## Households and Families: 2010

## 2010 Census Briefs

## INTRODUCTION

The 2010 Census enumerated 308.7 million people in the United States, a 9.7 percent increase from 281.4 million in Census 2000. Of the total population in $2010,300.8$ million lived in 116.7 million households for an average of 2.58 people per household. This was down from an average of 2.59 in 2000 when 273.6 million people lived in 105.5 million households. The remaining 8.0 million people in 2010 lived in group-quarters arrangements such as school dormitories, nursing homes, or military barracks. This report presents information on the number and types of living arrangements of American households in 2010 derived from the relationship question on the 2010 Census.

## HOUSEHOLD RELATIONSHIP QUESTION

The relationship item (Figure 1), a version of which has been on the census since 1880, asks the relationship of each member of the household to the householder or the person designated as the individual who owns or rents the housing unit. ${ }^{1}$ This question provides information about individuals as well as the composition of families and households. Three separate categories describe the sons and daughters
${ }^{1}$ In a case of joint ownership, one individual is chosen as the householder. If this choice cannot be made, the first person 15 years and over listed on the form is chosen as the householder.
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of the householder in 2010: biological, adopted, or stepchild. Relatives identified in the questionnaire are spouses, brothers, sisters, and parents of the householder, as well as grandchildren, parents-in-law, and sons/daughters-in-law.

Those who live in households but who were not related to the householder were identified as housemates/roommates, roomers or boarders, and unmarried partners of the householder. This latter group includes people who initially identified themselves as being same-sex spouses of the householder. The tables with same-sex couples show these groups in two ways. One estimate shows households as originally reported on the census forms. The second presents improved and preferred estimates of the same-sex household population, accounting for marking errors that inadvertently overestimated that

Table 1.
Relationship to Householder by Age: 2010
(For information on confidentiality protection, nonsampling errors, and definitions, see www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/doc/sf1.pdf)

| Relationship type | Total | Number |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Under 18 years | $\begin{array}{r} 18 \text { to } 29 \\ \text { years } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 30 to 44 years | $\begin{array}{r} 45 \text { to } 64 \\ \text { years } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 65 years and over |
| Total household population | 300,758,215 | 73,920,881 | 47,903,506 | 59,766,531 | 80,357,019 | 38,810,278 |
| Householder | 116,716,292 | 28,297 | 13,862,048 | 30,758,709 | 46,247,402 | 25,819,836 |
| Spouse | 56,510,377 | 8,793 | 4,863,702 | 17,524,307 | 24,935,103 | 9,178,472 |
| Biological son or daughter | 82,582,058 | 60,466,596 | 16,007,784 | 3,941,728 | 2,093,818 | 72,132 |
| Adopted son or daughter | 2,072,312 | 1,527,020 | 403,558 | 99,376 | 41,282 | 1,076 |
| Stepson or stepdaughter | 4,165,886 | 2,784,531 | 1,100,511 | 217,220 | 61,226 | 2,398 |
| Brother or sister | 3,433,951 | 298,242 | 1,125,419 | 848,247 | 922,338 | 239,705 |
| Father or mother | 3,033,003 | (X) | (X) | 128,343 | 1,187,041 | 1,717,619 |
| Grandchild | 7,139,601 | 5,825,229 | 1,117,324 | 180,096 | 16,926 | 26 |
| Parent-in-law | 925,713 | (X) | (X) | 10,178 | 281,266 | 634,269 |
| Son-in-law or daughter-in-law | 1,216,299 | 25,063 | 593,674 | 428,186 | 158,997 | 10,379 |
| Other relative | 4,662,672 | 1,631,262 | 1,268,787 | 774,403 | 648,580 | 339,640 |
| Roomer or boarder | 1,526,210 | 142,899 | 559,814 | 376,180 | 363,573 | 83,744 |
| Housemate or roommate. | 5,223,365 | 42,515 | 3,163,824 | 1,084,638 | 769,490 | 162,898 |
| Unmarried partner | 7,744,711 | 11,651 | 2,622,772 | 2,724,034 | 2,020,431 | 365,823 |
| Other nonrelative. | 3,805,765 | 1,128,783 | 1,214,289 | 670,886 | 609,546 | 182,261 |

(X) Not applicable

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 Census Summary File 1.
population's size. ${ }^{2}$ This report uses this set of estimates in the text, as it represents the best set of numbers from the 2010 Census.

## People related to the householder

Despite the diversity of households in the United States, three relationship categories made up the majority of people in 2010 . The householder, his or her spouse, and his or her sons and daughters comprised 262.0 million people or 87 percent of the population (Table 1). Of the 88.8 million children of householders, 93 percent were biological children. There were approximately twice as many stepchildren ( 4.2 million) as adopted children ( 2.1 million).

As expected, most of the children living with their parents were under 18 years old. These three child types exhibit different age distributions. About 73 percent of either biological or adopted

[^0]children were under 18 , compared with 67 percent of stepchildren. Stepchildren were more likely to be young adults ages 18 to 29 years (26 percent) than either biological or adopted children (19 percent each). Stepchildren were older in general as they reflect the blending of two different families where the spouse already has older children from a prior marriage.

In the same generation as the children of the householder are the sons-in-law and daughters-in-law of the householder. They numbered 1.2 million in 2010, and almost half of them were young adults who depended on their in-laws for housing assistance. Given their age, most were probably recently married. About one-third of all brothers and sisters of the householder (3.4 million) were 18 -to- 29 years old.

Another 1.1 million young adults were grandchildren of the householder. This age group made up 16 percent of the 7.1 million grandchildren living with their grandparents-the majority of these grandchildren were under 18 (82 percent). At the other end of
the generational continuum were the parents and parents-in-law of the householder, comprising about 3.0 million and 926,000 relatives, respectively. Unlike people in any other relationship category, the majority of these were 65 years and over- 57 percent of parents and 69 percent of parents-in-law were this age.

Although not specified by detailed type in the 2010 Census, another 4.7 million were "other relatives" who lived in households. About one-third of them were under 18 and were often nephews and nieces of the householder. ${ }^{3}$

## Nonrelatives of the householder

People who were not related to the householder numbered 18.3 million in 2010 ( 6.1 percent of the household population), up from 14.6 million in 2000 ( 5.2 percent of the household population). In fact, 1 out of every 8 homes in

[^1]
## UNMARRIED PARTNER HOUSEHOLDS

An "unmarried partner household" consists of a householder and a person living in the household who reports that he or she is (1) an unmarried partner of the householder and of the opposite sex;
(2) an unmarried partner of the householder and of the same sex; or
(3) a spouse of the householder and of the same sex. Procedures for the 2010 Census edited same-sex spouse households as unmarried partner households, and these households appear as such in published Summary File 1 tabulations. During the review of the data, counts of same-sex spouses appeared inflated due to mismarking errors in the gender item on the census forms. Up to 28 percent of the total number of same-sex unmarried partner households may actually be opposite-sex households: 62 percent of reported samesex spouses were probably marked in error compared with 7 percent of reported same-sex unmarried partners. This report presents data both for same-sex households as shown in Summary File 1 tabulations and for a set of "preferred estimates" that attempts to remove statistically same-sex households that are likely oppositesex households.

2010 contained one or more people not related to the householder. ${ }^{4}$ Roomers or boarders comprised 1.5 million individuals who represented a wide array of people such as students, migrants to an area waiting for better accommodations, or people who could not afford
${ }^{4}$ Proportion derived from U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 Census Summary File 1, Table P27.
to rent their own home. ${ }^{5}$ About 143,000 (9.4 percent) of roomers and boarders were less than 18 years old, suggesting they might be children of displaced families living in boarding homes. Another 61.3 percent $(936,000)$ were in the prime working ages of 18 to 44 years, compared with 35.8 percent

[^2]for the household population as a whole.

Housemates or roommates who were coequals with the householder and who shared maintenance of the housing unit had more economic equality with the householder. Looking at the age structure of these 5.2 million people, 61 percent were young adults ages 18 to 29 who might be sharing living expenses. The percentage declined sharply for the next older age group, 30 to 44 years old (21 percent).

Overall, the unmarried partner population numbered 7.7 million in 2010 and grew 41 percent between 2000 and 2010, four times as fast as the overall household population (10 percent). Unmarried partners were generally older than housemates: 2.6 million ( 34 percent) were 18 to 29 years old, while 2.7 million ( 35 percent) were 30 to 44 years old. In addition, 26 percent of unmarried partners were 45-to-64 year olds, compared with 15 percent of housemates. This difference in age profiles reflects the transitions occurring first when a young person shares expenses as a housemate or roommate after leaving the parent's home and later when that person develops a more permanent and personal relationship with an unmarried partner.

## HOUSEHOLDS

All of these various relationship types contribute to the formation of households, both family and nonfamily households. Who lives in a household has important consequences for economic resources available to housing units and for access to everyday social support systems such as care for young children or older parents. The following sections show the different types of households in 2010 and their growth over the decade.

## The number of households grew by over 11 million since 2000.

The number of households in the United States increased 11 percent, from 105.5 million in 2000 to 116.7 million in 2010. While family households increased 8 percent, from 71.8 million in 2000 to 77.5 million in 2010, nonfamily households increased faster, 16 percent, from 33.6 million in 2000 to 39.2 million in 2010 . As a proportion of all households, family households declined from 68 percent in 2000 to 66 percent in 2010, while the proportion of nonfamily households increased from 32 percent to 34 percent, respectively.

Table 2 shows that husband-wife households numbered 56.5 million in 2010 and made up 73 percent of all family households in 2010 (households containing at least one person related to the householder by birth, marriage, or adoption).

## HOUSEHOLD DEFINITIONS

A "household" includes all of the people who occupy a housing unit. One person in each household is designated as the "householder." In most cases, this is the person, or one of the people, in whose name the home is owned, being bought, or rented. If there is no such person in the household, any household member 15 years old and over can be designated as the householder.

A family consists of a householder and one or more other people living in the same household who are related to the householder by birth, marriage, or adoption. Biological, adopted, and stepchildren of the householder who are under 18 are the "own children" of the householder. Own children do not include other children present in the household, regardless of the presence or absence of the other childrens' parents.

A family household may also contain people not related to the householder. A family in which the householder and his or her spouse of the opposite sex are enumerated as members of the same household is a husband-wife household. In this report, husband-wife households only refer to opposite-sex spouses and do not include households that were originally reported as same-sex spouse households. Same-sex spousal households are included in the category, "same-sex unmarried partner households" but may be either a family or nonfamily household depending on the presence of another person who is related to the householder. The remaining types of family households not maintained by a husband-wife couple are designated by the sex of the householder.

A nonfamily household consists of a householder living alone or with nonrelatives only, for example, with roommates or an unmarried partner.

Family households maintained by a female householder with no spouse present numbered 15.3 million, more than twice the number maintained by a male householder with no spouse present ( 5.8 million). Among nonfamily households, one-person households predominated (31.2 million) and were more than three times as common as
nonfamily households with two or more people ( 8.0 million). More women than men lived alone (17.2 million and 13.9 million, respectively). A geographic look at oneperson households follows later in this report.

Despite increases in both the number of households and of people in the United States since 2000, the

Table 2.
Households by Type: 2000 and 2010
(For information on confidentiality protection, nonsampling errors, and definitions, see www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/doc/sfl.pdf)

| Household type | 2000 |  | 2010 |  | Change, 2000 to 2010 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Total households. | 105,480,101 | 100.0 | 116,716,292 | 100.0 | 11,236,191 | 10.7 |
| Family household. | 71,787,347 | 68.1 | 77,538,296 | 66.4 | 5,750,949 | 8.0 |
| Husband-wife households | 54,493,232 | 51.7 | 56,510,377 | 48.4 | 2,017,145 | 3.7 |
| With own children. | 24,835,505 | 23.5 | 23,588,268 | 20.2 | -1,247,237 | -5.0 |
| Without own children | 29,657,727 | 28.1 | 32,922,109 | 28.2 | 3,264,382 | 11.0 |
| Female householder, no spous | 12,900,103 | 12.2 | 15,250,349 | 13.1 | 2,350,246 | 18.2 |
| With own children. . | 7,561,874 | 7.2 | 8,365,912 | 7.2 | 804,038 | 10.6 |
| Without own children | 5,338,229 | 5.1 | 6,884,437 | 5.9 | 1,546,208 | 29.0 |
| Male householder, no spouse p | 4,394,012 | 4.2 | 5,777,570 | 5.0 | 1,383,558 | 31.5 |
| With own children. | 2,190,989 | 2.1 | 2,789,424 | 2.4 | 598,435 | 27.3 |
| Without own children | 2,203,023 | 2.1 | 2,988,146 | 2.6 | 785,123 | 35.6 |
| Nonfamily households | 33,692,754 | 31.9 | 39,177,996 | 33.6 | 5,485,242 | 16.3 |
| Male householder | 15,556,103 | 14.7 | 18,459,253 | 15.8 | 2,903,150 | 18.7 |
| Living alone | 11,779,106 | 11.2 | 13,906,294 | 11.9 | 2,127,188 | 18.1 |
| Not living alone. | 3,776,997 | 3.6 | 4,552,959 | 3.9 | 775,962 | 20.5 |
| Female householder | 18,136,651 | 17.2 | 20,718,743 | 17.8 | 2,582,092 | 14.2 |
| Living alone | 15,450,969 | 14.6 | 17,298,615 | 14.8 | 1,847,646 | 12.0 |
| Not living alone. | 2,685,682 | 2.5 | 3,420,128 | 2.9 | 734,446 | 27.3 |
| Unmarried couple households ${ }^{1}$ | 5,475,768 | 5.2 | 7,744,711 | 6.6 | 2,268,943 | 41.4 |
| Opposite-sex partners | 4,881,377 | 4.6 | 6,842,714 | 5.9 | 1,961,337 | 40.2 |
| Same-sex partners ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Summary File 1 counts | 594,391 | 0.6 | 901,997 | 0.8 | 307,606 | 51.8 |
| Preferred estimates | 358,390 | 0.3 | 646,464 | 0.6 | 288,074 | 80.4 |
| Average household size | 2.59 | (X) | 2.58 | (X) | -0.01 | (X) |
| Average family size . . . | 3.14 | (X) | 3.14 | (X) | 0.00 | (X) |

(X) Not applicable.
${ }^{1}$ Unmarried couple households can be family or nonfamily households depending on the relationship of others in the household to the householder. In this table, it is the sum of opposite-sex partners and same-sex partners from Summary File 1 counts.
${ }^{2}$ Summary File 1 counts in this table are consistent with Summary File 1 counts shown in American FactFinder.
Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Summary File 1 and 2010 Census Summary File 1.
average household size decreased over the decade, from 2.59 to 2.58 , but average family size stayed the same, 3.14. ${ }^{6}$ These indicators show a slowing of the downward trends that have existed since the end of the Baby Boom in the 1960s. In 1960, the average household size was 3.29 people per

[^3]household, and the average family size was 3.65 people per family. ${ }^{7}$

The number of households within each category type increased in the last 10 years, including husbandwife households, which increased

[^4]by 2.0 million. Figure 2 shows that, despite this increase, in 2010 less than half of all households (48 percent) were husband-wife households, down from 52 percent in 2000 and 55 percent in 1990. This is the first time that husband-wife families fell below 50 percent of all households in the United States since data on families were first

Figure 2.
Households by Type: 1990, 2000, and 2010
(Percent distribution. For information on confidentiality protection, nonsampling error, and definitions, see www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/doc/sfl.pdf)


Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2010 Summary File 1; Census 2000 Summary File 1; 1990 Census of Population, Summary Population and Housing Characteristics, United States (1990 CPH-1-1).
tabulated in 1940. ${ }^{8}$ For each of the other types of households shown in Figure 2, the percentage share has increased since 1990.

Opposite-sex unmarried partner households increased by 40 percent

[^5]since 2000, almost four times the national average. For same-sex households, the preferred estimates for 2000 and 2010 showed an 80 percent increase. However, same-sex partner households made up less than 1 percent of all households in both 2000 and 2010.

## Household types varied by race of householder in 2010.

Two-thirds of all households in the United States were family households (Table 3). This proportion varied considerably by race: 64 percent of non-Hispanic White alone households were family households, compared with 78 percent of Hispanic or Latino households.

## DEFINITION OF RACE CATEGORIES USED IN THE 2010 CENSUS

The U.S. Census Bureau collects race and Hispanic origin information following the guidance of the U.S. Office of Management and Budget's (OMB) 1997 Revisions to the Standards for the Classification of Federal Data on Race and Ethnicity. These federal standards mandate that race and Hispanic origin (ethnicity) are separate and distinct concepts and that when collecting these data via self-identification, two different questions must be used. Individuals who responded to the question on Hispanic origin are classified as either Hispanic or as non-Hispanic.

Individuals who responded to the question on race by indicating only one race are referred to as the race-alone population or the group that reported only one race category (e.g., White alone, Black or African American alone, American Indian and Alaska Native alone, Asian alone, Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone, and Some Other Race alone). Individuals who chose more than one of the six race categories are referred to as the Two or More Races population in this report. All respondents who indicated multiple races (more than one race) or races in combination with each other can be collapsed into the Two or More Races population category, which, combined with the six race-alone categories, yields seven mutually exclusive and exhaustive categories. Thus, the six race-alone categories and the Two or More Races category sum to the total population.

As a matter of policy, the Census Bureau does not advocate the use of the alone population over the alone-or-in-combination population or vice versa. The use of the alone population in sections of this report does not imply that it is a preferred method of presenting or analyzing data. The same is true for household and family tables presented in Summary Files 1 or 2 that show the alone-or-incombination population. Data on race from the 2010 Census can be presented and discussed in a variety of ways.

Households containing husbandwife families varied as well: 29 percent of all Black or African American alone households were husband-wife households, while 60 percent of Asian alone households were husband-wife families.

Three in 10 Black or African American alone households were female householder, no spouse present families, three times as high as White alone households ( 9.9 percent) and Asian alone households ( 9.5 percent). The majority of female family households with no spouse present contained own children of the householder, except for Asian alone households. Male family households with no spouse present represented 5 percent of all households. Almost one-half of all of these households contained own children of the householder.

Households containing unmarried couples can be family or nonfamily households, depending on the presence of relatives of the householder. Nationally, 6.6 percent of all households were unmarried partner households. American Indian and Alaska Native alone households reported the largest percentage of unmarried partner households (10.9 percent). Asian alone households had the lowest proportion of unmarried couple households, 3.6 percent. The majority of all

Table 3.
Household Type by Race and Hispanic Origin: 2010
(For information on confidentiality protection, nonsampling errors, and definitions, see www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/doc/sf1.pdf)


${ }^{1}$ Unmarried couple households can be family or nonfamily households depending on the relationship of others in the household to the householder. In this table it is the sum of opposite-sex partners and same-sex partners from Summary File 1 counts.
${ }^{2}$ Summary File 1 counts in this table are consistent with Summary File 1 counts shown in American FactFinder.
${ }^{3}$ Preferred estimates remove likely numbers of opposite-sex couples included in same-sex tabulations.
Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 Census Summary File 1.
unmarried partner households were opposite-sex partner households.

Also shown in Table 3 are the preferred estimates for same-sex partner households by race and Hispanic or Latino origin. The preferred estimates removed the households that were likely to have been opposite-sex households as judged by inconsistencies between their first names and their responses to the gender item. ${ }^{9}$ This resulted in a reduction of same-sex households as a percentage of all households from 0.8 percent to 0.6 percent. About 0.1 percent of all households in the United States in 2010 were estimated to be same-sex partner households with own children of the householder present, the highest being 0.3 percent for Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander alone households.

## Thirty-one percent of all households were in four states.

Table 4 shows that four states contained 31 percent of all households enumerated in 2010: California ( 12.6 million), Texas ( 8.9 million), Florida ( 7.4 million), and New York

[^6](7.3 million). ${ }^{10}$ These states also had the most households in 2000, although Florida, which had the fourth-highest number of households in 2000, was the third highest in 2010, topping New York. Sixteen states had less than 1.0 million households, with Wyoming having the fewest $(227,000)$. Nevada, which had 751,000 households in 2000, had slightly over 1.0 million households in 2010. No state experienced a decline in the number of households in 2010. On a regional basis, more households were located in the South (43.6 million) than any other region in the country. ${ }^{11}$

The average number of people per household in 2010 ranged from a

[^7] Washington, and Wyoming.
low of 2.30 in North Dakota to a high of 3.10 in Utah, the only state in 2010 that averaged more than 3 people per household. The District of Columbia averaged only 2.11 people per household, a decline from 2.16 in 2000. Regionally, the West had the highest average number of people per household (2.74), while the lowest average was in the Midwest (2.49).

Utah had the highest average number of people per family (3.56), followed by California (3.45) and Hawaii (3.42). Ten states averaged less than 3 people per family in 2010: Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont in the Northeast; West Virginia and Kentucky in the South; Iowa, North Dakota, and Wisconsin in the Midwest; and Montana and Wyoming in the West.

## HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION

## Utah had the highest proportion of husband-wife households in 2010.

Sixty-one percent of all households in Utah were married husband-wife couple households, the highest in the country. New York and Louisiana had the lowest proportions of husband-wife households (44 percent). Husband-wife couples

Table 4.
Households and Families for the United States, Regions, States, and for Puerto Rico: 2000 and 2010
(For information on confidentiality protection, nonsampling errors, and definitions, see www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/doc/sfl.pdf)

| Area | All households |  | Percent of households in 2010 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Average number of people in 2010 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Family households |  |  |  |  |  | Nonfamily households |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Husband-wife households |  | Female family households ${ }^{1}$ |  | Male family households ${ }^{1}$ |  | One person |  | Two or more people | Perhousehold | $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{Per} \\ \text { family } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
|  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { April 1, } \\ 2000 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { April 1, } \\ 2010 \end{array}$ | Total | With own children under 18 years | Total | With own children under 18 years | Total | With own children under 18 years | Total | With householder 65 years and over |  |  |  |
| United States | 105,480,101 | 116,716,292 | 48.4 | 20.2 | 13.1 | 7.2 | 5.0 | 2.4 | 26.7 | 9.4 | 6.8 | 2.58 | 3.14 |
| REGION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Northeast. | 20,285,622 | 21,215,415 | 46.9 | 19.5 | 13.3 | 6.9 | 4.7 | 2.1 | 28.1 | 10.7 | 7.0 | 2.53 | 3.12 |
| Midwest | 24,734,532 | 26,215,951 | 48.8 | 19.7 | 11.9 | 6.9 | 4.6 | 2.4 | 28.1 | 10.1 | 6.5 | 2.49 | 3.06 |
| South. | 38,015,214 | 43,609,929 | 48.3 | 19.7 | 14.2 | 7.8 | 4.9 | 2.3 | 26.4 | 9.0 | 6.3 | 2.56 | 3.10 |
| West | 22,444,733 | 25,674,997 | 49.5 | 22.1 | 12.2 | 6.6 | 5.6 | 2.8 | 24.8 | 8.4 | 8.0 | 2.74 | 3.30 |
| StATE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alabama | 1,737,080 | 1,883,791 | 47.9 | 18.5 | 15.3 | 8.1 | 4.6 | 2.0 | 27.4 | 9.8 | 4.8 | 2.48 | 3.02 |
| Alaska | 221,600 | 258,058 | 49.4 | 22.7 | 10.7 | 6.8 | 6.0 | 3.5 | 25.6 | 5.4 | 8.2 | 2.65 | 3.21 |
| Arizona | 1,901,327 | 2,380,990 | 48.1 | 19.5 | 12.4 | 7.1 | 5.6 | 3.0 | 26.1 | 9.1 | 7.7 | 2.63 | 3.19 |
| Arkansas | 1,042,696 | 1,147,084 | 49.5 | 18.9 | 13.4 | 7.7 | 4.7 | 2.4 | 27.1 | 10.1 | 5.3 | 2.47 | 3.00 |
| California | 11,502,870 | 12,577,498 | 49.4 | 23.4 | 13.3 | 6.8 | 6.0 | 2.8 | 23.3 | 8.1 | 8.0 | 2.90 | 3.45 |
| Colorado | 1,658,238 | 1,972,868 | 49.2 | 21.4 | 10.1 | 6.0 | 4.6 | 2.5 | 27.9 | 7.8 | 8.1 | 2.49 | 3.08 |
| Connecticut | 1,301,670 | 1,371,087 | 49.0 | 20.9 | 12.9 | 7.1 | 4.4 | 1.9 | 27.3 | 10.6 | 6.5 | 2.52 | 3.08 |
| Delaware | 298,736 | 342,297 | 48.3 | 18.3 | 14.2 | 7.6 | 5.0 | 2.4 | 25.6 | 9.7 | 7.0 | 2.55 | 3.06 |
| District of Columbia | 248,338 | 266,707 | 22.0 | 7.9 | 16.4 | 7.9 | 3.9 | 1.3 | 44.0 | 9.7 | 13.7 | 2.11 | 3.01 |
| Florida | 6,337,929 | 7,420,802 | 46.6 | 16.6 | 13.5 | 7.1 | 5.0 | 2.3 | 27.2 | 11.1 | 7.6 | 2.48 | 3.01 |
| Georgia | 3,006,369 | 3,585,584 | 47.8 | 21.1 | 15.8 | 8.9 | 4.9 | 2.2 | 25.4 | 7.5 | 6.1 | 2.63 | 3.17 |
| Hawaii. | 403,240 | 455,338 | 50.5 | 20.1 | 12.6 | 5.2 | 5.8 | 2.4 | 23.3 | 8.1 | 7.7 | 2.89 | 3.42 |
| Idaho | 469,645 | 579,408 | 55.3 | 24.0 | 9.6 | 5.9 | 4.7 | 2.8 | 23.8 | 8.8 | 6.6 | 2.66 | 3.16 |
| Illinois. | 4,591,779 | 4,836,972 | 48.2 | 21.0 | 12.9 | 6.9 | 4.7 | 2.2 | 27.8 | 9.7 | 6.4 | 2.59 | 3.20 |
| Indiana. | 2,336,306 | 2,502,154 | 49.6 | 19.9 | 12.4 | 7.3 | 4.9 | 2.6 | 26.9 | 9.5 | 6.2 | 2.52 | 3.05 |
| lowa. | 1,149,276 | 1,221,576 | 51.2 | 20.0 | 9.3 | 5.9 | 4.2 | 2.5 | 28.4 | 11.1 | 6.9 | 2.41 | 2.97 |
| Kansas. | 1,037,891 | 1,112,096 | 51.1 | 21.3 | 10.4 | 6.5 | 4.5 | 2.6 | 27.8 | 9.9 | 6.2 | 2.49 | 3.06 |
| Kentucky | 1,590,647 | 1,719,965 | 49.3 | 19.1 | 12.7 | 7.1 | 4.8 | 2.4 | 27.5 | 9.8 | 5.6 | 2.45 | 2.98 |
| Louisiana | 1,656,053 | 1,728,360 | 44.4 | 17.6 | 17.2 | 9.3 | 5.5 | 2.6 | 26.9 | 8.9 | 6.0 | 2.55 | 3.10 |
| Maine. | 518,200 | 557,219 | 48.5 | 16.7 | 10.0 | 6.0 | 4.5 | 2.7 | 28.6 | 11.3 | 8.4 | 2.32 | 2.83 |
| Maryland | 1,980,859 | 2,156,411 | 47.6 | 20.4 | 14.6 | 7.6 | 4.8 | 2.2 | 26.1 | 8.7 | 6.8 | 2.61 | 3.15 |
| Massachusetts. | 2,443,580 | 2,547,075 | 46.3 | 19.7 | 12.5 | 6.8 | 4.2 | 1.8 | 28.7 | 10.6 | 8.3 | 2.48 | 3.08 |
| Michigan | 3,785,661 | 3,872,508 | 48.0 | 18.9 | 13.2 | 7.3 | 4.8 | 2.4 | 27.9 | 10.2 | 6.2 | 2.49 | 3.05 |
| Minnesota | 1,895,127 | 2,087,227 | 50.8 | 21.2 | 9.5 | 5.9 | 4.3 | 2.3 | 28.0 | 9.7 | 7.4 | 2.48 | 3.05 |
| Mississippi | 1,046,434 | 1,115,768 | 45.4 | 17.8 | 18.5 | 10.0 | 5.2 | 2.4 | 26.3 | 9.5 | 4.6 | 2.58 | 3.11 |
| Missouri. | 2,194,594 | 2,375,611 | 48.4 | 18.9 | 12.3 | 7.1 | 4.6 | 2.5 | 28.3 | 10.1 | 6.4 | 2.45 | 3.00 |
| Montana. | 358,667 | 409,607 | 49.2 | 17.8 | 9.0 | 5.4 | 4.5 | 2.6 | 29.7 | 10.7 | 7.5 | 2.35 | 2.91 |
| Nebraska | 666,184 | 721,130 | 50.8 | 21.2 | 9.8 | 6.2 | 4.2 | 2.3 | 28.7 | 10.4 | 6.5 | 2.46 | 3.04 |
| Nevada | 751,165 | 1,006,250 | 46.0 | 19.6 | 12.7 | 7.0 | 6.6 | 3.3 | 25.7 | 7.9 | 9.1 | 2.65 | 3.20 |
| New Hampshire. | 474,606 | 518,973 | 52.1 | 20.4 | 9.7 | 5.7 | 4.5 | 2.5 | 25.6 | 9.2 | 8.0 | 2.46 | 2.96 |
| New Jersey | 3,064,645 | 3,214,360 | 51.1 | 23.3 | 13.3 | 6.6 | 4.8 | 2.0 | 25.2 | 10.1 | 5.5 | 2.68 | 3.22 |
| New Mexico . | 677,971 | 791,395 | 45.3 | 17.9 | 14.0 | 7.8 | 6.2 | 3.4 | 28.0 | 9.3 | 6.5 | 2.55 | 3.13 |
| New York | 7,056,860 | 7,317,755 | 43.6 | 18.7 | 14.9 | 7.5 | 5.0 | 2.1 | 29.1 | 10.5 | 7.3 | 2.57 | 3.20 |
| North Carolina . | 3,132,013 | 3,745,155 | 48.4 | 19.6 | 13.7 | 7.8 | 4.6 | 2.3 | 27.0 | 9.1 | 6.3 | 2.48 | 3.01 |
| North Dakota | 257,152 | 281,192 | 48.6 | 18.6 | 8.2 | 5.2 | 4.1 | 2.2 | 31.5 | 11.0 | 7.7 | 2.30 | 2.91 |
| Ohio. | 4,445,773 | 4,603,435 | 47.2 | 18.2 | 13.1 | 7.5 | 4.7 | 2.4 | 28.9 | 10.4 | 6.2 | 2.44 | 3.01 |
| Oklahoma | 1,342,293 | 1,460,450 | 49.5 | 19.7 | 12.3 | 7.0 | 5.0 | 2.7 | 27.5 | 9.9 | 5.8 | 2.49 | 3.04 |
| Oregon. | 1,333,723 | 1,518,938 | 48.3 | 18.7 | 10.5 | 6.1 | 4.7 | 2.5 | 27.4 | 9.7 | 9.1 | 2.47 | 3.00 |
| Pennsylvania | 4,777,003 | 5,018,904 | 48.2 | 18.3 | 12.2 | 6.5 | 4.6 | 2.2 | 28.6 | 11.4 | 6.5 | 2.45 | 3.02 |
| Rhode Island | 408,424 | 413,600 | 44.5 | 17.6 | 13.5 | 7.7 | 4.8 | 2.2 | 29.6 | 11.3 | 7.6 | 2.44 | 3.04 |
| South Carolina. | 1,533,854 | 1,801,181 | 47.2 | 17.7 | 15.6 | 8.4 | 4.7 | 2.2 | 26.5 | 9.2 | 5.9 | 2.49 | 3.01 |
| South Dakota. | 290,245 | 322,282 | 50.1 | 19.7 | 9.7 | 6.2 | 4.4 | 2.6 | 29.4 | 10.9 | 6.4 | 2.42 | 3.00 |
| Tennessee. | 2,232,905 | 2,493,552 | 48.7 | 18.7 | 13.9 | 7.5 | 4.8 | 2.3 | 26.9 | 9.4 | 5.7 | 2.48 | 3.01 |
| Texas. | 7,393,354 | 8,922,933 | 50.6 | 23.7 | 14.1 | 8.0 | 5.2 | 2.5 | 24.2 | 7.2 | 5.9 | 2.75 | 3.31 |
| Utah. | 701,281 | 877,692 | 61.0 | 31.7 | 9.7 | 5.5 | 4.4 | 2.2 | 18.7 | 6.4 | 6.1 | 3.10 | 3.56 |
| Vermont. | 240,634 | 256,442 | 48.5 | 17.6 | 9.6 | 6.0 | 4.4 | 2.6 | 28.2 | 10.3 | 9.3 | 2.34 | 2.85 |
| Virginia. | 2,699,173 | 3,056,058 | 50.2 | 21.1 | 12.4 | 6.7 | 4.4 | 2.0 | 26.0 | 8.5 | 7.0 | 2.54 | 3.06 |
| Washington | 2,271,398 | 2,620,076 | 49.2 | 20.4 | 10.5 | 6.2 | 4.7 | 2.5 | 27.2 | 8.7 | 8.4 | 2.51 | 3.06 |
| West Virginia | 736,481 | 763,831 | 49.8 | 17.0 | 11.2 | 5.7 | 4.8 | 2.3 | 28.4 | 11.6 | 5.8 | 2.36 | 2.88 |
| Wisconsin | 2,084,544 | 2,279,768 | 49.6 | 19.4 | 10.3 | 6.4 | 4.5 | 2.5 | 28.2 | 10.2 | 7.4 | 2.43 | 2.99 |
| Wyoming . | 193,608 | 226,879 | 50.9 | 19.6 | 8.9 | 5.6 | 4.8 | 2.8 | 28.0 | 8.8 | 7.4 | 2.42 | 2.96 |
| Puerto Rico . . . . | 1,261,325 | 1,376,531 | 45.0 | 18.2 | 22.6 | 10.9 | 5.5 | 2.2 | 23.8 | 9.5 | 3.1 | 2.68 | 3.17 |

${ }^{1}$ No spouse present in household.
Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Summary File 1 and 2010 Census Summary File 1.

Table 5.
Top Ten Places of $\mathbf{1 0 0 , 0 0 0}$ or More Population With the Highest Percentage of One-Person Households: 2010
(For information on confidentiality protection, nonsampling errors, and definitions, see www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/doc/sf1.pdf)

| Place ${ }^{1}$ | Total households | One-person households |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Number | Percent of total | With householder 65 years and over |  |
|  |  |  |  | Number | Percent of one-person households |
| Atlanta city, Georgia. | 185,142 | 81,555 | 44.0 | 15,832 | 19.4 |
| Washington city, District of Columbia | 266,707 | 117,431 | 44.0 | 25,913 | 22.1 |
| Cincinnati city, Ohio . | 133,420 | 57,941 | 43.4 | 13,230 | 22.8 |
| Alexandria city, Virginia | 68,082 | 29,564 | 43.4 | 4,882 | 16.5 |
| St. Louis city, Missouri | 142,057 | 60,468 | 42.6 | 14,424 | 23.9 |
| Pittsburgh city, Pennsylvania | 136,217 | 56,823 | 41.7 | 16,469 | 29.0 |
| Arlington CDP, Virginia. | 98,050 | 40,516 | 41.3 | 6,523 | 16.1 |
| Seattle city, Washington. | 283,510 | 117,054 | 41.3 | 24,611 | 21.0 |
| Cambridge city, Massachusetts. | 44,032 | 17,933 | 40.7 | 4,242 | 23.7 |
| Denver city, Colorado. . . . . . . . . . . . | 263,107 | 106,828 | 40.6 | 23,686 | 22.2 |

${ }^{1}$ The 2010 Census showed 282 places in the United States with 100,000 or more population. They included 273 incorporated places (including 5 city-county consolidations) and 9 census designated places (CDPs) that were not legally incorporated.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 Census Summary File 1.
maintained only 22 percent of households in the District of Columbia. Regional patterns in the proportion of husband-wife households show that the highest percentage was in the West ( 50 percent) while the lowest percentage was in the Northeast (47 percent).

## Over a quarter of households were one-person households.

In 2010, 31.2 million households consisted of one person living alone. ${ }^{12}$ This represents a 4.0 million increase in one-person households since 2000. Although this increase from 2000 to 2010 was smaller than the growth experienced between 1990 and 2000 ( 4.6 million), the proportion of oneperson households grew slightly from 26 percent in 2000 to 27 percent in 2010. About one-third of
${ }^{12}$ One-person households are a subset of nonfamily households. In one-person households the householder lives alone.
all one-person households in 2010 had householders who were 65 years and over, compared with 22 percent of all householders (Table 1).

Table 5 shows the top ten places with the highest proportion of one-person households and the percentage of these households maintained by a person 65 and older. In 2010, one-person households were the most common form of household type in Atlanta, Georgia, and Washington, DC (both 44 percent), followed by St. Louis, Missouri; Cincinnati, Ohio; and Alexandria, Virginia, with 43 percent. People over the age of 65 occupied less than 20 percent of one-person households in Atlanta; Arlington, Virginia; and Alexandria. These areas may represent cities inhabited by younger adults who may move in search of job opportunities.

Figures 3a, 3b, and 3c are maps showing the percentage of oneperson households and their geographical concentration at the county level. ${ }^{13}$ Figure 3a shows a high percentage of one-person households concentrated along the upper and central Midwest extending down into northeastern New Mexico. Figure 3b shows a much smaller proportion of Midwestern counties with high concentrations of persons living alone for those aged 15 to 64 years. Figure 3c specifically examines one-person households composed of individuals 65 years and older. It shows that the high percentages noted in Figure 3a in the Midwest are the result of the elderly living alone, perhaps staying in or not moving far from homes or towns where
${ }^{13}$ A reference to state includes states and their statistically equivalent entities. A reference to county includes counties and their statistically equivalent entities.



they were born. ${ }^{14}$ Note that in Alaska the reverse is true: relatively high numbers of counties with younger people living alone and very low concentrations of people 65 years and over living alone. This may result from the presence of industries-such as mining and log-ging-that attract younger people.

## Unmarried partner households increased from 2000 to 2010.

The unmarried partner category identifies people with a close and personal relationship to the householder that goes beyond sharing household expenses. Two people may live together as an unmarried couple for a variety of reasons. For young men and women, the arrangement may represent a transitory or trial relationship, while for others it may be a precursor to an eventual marriage. For older couples that have been formerly married, it could represent an alternative lifestyle to the one they previously experienced, especially if they do not anticipate any future childbearing or childrearing activities. Unmarried partners can be either opposite-sex couple households or same-sex couple households.

There were 4.9 million oppositesex unmarried partner households in 2000, increasing to 6.8 million by 2010 (Table 2). Opposite-sex unmarried partner households accounted for 4.6 percent of all households in 2000, while in 2010 they accounted for 5.9 percent of all households. State-level data in Table 6 show that Maine had the highest percentage of oppositesex unmarried partner households

[^8](8.4 percent), followed by Vermont
(8.1 percent). The only states with less than 5 percent of households reporting as opposite-sex unmarried partner households were Utah and Alabama ( 3.9 percent and 4.1 percent, respectively). Puerto Rico recorded 5.9 percent of its households as opposite-sex unmarried partner households.

Using the preferred set of estimates for measuring same-sex unmarried partner households shows there were 358,000 same-sex unmarried partner households in 2000, increasing to 646,000 in the 2010 Census (Table 2). In 2000, samesex unmarried partner households accounted for 0.3 percent of all households, doubling in proportion to 0.6 percent of all households in 2010. Regionally, same-sex unmarried partner households were most common in the West ( 0.7 percent) and least common in the Midwest ( 0.4 percent). Of all areas, Washington, DC, had the highest percentage of same-sex unmarried partner households (1.8 percent). Among the states, proportions of 0.8 percent were found only on the east coast (Delaware, Massachusetts, and Vermont) and the west coast (California and Oregon). North Dakota and South Dakota had the lowest percentages (0.2 percent). Puerto Rico reported only 0.3 percent of all households were same-sex partner households.

## Multigenerational families numbered 5.1 million in 2010.

A topic of growing interest is that of multigenerational familiesfamily households consisting of three or more generations of relatives, such as a householder living with his or her children and
grandchildren. ${ }^{15}$ Multigenerational households may be more likely to reside in areas where new immigrants live with their relatives, in areas where housing shortages or high costs force families to double up their living arrangements, or in areas that have relatively high percentages of children born to unmarried mothers and where unmarried mothers live with their children in their parents' homes.

In 2000, there were 3.9 million multigenerational households; that number increased to 5.1 million in 2010. ${ }^{16}$ In 2000, multigenerational households made up 3.7 percent of all households, while in 2010 they made up 4.4 percent of all households. Hawaii had the highest percentage of multigenerational households, which accounted for 8.8 percent of all households in that state. Other states exceeding 5 percent in 2010 tended to be in the West and in the South, including California ( 6.7 percent), Georgia (5.1 percent), Louisiana (5.2 percent), Maryland (5.1 percent), Mississippi (5.7 percent), Nevada (5.1 percent), and Texas ( 5.8 percent). The state with the smallest percentage of multigenerational households was North Dakota (1.4 percent), which was also the state with the highest proportion of

[^9]Table 6.
Household Indicators for the United States, Regions, and States, and for Puerto Rico: 2010
(For information on confidentiality protection, nonsampling errors, and definitions, see www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/doc/sfl.pdf)

| Area | Percent of all households |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Unmarried partner households |  |  | Multigenerational households | Presence of nonrelatives in the household | With <br> individuals under 18 years | With individuals 65 years and over |
|  | Opposite-sex partners | Same-sex partners |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Summary File 1 counts ${ }^{1}$ | Preferred estimates ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |
| United States. | 5.9 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 4.4 | 12.1 | 33.4 | 24.9 |
| REGION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Northeast. | 5.9 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 4.1 | 11.9 | 31.5 | 26.7 |
| Midwest. | 6.0 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 3.2 | 11.2 | 32.0 | 24.5 |
| South. | 5.4 | 0.8 | 0.5 | 4.7 | 11.4 | 34.0 | 24.8 |
| West . | 6.3 | 0.9 | 0.7 | 5.3 | 14.5 | 35.4 | 24.2 |
| STATE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alabama | 4.1 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 4.4 | 8.8 | 33.1 | 25.5 |
| Alaska | 7.8 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 3.7 | 15.1 | 36.4 | 16.0 |
| Arizona | 6.9 | 0.9 | 0.7 | 4.9 | 13.9 | 33.6 | 26.4 |
| Arkansas | 5.1 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 3.8 | 9.8 | 33.0 | 26.2 |
| California . | 6.2 | 1.0 | 0.8 | 6.7 | 15.3 | 37.5 | 24.7 |
| Colorado | 5.6 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 3.2 | 12.6 | 32.7 | 20.2 |
| Connecticut | 5.8 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 3.7 | 11.2 | 32.7 | 26.5 |
| Delaware. | 6.4 | 1.0 | 0.8 | 4.7 | 12.8 | 32.5 | 27.0 |
| District of Columbia | 5.8 | 1.9 | 1.8 | 3.9 | 18.3 | 20.7 | 20.4 |
| Florida. . . . . | 6.5 | 0.9 | 0.7 | 4.6 | 13.4 | 29.8 | 31.4 |
| Georgia | 5.1 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 5.1 | 11.4 | 36.8 | 21.2 |
| Hawaii | 6.3 | 0.9 | 0.7 | 8.8 | 15.5 | 34.3 | 30.3 |
| Idaho. | 5.7 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 3.0 | 11.6 | 35.7 | 23.9 |
| Illinois. | 5.7 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 4.4 | 11.1 | 33.5 | 24.2 |
| Indiana. | 6.3 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 3.4 | 11.3 | 33.3 | 23.9 |
| lowa.. | 6.2 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 2.0 | 11.2 | 30.6 | 25.5 |
| Kansas. | 5.3 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 2.8 | 10.6 | 33.2 | 23.7 |
| Kentucky | 5.7 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 3.5 | 10.3 | 32.6 | 24.4 |
| Louisiana. | 6.1 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 5.2 | 11.4 | 34.7 | 23.7 |
| Maine. . . | 8.4 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 2.2 | 13.9 | 27.8 | 27.1 |
| Maryland . . . | 5.6 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 5.1 | 12.6 | 34.3 | 23.9 |
| Massachusetts. | 6.0 | 1.0 | 0.8 | 3.5 | 12.8 | 30.8 | 25.6 |
| Michigan . | 5.8 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 3.4 | 10.9 | 31.6 | 25.4 |
| Minnesota | 6.2 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 2.2 | 11.9 | 31.6 | 22.8 |
| Mississippi. | 5.1 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 5.7 | 9.7 | 35.8 | 25.1 |
| Missouri. . | 6.1 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 3.2 | 11.1 | 31.8 | 25.0 |
| Montana. | 6.1 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 2.3 | 11.8 | 28.4 | 25.6 |
| Nebraska. | 5.5 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 2.2 | 10.8 | 32.0 | 23.9 |
| Nevada . . | 7.7 | 0.9 | 0.7 | 5.1 | 16.4 | 33.9 | 24.0 |
| New Hampshire. | 7.4 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 2.8 | 13.1 | 31.0 | 24.4 |
| New Jersey | 5.2 | 0.8 | 0.5 | 5.0 | 10.5 | 35.0 | 26.9 |
| New Mexico. | 7.3 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 5.0 | 12.8 | 33.7 | 25.3 |
| New York . | 5.9 | 0.9 | 0.7 | 4.6 | 12.7 | 31.7 | 26.3 |
| North Carolina . | 5.2 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 3.8 | 10.9 | 33.3 | 23.9 |
| North Dakota. | 6.0 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 1.4 | 11.4 | 27.9 | 23.9 |
| Ohio. . . | 6.1 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 3.2 | 10.9 | 31.3 | 25.3 |
| Oklahoma | 5.3 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 3.7 | 10.6 | 33.3 | 25.0 |
| Oregon. . . . | 7.1 | 1.0 | 0.8 | 3.0 | 14.9 | 30.1 | 25.3 |
| Pennsylvania | 6.0 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 3.5 | 10.9 | 29.9 | 27.9 |
| Rhode Island. | 6.7 | 0.9 | 0.7 | 3.8 | 12.7 | 30.1 | 26.6 |
| South Carolina. | 5.3 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 4.6 | 10.8 | 32.8 | 25.5 |
| South Dakota. | 6.1 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 2.2 | 10.9 | 31.1 | 24.9 |
| Tennessee. | 5.2 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 4.2 | 10.4 | 32.6 | 24.9 |
| Texas. | 5.2 | 0.8 | 0.5 | 5.8 | 11.1 | 38.9 | 21.2 |
| Utah. | 3.9 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 4.6 | 11.1 | 43.3 | 20.0 |
| Vermont. | 8.1 | 1.1 | 0.8 | 1.9 | 14.8 | 28.3 | 25.4 |
| Virginia. . . | 5.0 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 4.0 | 11.8 | 33.4 | 23.3 |
| Washington . | 6.7 | 0.9 | 0.7 | 3.2 | 14.1 | 31.9 | 22.8 |
| West Virginia | 6.0 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 3.2 | 10.4 | 28.6 | 28.5 |
| Wisconsin ... | 6.7 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 2.2 | 11.8 | 30.6 | 24.0 |
| Wyoming .. | 6.6 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 2.4 | 12.3 | 30.9 | 22.0 |
| Puerto Rico . . . . . . | 5.9 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 6.6 | 8.3 | 37.0 | 29.6 |

${ }^{1}$ Summary File 1 counts in this table are consistent with Summary File 1 counts shown in the American FactFinder.
${ }^{2}$ Preferred estimates remove likely numbers of opposite-sex couples included in same-sex tabulations.
Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 Census Summary File 1.
one-person households (31.5 percent, Table 4). Puerto Rico recorded 6.6 percent of households as multigenerational households.

## Thirty-three percent of households included people under 18 years, and 25 percent included people 65 years and over.

There were 38 million households in 2000 with individuals under the age of 18 , representing 36 percent of all households. ${ }^{17}$ By 2010, this number slightly increased to 39 million households, but the proportion of these households declined to 33 percent. Utah, in 2010, had the highest percentage of households with individuals under the age of 18 years, accounting for 43 percent of all households in Utah. States with less than 28 percent of households with individuals under the age of 18 years were Maine and North Dakota, while the District of Columbia recorded 21 percent.

In 2000, 25 million households had individuals aged 65 years and over, which amounted to 23 percent of all households. In 2010, the number of households with people aged 65 and over increased to 29 million, which accounted for 25 percent of households. Only two states had a person aged 65 years and over living in at least 30 percent of the state's households: Florida (31 percent) and Hawaii (30 percent). These areas probably reflect popular retirement destinations. Alaska and Utah had the lowest percentages of households with a person 65 years and over ( 16 percent and 20 percent, respectively).
${ }^{17}$ See Simmons and O'Neill, op. cit. The data for 2010 are from the U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2010 Summary File 1.

Interracial couples were most prevalent in the West.

In 2010, almost 7 percent of married couple households included a householder and spouse of different races (Table 7). ${ }^{18}$ Four to 6 percent of married couples in the Midwest, the Northeast, and the South consisted of spouses of different races, compared with 11 percent in the West. Hawaii had the highest proportion (37 percent), followed by Oklahoma and Alaska (both about 17 percent). Because these states have high proportions of native populations (for example, Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islanders, and American Indian and Alaska Natives, respectively), these states may have greater potential for the likelihood of interracial marriage.

Unmarried partner households consistently had higher percentages of partners of different races than do married couple households at national and regional levels and for individual states. ${ }^{19}$ Nationally, the percentage for both oppositesex and same-sex couples was 14 percent. ${ }^{20}$ For opposite-sex unmarried partner households, the

[^10]highest percentage of mixed-race partnerships was in the West (21 percent) while the lowest was in the Midwest (11 percent). Over half (56 percent) of these households in Hawaii had partners of different races, followed by Alaska and Oklahoma (28 percent each).

Regional patterns and levels for same-sex unmarried partner households were similar to those for opposite-sex unmarried partner households. Again, as with opposite-sex unmarried partners, same-sex unmarried partners had the highest percentage of mixedrace partnerships in the West (21 percent) while the lowest was in the Midwest (11 percent). Fifty percent of same-sex unmarried partner households in Hawaii had partners of different races, followed by California, Oklahoma, and Alaska (23 percent each).

## Four percent of married couple households had one Hispanic partner and one non-Hispanic partner.

Nationally, 4.3 percent of married couples had partners where one is Hispanic and the other is not of Hispanic origin, compared with 8.2 percent of opposite-sex unmarried partners and 10.4 percent of samesex unmarried partners (Table 7). Similar to the geographic pattern noted for interracial partners, the highest percentages of Hispanic/ non-Hispanic partner households for all three types of households were in the West. New Mexico had twice the national average of the proportion of households having only one Hispanic partner for each household type. West Virginia had the lowest proportions for both opposite-sex married and unmarried partners ( 0.9 percent and 1.7 percent, respectively), while Mississippi had the lowest

Table 7.

## Percent of Households With Partners of a Different Race or Hispanic Origin for the United Sates, Regions, and States, and for Puerto Rico: 2010

(For information on confidentiality protection, nonsampling errors, and definitions, see www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/doc/sfl.pdf)


${ }^{1}$ Summary File 1 counts in this table are consistent with Summary File 1 counts shown in the American FactFinder.
${ }^{2}$ Preferred estimates remove likely numbers of opposite-sex couples included in same-sex tabulations.
Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 Census Summary File 1.
proportion for same-sex unmarried partners (2.4 percent). This, of course, reflects the below-national proportions of people in these states who are Hispanic or Latino. ${ }^{21}$

Figures $4 a, 4 b$, and $4 c$ summarize state variations in coupled households with partners of either a different race or Hispanic origin for the three types of coupled households. ${ }^{22}$ The maps show the state variations within each type of coupled household, the similarity in these geographical variations among the types of households, and the differences in the levels of these proportions.

Overall, 10 percent of oppositesex married couples had partners of a different race or Hispanic origin. States with higher percentages of couples of a different race or Hispanic origin were primarily located in the western and southwestern parts of the country. These areas tend to have a high Hispanic population. Hawaii had the highest percentage of spouses of a different race or Hispanic origin (39 percent). Alaska, New Mexico, and Oklahoma also had about 19 percent of opposite-sex married couples where the partner is of a different race or Hispanic origin than the householder. This reflects the high proportion of American Indian and Alaska Native alone population in Alaska and Oklahoma and the high proportion of Hispanics or Latinos in New Mexico. Another interesting pattern of relatively low percentages (less than 5 percent) emerges in a range of states extending from the Gulf Coast states of Mississippi and Alabama through Appalachia to Ohio and Pennsylvania, and

[^11]another cluster emerges among the New England states of Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont. States in the South had a history of interracial marriage laws that prohibited marriage between Whites and Blacks. These laws were not repealed until 1967 in the Supreme Court decision of Loving v. Virginia. ${ }^{23}$ The low proportions noted in the New England states likely reflect the small proportions of the population in those states that are either Black or Hispanic (1 percent to 2 percent). ${ }^{24}$

Although opposite-sex unmarried couples were approximately twice as likely to have partners of a different race or Hispanic origin ( 18 percent) as opposite-sex married couples ( 10 percent), they have a similar pattern of state percentages. Figure 4b shows that the states with the highest percentages of opposite-sex unmarried partners of a different race or Hispanic origin were in the western and southwestern United States, including Hawaii and Alaska. ${ }^{25}$ Diverse populations in terms of both racial and ethnic origins characterize these areas. Along with the areas mentioned earlier, above-average percentages of couples of different racial and ethnic origins were noted in Kansas, Oklahoma, and Texas in the West Central part of the United States, Florida in the South, and New Jersey and New York in the Northeast.
${ }^{23}$ Alabama did not officially remove language prohibiting interracial marriage from its state constitution until 2000. "Alabama removes ban on interracial marriage," USA Today, November 7, 2000.
${ }^{24}$ See Ennis, Rios-Vargas, and Albert, op. cit., Table 2, and Sonya Rastogi, Tallese D. Johnson, Elizabeth M. Hoeffel, and Malcom P. Drewery, Jr., "The Black Population: 2010," 2010 Census Briefs, C2010BR-06 (September 2011), Table 5.
${ }^{25}$ The correlation between the percentages of partners of a different race and Hispanic origin between opposite-sex married and unmarried couples for the 50 states and the District of Columbia is 0.980 .

The final map (Figure 4c) shows that same-sex unmarried partners with a partner of a different race or Hispanic origin were about 2 percentage points higher than for opposite-sex unmarried partners. However, both household types had similar geographical patterns. ${ }^{26}$ As with opposite-sex unmarried couples, the states with the highest percentages of different-race same-sex unmarried partners were in the western and southwestern United States, along with Hawaii and Alaska. New Jersey, New York, and the District of Columbia had higher than average percentages on the east coast. The lowest percentages of interracial/ ethnic same-sex couples were in a band of states extending from the lower Mississippi Valley through Appalachia and in upper New England.

The striking similarity in state variations among the three household types suggests that the racial and ethnic composition of populations strongly influenced the patterns shown among the states, while the type of household-married or unmarried-was an important factor that affected the proportionate level of mixed race and ethnic partners.

## METHODOLOGY AND SOURCES OF DATA

This report uses decennial census data primarily for the years 2000 and 2010 . Unrounded data are used to compute all derived values. For readability, most whole numbers in the text are expressed in millions or rounded to the nearest thousand, and most percentages are rounded to the nearest whole percent. In the tables, whole numbers are unrounded, and percentages
${ }^{26}$ The correlation between the percentages of partners of a different race and Hispanic origin between opposite-sex and same-sex unmarried couples for the 50 states and the District of Columbia is 0.961 .

are rounded to the nearest tenth. Maps are created using unrounded data.

## ABOUT THE 2010 CENSUS

## Why was the 2010 Census conducted?

The U.S. Constitution mandates that a census be taken in the United States every 10 years. This is required in order to determine the number of seats each state is to receive in the U.S. House of Representatives. The data collected in the census is used to provide states with the small-area data they need to redraw state legislative districts to distribute over $\$ 400$ billion in federal program funding per year and to help a variety of stakeholders in tasks such as planning services for their communities or researching the diversity of their neighborhoods.

Why did we ask the household relationship question?

The relationship question measures the changing composition of families and households in the United States and provides essential information for the planning and carrying out of federal programs
designed to help families and children. The information derived from the relationship item helps to identify, for example, areas that have experienced changes in the number of children, elderly people living alone or with their children, and single-parent households so that government agencies can develop and evaluate programs that assist these populations. Housing agencies and developers use this information to determine community needs for different types of housing, such as multibedroom housing for areas with large household populations or special needs housing for the elderly. Businesses use the data to find potential new markets or to change their product mix in neighborhoods to reflect changes in family structure and associated consumer habits.

## FOR MORE INFORMATION

For more information on families and households in the United States and additional 2010 Census tables on interracial spouses and partners, visit the U.S. Census Bureau's Web site at <www.census.gov/hhes /families>. Data on families and households for state and local
areas are available on the Internet at <factfinder2.census .gov>. Information on confidentiality protection, nonsampling error, and definitions is available on the Census Bureau's Web site at <www.census .gov/prod/cen2010/doc/sfl>. Information on other population and housing topics is presented in the 2010 Census Briefs series located on the U.S. Census Bureau's Web site at <www.census.gov /prod/cen2010/>. This series presents information about race, Hispanic origin, age, sex, and housing tenure and type.

If you have questions or need additional information, please call the Customer Services Center at 1-800-923-8282. You can also visit the Census Bureau's Question and Answer Center at <ask.census.gov> to submit your questions online.


[^0]:    ${ }^{2}$ See Martin O’Connell and Sarah Feliz, "Same-sex Couple Household Statistics From the 2010 Census," SEHSD Working Paper Number 2011-26, September 27, 2011, <www.census.gov/hhes/samesex/data /decennial.html>.

[^1]:    ${ }^{3}$ There were 845,000 nephews and nieces of the householder under 18 in Census 2000. See Terry Lugaila and Julia Overturf, "Children and the Households They Live In: 2000," Census 2000 Special Reports, CENSR-14 (March 2004), Table 1.

[^2]:    ${ }^{5}$ A historical perspective and the growth and characteristics of roomers and board ers is presented in Melissa Scopilliti and Martin O'Connell, "Roomers and Boarders: 1880-2005," paper presented at the Annual Meetings of the Population Association of America, New Orleans, LA, April 17-19, 2008, <www.census.gov/population /www/documentation/paa2008/Scopilliti-OConnell-PAA-2008.ppt>.

[^3]:    ${ }^{6}$ Average family size is the number of family members in the household (persons related to the householder including the householder) per family household. This computation excludes persons not related to the householder.

[^4]:    ${ }^{7}$ Average household size for 1960 may be found in Frank Hobbs and Nicole Stoops, "Demographic Trends in the 20th Century," Census 2000 Special Reports, CENSR-4 (November 2002), Figure 5-3. Average family size for 1960 may be found in U.S. Census Bureau, 1960 Census of Population, Supplementary Reports, PC(S1)-38, Families in the United States: 1960, Table 280.

[^5]:    ${ }^{8}$ See the Census Bureau's Families and Living Arrangements Web page, Historical Table HH-1, <www.census.gov/population /socdemo/hh-fam/hhl.xls>.

[^6]:    ${ }^{9}$ See O'Connell and Feliz, op. cit., for a detailed discussion of this statistical procedure.

[^7]:    ${ }^{10}$ These four states (California, Texas, Florida, and New York) also were the states with the largest populations.
    ${ }^{11}$ There were four regions (Northeast, Midwest, South, and West). The Northeast region includes Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Vermont. The Midwest region includes Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, and Wisconsin. The South region includes Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, the District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia. The West region includes Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah,

[^8]:    ${ }^{14}$ Data from the 2010 American Community Survey indicated that the Midwest region had the highest proportion of people living in the state where they were born. See Ping Ren, "Lifetime Mobility in the United States: 2010," American Community Survey Briefs, ACSBR/10-07 (November 2011 ), <www.census.gov/prod/2011pubs/acsbr10 -07.pdf>.

[^9]:    ${ }^{15}$ The numbers in this report only identify three types of commonly encountered multigenerational households: (1) householder-child-grandchild, (2) parent/parent-in-law of householder-householder-child, and (3) parent/parent-in-law of householder-householder-child-grandchild. These numbers, then, represent a subset of all possible multigenerational households but were the most common combinations; they made up 98.1 percent of all households in 2000 with three or more generations of relatives. See Frank Hobbs, "Examining American Household Composition: 1990 and 2000," Census 2000 Special Reports, CENSR-24 (August 2005), Table 7, <www.census.gov /prod/2005pubs/censr-24.pdf>.
    ${ }^{16}$ The data in this section referring to numbers for 2000 are from Tavia Simmons and Grace O'Neill, "Households and Families: 2000," Census 2000 Briefs, C2KBR/01-8 (September 2001). The data for 2010 are from the U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2010 Summary File 1.

[^10]:    ${ }^{18}$ The seven race groups used in this report were White alone; Black or African American alone, American Indian and Alaska Native alone, Asian alone, Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone; Some other race alone; and Two or more races. If either spouse or partner was not in the same single race as the other spouse or partner, or if at least one spouse or partner was in a multiplerace group, then the couple was classified as an interracial couple.
    ${ }^{19}$ Since unmarried partner relationships are often short-term or trial relationships, the partners may be less likely to choose partners with the same characteristics, such as race or ethnicity, as do married couples. See Robert Schoen and Robin M. Weinick, "Partner Choice in Marriage and Cohabitations," Journal of Marriage and Family, Vol. 55, No. 2 (1993), pp. 408-414.
    ${ }^{20}$ Data in this section refer to same-sex households using preferred estimates. About 85 percent of the 255,000 misclassified same-sex households in the Summary File 1 counts are estimated to be married oppositesex households (O'Connell and Feliz, op. cit., Appendix Table 6b).

[^11]:    ${ }^{21}$ Sharon R. Ennis, Merarys Rios-Vargas, and Nora Albert, "The Hispanic Population: 2010," 2010 Census Briefs, C2010BR-04 (May 2011), Table 2.
    ${ }^{22}$ A reference to state includes states and their statistically equivalent entities. A reference to county includes counties and their statistically equivalent entities.

