Table 1. Modeled estimates (with standard errors) of the percent distribution of household telephone status for adults aged 18 and over, by state: United States, 2018

| Geographic area | Wireless-only | Wirelessmostly | Dual-use | Landlinemostly | Landline-only | No telephone service | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alabama | 57.6 (2.4) | 14.6 (1.5) | 12.0 (1.3) | 6.4 (1.0) | 5.8 (0.8) | 3.6 | 100.0 |
| Alaska | 57.3 (1.9) | 19.0 (1.9) | 14.4 (1.6) | 3.4 (0.8) | 3.0 (0.6) | 3.0 | 100.0 |
| Arizona | 64.9 (2.1) | 12.7 (1.3) | 10.2 (1.0) | 5.2 (0.9) | 3.3 (0.6) | 3.7 | 100.0 |
| Arkansas | 66.4 (2.6) | 10.7 (1.5) | 8.7 (1.1) | 6.0 (1.0) | 4.2 (0.8) | 4.0 | 100.0 |
| California | 55.4 (1.2) | 20.1 (0.9) | 13.3 (0.7) | 5.3 (0.4) | 3.3 (0.3) | 2.5 | 100.0 |
| Colorado | 61.4 (2.1) | 16.3 (1.5) | 11.6 (1.0) | 4.7 (0.8) | 3.0 (0.5) | 3.0 | 100.0 |
| Connecticut | 40.8 (2.2) | 22.7 (1.9) | 20.2 (1.6) | 7.5 (1.0) | 6.6 (1.0) | 2.1 | 100.0 |
| Delaware | 45.9 (2.7) | 19.9 (2.0) | 21.0 (1.7) | 7.6 (1.1) | 4.0 (0.8) | 1.6 | 100.0 |
| District of Columbia | 57.4 (2.8) | 19.7 (2.2) | 14.0 (1.5) | 2.9 (0.7) | 3.3 (0.8) | 2.6 | 100.0 |
| Florida | 60.9 (1.4) | 15.9 (1.0) | 11.0 (0.7) | 4.4 (0.5) | 4.0 (0.5) | 3.7 | 100.0 |
| Georgia | 59.0 (1.5) | 17.9 (1.2) | 12.1 (1.0) | 4.5 (0.6) | 3.5 (0.5) | 3.1 | 100.0 |
| Hawaii | 51.6 (2.3) | 16.6 (1.9) | 20.6 (1.8) | 4.8 (0.8) | 3.2 (0.7) | 3.2 | 100.0 |
| Idaho | 72.2 (2.7) | 9.2 (1.2) | 7.8 (1.2) | 4.7 (1.0) | 3.1 (0.6) | 3.0 | 100.0 |
| Illinois | 59.8 (1.6) | 15.0 (1.1) | 13.6 (0.9) | 5.6 (0.7) | 3.0 (0.5) | 3.0 | 100.0 |
| Indiana | 63.3 (1.8) | 13.0 (1.4) | 9.6 (0.8) | 6.4 (0.8) | 4.0 (0.6) | 3.7 | 100.0 |
| lowa | 61.3 (2.6) | 13.6 (1.5) | 11.0 (1.0) | 6.9 (0.9) | 3.8 (0.7) | 3.4 | 100.0 |
| Kansas | 64.6 (2.3) | 13.3 (1.7) | 11.2 (1.3) | 4.6 (0.9) | 3.4 (0.7) | 2.9 | 100.0 |
| Kentucky | 61.9 (2.4) | 11.8 (1.2) | 9.8 (1.0) | 7.3 (1.0) | 5.7 (0.9) | 3.4 | 100.0 |
| Louisiana | 57.6 (2.0) | 17.9 (1.5) | 12.0 (1.2) | 5.0 (0.9) | 4.2 (0.7) | 3.3 | 100.0 |
| Maine | 47.7 (2.9) | 15.1 (1.7) | 14.5 (1.4) | 13.3 (1.7) | 6.7 (1.0) | 2.7 | 100.0 |
| Maryland | 39.4 (2.2) | 28.0 (2.0) | 19.4 (1.4) | 7.3 (0.8) | 3.0 (0.6) | 2.9 | 100.0 |
| Massachusetts | 39.9 (1.9) | 21.9 (1.6) | 21.8 (1.4) | 7.6 (1.0) | 6.5 (0.8) | 2.3 | 100.0 |
| Michigan | 57.3 (2.0) | 14.3 (1.1) | 12.1 (1.0) | 8.3 (0.9) | 4.7 (0.6) | 3.3 | 100.0 |
| Minnesota | 56.2 (2.1) | 16.0 (1.4) | 12.9 (1.0) | 7.6 (0.8) | 4.4 (0.7) | 2.9 | 100.0 |
| Mississippi | 66.5 (2.7) | 14.1 (1.7) | 8.1 (1.1) | 4.0 (0.8) | 3.9 (0.8) | 3.4 | 100.0 |
| Missouri | 64.2 (2.2) | 12.5 (1.2) | 11.0 (1.1) | 5.8 (0.7) | 3.2 (0.5) | 3.2 | 100.0 |
| Montana | 51.9 (2.9) | 13.3 (1.6) | 15.0 (1.6) | 9.3 (1.4) | 6.3 (1.1) | 4.2 | 100.0 |
| Nebraska | 58.7 (2.4) | 15.1 (1.8) | 13.3 (1.3) | 5.8 (1.1) | 4.2 (0.9) | 2.9 | 100.0 |
| Nevada | 62.7 (2.6) | 15.4 (1.6) | 11.5 (1.3) | 2.8 (0.7) | 4.0 (0.7) | 3.7 | 100.0 |
| New Hampshire | 46.0 (1.9) | 17.9 (1.7) | 18.8 (1.7) | 10.4 (1.4) | 4.5 (0.9) | 2.5 | 100.0 |
| New Jersey | 38.1 (1.8) | 27.6 (1.7) | 20.2 (1.3) | 7.0 (0.9) | 4.9 (0.7) | 2.1 | 100.0 |
| New Mexico | 66.4 (2.3) | 9.7 (1.4) | 10.0 (1.1) | 4.2 (0.8) | 4.1 (0.7) | 5.5 | 100.0 |
| New York | 38.8 (1.3) | 21.8 (1.0) | 22.4 (1.0) | 7.7 (0.6) | 6.0 (0.5) | 3.2 | 100.0 |
| North Carolina | 57.3 (1.6) | 15.8 (1.2) | 12.9 (1.0) | 6.5 (0.8) | 4.5 (0.6) | 2.9 | 100.0 |
| North Dakota | 58.4 (3.0) | 17.1 (2.1) | 13.2 (1.6) | 4.9 (1.0) | 3.4 (0.7) | 3.0 | 100.0 |
| Ohio | 58.5 (1.6) | 12.7 (0.9) | 13.4 (0.9) | 8.1 (0.8) | 4.3 (0.6) | 3.0 | 100.0 |
| Oklahoma | 66.7 (2.0) | 12.4 (1.5) | 9.9 (1.1) | 3.7 (0.7) | 3.6 (0.7) | 3.7 | 100.0 |
| Oregon | 63.4 (2.3) | 12.6 (1.4) | 9.7 (1.0) | 6.5 (0.9) | 5.6 (0.9) | 2.2 | 100.0 |
| Pennsylvania | 43.4 (1.4) | 17.7 (1.1) | 21.1 (1.1) | 10.5 (0.9) | 4.3 (0.5) | 3.0 | 100.0 |
| Rhode Island | 45.6 (2.8) | 18.4 (1.9) | 18.4 (1.6) | 9.7 (1.3) | 5.6 (0.9) | 2.3 | 100.0 |
| South Carolina | 55.7 (2.1) | 15.1 (1.4) | 13.3 (1.2) | 8.0 (1.1) | 4.9 (0.7) | 3.0 | 100.0 |
| South Dakota | 60.9 (2.9) | 15.3 (1.9) | 10.9 (1.4) | 4.5 (0.9) | 3.9 (0.7) | 4.3 | 100.0 |
| Tennessee | 61.2 (2.0) | 15.7 (1.4) | 9.6 (0.9) | 6.8 (0.8) | 3.7 (0.6) | 3.0 | 100.0 |
| Texas | 67.9 (1.2) | 15.1 (0.9) | 7.5 (0.6) | 3.7 (0.4) | 2.5 (0.3) | 3.3 | 100.0 |
| Utah | 69.0 (2.5) | 13.6 (1.5) | 10.4 (1.2) | 2.0 (0.6) | 2.6 (0.6) | 2.4 | 100.0 |
| Vermont | 48.0 (2.6) | 11.3 (1.4) | 10.3 (1.4) | 13.2 (1.6) | 12.1 (1.6) | 5.0 | 100.0 |
| Virginia | 49.1 (1.9) | 20.7 (1.5) | 15.0 (1.1) | 8.1 (0.9) | 4.9 (0.6) | 2.2 | 100.0 |
| Washington | 58.2 (1.7) | 16.4 (1.3) | 12.4 (1.1) | 5.4 (0.7) | 5.0 (0.8) | 2.6 | 100.0 |
| West Virginia | 52.6 (2.9) | 13.1 (1.8) | 13.2 (1.4) | 12.1 (1.5) | 5.7 (1.0) | 3.3 | 100.0 |
| Wisconsin | 54.0 (1.9) | 14.8 (1.4) | 14.1 (1.2) | 9.2 (0.9) | 4.1 (0.6) | 3.8 | 100.0 |
| Wyoming | 69.5 (2.0) | 8.5 (1.1) | 12.4 (1.4) | 4.3 (0.8) | 3.2 (0.7) | 2.1 | 100.0 |

See notes on next page.

## NATIONAL CENTER FOR HEALTH STATISTICS

## National Health Interview Survey Early Release Program

NOTES: Small-area statistical modeling techniques were used to combine National Health Interview Survey (NHIS) data collected from within specific geographies (states and some counties) with auxiliary data that are representative of those geographies to produce model-based estimates. Estimates were modeled using the procedures described in previous National Health Statistics Reports (e.g., http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nhsr/nhsr039.pdf), with a few modifications: Models were based on five 12-month periods (2014-2018); LASSO regression models (least absolute shrinkage and selection operator) were used to select the best set of covariates for the models; covariates for these adult models were allowed to differ from the covariates for models based on children; potential covariates originally drawn from infoUSA.com were dropped in favor of additional covariates from the American Community Survey (ACS) on internet and smartphone use; the variances for the direct estimates were computed using in-house rather than publicly available sample design variables; and the reported standard errors were based on the variance of the estimate prior to benchmarking to national NHIS estimates for the corresponding phone category and modified state-level ACS estimates for the population without telephone service.

The proportion of adults living in households with no telephone service was not modeled. Other proportions were adjusted so that this estimate agreed with a modified 2018 ACS estimate for this proportion. Beginning in 2017, the Census Bureau changed the way their ACS telephone service data are edited, resulting in a decrease in housing units with no telephone service. For the estimates reported here, the state-level ACS estimates were modified so that a national estimate derived from those modified state estimates would match the corresponding NHIS estimate for 2018. The state-level estimates reported here for the proportion of adults living in households with no telephone service will not match similar estimates reported by the Census Bureau.

Small-area statistical modeling assumes that the design-based estimates of variance are stable and that the direct estimates are unbiased. Users are therefore cautioned that the approach used to create the model-based estimates can produce substantially biased prevalence estimates and unstable variance estimates when the direct estimate from NHIS is based on small sample sizes, when that sample is drawn from only a few geographic areas, and when those few geographic areas are not representative of the state of interest.
SOURCES: NCHS, National Health Interview Survey, 2014-2018; and U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013-2018.
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS: Estimates were calculated by Nadarajasundaram Ganesh of NORC at the University of Chicago, in collaboration with Lin Liu of NORC and with staff of the National Center for Health Statistics, Division of Health Interview Statistics and Division of Research and Methodology.

Table 2. Modeled estimates (with standard errors) of the percent distribution of household telephone status for children under age 18, by state: United States, 2018

| Geographic area | Wireless-only | Wirelessmostly | Dual-use | Landlinemostly | Landline-only | No telephone service | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alabama | 71.6 (3.2) | 14.9 (2.7) | 5.3 (1.6) | 2.5 (1.1) | 2.0 (0.8) | 3.8 | 100.0 |
| Alaska | 67.5 (2.7) | 20.0 (3.5) | 6.3 (2.0) | 0.9 (0.7) | 0.8 (0.5) | 4.5 | 100.0 |
| Arizona | 75.7 (2.8) | 13.5 (2.3) | 4.8 (1.4) | 1.0 (0.5) | 1.2 (0.6) | 3.8 | 100.0 |
| Arkansas | 81.2 (2.7) | 9.8 (2.0) | 3.7 (1.3) | 0.6 (0.5) | 1.7 (0.8) | 3.1 | 100.0 |
| California | 63.5 (1.7) | 21.6 (1.5) | 8.5 (1.0) | 2.3 (0.5) | 1.8 (0.5) | 2.3 | 100.0 |
| Colorado | 67.9 (2.9) | 20.6 (2.6) | 7.8 (1.5) | 1.2 (0.6) | 0.6 (0.4) | 1.9 | 100.0 |
| Connecticut | 50.6 (3.5) | 27.1 (3.4) | 14.7 (2.7) | 3.6 (1.2) | 2.3 (0.9) | 1.7 | 100.0 |
| Delaware | 55.9 (3.9) | 26.4 (3.6) | 12.7 (2.5) | 2.4 (1.1) | 1.0 (0.6) | 1.7 | 100.0 |
| District of Columbia | 52.9 (4.5) | 28.4 (4.1) | 11.2 (2.9) | 0.9 (0.8) | 1.5 (0.9) | 5.1 | 100.0 |
| Florida | 72.9 (2.1) | 14.7 (1.8) | 5.6 (1.1) | 1.0 (0.4) | 1.7 (0.5) | 4.1 | 100.0 |
| Georgia | 69.2 (2.6) | 19.0 (2.2) | 6.0 (1.3) | 0.6 (0.4) | 2.7 (0.8) | 2.5 | 100.0 |
| Hawaii | 62.2 (2.8) | 19.2 (3.0) | 12.4 (2.7) | 1.4 (0.9) | 0.3 (0.3) | 4.4 | 100.0 |
| Idaho | 81.8 (3.1) | 8.6 (2.1) | 6.3 (2.1) | 0.3 (0.4) | 0.7 (0.5) | 2.2 | 100.0 |
| Illinois | 68.9 (2.3) | 17.7 (1.9) | 8.5 (1.4) | 1.3 (0.6) | 0.5 (0.3) | 3.0 | 100.0 |
| Indiana | 75.4 (2.5) | 10.7 (1.9) | 4.7 (1.4) | 1.4 (0.7) | 2.4 (0.9) | 5.3 | 100.0 |
| lowa | 73.1 (3.3) | 14.9 (2.5) | 6.7 (1.7) | 1.2 (0.6) | 1.6 (0.8) | 2.6 | 100.0 |
| Kansas | 77.2 (3.0) | 14.7 (2.8) | * | 1.7 (1.0) | 0.7 (0.5) | 2.3 | 100.0 |
| Kentucky | 70.6 (3.3) | 12.9 (2.4) | 6.6 (1.8) | 3.1 (1.1) | 2.9 (1.0) | 4.0 | 100.0 |
| Louisiana | 67.8 (3.1) | 18.1 (2.7) | 7.1 (1.9) | 1.7 (0.9) | 2.7 (1.0) | 2.5 | 100.0 |
| Maine | 63.1 (4.5) | 18.8 (3.3) | 7.2 (1.9) | * | * | 2.2 | 100.0 |
| Maryland | 49.1 (3.7) | 31.6 (3.4) | 13.9 (2.5) | 1.5 (0.7) | 0.8 (0.5) | 3.1 | 100.0 |
| Massachusetts | 43.7 (3.1) | 27.6 (2.8) | 19.4 (2.5) | 2.9 (1.0) | 4.0 (1.0) | 2.4 | 100.0 |
| Michigan | 69.5 (2.6) | 15.5 (2.2) | 7.1 (1.6) | 2.1 (0.8) | 1.7 (0.7) | 4.2 | 100.0 |
| Minnesota | 63.2 (3.2) | 20.1 (2.9) | 10.2 (2.3) | 1.9 (0.9) | 1.9 (0.7) | 2.6 | 100.0 |
| Mississippi | 80.9 (2.7) | 11.3 (2.4) | * | 1.0 (0.7) | 0.6 (0.5) | 3.0 | 100.0 |
| Missouri | 74.9 (2.5) | 12.1 (1.8) | 5.6 (1.6) | 0.9 (0.5) | 2.5 (0.8) | 4.1 | 100.0 |
| Montana | 62.0 (3.8) | 17.8 (3.2) | 11.0 (2.5) | 2.5 (1.1) | 2.4 (1.0) | 4.3 | 100.0 |
| Nebraska | 71.1 (3.0) | 17.8 (2.6) | 6.5 (1.6) | 1.5 (0.9) | 1.8 (0.8) | 1.3 | 100.0 |
| Nevada | 72.1 (3.6) | 15.2 (2.7) | 6.2 (1.8) | 0.7 (0.6) | 2.1 (0.9) | 3.7 | 100.0 |
| New Hampshire | 53.8 (4.3) | 23.4 (3.6) | 14.5 (2.5) | * | 1.2 (0.7) | 3.1 | 100.0 |
| New Jersey | 41.5 (2.8) | 31.8 (2.9) | 16.9 (2.4) | 4.4 (1.3) | 3.2 (0.9) | 2.2 | 100.0 |
| New Mexico | 81.5 (2.6) | 4.3 (1.4) | 6.6 (1.8) | 0.8 (0.6) | 1.0 (0.6) | 6.0 | 100.0 |
| New York | 45.9 (2.1) | 24.9 (1.9) | 19.0 (1.8) | 2.8 (0.6) | 2.9 (0.6) | 4.5 | 100.0 |
| North Carolina | 69.0 (2.5) | 16.0 (2.0) | 8.1 (1.5) | 1.6 (0.7) | 2.6 (0.7) | 2.6 | 100.0 |
| North Dakota | 64.7 (4.1) | 21.1 (3.5) | 8.5 (2.5) | 2.2 (1.2) | 0.8 (0.6) | 2.5 | 100.0 |
| Ohio | 71.8 (2.3) | 11.7 (1.6) | 8.2 (1.5) | 1.3 (0.6) | 2.0 (0.6) | 5.0 | 100.0 |
| Oklahoma | 75.7 (2.6) | 10.9 (2.2) | 8.1 (2.0) | 0.2 (0.3) | 1.2 (0.7) | 3.8 | 100.0 |
| Oregon | 73.6 (3.5) | 15.3 (2.6) | 5.9 (1.8) | 1.0 (0.6) | 2.1 (0.9) | 2.1 | 100.0 |
| Pennsylvania | 52.5 (2.5) | 21.6 (2.2) | 14.5 (2.0) | 3.7 (0.9) | 2.3 (0.7) | 5.4 | 100.0 |
| Rhode Island | 60.1 (4.0) | 21.3 (3.4) | 12.2 (2.8) | 2.4 (1.2) | 1.3 (0.7) | 2.7 | 100.0 |
| South Carolina | 67.2 (2.8) | 16.7 (2.6) | 9.1 (2.0) | 2.1 (0.9) | 1.9 (0.8) | 3.0 | 100.0 |
| South Dakota | 69.8 (3.5) | 17.0 (2.6) | * | 0.1 (0.3) | 2.2 (1.0) | 6.3 | 100.0 |
| Tennessee | 71.4 (2.8) | 16.6 (2.3) | 5.5 (1.3) | 1.7 (0.7) | 1.6 (0.6) | 3.1 | 100.0 |
| Texas | 76.6 (1.6) | 14.1 (1.3) | 3.5 (0.7) | 1.2 (0.4) | 1.4 (0.4) | 3.1 | 100.0 |
| Utah | 71.1 (3.1) | 16.1 (2.5) | 10.1 (2.1) | 0.1 (0.1) | 1.6 (0.6) | 1.1 | 100.0 |
| Vermont | 59.4 (3.4) | 12.7 (2.3) | 6.1 (1.8) | 12.4 (2.4) | 6.1 (1.6) | 3.3 | 100.0 |
| Virginia | 62.3 (2.7) | 22.1 (2.5) | 9.9 (1.7) | 1.8 (0.6) | 2.3 (0.8) | 1.6 | 100.0 |
| Washington | 66.6 (2.6) | 18.7 (2.3) | 8.9 (1.8) | 1.2 (0.5) | 2.3 (0.7) | 2.3 | 100.0 |
| West Virginia | 66.7 (4.0) | 14.3 (2.7) | 7.0 (2.0) | 6.8 (2.1) | 1.4 (0.8) | 3.8 | 100.0 |
| Wisconsin | 60.4 (3.0) | 17.8 (2.6) | 10.4 (1.7) | 4.3 (1.2) | 2.0 (0.8) | 5.2 | 100.0 |
| Wyoming | 78.6 (2.9) | 10.3 (2.0) | 6.2 (1.6) | 1.0 (0.6) | 1.2 (0.6) | 2.7 | 100.0 |

[^0]See additional notes on next page.
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NOTES: Small-area statistical modeling techniques were used to combine National Health Interview Survey (NHIS) data collected from within specific geographies (states and some counties) with auxiliary data that are representative of those geographies to produce model-based estimates. Estimates were modeled using the procedures described in previous National Health Statistics Reports (e.g., http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nhsr/nhsr039.pdf), with a few modifications: Models were based on five 12-month periods (2014-2018); LASSO regression models (least absolute shrinkage and selection operator) were used to select the best set of covariates for the models; covariates for these child models were allowed to differ from the covariates for models based on adults; potential covariates originally drawn from infoUSA.com were dropped in favor of additional covariates from the American Community Survey (ACS) on internet and smartphone use; the variances for the direct estimates were computed using in-house rather than publicly available sample design variables; and the reported standard errors were based on the variance of the estimate prior to benchmarking to national NHIS estimates for the corresponding phone category and modified state-level ACS estimates for the population without telephone service.

The proportion of children living in households with no telephone service was not modeled. Other proportions were adjusted so that this estimate agreed with a modified 2018 ACS estimate for this proportion. Beginning in 2017, the Census Bureau changed the way their ACS telephone service data are edited, resulting in a decrease in housing units with no telephone service. For the estimates reported here, the state-level ACS estimates were modified so that a national estimate derived from those modified state estimates would match the corresponding NHIS estimate for 2018. The state-level estimates reported here for the proportion of children living in households with no telephone service will not match similar estimates reported by the Census Bureau.

Small-area statistical modeling assumes that the design-based estimates of variance are stable and that the direct estimates are unbiased. Users are therefore cautioned that the approach used to create the model-based estimates can produce substantially biased prevalence estimates and unstable variance estimates when the direct estimate from NHIS is based on small sample sizes, when that sample is drawn from only a few geographic areas, and when those few geographic areas are not representative of the state of interest.
SOURCES: NCHS, National Health Interview Survey, 2014-2018; and U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013-2018.
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS: Estimates were calculated by Nadarajasundaram Ganesh of NORC at the University of Chicago, in collaboration with Lin Liu of NORC and with staff of the National Center for Health Statistics, Division of Health Interview Statistics and Division of Research and Methodology.


[^0]:    * Estimate does not meet NCHS standards of reliability as specified in National Center for Health Statistics Data Presentation Standards for Proportions (available from: https://mww.cdc.gov/nchs/data/series/sr_02/sr02_175.pdf).

