 establ i shments that of fer heal th i nsur ance by firmsize and St at e: Uni ted St ates, 1999 ( 40 St at es are shown separ at el y)

| Di vision and State | Tot al | Less than 10 empl oyees | $10-24$ $25-99$ $100-999$ <br> empl oyees empl oyees empl oyees | 1000 or nore empl oyees | Less than 50 empl oyees | 50 or more empl oyees |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Uni ted St at es | 17. $9 \%$ | 11. 5\% | $15.4 \%$ 15.5\% 17.3\% | 20.8\% | 14. $2 \%$ | 19. $2 \%$ |
| New Engl and: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mai ne | 15. 5\% |  |  |  | 14. $8 \%$ * | 15. 6\% |
| Massachusetts | 21. $4 \%$ |  |  |  | 21. 5\% | 21. 3\% |
| Connecti cut | 23. 3\% |  |  |  | 23. 7\% | 23. $2 \%$ |
| Rhode I sI and | 19. $6 \%$ |  | These cell estimates have been suppressed |  | 14. $6 \%$ | 22. $4 \%$ |
| Vernont | 13. $9 \%$ |  | because the size of thei $r$ standard errors nakes |  | 13. 5\% | 14. 1\% |
| M ddl e Atl antic: |  |  | them extremel y unrel i abl e. Col unm or row |  |  |  |
| New York | 16. $2 \%$ |  | esti mates should be used in place of these |  | 15. 2\% | 16. $7 \%$ |
| New J ersey | 18. $7 \%$ |  | esti mates. |  | 12. 4\% | 20. 8\% |
| Pennsyl vani a | 16. 8\% |  |  |  | 15. $9 \%$ * | 17. 1\% |
| East North Central : |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ohi o | 17. $8 \%$ |  |  |  | 12. 5\% | 19. $4 \%$ |
| I ndi ana | 17. $5 \%$ |  |  |  | 14. 5\% | 18. $4 \%$ |
| III i noi s | 17. 3\% |  |  |  | 10. 9\% | 19. 1\% |
| M chi gan | 18. 9\% |  |  |  | 18. 8\% | 18. 9\% |
| W sconsi n | 18. 3\% |  |  |  | 16. 5\% | 18.9\% |
| West North Central : |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| M nnesota | 19. $6 \%$ |  |  |  | 14. 1\% | 21. 1\% |
| I owa | 24. $5 \%$ |  |  |  | 30. 1\% | 23. 1\% |
| M ssouri | 19. $4 \%$ |  |  |  | 17. 2\% | 20.1\% |
| Nebr aska | 20.6\% |  |  |  | 17. 1\% | 21. 7\% |
| Kansas | 18. 4 \% |  |  |  | 13. 6\% | 20. 3\% |
| South Atl antic: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maryl and | 20.4\% |  |  |  | 16. 8\% | 21. 4\% |
| Vir gi ni a | 19. 5\% |  |  |  | 21. 5\% | 19. 0\% |
| North Carol ina | 15. $0 \%$ |  |  |  | 12. 8\% | 16. 0\% |
| South Carol i na | 20. $2 \%$ |  |  |  | 19. 9\% | 20. 2\% |
| Georgi a | 22. $0 \%$ |  |  |  | 11. 6\% * | 24. 5\% |
| Fl ori da | 20.3\% |  |  |  | 15. 3\% | 21. 8\% |
| East South Central : |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kent ucky | 18. $2 \%$ |  |  |  | 14. 3\% | 19. 8\% |
| Tennessee | 22. 3\% |  |  |  | 26. 3\% | 21. 0\% |
| Al abama | 25. $6 \%$ |  |  |  | 17. 8\% | 28. 5\% |
| M ssissi ppi | 19. $7 \%$ |  |  |  | 16. 2\% | 21. 9\% |
| West South Central : |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ar kansas | 20.9\% |  |  |  | 12. $2 \%$ * | 23. 8\% |
| Loui si ana | 20. $2 \%$ |  |  |  | 16. $4 \%$ * | 21. 5\% |
| OKl ahoma | 12. 0\% |  |  |  | 13. 5\% | 11. 3\% |
| Texas | 17. 4 \% |  |  |  | 9. $6 \%$ | 20. 2\% |
| Mount ai n : |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Col or ado | 12. $8 \%$ |  |  |  | 12. 1\% | 13. 1\% |
| Ari zona | 16. $5 \%$ |  |  |  | 8. 1\% | 20.5\% |
| Nevada | 9. 1\% |  |  |  | 5. $8 \%$ * | 10. 8\% |
| Mbnt ana | 17. 0\% |  |  |  | 13. 9\% | 19. 8\% |
| Pacific: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Washi ngt on | 11. 8\% |  |  |  | 10. 2\% | 12.5\% |
| Oregon | 12. $4 \%$ |  |  |  | 6. 5\% * | 14. 9\% |
| Cal i f or ni a | 17. 2\% |  |  |  | 10. 7\% | 19. 4\% |
| Hawai i | 8. 3\% |  |  |  | 4. $7 \%$ * | 11. 1\% |
| States not shown separatel y | 14. $5 \%$ |  |  |  | 15. $4 \%$ | 14. 2\% |

 Note: Definitions and descriptions of the methods used for this survey can be found in the Techni cal Appendi $x$.
*Fi gure does not meet standard of reliability or precision.

Table II.C. 3. b(1999) Standard error for percent of tot al premum for mixed provider plans contributed by employees enrolled in single coverage at private-sector establishments that offer heal th insurance by firmsize and State: United States, 1999 ( 40 States are shown separately)

| Di vi sion and State | Tot al | Less than 10 empl oyees | $\begin{array}{r} 10-24 \\ \text { empl oyees } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 25-99 \\ \text { empl oyees } \end{array}$ | $100-999$ empl oyees | 1000 or nore empl oyees | Less than 50 empl oyees | 50 or more empl oyees |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| United States | 0. $36 \%$ | 0. $39 \%$ | 0.70\% | 0. $53 \%$ | 0. $82 \%$ | 0. $61 \%$ | 0. $29 \%$ | 0. $51 \%$ |
| New Engl and: 0.35\% 0.53\% 0. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mai ne | 2. 61\% |  |  |  |  |  | 6. $71 \%$ * | 2. 14\% |
| Massachusetts | 1. 08\% |  |  |  |  |  | 2. $21 \%$ | 1. $30 \%$ |
| Connecti cut | 2. $23 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  | 4. $88 \%$ | 2. $73 \%$ |
| Rhode I sland | 1. $80 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  | 3. $35 \%$ | 1. $95 \%$ |
| Vernont | 1. $62 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  | 2. $38 \%$ | 1. $33 \%$ |
| M ddl e Atl antic: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| New York | 1. $41 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  | 2. $53 \%$ | 2. $02 \%$ |
| New J ersey | 3. $11 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  | 2. $28 \%$ | 3. $75 \%$ |
| Pennsyl vani a | 1. 54\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5. 76\% * | 1. $82 \%$ |
| East North Central : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ohi o | 1. 04\% |  |  |  |  |  | 2. $39 \%$ | 1. $18 \%$ |
| I ndi ana | 1. 59\% |  |  |  |  |  | 3. $04 \%$ | 1. $93 \%$ |
| lilin nois | 0.88\% |  |  |  |  |  | 1. $36 \%$ | 0. 99\% |
| M chi gan | 1. $90 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  | 4. $07 \%$ | 2. $31 \%$ |
| W sconsi n | 1. $32 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  | 2. $39 \%$ | 1. $46 \%$ |
| West North Central: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| M nnesot a | 2. $02 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  | 2. $89 \%$ | 1. $88 \%$ |
| I ova | 3. $22 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  | 6. 17\% | 2. $67 \%$ |
| M ssouri | 2. $46 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  | 3. $06 \%$ | 3. $44 \%$ |
| Nebr aska | 1. $12 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  | 3. 09\% | 1. $56 \%$ |
| Kansas | 1. $72 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  | 1. $51 \%$ | 2. $75 \%$ |
| South Atlantic: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maryl and | 2. $39 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  | 3. $88 \%$ | 2. $62 \%$ |
| Vi rgi ni a | 1. $85 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  | 3. $75 \%$ | 2. $32 \%$ |
| North Carol i na | 0. $86 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  | 2. $41 \%$ | 1. $31 \%$ |
| South Carol ina | 2. $26 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  | 4. 11\% | 2. $09 \%$ |
| Georgi a | 1. $64 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  | 5. $03 \%$ * | 3. 19\% |
| East South Central: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kent ucky | 0. $89 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  | 3. $60 \%$ | 1. $14 \%$ |
| Tennessee | 2. $40 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  | 5. $60 \%$ | 2. $30 \%$ |
| Al abama | 2. $71 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  | 4. $85 \%$ | 3. $38 \%$ |
| M ssi ssi ppi | 1. 58\% |  |  |  |  |  | 2. $72 \%$ | 2. $57 \%$ |
| West South Central: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Arkansas | 2. $01 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  | 4. 32\% * | 1. $94 \%$ |
| Loui si ana | 1. $97 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  | 5. 37\%* | 2. $40 \%$ |
| OKl ahoma | 1. $77 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  | 2. $31 \%$ | 2. $67 \%$ |
| Texas | 1. $56 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  | 1. $53 \%$ | 1. $82 \%$ |
| Mbuntain: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Col or ado | 0. $68 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  | 3. $15 \%$ | 1. $45 \%$ |
| Arizona | 2. $22 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  | 1. $64 \%$ | 3. $67 \%$ |
| Nevada | 1. 50\% |  |  |  |  |  | 2. $27 \%$ * | 2. $28 \%$ |
| Mbnt ana | 1. $97 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  | 3. $48 \%$ | 3. $25 \%$ |
| Pacific: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Washi ngt on | 1. $98 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  | 2. $64 \%$ | 2. $16 \%$ |
| Oregon | 3. 16\% |  |  |  |  |  | 2. $54 \%$ * | 3. $68 \%$ |
| Cal if orni a | 1. 55\% |  |  |  |  |  | 2. $60 \%$ | 1. $86 \%$ |
| Hawai i | 1. 08\% |  |  |  |  |  | 2. $05 \%$ * | 1. 98\% |
| States not shown separatel y | 1. 59\% |  |  |  |  |  | 1. $73 \%$ | 1. $83 \%$ |

Source: Agency for Heal thcare Research and Quality, Center for Cost and Fi nancing Studi es. 1999 Medi cal Expenditure Panel Survey - Insurance Component. Note: Definitions and descriptions of the methods used for this survey can be found in the Technical Appendix.
*Fi gure does not meet standard of reliability or precision

