3	10.9	10.0	10.0	9.9	10.4	10.8	10.1	11.2	11.5	11.1	10.9	10.7	10.8	10.5
Colorado	7.9	8.1	8.9	8.8	9.7	7.0	11.0	9.5	10.1	11.4	9.2	12.5	11.7	8.5	8.6	10.6	9.1	9.5	9.5
Connecticut	8.2	7.2	7.3	7.3	9.2	7.7	7.2	7.7	8.4	5.8	8.6	8.1	9.3	9.3	6.8	7.4	9.3	9.4	11.7
Delaware	11.5	11.8	9.9	7.5	10.1	9.8	9.7	6.4	9.7	10.7	8.1	8.1	9.2	9.3	10.9	10.4	10.6	9.4	9.7
District of Columbia	13.6	11.7	10.4	14.2	13.9	12.8	9.4	10.9	10.4	9.5	12.9	9.4	11.1	11.5	11.5	13.4	15.1	10.0	12.6
Florida	10.5	11.8	12.6	11.6	10.8	11.2	10.0	10.5	10.5	10.1	10.0	11.3	9.9	11.2	12.5	12.1	12.2	11.0	11.4
Georgia	14.3	11.0	10.8	10.4	12.2	13.1	12.0	12.0	11.9	10.8	11.2	13.3	12.1	11.0	12.5	13.4	11.3	10.2	11.8
Hawaii	11.2	9.8	10.1	10.7	8.7	8.3	10.4	6.2	7.9	9.0	7.2	10.6	9.3	10.1	8.8	8.1	8.7	9.3	6.0
Idaho	11.4	9.0	12.4	12.9	12.6	12.6	10.6	10.8	11.3	10.7	10.6	12.6	8.7	9.7	10.8	14.0	11.2	12.2	8.7
Illinois	9.0	8.5	8.1	8.3	8.2	8.1	8.2	8.7	8.8	9.9	9.0	8.6	10.3	10.0	10.1	10.1	10.1	9.2	9.0
Indiana	9.7	10.5	10.4	9.5	8.7	9.6	10.0	10.6	7.8	8.1	8.5	9.7	8.4	10.8	12.8	9.8	10.6	8.9	10.4
Iowa	9.7	8.6	6.6	6.9	8.2	9.0	9.4	8.5	6.9	8.7	9.7	9.2	9.1	9.5	9.6	8.6	8.7	9.5	8.4
Kansas	8.7	7.3	7.9	8.7	6.7	8.9	8.2	7.5	7.1	8.2	8.1	6.6	8.8	9.9	10.1	12.2	10.8	10.8	9.2
Kentucky	11.6	14.6	11.4	11.1	10.1	11.8	11.9	12.3	13.2	14.2	16.8	15.1	15.7	16.2	17.4	16.6	14.8	14.7	14.8
Louisiana	12.3	13.4	12.1	12.1	11.4	12.5	12.6	13.4	13.8	14.4	12.0	10.8	12.2	17.3	14.3	15.1	14.2	11.2	13.1
Maine	12.0	12.0	11.9	12.0	10.7	12.6	12.9	13.5	12.2	11.7	9.8	12.4	14.5	13.6	17.4	11.8	12.8	15.8	12.8
Maryland	8.2	8.5	8.9	8.6	9.4	8.5	8.4	7.4	9.8	7.5	8.9	7.9	7.6	12.9	8.8	9.4	9.0	7.8	8.7
Massachusetts	10.2	10.1	8.6	9.5	9.1	10.3	7.8	8.7	9.7	9.9	11.5	10.6	9.4	9.7	11.0	12.0	12.0	11.1	9.3
Michigan	11.7	11.7	11.4	12.7	13.1	12.4	12.6	11.8	12.0	13.1	13.0	12.5	11.3	12.7	12.5	11.4	11.6	11.5	10.7
Minnesota	9.4	8.5	9.7	9.1	8.7	10.3	10.0	9.5	8.1	8.9	9.0	10.6	8.7	11.4	8.7	7.9	9.8	9.4	8.7
Mississippi	16.5	13.1	13.6	13.6	14.4	11.0	12.3	13.2	14.9	12.8	15.7	15.8	13.0	13.3	14.9	16.7	13.6	13.4	12.9
Missouri	10.7	11.2	10.5	9.6	9.6	9.3	9.4	10.6	10.4	9.6	10.9	8.8	11.4	10.7	13.3	9.1	12.8	11.6	9.4
Montana	9.2	8.7	11.7	12.6	9.8	13.0	11.1	12.9	11.6	11.6	10.3	11.9	12.4	11.8	12.2	13.9	12.4	11.8	13.6
Nebraska	9.0	7.9	7.7	8.3	8.3	6.0	7.0	6.8	8.3	8.0	9.7	8.1	7.4	8.5	9.2	8.2	10.4	10.4	9.8
Nevada	10.1	8.9	8.5	8.0	8.6	8.7	8.2	11.8	8.9	8.6	9.0	10.3	10.0	11.3	9.7	10.0	8.4	10.3	9.7
New Hampshire	8.0	12.3	11.5	9.0	9.6	8.3	9.6	9.0	10.1	10.0	10.7	10.8	10.9	10.3	9.4	12.3	12.3	10.9	9.6

Continued

Table 4. Continued

	Survey Year																	
Location	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985[b]	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994[b]	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
New Jersey	8.6	10.4	9.4	7.5	7.9	8.5	9.0	8.4	6.9	7.0	7.1	7.2	8.0	9.7	8.4	8.8	9.6	8.7	8.1
New Mexico	11.6	14.1	11.0	11.0	12.0	9.6	10.9	10.8	10.8	11.3	11.0	10.6	12.6	13.9	11.6	13.3	12.8	11.4	11.5
New York	9.8	10.3	9.0	10.3	10.5	10.2	9.0	9.6	9.8	9.3	10.9	10.1	11.6	11.3	11.4	11.1	12.0	11.5	12.8
North Carolina	11.0	12.7	11.6	10.1	10.4	11.5	10.1	10.8	10.7	10.9	11.0	10.4	11.1	12.0	12.2	11.3	10.5	11.5	11.5
North Dakota	8.8	8.3	6.0	8.4	7.9	8.3	7.9	8.6	9.0	10.0	11.3	9.3	8.6	7.5	7.4	8.9	8.7	9.8	8.7
Ohio	11.7	11.0	10.2	10.8	11.0	9.6	9.9	9.9	10.4	10.3	10.4	10.3	10.2	11.3	11.6	11.8	11.5	10.9	12.1
Oklahoma	12.4	10.5	10.7	9.5	7.9	9.9	8.7	7.8	13.1	11.1	11.6	12.6	9.6	13.0	12.0	13.0	11.6	14.1	14.4
Oregon	13.2	12.6	11.7	13.0	10.4	10.8	11.1	13.1	13.8	10.4	12.6	13.7	12.2	10.8	11.0	12.9	11.5	10.1	10.8
Pennsylvania	12.3	11.5	10.0	11.3	11.1	10.5	11.0	10.5	10.8	9.8	10.2	11.5	11.2	11.0	11.9	12.5	12.2	11.5	10.9
Rhode Island	13.7	14.0	13.4	14.5	12.5	11.3	11.6	12.7	10.9	9.3	11.2	11.0	11.6	11.6	11.9	13.8	13.2	12.5	9.6
South Carolina	12.3	10.3	11.9	11.4	11.7	11.0	11.9	10.2	9.4	11.3	10.9	12.2	12.5	12.1	13.5	12.8	11.6	11.5	11.3
South Dakota	8.3	9.8	10.1	8.7	8.1	10.6	8.9	8.6	10.0	11.2	10.7	9.0	12.4	11.3	9.3	10.4	10.3	11.7	9.2
Tennessee	10.2	12.4	15.2	13.5	13.1	15.0	13.7	12.3	13.2	13.4	11.6	14.6	16.2	17.0	15.1	13.5	17.9	14.5	12.7
Texas	10.3	8.3	9.1	9.2	9.0	8.5	9.5	10.0	9.3	10.1	9.3	10.7	9.6	10.3	9.7	9.8	8.8	10.1	9.9
Utah	8.8	8.3	9.2	8.5	8.9	7.9	7.7	5.9	7.0	9.7	8.2	8.3	8.4	10.0	9.9	9.4	8.0	10.1	8.7
Vermont	12.1	11.0	11.2	10.3	10.9	9.7	9.2	9.6	9.0	7.7	10.8	13.5	12.0	11.9	11.6	10.9	11.0	12.0	9.4
Virginia	9.9	9.0	9.7	8.1	9.7	9.9	10.2	10.2	9.1	9.4	10.6	9.1	8.6	9.2	10.7	11.3	11.8	10.9	9.0
Washington	14.1	10.9	10.7	9.4	10.7	11.7	12.4	10.2	9.3	11.1	13.4	13.1	8.6	11.6	12.3	12.5	12.2	9.3	11.8
West Virginia	15.4	15.1	15.9	15.6	14.1	13.2	12.9	14.3	14.4	15.2	13.7	14.2	17.1	17.2	18.8	16.6	19.5	16.3	15.0
Wisconsin	9.6	10.1	8.9	9.9	10.1	7.4	9.0	8.4	9.6	10.5	10.4	10.2	11.3	11.8	9.7	9.8	11.4	13.0	12.4
Wyoming	8.5	9.8	11.0	8.8	9.4	10.1	12.1	11.1	11.3	10.9	8.1	11.3	10.2	10.8	10.5	10.5	12.1	11.1	11.5

Source: Author's calculations using the March Current Population Survey, 1981 through 1999.

[a] Persons with a work disability fall into one of the following categories, each of which is related to a question on the CPS: (1) they have a work limitation, (2) they did not work in the previous year because they were ill or disabled and unable to work, (3) they retired or left a job for health reasons, (4) they received veterans' benefits due to a service-contracted disability in the previous year, (5) they received workers' compensation benefits or other benefits in the previous year as a result of job-related injury or illness, (6) they received Supplemental Security Income benefits and were less than 65 years old in the previous year, and/or (7) they received Medicare and were less than 65 years in the previous year.

[b] In April of survey year 1984, sample weights based on the 1970 Census were replaced with sample weights based on the 1980 Census and the sample design was changed to increase the accuracy of state estimates. In survey year 1994 there were several changes in the CPS. It moved fully to computer-assisted survey interviews. Sample weights based on the 1980 Census were replaced with sample weights based on the 1990 Census. The Monthly Basic Survey was revised, and three new disability questions were added. It is possible that these changes affected the measurement of the population with a disability either through changes in the sample weights or in the way respondents answered disability

Table 5. Estimated Percentages of Non-Institutionalized Civilians Aged 25 through 61 with a Work Disability for the United States, and for Each State and the District of Columbia Averaged over Various Periods , Percentage Changes for these Periods, and Corresponding State Rankings[a]

	Period							
	Survey Years 1981-1999[b]		Survey Years 1981-1985[b]		Survey Years 1995-1999[b]		Survey Years 1981-1985 to 1995-1999	
Location	Average	Rank[c]	Average	Rank[c]	Average	Rank[c]	Percentage Change[d]	Rank[c]
United States	10.7	-	10.5	-	11.2	-	6.4 *	-
West Virginia	15.5	1	15.2	2	17.2	1	12.5 *	17
Arkansas	14.5	2	15.3	1	15.1	3	-1.2	41
Tennessee	14.0	3	12.9	5	14.7	4	13.5	15
Mississippi	13.9	4	14.2	3	14.3	5	0.4	37
Kentucky	13.9	5	11.7	12	15.7	2	28.6 *	2
Louisiana	13.1	6	12.2	7	13.6	7	10.3	20
Maine	12.8	7	11.7	13	14.1	6	18.6 *	5
Alabama	12.1	8	10.9	24	12.7	10	15.9 *	8
Rhode Island	12.1	9	13.6	4	12.2	12	-10.9	50
Michigan	12.1	10	12.1	9	11.5	21	-5.1	48
Oregon	11.9	11	12.2	8	11.3	24	-7.9	49
Georgia	11.9	12	11.8	11	11.8	16	0.5	36
District of Columbia	11.8	13	12.8	6	12.5	11	-2.3	45
Montana	11.7	14	10.4	25	12.8	9	20.3 *	4
New Mexico	11.7	15	11.9	10	12.1	14	1.6	35
South Carolina	11.6	16	11.5	15	12.1	13	5.4	28
Washington	11.3	17	11.2	19	11.6	19	3.8	32
Oklahoma	11.2	18	10.2	27	13.0	8	24.2 *	3
Idaho	11.2	19	11.7	14	11.4	23	-2.5	46
Pennsylvania	11.1	20	11.2	17	11.8	17	4.9	31
North Carolina	11.1	21	11.2	18	11.4	22	1.9	34
Florida	11.1	22	11.5	16	11.8	15	3.4	33
Ohio	10.8	23	10.9	22	11.6	20	5.7	27
Vermont	10.7	24	11.1	20	11.0	29	-1.2	42
California	10.7	25	10.9	23	10.8	31	-1.4	43
New York	10.5	26	10.0	31	11.8	18	16.3 *	6
Arizona	10.5	27	11.0	21	10.6	35	-3.7	47
Wyoming	10.5	28	9.5	35	11.1	27	15.9 *	7
Missouri	10.5	29	10.3	26	11.2	26	8.7	23
New Hampshire	10.2	30	10.1	30	10.9	30	7.8	25
Wisconsin	10.2	31	9.7	33	11.2	25	14.6	11
Massachusetts	10.0	32	9.5	34	11.1	28	15.2 *	10
South Dakota	9.9	33	9.0	40	10.2	37	12.2	18
Virginia	9.8	34	9.3	37	10.7	32	14.5	12
Indiana	9.7	35	9.8	32	10.5	36	7.2	26
Delaware	9.6	36	10.1	28	10.2	38	0.2	38
Texas	9.6	37	9.2	38	9.7	40	5.1	29
Colorado	9.5	38	8.7	45	9.5	43	8.5	24
Nevada	9.4	39	8.8	41	9.6	41	9.0	22
Alaska	9.4	40	9.3	36	10.7	33	14.3 *	14

Continued

Table 5. Continued

	Period							
	Survey Years 1981-1999[b]		Survey Years 1981-1985[b]		Survey Years 1995-1999[b]		Survey Years 1981-1985 to 1995-1999	
Location	Average	Rank[c]	Average	Rank[c]	Average	Rank[c]	Percentage Change[d]	Rank[c]
Minnesota	9.3	41	9.1	39	8.9	46	-1.8	44
Illinois	9.1	42	8.4	46	9.7	39	14.4 *	13
Hawaii	9.0	43	10.1	29	8.2	51	-21.5 *	51
Maryland	8.7	44	8.7	44	8.7	48	0.0	39
Kansas	8.7	45	7.9	50	10.6	34	29.9 *	1
Iowa	8.7	46	8.0	48	9.0	45	11.4	19
North Dakota	8.6	47	7.9	49	8.7	50	10.0	21
Utah	8.6	48	8.8	43	9.2	44	4.9	30
Nebraska	8.4	49	8.2	47	9.6	42	15.3	9
New Jersey	8.4	50	8.8	42	8.7	49	-0.5	40
Connecticut	8.2	51	7.9	51	8.9	47	12.5	16

Source: Author's calculations using the March Current Population Survey, 1981 through 1999.

[a] Persons with a work disability fall into one of the following categories, each of which is related to a question on the CPS: (1) they have a work limitation, (2) they did not work in the previous year because they were ill or disabled and unable to work, (3) they retired or left a job for health reasons, (4) they received veterans' benefits due to a service-contracted disability in the previous year, (5) they received workers' compensation benefits or other benefits in the previous year as a result of job-related injury or illness, (6) they received Supplemental Security Income benefits and were less than 65 years old in the previous year, and/or (7) they received Medicare and were less than 65 years in the previous year.

[b] In April of survey year 1984, sample weights based on the 1970 Census were replaced with sample weights based on the 1980 Census and the sample design was changed to increase the accuracy of state estimates. In survey year 1994 there were several changes in the CPS. It moved fully to computer-assisted survey interviews. Sample weights based on the 1980 Census were replaced with sample weights based on the 1990 Census. The Monthly Basic Survey was revised, and three new disability questions were added. It is possible that these changes affected the measurement of the population with a disability either through changes in the sample weights or in the way respondents answered disability questions.

[c] Looking at the percentages, some states appear to be tied and thus should have the same rank. However, the rankings are based on three decimal places. There were no ties.

[d] The percentage change is the difference between the two averages divided by the average of the two averages multiplied by 100. Asterisks (*) note locations where the absolute change in the percentage with disabilities from period to period is statistically different from zero, assuming a 90 percent confidence level.

Appendix Table 1. Estimated Population of Non-Institutionalized Civilians Aged 25 through 61 in the United States, and for Each State and the District of Columbia, Survey Years 1981 through 1999 (in thousands)[a]

	Survey Year																		
Location	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985[b]	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994[b]	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
United States	101,787	103,693	105,496	107,610	109,659	112,111	114,095	116,021	118,067	119,876	121,582	123,233	125,024	126,986	128,358	130,278	132,192	133,590	134,769
Alabama	1,676	1,703	1,754	1,803	1,784	1,899	1,903	1,852	1,881	1,952	1,975	1,998	1,985	1,981	2,008	2,020	2,065	2,169	2,138
Alaska	175	181	209	230	247	257	253	242	241	249	257	263	268	302	311	316	330	330	315
Arizona	1,193	1,207	1,232	1,274	1,382	1,507	1,580	1,665	1,643	1,644	1,679	1,743	1,716	1,893	1,961	1,959	2,164	2,143	2,293
Arkansas	972	969	926	959	1,014	1,030	1,057	1,107	1,116	1,096	1,091	1,107	1,081	1,138	1,188	1,177	1,197	1,170	1,151
California	11,080	11,551	11,809	12,036	12,355	12,923	13,273	13,738	13,771	14,303	14,661	15,164	15,522	15,437	15,737	15,822	16,248	16,386	16,577
Colorado	1,402	1,387	1,489	1,578	1,544	1,631	1,598	1,622	1,583	1,626	1,630	1,725	1,668	1,796	1,937	2,008	1,950	2,064	2,149
Connecticut	1,421	1,492	1,568	1,565	1,584	1,553	1,550	1,508	1,632	1,628	1,622	1,669	1,679	1,641	1,546	1,621	1,643	1,656	1,693
Delaware	264	277	279	279	283	296	307	310	330	338	352	354	381	361	357	368	369	347	366
DC	304	316	313	303	303	306	318	307	303	294	298	281	286	316	322	291	283	269	270
Florida	4,385	4,402	4,545	4,734	4,964	5,165	5,321	5,658	5,876	6,001	6,150	6,265	6,563	6,603	6,689	6,845	6,954	7,076	6,927
Georgia	2,391	2,428	2,493	2,628	2,685	2,832	2,997	2,920	3,067	3,048	3,248	3,196	3,265	3,574	3,699	3,695	3,766	3,804	3,963
Hawaii	437	445	443	463	484	505	493	507	500	536	548	557	571	573	555	552	561	548	548
Idaho	386	408	412	427	445	434	434	426	440	469	477	484	482	525	551	549	574	592	581
Illinois	5,080	5,161	5,253	5,248	5,346	5,460	5,493	5,519	5,499	5,658	5,788	5,853	5,898	5,821	5,788	5,910	5,853	5,896	5,996
Indiana	2,383	2,436	2,441	2,458	2,554	2,558	2,614	2,612	2,732	2,635	2,633	2,714	2,781	2,764	2,811	2,785	2,818	2,888	2,953
Iowa	1,267	1,239	1,195	1,272	1,300	1,242	1,306	1,332	1,331	1,358	1,319	1,319	1,394	1,324	1,301	1,363	1,408	1,373	1,336
Kansas	981	958	1,030	1,062	1,100	1,056	1,066	1,136	1,131	1,160	1,159	1,205	1,220	1,180	1,149	1,173	1,166	1,187	1,223
Kentucky	1,588	1,661	1,696	1,753	1,706	1,687	1,700	1,803	1,652	1,739	1,800	1,746	1,823	1,832	1,880	1,944	1,909	1,945	1,951
Louisiana	1,809	1,865	1,916	1,971	1,867	1,953	1,995	2,003	2,072	1,998	1,936	1,963	2,020	2,032	2,059	2,105	2,050	2,143	2,055
Maine	487	513	528	550	554	529	546	558	582	612	622	629	645	612	616	642	635	654	664
Maryland	2,006	2,057	2,002	2,051	2,130	2,170	2,257	2,284	2,371	2,387	2,493	2,541	2,584	2,558	2,604	2,599	2,587	2,678	2,681
Massachusetts	2,608	2,689	2,636	2,730	2,730	2,797	2,812	2,879	2,940	2,921	2,987	2,999	3,037	3,064	3,089	3,230	3,179	3,122	3,117
Michigan	4,111	4,153	4,148	4,234	4,263	4,264	4,299	4,367	4,439	4,476	4,564	4,567	4,574	4,684	4,645	4,699	4,708	4,696	4,801
Minnesota	1,726	1,813	1,872	2,000	1,947	1,959	2,035	2,100	2,119	2,041	2,148	2,137	2,183	2,214	2,295	2,276	2,405	2,384	2,339
Mississippi	1,031	1,000	1,059	1,077	1,035	1,097	1,141	1,140	1,124	1,179	1,178	1,180	1,178	1,168	1,210	1,282	1,317	1,316	1,279
Missouri	2,174	2,205	2,210	2,251	2,297	2,295	2,345	2,398	2,489	2,459	2,572	2,552	2,483	2,551	2,430	2,605	2,531	2,535	2,762
Montana	361	367	365	376	393	389	387	382	384	400	401	404	390	405	401	403	432	444	443
Nebraska	665	693	684	673	715	700	714	740	731	758	757	769	771	739	765	752	783	769	799
Nevada	425	444	456	447	456	500	521	534	592	600	600	625	659	759	792	798	851	878	942
New Hampshire	427	443	443	463	459	485	503	525	562	552	593	617	610	582	574	582	616	589	627

Continued

Appendix Table 1. Continued

	Survey Year																		
Location	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985[b]	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994[b]	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
New Jersey	3,416	3,361	3,402	3,574	3,646	3,643	3,750	3,783	3,802	3,895	3,895	3,902	3,955	4,044	4,036	3,987	4,063	4,125	4,136
New Mexico	573	561	595	598	648	652	677	670	674	727	728	726	739	770	787	816	838	845	829
New York	7,806	7,966	8,030	8,115	8,403	8,507	8,558	8,490	8,625	8,754	8,812	8,839	8,812	9,114	8,978	9,174	9,143	8,885	9,083
North Carolina	2,784	2,816	2,832	2,820	2,867	2,960	3,012	3,050	3,175	3,157	3,208	3,286	3,303	3,366	3,469	3,589	3,651	3,738	3,760
North Dakota	272	275	284	296	300	302	284	295	299	295	291	293	280	277	284	291	288	284	291
Ohio	4,819	4,984	5,117	5,007	5,001	5,035	5,119	5,203	5,197	5,147	5,309	5,380	5,458	5,428	5,330	5,525	5,509	5,575	5,632
Oklahoma	1,268	1,320	1,326	1,382	1,466	1,492	1,484	1,471	1,515	1,544	1,522	1,534	1,502	1,599	1,572	1,519	1,547	1,603	1,605
Oregon	1,275	1,280	1,265	1,289	1,316	1,331	1,351	1,286	1,352	1,401	1,398	1,487	1,541	1,554	1,601	1,589	1,584	1,737	1,764
Pennsylvania	5,435	5,410	5,434	5,452	5,378	5,516	5,622	5,671	5,932	5,917	5,750	5,815	5,825	5,783	5,858	5,922	6,010	6,016	5,980
Rhode Island	419	420	412	445	435	455	480	492	478	463	472	502	486	488	467	455	477	473	492
South Carolina	1,386	1,430	1,462	1,473	1,575	1,522	1,509	1,629	1,675	1,708	1,704	1,788	1,763	1,790	1,833	1,840	1,851	1,893	1,970
South Dakota	275	285	290	294	302	301	303	317	327	318	316	308	332	331	334	332	326	304	322
Tennessee	2,102	2,022	2,077	2,113	2,179	2,219	2,192	2,374	2,382	2,375	2,364	2,330	2,480	2,666	2,621	2,732	2,734	2,837	2,804
Texas	6,393	6,618	6,799	7,161	7,314	7,511	7,795	7,634	7,766	8,174	8,258	8,259	8,524	8,762	9,046	9,199	9,498	9,724	9,846
Utah	575	584	604	602	638	660	683	679	694	683	690	693	732	838	806	838	855	899	911
Vermont	244	249	233	238	251	259	257	263	271	281	281	292	317	308	307	312	304	299	320
Virginia	2,462	2,466	2,596	2,581	2,720	2,743	2,785	2,915	2,957	3,037	3,115	3,184	3,297	3,232	3,443	3,239	3,383	3,414	3,327
Washington	1,903	1,938	2,070	2,010	2,072	2,204	2,074	2,213	2,366	2,486	2,505	2,505	2,513	2,606	2,632	2,772	2,957	3,104	3,056
West Virginia	852	859	878	889	908	862	882	889	880	868	872	867	848	867	907	884	885	878	842
Wisconsin	2,102	2,153	2,147	2,136	2,083	2,229	2,238	2,299	2,349	2,301	2,323	2,397	2,380	2,504	2,530	2,651	2,704	2,675	2,621
Wyoming	213	233	238	240	227	231	226	220	220	226	227	223	222	228	246	241	234	233	241

Source: Author's calculations using the March Current Population Survey, 1981 through 1999.

[a] These estimated populations are the denominators of the estimated percentages in Tables 1, 2, and 4.

[b] In April of survey year 1984, sample weights based on the 1970 Census were replaced with sample weights based on the 1980 Census and the sample design was changed to increase the accuracy of state estimates. In survey year 1994 there were several changes in the CPS. It moved fully to computer-assisted survey interviews. Sample weights based on the 1980 Census were replaced with sample weights based on the 1990 Census. The Monthly Basic Survey was revised, and three new disability questions were added. It is possible that these changes affected the measurement of the population with a disability either through changes in the sample weights or in the way respondents answered disability questions.

Appendix Table 2. Estimated Coefficient of Variation for Each of the Estimated Percentages of Non-Institutionalized Civilians Aged 25 through 61 with a Work Limitation in Table 2[a]

	Survey Year																		
Location	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985[b]	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994[b]	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
United States	1.5	1.6	1.7	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.7	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6
Alabama	11.4	11.5	12.6	11.4	15.7	13.7	13.9	14.8	13.4	11.5	11.2	11.0	12.6	9.8	11.6	11.1	10.9	10.7	11.4
Alaska	3.2	5.0	4.7	4.8	6.5	6.5	5.1	6.1	5.7	15.6	15.1	13.3	14.8	11.7	11.8	14.3	13.2	12.1	13.9
Arizona	13.6	13.0	12.1	12.5	16.6	14.3	13.4	15.2	15.2	13.9	15.5	14.7	12.5	12.2	13.0	13.5	11.1	13.1	14.3
Arkansas	9.6	9.2	9.5	9.9	9.4	8.9	8.8	9.2	8.9	12.6	12.0	11.3	11.2	10.3	11.7	9.8	10.2	10.2	10.9
California	5.1	5.3	5.6	5.8	6.3	6.1	6.1	6.2	9.6	5.4	5.3	5.4	4.8	5.0	4.9	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4
Colorado	13.3	14.6	12.9	13.3	15.9	19.7	14.4	15.1	14.4	13.9	15.7	12.7	13.1	15.9	14.2	12.7	14.1	13.7	12.5
Connecticut	14.9	17.7	16.2	16.5	15.1	16.3	19.3	16.6	17.4	22.3	19.4	16.8	16.5	15.2	19.4	19.4	17.2	14.4	13.2
Delaware	9.7	6.1	7.4	8.5	7.0	7.3	7.4	8.1	6.3	15.1	17.1	15.6	14.0	15.2	13.7	14.8	15.7	17.0	17.5
District of Columbia	11.9	7.2	7.0	6.5	5.8	6.6	6.5	6.4	6.2	15.0	12.7	15.5	15.2	14.2	13.7	12.0	12.1	15.8	13.8
Florida	8.0	9.2	8.8	8.8	6.1	6.2	6.3	6.1	5.6	6.9	6.9	6.2	6.6	6.1	5.7	6.6	6.4	6.7	6.7
Georgia	8.9	12.4	12.5	12.4	15.2	14.5	14.6	15.5	13.9	12.1	12.6	11.7	11.6	11.3	10.6	10.0	11.1	11.4	10.3
Hawaii	10.1	8.4	8.7	8.3	8.5	8.9	8.2	11.0	10.5	15.9	18.3	15.4	14.2	14.5	14.9	20.0	17.2	16.5	19.9
Idaho	7.9	8.4	7.7	7.2	6.5	6.3	6.9	6.7	6.8	12.3	12.5	11.9	13.2	14.6	11.3	11.6	12.7	11.4	14.6
Illinois	8.0	9.8	10.3	9.7	7.8	8.3	7.9	7.8	7.4	7.5	7.4	8.0	6.9	6.8	7.0	8.2	7.9	8.0	8.1
Indiana	12.0	11.4	11.8	11.9	14.6	13.7	12.5	13.7	19.1	16.3	15.4	14.4	15.6	14.7	12.1	13.5	13.5	13.6	13.1
Iowa	14.0	14.3	16.1	16.1	13.8	12.6	12.0	13.6	13.8	14.1	14.7	14.8	13.2	13.5	13.3	15.2	15.0	15.2	16.1
Kansas	13.1	16.8	16.3	15.5	14.8	12.9	13.7	14.0	13.2	14.5	16.1	16.0	14.7	13.0	14.0	13.5	13.8	13.4	14.1
Kentucky	13.0	13.2	14.4	14.7	14.6	13.6	13.1	12.7	11.8	11.7	9.6	10.1	10.1	9.8	9.1	9.3	11.0	10.4	10.1
Louisiana	11.0	9.9	10.7	11.2	16.2	14.2	14.4	14.4	12.8	11.7	13.0	13.9	12.3	9.7	11.9	10.4	10.9	12.1	11.2
Maine	10.2	8.7	8.5	7.9	7.9	7.4	7.4	7.1	6.7	13.2	13.9	12.3	10.6	11.5	9.9	12.8	12.7	11.3	12.2
Maryland	15.2	14.0	13.7	14.1	13.2	14.6	14.9	15.9	16.5	16.0	15.7	15.1	16.2	11.9	14.2	14.8	15.5	16.5	15.6
Massachusetts	9.0	9.8	11.0	10.2	5.8	5.4	6.3	5.8	5.1	7.3	6.8	7.2	7.4	7.2	6.7	8.6	9.1	8.8	10.2
Michigan	8.0	8.7	8.8	8.0	5.4	5.6	5.7	6.1	5.3	6.2	6.4	6.4	6.4	6.2	6.3	7.9	7.7	7.8	8.1
Minnesota	14.5	16.3	15.1	14.4	16.6	16.5	15.9	15.8	16.6	14.9	14.3	12.6	13.6	12.6	14.7	16.4	13.9	14.5	15.1
Mississippi	9.3	9.7	9.6	9.2	9.2	10.3	9.8	9.7	8.6	10.9	9.9	10.1	11.3	11.3	11.4	11.5	11.2	11.3	12.2
Missouri	11.2	12.5	13.0	12.6	14.2	14.1	14.2	14.3	16.1	14.1	13.0	14.1	13.0	13.5	11.8	15.1	12.9	12.8	13.2
Montana	7.9	8.8	6.8	6.3	6.5	5.6	6.0	5.6	5.3	12.1	12.4	11.7	12.8	12.0	12.3	11.6	11.2	11.1	10.9
Nebraska	14.8	11.8	12.2	11.8	10.1	12.5	10.6	10.1	9.8	16.4	14.1	14.7	15.9	15.2	15.2	15.1	14.6	14.4	15.5
Nevada	7.4	10.9	9.9	10.2	10.8	10.1	11.0	8.6	8.6	17.5	15.4	13.1	14.0	11.4	12.2	14.8	15.6	15.0	14.4
New Hampshire	14.0	8.1	8.8	9.0	11.0	12.0	9.8	11.6	9.0	16.9	16.1	15.0	14.3	14.1	15.2	15.1	12.8	15.0	14.8

Continued

Appendix Table 2. Continued

	Survey Year																	
Location	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985[b]	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994[b]	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
New Jersey	10.4	10.0	10.6	11.7	6.4	6.5	6.2	6.8	6.7	9.1	9.3	8.9	8.4	7.6	7.6	10.1	9.1	9.8	9.9
New Mexico	8.1	7.3	8.6	8.3	8.3	9.0	7.7	8.2	7.5	12.2	12.2	12.8	11.0	10.1	11.4	11.4	11.2	12.1	12.8
New York	6.4	6.6	7.2	6.6	4.9	5.1	5.5	5.4	7.4	5.7	5.4	5.6	5.3	5.0	5.0	5.8	5.7	5.8	5.4
North Carolina	10.3	10.7	11.4	12.2	4.8	4.7	5.1	5.0	4.6	6.6	6.8	6.6	6.5	5.9	5.9	8.9	9.5	8.7	8.8
North Dakota	7.2	7.6	8.6	7.7	6.3	6.2	6.5	6.0	5.6	12.7	13.0	14.0	16.4	15.4	15.2	17.8	15.8	15.6	15.4
Ohio	7.0	8.2	8.5	8.0	6.2	6.7	6.7	6.8	5.9	6.9	6.8	6.6	6.9	6.4	6.6	7.3	7.7	8.0	7.2
Oklahoma	14.8	12.0	12.0	12.2	14.4	12.8	13.3	15.5	10.7	12.3	12.1	11.4	13.2	10.9	11.7	11.5	11.7	10.6	10.5
Oregon	13.6	12.0	12.8	12.0	14.4	14.3	14.0	13.0	11.5	14.5	13.0	11.9	12.7	14.2	13.5	12.7	12.7	13.2	13.5
Pennsylvania	6.4	7.9	8.7	7.6	6.4	6.5	6.4	7.0	6.3	7.3	7.0	6.4	6.4	6.7	6.2	6.9	6.7	7.1	7.2
Rhode Island	11.2	8.5	8.4	8.1	8.9	8.6	9.5	8.8	7.9	17.1	15.1	14.3	13.7	14.8	14.4	12.7	13.8	13.8	14.8
South Carolina	13.3	13.5	12.8	12.5	10.7	10.6	10.3	11.5	10.7	10.3	10.9	10.0	10.4	10.7	9.4	12.4	13.8	13.1	11.9
South Dakota	9.0	7.4	6.4	7.7	6.0	5.1	6.1	5.9	5.1	12.8	12.5	12.7	10.9	11.9	12.6	14.0	14.2	14.2	14.3
Tennessee	12.1	13.4	11.2	12.1	13.4	11.8	12.2	13.6	11.7	10.9	11.8	10.7	9.1	8.8	9.5	11.1	9.4	10.5	12.3
Texas	7.1	9.9	9.7	8.8	9.1	9.1	8.3	8.5	7.9	6.8	7.2	6.9	7.2	6.6	6.7	7.1	7.6	6.7	6.9
Utah	9.5	11.0	10.3	11.5	11.6	11.3	12.6	13.9	10.9	15.1	18.0	17.1	17.5	13.5	14.2	14.8	16.0	14.1	15.2
Vermont	6.9	6.4	6.7	6.6	7.1	7.0	6.6	6.7	6.5	16.6	14.2	12.5	12.2	12.5	13.6	15.1	13.9	13.1	14.6
Virginia	12.1	18.2	17.0	20.3	15.3	15.0	15.4	14.6	13.9	12.0	11.9	11.7	12.6	13.0	11.1	11.5	11.5	12.0	13.3
Washington	10.2	15.0	14.9	16.0	17.0	14.7	15.1	17.1	17.2	12.8	11.0	12.3	14.6	12.2	10.8	12.9	12.5	14.4	12.9
West Virginia	10.3	7.6	7.4	7.5	8.2	9.2	9.0	8.4	7.7	10.6	11.6	11.1	9.9	9.4	9.0	9.0	7.9	9.2	9.8
Wisconsin	13.2	17.2	18.3	17.8	15.6	18.2	17.5	17.7	14.7	12.9	13.7	14.0	12.2	11.7	13.0	14.0	12.6	11.9	12.6
Wyoming	6.4	7.3	6.8	7.2	7.4	6.3	6.5	6.5	6.0	15.2	17.4	14.8	16.2	15.4	15.6	12.7	12.4	13.8	13.2

Source: Author's calculations using the March Current Population Survey, 1981 through 1999.

[a] Persons with a *work limitation* are defined as those who report having (or are reported by the household's respondent as having), at the time of the survey, "a health problem or disability which prevents them from working or which limits the kind or amount of work they can do."

[b] In April of survey year 1984, sample weights based on the 1970 Census were replaced with sample weights based on the 1980 Census and the sample design was changed to increase the accuracy of state estimates. In survey year 1994 there were several changes in the CPS. It moved fully to computer-assisted survey interviews. Sample weights based on the 1980 Census were replaced with sample weights based on the 1990 Census. The Monthly Basic Survey was revised, and three new disability questions were added. It is possible that these changes affected the measurement of the population with a disability either through changes in the sample weights or in the way respondents answered disability

Appendix Table 3. Estimated Coefficient of Variation for Each of the Estimated Percentages of Non-Institutionalized Civilians Aged 25 through 61 with a Work Disability in Table 4[a]

	Survey Year																		
Location	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985[b]	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994[b]	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
United States	1.3	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.4	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.2	1.2	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.4
Alabama	10.1	9.9	11.2	10.1	13.3	12.2	12.4	12.6	11.0	9.8	9.2	10.0	10.8	8.3	10.0	9.5	10.2	9.4	10.6
Alaska	2.5	3.7	3.7	3.7	4.8	5.1	4.4	5.0	4.5	12.8	11.8	10.5	11.1	9.5	9.7	11.1	11.0	9.6	11.0
Arizona	11.5	10.6	10.8	11.4	13.9	12.1	12.4	12.5	13.3	11.8	12.8	12.3	10.8	10.4	11.1	11.1	9.8	10.1	11.2
Arkansas	8.6	8.1	8.3	8.3	8.4	8.1	7.7	8.0	8.0	11.0	10.3	9.7	9.7	8.7	10.2	8.6	8.7	8.5	10.0
California	4.0	4.3	4.6	4.7	5.3	5.0	5.2	5.1	7.8	4.3	4.2	4.3	4.0	3.9	4.0	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4
Colorado	10.1	12.2	11.2	10.9	13.5	15.7	12.4	13.4	12.0	11.2	12.6	10.4	10.9	12.5	12.0	10.8	12.0	11.3	11.1
Connecticut	12.8	14.4	13.8	13.8	12.5	13.9	14.5	14.1	14.6	17.3	14.0	14.2	13.2	13.3	16.3	15.2	13.3	13.2	11.6
Delaware	8.4	5.5	6.1	7.0	6.0	5.9	5.8	7.3	5.3	11.9	13.6	13.5	12.2	12.4	11.5	12.4	12.3	13.5	13.0
District of Columbia	10.0	5.9	6.3	5.4	4.8	5.0	5.9	5.5	5.0	13.6	11.4	14.0	12.7	11.8	11.7	10.3	9.7	12.7	11.1
Florida	6.7	7.9	7.5	7.7	5.4	5.2	5.5	5.1	4.7	5.8	5.7	5.3	5.6	5.2	4.8	5.5	5.5	5.8	5.7
Georgia	7.8	10.8	10.8	10.7	13.7	12.7	13.1	13.2	11.9	10.9	10.4	9.5	9.9	10.0	9.2	8.6	9.3	9.9	8.9
Hawaii	8.1	7.0	6.9	6.5	7.6	7.7	6.9	8.9	7.4	12.8	14.3	11.5	12.2	11.6	12.8	14.9	14.2	13.9	17.6
Idaho	6.5	7.5	6.2	5.9	5.3	5.4	6.0	5.9	5.3	10.7	10.7	9.6	11.9	10.7	9.8	9.3	10.4	9.7	11.8
Illinois	6.8	8.4	8.6	8.5	7.0	6.9	6.9	6.6	6.1	6.1	6.4	6.5	5.9	6.0	6.0	6.7	6.7	7.0	7.0
Indiana	9.5	9.8	9.8	10.2	12.5	11.8	11.5	11.1	16.5	13.5	13.2	12.0	12.8	11.3	10.1	11.6	11.0	12.0	10.9
Iowa	11.8	12.5	14.6	13.9	11.5	11.1	10.6	11.1	11.4	12.1	11.5	11.9	11.6	11.7	11.7	12.8	12.6	12.1	13.2
Kansas	11.8	14.2	13.2	12.3	12.4	10.8	11.3	11.5	10.8	12.6	12.7	13.9	11.8	11.2	11.2	10.8	11.6	11.5	12.4
Kentucky	11.0	11.0	12.5	12.5	12.9	11.9	11.8	11.2	10.3	9.6	8.5	9.2	8.8	8.6	8.2	8.4	9.1	9.1	9.0
Louisiana	9.6	8.8	9.2	9.1	14.1	13.1	12.9	12.4	11.0	9.8	11.0	11.6	10.7	8.7	9.7	8.7	9.1	10.2	9.5
Maine	8.5	6.7	6.7	6.5	6.9	6.5	6.3	6.1	5.7	10.6	11.7	10.1	9.2	9.8	8.4	11.2	10.7	9.3	10.5
Maryland	13.0	11.8	11.7	11.7	11.7	12.2	12.1	12.9	14.0	14.0	12.5	13.2	13.3	10.0	12.3	12.4	12.7	13.5	12.7
Massachusetts	7.2	7.8	8.6	8.0	4.8	4.4	5.1	4.8	4.1	6.2	5.6	5.9	6.2	6.1	5.6	7.4	7.5	7.9	8.7
Michigan	6.7	7.4	7.5	7.0	4.8	4.9	4.9	5.0	4.5	5.2	5.2	5.3	5.6	5.2	5.2	6.7	6.7	6.7	6.9
Minnesota	12.1	13.6	12.5	12.5	15.4	13.9	13.9	14.1	13.9	12.8	12.4	11.4	12.5	10.7	12.2	13.0	11.3	11.5	12.2
Mississippi	7.8	8.6	8.2	8.1	8.3	9.4	8.7	8.3	7.2	9.7	8.6	8.6	9.7	9.6	8.8	8.6	9.6	9.7	10.0
Missouri	9.5	10.5	10.8	11.2	12.8	13.0	12.8	11.9	13.8	12.2	11.1	12.6	11.0	11.3	10.2	12.5	10.5	11.1	11.9
Montana	6.7	6.7	5.7	5.4	5.6	4.8	5.3	4.9	4.7	10.2	10.9	10.0	10.0	10.0	9.9	9.6	9.9	10.0	9.3
Nebraska	12.6	10.3	10.5	10.1	8.4	10.0	9.2	9.1	7.6	12.4	11.2	12.3	12.8	12.1	11.4	13.7	11.7	11.9	12.0
Nevada	6.3	7.9	8.0	8.3	9.1	8.6	8.7	7.0	7.2	12.6	12.3	11.1	11.1	9.6	10.2	12.1	13.0	11.4	11.4
New Hampshire	10.9	6.8	7.0	7.9	8.7	9.2	8.3	8.5	7.1	12.9	12.0	11.7	11.7	12.4	13.1	11.8	11.5	12.6	13.0

Continued

Appendix Table 3. Continued

	Survey Year																		
Location	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985[b]	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994[b]	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
New Jersey	8.4	8.4	8.9	9.8	5.6	5.4	5.2	5.3	5.3	7.2	7.1	7.1	6.6	5.9	6.4	8.0	7.5	7.9	8.2
New Mexico	7.0	6.7	7.5	7.5	6.7	7.5	6.9	6.9	6.4	10.5	10.6	10.9	9.8	9.0	9.9	9.8	9.8	10.5	10.5
New York	5.2	5.6	5.9	5.5	4.1	4.2	4.4	4.3	6.1	4.7	4.3	4.5	4.2	4.1	4.1	4.8	4.6	4.8	4.5
North Carolina	9.1	9.5	10.0	10.8	4.4	4.1	4.3	4.1	3.8	5.6	5.5	5.6	5.4	5.2	5.0	7.8	8.1	7.6	7.6
North Dakota	6.2	6.7	7.9	6.5	5.4	5.2	5.5	5.2	4.6	11.0	10.3	11.5	12.3	13.3	13.2	12.9	13.2	12.4	13.1
Ohio	6.1	7.1	7.3	7.1	5.4	5.8	5.7	5.6	5.0	5.9	5.8	5.8	5.8	5.5	5.4	6.4	6.5	6.7	6.3
Oklahoma	11.8	10.7	10.5	11.0	13.0	11.5	12.3	13.1	8.9	10.7	10.5	10.0	11.7	9.6	10.1	9.7	10.2	9.0	8.9
Oregon	11.6	10.0	10.5	9.8	12.5	12.1	11.8	11.0	9.6	12.1	10.8	10.0	10.5	11.2	10.9	10.5	11.2	11.5	11.0
Pennsylvania	5.5	6.6	7.1	6.6	5.7	5.8	5.6	5.7	5.0	5.9	5.8	5.4	5.5	5.6	5.3	5.8	5.8	6.0	6.2
Rhode Island	9.7	6.7	6.9	6.3	7.2	7.4	7.1	6.7	6.7	13.6	12.1	11.8	11.7	11.7	11.7	11.1	11.1	11.5	13.1
South Carolina	10.8	11.1	10.1	10.3	9.0	9.5	9.1	9.5	9.1	9.6	9.8	9.0	9.0	9.0	8.4	10.6	11.2	11.1	10.9
South Dakota	6.9	5.7	5.6	6.0	5.0	4.3	4.8	4.8	3.9	9.9	10.3	11.4	9.2	9.7	10.8	11.5	11.7	11.2	12.5
Tennessee	10.3	11.1	9.7	10.3	11.7	10.7	11.4	11.6	10.2	9.3	10.1	8.9	8.1	7.6	8.3	9.7	8.2	9.1	9.9
Texas	5.9	8.4	7.8	7.6	7.7	7.8	7.2	7.1	6.7	5.8	6.1	5.6	5.9	5.6	5.7	6.0	6.3	5.7	5.8
Utah	7.8	9.4	8.8	9.2	9.4	9.9	9.9	11.5	9.4	12.5	13.6	13.5	13.1	11.1	11.4	12.2	13.2	11.2	12.2
Vermont	6.0	5.2	5.3	5.5	5.5	5.8	6.0	5.8	5.5	14.6	12.1	10.4	10.7	10.9	11.1	11.8	12.0	11.5	12.8
Virginia	10.8	15.6	14.6	16.2	13.0	12.8	12.5	12.3	11.9	10.5	9.7	10.4	10.6	10.3	9.1	10.3	9.9	10.3	11.6
Washington	9.0	12.8	12.5	13.6	14.1	13.0	13.0	14.0	13.1	10.5	9.4	9.5	12.0	10.0	9.6	10.6	10.4	11.8	10.4
West Virginia	8.8	6.8	6.5	6.5	7.1	7.6	7.6	7.1	6.6	9.1	9.6	9.5	8.6	8.5	7.9	8.0	7.3	8.1	8.7
Wisconsin	10.8	14.2	15.1	14.4	13.0	14.9	13.3	13.6	11.6	10.7	10.7	10.6	10.0	9.6	10.6	11.1	10.1	9.4	9.8
Wyoming	5.2	5.5	5.0	5.7	6.0	5.7	5.2	5.5	5.0	12.7	14.9	12.6	13.3	12.8	12.5	11.3	10.6	11.1	10.7

Source: Author's calculations using the March Current Population Survey, 1981 through 1999.

[a] Persons with a work disability fall into one of the following categories, each of which is related to a question on the CPS: (1) they have a work limitation, (2) they did not work in the previous year because they were ill or disabled and unable to work, (3) they retired or left a job for health reasons, (4) they received veterans' benefits due to a service-contracted disability in the previous year, (5) they received workers' compensation benefits or other benefits in the previous year as a result of job-related injury or illness, (6) they received Supplemental Security Income benefits and were less than 65 years old in the previous year, and/or (7) they received Medicare and were less than 65 years in the previous year.

[b] In April of survey year 1984, sample weights based on the 1970 Census were replaced with sample weights based on the 1980 Census and the sample design was changed to increase the accuracy of state estimates. In survey year 1994 there were several changes in the CPS. It moved fully to computer-assisted survey interviews. Sample weights based on the 1980 Census were replaced with sample weights based on the 1990 Census. The Monthly Basic Survey was revised, and three new disability questions were added. It is possible that these changes affected the measurement of the population with a disability either through changes in the sample weights or in the way respondents answered disability

Appendix Table 4. Sample Sizes used to Calculate Each of the Estimated Percentages of Non-Institutionalized Civilians Aged 25 through 61 with a Work Limitation or a Work Disability in Tables 1, 2, and 4

	Survey Year																		
Location	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985[b]	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994[b]	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
United States	80,878	73,341	74,062	73,886	74,659	73,569	73,065	73,872	68,788	75,610	76,030	75,147	74,755	72,509	72,431	63,269	64,257	64,624	65,141
Alabama	1,232	1,112	1,151	1,126	928	723	910	880	834	887	927	937	878	836	885	784	803	839	818
Alaska	982	1,008	1,137	1,152	1,220	1,288	1,114	1,016	1,090	1,038	1,078	1,101	1,091	978	894	750	786	752	783
Arizona	1,270	1,025	959	951	871	764	782	850	816	854	836	797	767	803	947	950	1,047	1,077	1,123
Arkansas	1,131	881	895	869	881	792	865	943	940	906	935	916	885	845	818	828	801	778	745
California	7,186	7,289	7,300	7,292	7,198	6,453	6,409	6,531	3,814	6,839	7,102	7,042	6,956	6,564	6,466	6,183	6,440	6,455	6,438
Colorado	1,323	1,325	1,375	1,365	1,057	860	837	815	823	827	848	924	911	885	930	937	1,001	1,029	1,064
Connecticut	927	809	848	857	852	868	757	715	667	705	691	682	735	696	622	631	631	693	708
Delaware	877	680	706	735	750	678	668	700	713	726	685	651	654	607	590	641	645	629	628
DC	869	692	684	683	716	708	730	717	670	720	676	622	618	600	638	605	610	610	564
Florida	2,381	2,359	2,406	2,385	2,860	3,095	3,298	3,466	3,649	3,684	3,633	3,424	3,408	3,367	3,184	3,099	3,023	3,068	3,110
Georgia	1,386	1,283	1,374	1,319	1,068	871	876	886	878	840	854	782	799	889	1,636	1,044	1,074	1,107	1,063
Hawaii	945	813	807	827	763	748	697	725	714	725	680	689	710	661	630	649	635	552	575
Idaho	1,001	780	838	898	931	905	888	869	873	955	978	899	877	967	872	866	897	955	955
Illinois	2,887	2,786	2,678	2,715	2,932	3,077	2,959	2,972	2,997	3,107	3,061	3,123	3,110	2,981	3,082	2,642	2,646	2,693	2,737
Indiana	1,459	1,404	1,364	1,325	1,170	1,111	1,049	1,043	866	834	805	796	843	822	689	768	796	862	850
Iowa	1,264	1,071	1,045	1,090	977	836	882	887	849	885	938	926	968	861	756	775	785	796	744
Kansas	1,049	797	808	863	900	841	845	853	819	898	902	897	942	852	786	751	717	750	747
Kentucky	1,213	1,013	1,047	1,022	887	830	851	861	762	772	833	850	881	839	799	791	812	802	834
Louisiana	1,093	1,064	1,034	992	880	817	743	756	769	727	708	736	711	693	800	781	816	824	841
Maine	1,058	908	911	954	834	700	727	726	747	785	761	755	753	729	628	660	654	681	705
Maryland	1,274	1,295	1,295	1,314	1,222	1,109	1,034	1,019	726	787	792	762	778	693	730	736	728	764	721
Massachusetts	1,670	1,638	1,683	1,729	2,329	2,842	2,794	2,875	2,796	2,828	2,890	2,836	2,851	2,867	2,961	1,501	1,495	1,526	1,548
Michigan	2,495	2,357	2,384	2,304	2,688	2,965	2,898	2,948	2,899	3,028	3,092	3,105	3,039	2,982	3,047	2,139	2,157	2,072	2,142
Minnesota	1,205	1,215	1,276	1,458	1,131	892	827	825	785	735	771	776	833	821	818	877	917	923	862
Mississippi	1,173	933	941	929	846	909	870	906	876	930	912	901	950	880	747	752	785	732	699
Missouri	1,359	1,306	1,325	1,277	1,229	1,080	990	988	829	807	816	803	834	777	645	734	737	706	727
Montana	1,136	956	989	1,026	932	974	960	953	942	990	1,002	913	909	906	888	790	823	875	901
Nebraska	1,130	963	894	860	916	856	879	885	852	906	923	943	972	899	865	768	798	800	835
Nevada	1,465	887	818	800	728	704	707	773	812	839	899	906	838	829	818	745	794	869	1,010
New Hampshire	912	714	721	698	635	577	616	670	640	663	603	607	663	583	589	625	606	633	688

Continued

Appendix Table 4. Continued

	Survey Year																		
Location	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985[b]	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994[b]	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
New Jersey	2,157	2,051	1,981	1,977	2,578	3,114	3,083	2,959	2,955	3,123	3,235	3,290	3,241	3,271	3,191	2,011	2,066	2,034	2,085
New Mexico	1,520	989	1,096	1,123	1,152	1,031	1,058	980	1,042	1,151	1,077	1,043	966	938	1,050	1,078	1,174	1,154	1,183
New York	4,667	4,550	4,626	4,565	5,074	5,276	5,186	5,081	3,374	5,610	5,664	5,480	5,312	5,164	5,079	4,334	4,357	4,210	4,181
North Carolina	1,428	1,288	1,379	1,388	2,164	2,827	2,827	2,833	2,910	3,026	2,921	2,928	2,960	2,791	2,515	1,477	1,641	1,580	1,586
North Dakota	1,121	871	878	880	956	890	886	966	946	905	928	927	860	886	792	712	700	721	724
Ohio	2,847	2,796	2,799	2,733	2,897	3,036	3,089	3,164	3,108	3,117	3,258	3,240	3,272	3,142	2,983	2,283	2,236	2,331	2,331
Oklahoma	1,158	1,010	1,027	981	978	971	839	850	831	854	873	894	899	960	928	864	891	926	916
Oregon	1,307	1,017	989	1,031	892	694	743	694	729	761	768	813	821	790	820	792	757	830	872
Pennsylvania	3,027	2,928	2,920	2,835	2,947	3,044	2,893	2,999	3,044	3,098	3,098	3,162	3,068	2,993	3,110	2,648	2,628	2,602	2,657
Rhode Island	931	662	661	747	675	636	653	652	657	648	598	633	638	655	612	630	621	604	664
South Carolina	914	824	819	785	824	878	934	1,008	993	1,058	999	993	960	877	763	663	675	690	673
South Dakota	1,121	1,038	1,027	1,010	976	963	1,011	1,036	993	970	928	922	1,050	1,018	940	815	779	711	718
Tennessee	1,073	1,044	1,054	1,007	953	830	836	876	888	863	869	916	938	892	796	787	815	828	864
Texas	4,040	4,023	3,918	4,038	4,073	3,914	3,885	3,876	4,009	4,114	4,091	3,910	3,909	3,870	3,765	3,585	3,672	3,706	3,739
Utah	1,388	1,035	1,047	1,011	817	717	784	793	778	796	819	754	762	806	760	807	820	832	821
Vermont	942	730	747	726	663	633	650	653	642	626	610	636	561	571	621	655	646	626	623
Virginia	1,368	1,331	1,435	1,395	1,212	1,006	1,077	1,126	1,074	1,135	1,166	1,087	1,090	1,018	1,585	920	972	958	944
Washington	1,243	1,074	1,147	1,131	960	797	782	814	872	956	944	847	777	773	824	820	845	921	928
West Virginia	1,154	870	893	849	869	822	836	840	854	879	872	882	815	798	821	831	800	798	767
Wisconsin	1,145	1,142	1,155	1,115	933	960	986	990	985	1,009	1,020	1,023	1,047	981	918	956	936	899	889
Wyoming	975	705	771	744	735	657	565	629	657	684	661	666	645	603	798	799	767	811	811

Source: Author's calculations using the March Current Population Survey, 1981 through 1999.

[a] These sample size are the number of survey participants used to calculate the estimated percentages in Tables 1, 2, and 4.

[b] In April of survey year 1984, sample weights based on the 1970 Census were replaced with sample weights based on the 1980 Census and the sample design was changed to increase the accuracy of state estimates. In survey year 1994 there were several changes in the CPS. It moved fully to computer-assisted survey interviews. Sample weights based on the 1980 Census were replaced with sample weights based on the 1990 Census. The Monthly Basic Survey was revised, and three new disability questions were added. It is possible that these changes affected the measurement of the population with a disability either through changes in the sample weights or in the way respondents answered disability

Appendix Table 5. Estimated Correlation Coefficient of Disability Status from Year to Year in the United States, Survey Years 1981 to 1999[a]

Pair of Consecutive Survey Years	Definition of Disability	
	Work Limitation[b]	*Work Disability*[c]
1981 to 1982	0.552	0.578
1982 to 1983	0.563	0.590
1983 to 1984	0.557	0.590
1984 to 1985[d]	0.550	0.577
1985 to 1986[e]	0.568	0.584
1986 to 1987	0.568	0.584
1987 to 1988	0.568	0.598
1988 to 1989	0.550	0.571
1989 to 1990	0.568	0.606
1990 to 1991	0.561	0.584
1991 to 1992	0.577	0.594
1992 to 1993	0.579	0.599
1993 to 1994[d]	0.597	0.619
1994 to 1995[e]	0.586	0.618
1995 to 1996	0.586	0.619
1996 to 1997	0.581	0.619
1997 to 1998	0.616	0.640
1998 to 1999	0.637	0.639

Source: Author's calculations using the March Current Population Survey, 1981 through 1999.

[a] In the March CPS of any given year, approximately half of the households were surveyed the previous March, while the remaining households are eligible to be surveyed the following March. These estimated correlation coefficients measure the degree to which a person's disability status in one year is related to their disability status in the next year.

[b] Persons with a *work limitation* are defined as those who report having or are reported by the household's respondent as having), at the time of the survey, "a health problem or disability which prevents them from working or which limits the kind or amount of work they can do."

[c] Persons with a work disability fall into one of the following categories, each of which is related to a question on the CPS: (1) they have a work limitation, (2) they did not work in the previous year because they were ill or disabled and unable to work, (3) they retired or left a job for health reasons, (4) they received veterans' benefits due to a service-contracted disability in the previous year, (5) they received workers' compensation benefits or other benefits in the previous year as a result of job-related injury or illness, (6) they received Supplemental Security Income benefits and were less than 65 years old in the previous year, and/or (7) they received Medicare and were less than 65 years in the previous year.

[d] In April of survey year 1984, sample weights based on the 1970 Census were replaced with sample weights based on the 1980 Census and the sample design was changed to increase the accuracy of state estimates. In survey year 1994 there were several changes in the CPS. It moved fully to computer-assisted survey interviews. Sample weights based on the 1980 Census were replaced with sample weights based on the 1990 Census. The Monthly Basic Survey was revised, and three new disability questions were added. It is possible that these changes affected the measurement of the population with a disability either through changes in the sample weights or in the way respondents answered disability questions.

[e] It is not possible to identify individuals who are in both the March 1985 and March 1986 surveys; therefore estimated correlation coefficients for 1985 to 1986 are not available. A conservative proxy is the larger of the values form 1984 to 1985 and 1986 to 1987. This problem occurs for 1995 to 1996, as well.

For more information about the Cornell RRTC contact:

Susanne Bruyère, Ph.D.
Project Director

Cornell University
106 ILR Extension Building
Ithaca, NY 14853-3901

tel (607) 255-7727
fax (607) 255-2763
TDD (607) 255-2891
e-mail smb23@cornell.edu
web www.ilr.cornell.edu/rrtc