Table VII.A.2.b. (1) (2000) Percent of private-sector establishments that offer health insurance that offer an exclusive-provider plan that required no contribution from the employee for single coverage by proportion of employees who are full-time or low-wage and State: United States, 2000 (40 States are shown separately)

are shown separatery)		Percent Full-Time Employees			Percent Low-Wage Employees **		
Division and State	Total	75% or more	50- 74%	less than 50 %	50% or more	less than 50%	Unknown
United States	15. 6%	16. 5%	14. 9%	10. 9%	14. 7%	19. 6%	4. 4%
New Engl and:							
Massachusetts	25. 8%	26. 5%	21.5% *	27. 4%	30. 8%	29. 4%	6. 7% *
New Hampshi re	25. 2%	24. 7%	22. 9%	30. 3% *	30. 7%	29. 9%	2. 1% *
Connecticut	19. 0%	21.4%	20. 1%	5. 6% *	7. 9% *	23. 9%	10. 7% *
Middle Atlantic:							
New York	25. 5%	24. 4%	28. 3%	28. 5%	29. 3%	28. 3%	5. 3% *
New Jersey	14. 3%	16. 7%	5.8% *	6. 8% *	12. 2% *	16. 2%	8. 7% *
Pennsyl vani a	14. 5%	15. 8%	13.8% *	8. 5% *	17. 5%	16. 6%	3. 6% *
East North Central:							
Ohi o	13. 2%	15. 1%	9. 2% *	7. 8% *	14. 4%	15. 3%	7. 0% *
I ndi ana	10. 2%	12.0%	7. 1% *	4. 9% *	10. 2% *	10.8% *	8. 1% *
Illinois	8. 6%	8. 8%	9. 7% *	6. 3% *	6. 8% *	11.5%	0.8% *
Mi chi gan	11.4%	12. 5%	13. 3% *	2. 1% *	6. 1% *	15.6%	3. 1% *
Wi sconsi n	9. 1%	10. 5%	6.0% *	7. 4% *	6. 1% *	12. 7%	1. 3% *
West North Central:							
Mi nnesota	10. 3%	11. 9%	9. 7% *	3. 7% *	8.4% *	11. 9%	5. 1% *
Iowa	8. 1%	9. 4%	9. 9% *	1. 3% *	3.6% *	13. 5%	1. 2% *
Missouri	10. 3%	11. 9%	8. 9% *	3. 0% *	3. 9% *	14.6%	5. 2% *
Nebraska	3. 7% *	3. 3% *	0. 1% *	8. 7% *	4.3% *	3. 7% *	2.5% *
Kansas	9. 4%	9. 7%	8. 4% *	8. 6% *	10. 7% *	9. 8% *	4. 2% *
North Dakota	7. 6%	7. 0%	9. 3% *	8. 0% *	8.8% *	8.0% *	2.4% *
South Dakota	6. 0%	6. 3% *	7. 7% *	3. 2% *	3. 8% *	6. 7%	9. 5% *
South Atlantic:	0.00	0.0%		0.2%	3. 5.0	0.17	0.0%
Maryl and	15. 4%	13. 5% *	23. 7% *	16. 8%	17. 4%	19. 8%	4. 3% *
Vi rgi ni a	11. 9%	12.6%	11. 6% *	8. 5% *	10. 1%	17. 4%	1. 7% *
West Virginia	8. 6%	9. 1%	5. 9% *	8. 2% *	15. 3%	6. 7% *	1. 9% *
North Carolina	9. 7%	9. 9%	0. 8% *	17. 3% *	11.6% *	11. 9%	3. 5% *
South Carolina	2. 7% *	3. 2% *	1. 4% *	****	2. 4% *	3. 9% *	0. 5% *
Georgi a	8. 6%	11. 2%	1. 0% *	3.6% *	7. 7% *	11.5%	2. 7% *
Fl ori da	16. 8%	17. 9%	17. 4% *	6. 3% *	19. 1%	20. 2%	4. 2% *
East South Central:	10.0%	17.0%	17. 170	3. 370	10. 1%	20.2%	1. 2.0
Kentucky	7. 8%	7. 5%	10. 4% *	6. 3% *	8. 9% *	9. 2% *	3. 1% *
Tennessee	11. 3%	12. 9%	7. 3% *	5. 8% *	14. 8% *	14. 1%	4.4% *
Al abama	10. 9%	12. 0%	8. 6% *	1. 3% *	4. 7% *	18. 2%	0. 2% *
Mi ssi ssi ppi	5. 7% *	6. 7% *	****	7. 6% *	4. 9% *	8. 4% *	****
West South Central:	3. 7/0	0. 7%		7.0%	4. 3/0	3. 4/0	
Arkansas	6. 7%	6. 1%	7. 2% *	9.5% *	6. 0%	10. 3%	1. 2% *
Loui si ana	8. 1% *	8. 0% *	12. 7% *	****	11. 8% *	7. 7% *	3. 9% *
Okl ahoma	6. 1%	5. 6% *	3. 6% *	12.1% *	3. 6% *	11. 2% *	0. 4% *
Texas	8. 3%	7. 2%	10. 7% *	13. 8% *	16. 5% *	7. 7%	2. 2% *
Mountai n:	0. 3/0	7. £/0	10. 7/0	13. 6%	10. 3/0	7. 770	ω. ω/o
Col orado	23. 8%	23. 1%	28. 8% *	22.1% *	23. 3% *	31.6%	0.0% *
New Mexico	19. 3%	20. 8%	13. 3% *	15. 9% *	11. 5% *	27. 3%	8. 7% *
Ari zona	16. 7%	16. 6%	15. 7% *	19. 5% *	16. 2%	20. 4%	3. 2% *
				3. 2% *	6. 2% *		
Utah Paci fi c:	11. 9%	12. 7%	18.0% *	3. £70 T	U. 270	17. 0%	7. 6% *
	15. 4%	16. 9%	14.5% *	9. 5% *	16. 0% *	17 40/	2. 2% *
Washi ngton				9. 5% * 9. 6% *		17. 4%	2. 2% * 12. 2% *
Oregon	24. 7%	26. 5%	28. 5% *		16. 2%	29. 8%	
California	30. 2% 17. 2%	32.6%	26. 8% 13. 2% *	19. 6% 9. 2% *	25. 9%	37. 0% 20. 2%	9. 1% 2. 7% *
States not shown separately	17. 2%	19. 4%	13. Z% T	9. 2% ·	18. 4%	۵U. ۵%	L. 170 *

Source: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, Center for Cost and Financing Studies. 2000 Medical Expenditure Panel Survey - Insurance Component. Note: Definitions and descriptions of the methods used for this survey can be found in the Technical Appendix.
*Figure does not meet standard of reliability or precision.

^{**} The definition of low-wage employees changed in 2000. These data are not comparable to prior year's estimates. See Technical Appendix for details.
***** No estimate available. No reported values in cell.

Table VII. A. 2. b. (1) (2000) Standard error for percent of private-sector establishments that offer health insurance that offer an exclusive-provider plan that required no contribution from the employee for single coverage by proportion of employees who are full-time or low-wage and State: United States, 2000 (40 States are shown separately)

,	,	Percent Full-Time Employees			Percent Low-Wage Employees **		
Division and State	Total	75% or more	50-74%	less than 50 %	50% or more	less than 50%	Unknown
United States	0. 48%	0. 56%	0. 91%	1. 17%	0. 74%	0. 69%	0. 61%
New Engl and:							
Massachusetts	2. 73%	3. 66%	9. 33% *	7. 17%	4. 83%	3. 62%	3. 00% *
New Hampshire	3. 02%	4. 24%	6. 40%	9. 61% *	5. 30%	5. 27%	1. 37% *
Connecticut	1.97%	2. 98%	5. 17%	3. 45% *	3. 78% *	2. 33%	4. 22% *
Middle Atlantic:							
New York	2. 21%	2. 18%	5. 68%	5. 53%	5. 78%	2. 42%	3. 56% *
New Jersey	2. 43%	2. 56%	5. 23% *	4. 50% *	4.85% *	3. 05%	3. 46% *
Pennsyl vani a	1. 39%	1. 98%	4. 99% *	3. 79% *	2. 64%	2. 52%	1. 56% *
East North Central:		_, _,					
Ohi o	2.72%	3. 40%	3. 52% *	3. 17% *	3. 96%	4. 20%	3. 16% *
I ndi ana	2. 50%	3. 33%	3. 10% *	3. 56% *	4. 08% *	3. 58% *	4. 25% *
Illi noi s	1. 37%	1. 34%	3. 53% *	5. 89% *	3. 20% *	1. 91%	0. 39% *
Mi chi gan	1. 35%	1. 71%	9. 92% *	0. 97% *	2. 14% *	2. 41%	2. 16% *
Wi sconsi n	1. 75%	1. 73%	2. 30% *	2. 77% *	1. 88% *	2. 59%	0. 75% *
West North Central:	1. 75/0	1. 73%	۵. 30/10	2. 11/0	1. 00%	۵. 33/0	0.75/0
Minnesota	2. 82%	3. 49%	5. 14% *	2. 40% *	4.50% *	3. 15%	3. 60% *
I owa	1. 41%	2. 01%	4. 05% *	1. 04% *	2. 03% *	2. 22%	0. 77% *
Mi ssouri	1. 07%	1. 70%	4. 35% *	3. 09% *	1. 62% *	2. 26%	3. 16% *
Messouri Nebraska	1. 51% *	1. 37% *	0. 16% *	4. 55% *	2. 70% *	2. 20% 1. 74% *	3. 47% *
						1. 74% * 3. 27% *	
Kansas Nasath Dalasta	1. 77%	1.51%	4. 50% *	5. 96% *	4. 10% *		10. 14% *
North Dakota	1. 28%	1. 95%	7. 04% *	3. 31% *	3. 12% *	₩. U 1/0	3. 01% *
South Dakota	1. 63%	2. 00% *	3. 66% *	2. 05% *	1.87% *	1. 54%	4. 83% *
South Atlantic:	0.100/	A A 10/ w	10 100/ *	4 170/	0.00%	0. 700/	0 0 40/ +
Maryl and	3. 10%	4. 41% *	10. 13% *	4. 15%	3. 23%	3. 76%	2. 94% *
Vi rgi ni a	2. 72%	3. 55%	4. 43% *	4. 76% *	2. 98%	4. 56%	1. 66% *
West Virginia	1. 92%	2. 55%	4. 13% *	3. 89% *	3. 86%	3. 10% *	2. 19% *
North Carolina	2. 16%	2. 75%	0. 74% *	6. 32% *	4. 47% *	2. 87%	3. 32% *
South Carolina	1. 06% *	1. 42% *	1. 94% *	****	2. 18% *	1. 58% *	0. 98% *
Georgi a	2. 46%	3. 00%	2. 42% *	5. 80% *	3. 13% *	2. 98%	2. 83% *
Fl ori da	2. 41%	2. 96%	5.40 % *	5. 65% *	2. 52%	3. 99%	2. 20% *
East South Central:							
Kentucky	1.66%	2. 05%	4. 52% *	3. 08% *	3. 01% *	2. 91% *	1.69% *
Tennessee	1. 97%	2. 54%	3.89% *	2. 44% *	5. 71% *	3. 33%	2.80% *
Al abama	2. 95%	3. 56%	3. 08% *	0. 90% *	1. 82% *	4. 37%	0. 20% *
Mi ssi ssi ppi	2. 23% *	2. 21% *	****	4. 55% *	2. 93% *	3. 24% *	****
West South Central:							
Arkansas	0. 83%	0. 95%	3.64% *	3. 87% *	1. 50%	1. 79%	0.80% *
Loui si ana	3. 02% *	3. 45% *	4.85% *	****	3. 77% *	4. 00% *	2. 24% *
0kl ahoma	1.61%	1. 76% *	2. 78% *	6. 21% *	1. 76% *	4. 17% *	0. 28% *
Texas	0. 94%	1. 40%	4. 45% *	4. 72% *	5. 39% *	1. 56%	1. 93% *
Mountain:							
Col orado	1. 90%	2. 10%	10. 26% *	8. 20% *	8. 79% *	3. 16%	0. 05% *
New Mexico	2.61%	2. 85%	4.56% *	5. 75% *	4. 77% *	4. 43%	3. 87% *
Ari zona	3. 53%	4. 55%	5.44% *	11. 66% *	4. 85%	5. 50%	3. 43% *
Utah	1. 69%	1. 66%	6.94% *	5. 92% *	4. 54% *	2. 63%	3. 12% *
Pacific:							
Washington	1. 59%	2. 19%	4.69% *	4. 33% *	9. 86% *	1. 75%	1.54% *
0regon	2. 91%	3. 72%	9. 48% *	4. 38% *	3. 64%	3. 95%	4. 29% *
Cal i forni a	1. 71%	2. 13%	5. 38%	5. 11%	3. 97%	2. 53%	1. 55%
States not shown separately	1. 41%	2. 22%	4. 18% *	3. 57% *	3. 52%	3. 45%	4. 72% *
Separately	_,,		_, _,,	3. 3	3. 32.0	3. 13 ,0	2 2

Source: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, Center for Cost and Financing Studies. 2000 Medical Expenditure Panel Survey - Insurance Component. Note: Definitions and descriptions of the methods used for this survey can be found in the Technical Appendix. *Figure does not meet standard of reliability or precision.

^{**} The definition of low-wage employees changed in 2000. These data are not comparable to prior year's estimates. See Technical Appendix for details. ***** No estimate available. No reported values in cell.