

The Status of Women in Mississippi

POLITICS • ECONOMICS • HEALTH • DEMOGRAPHICS



INSTITUTE FOR WOMEN'S POLICY RESEARCH



About this Report

The Status of Women in Mississippi is part of an ongoing research project conducted by the Institute for Women's Policy Research (IWPR) to establish baseline measures of the status of women in all 50 states and the District of Columbia. The effort is part of a larger IWPR Economic Policy Education Program, funded by the Ford Foundation, intended to improve the ability of advocates and policymakers at the state level to address women's economic issues. The first series of reports were released in 1996 and included a summary national report and 14 state reports (California, Georgia, Illinois, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Texas, Virginia, Washington, and the District of Columbia). This report is part of the second series, which includes nine other states (Connecticut, Florida, Kentucky, Louisiana, Nebraska, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, and Vermont), as well as an update of the national report.

The data used in each report come from a variety of sources, primarily government agencies, although other organizations also provided data where relevant. Many individuals and organizations in Mississippi assisted in locating data and reviewing this report, and one organization has joined in co-publishing the report. While every effort has been made to check the accuracy and completeness of the information presented, any errors are the responsibility of the authors and IWPR. Please do not hesitate to contact the Institute with any questions or comments.

About the Institute for Women's Policy Research

The Institute for Women's Policy Research (IWPR) is a public policy research organization dedicated to informing and stimulating the debate on public policy issues of critical importance to women and their families. IWPR focuses on issues of poverty and welfare, affirmative action and pay equity, employment and earnings, work and family issues, and the economic and social aspects of health care and domestic violence. The Institute works with policymakers, scholars, and public interest groups around the country to design, execute, and disseminate research that illuminates economic and social policy issues affecting women and families, and to build a network of individuals and organizations that conduct and use women-oriented policy research. IWPR, an independent, nonprofit organization, also works in affiliation with the graduate programs in public policy and women's studies at the George Washington University.

About IWPR's Partners in this Project

In producing these reports, IWPR called upon many individuals and organizations in the states. Amy Tuck, Secretary, Mississippi State Senate, served as Chair of Mississippi's Advisory Committee. This position involved coordinating the various individuals on the Committee, who represented organizations from all over the state. Marianne Hill assisted in coordinating the work of the committee as well. The Committee reviewed the draft report for accuracy and applicability and made suggestions for ensuring that the data contained in the report would be useful. They also help to disseminate the report across the state.

Mississippi Advisory Committee

Amy Tuck, Chair
Secretary, Mississippi State Senate

Rev. Carol Burnett
Congregations for Children,
A Project of Moore Community House

Kay Higginbotham
Mississippi League of Women Voters

Marianne Hill
Institutions of Higher Learning

Cora Norman

Mary Lou Payne
American Association of University Women

Cyndi Chrestman Simpson
Mississippi Federation of Business and Professional
Women


Anne R. Sims
Family Violence/Rape Prevention,
Bureau of Women's Health,
Mississippi State Department of Health

Carol C. West
Mississippi College School of Law

Affiliations are for identification purposes only; the views expressed in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Advisory Committee.

The Status of Women in Mississippi

POLITICS • ECONOMICS • HEALTH • DEMOGRAPHICS



INSTITUTE FOR WOMEN'S POLICY RESEARCH



CO-PUBLISHER

Women's Political Network

CO-SPONSORING ORGANIZATIONS

Congregations for Children, a Project of Moore Community House

Mississippi National Organization for Women

Mississippi Women's Resource Center

National Association of Social Workers, Mississippi Chapter

Acknowledgments

A project of the size and complexity of *The Status of Women in the States* report series can only be carried out with the commitment and cooperation of many individuals and organizations. The Institute gratefully acknowledges the many individuals who contributed their time, knowledge, and expertise to this project, particularly the members of the state and national advisory committees. Many organizations also contributed data and information that was essential to the successful completion of the project.

The Institute would also like to express its appreciation to the Ford Foundation for primary financial support of this project, and especially to Helen Neuborne, IWPR's program officer, for her continuing support of the Institute's work. Additional funding was provided by the Motorola Corporation and by the Center for the Study of Women in Society, University of Oregon in the State of Oregon and by the George Gund Foundation in the State of Ohio.

IWPR owes a special debt of gratitude to Amy Caiazza and Daphne Nesbitt, Co-Coordinator of the 1998 Status of Women in the States Project, who worked effectively, cheerfully, and tirelessly to produce the 11 reports in the 1998 series. Daphne Nesbitt had the primary responsibility for collecting, updating, and analyzing much of the data used in the reports, including calculating the indicators. She also ensured the accuracy of the information in all the reports and supervised several IWPR interns who assisted in the data collection and data checking tasks, as well as in presenting the information in tables and charts. Ms. Nesbitt succeeded Dr. Julie Whittaker, the initial Study Director of the 1998 States Project, as the leader of the data collection and analysis effort. Dr. Whittaker, no longer with IWPR, conducted research on the reliability of the indicators, tabulated data from the Census Bureau's public use data sets, and, based upon the 1996 reports, updated the text of the 1998 reports. Amy Caiazza, Project Co-Coordinator, and State Issues Coordinator at IWPR, had the primary responsibility for working with IWPR's state partners. She worked with hundreds of individuals to form, organize, and coordinate the work of ten State Advisory Committees from around the country. Her enthusiasm for the project and her diplomacy in dealing with many different viewpoints have been

noted by many who worked with her throughout this process. Ms. Caiazza, a political scientist, also contributed to the data collection and analysis effort, particularly in the areas of political participation and representation and reproductive rights.

Special thanks are also due Shannon Garrett, Research Program Coordinator, for her able organizational skills, hard work, and dedication. In addition to assisting in data collection efforts and report writing, she also coordinated the manuscript preparation of all the final drafts.

In addition to those mentioned above, authors of the 1998 report series include: Katherine Allen, Study Director; Ellen Feder, Research Associate (former); Heidi Hartmann, Director; Sara Kicklitter, Intern; Lois Shaw, Senior Consulting Economist; Kristine Witkowski, Study Director; and Chava Zibman, Intern. Other research team members who contributed to the study include: Katie Burns, Intern; Holly Mead, Research Fellow; Nancy Reinhardt, Intern; Monica Schneider, Intern; Linda Shade, Consultant; Zohar Siwek, Intern; and Stefanie Stern, Intern. Barbara Gault, Associate Director for Research, provided technical expertise throughout the project, as did Diana Zuckerman, Senior Consulting Scientist (and former Director of Research and Policy Analysis at IWPR).

Finally, many individuals participated in the major effort of publishing eleven reports simultaneously. IWPR is grateful to Anna Rockett, Publications Editor, for her design expertise and patience in coordinating the production process, including layout, copy editing, proofreading, and preparation of the final copy. Other IWPR staff who assisted in the production and dissemination process include Liz Schiller, Associate Director of Development, Amanda Gordon, Communications and Outreach Assistant, Laura Nichols, Research Fellow, and Nancy Bennett, public relations consultant. Jill Braunstein, Associate Executive Director and Director of Communications, directed the entire production and dissemination effort. Her experience, expertise, and vision assured the timely completion of this complex project. The project was carried out under the general direction of Heidi Hartmann, Director and President of the Institute for Women's Policy Research.

In **Mississippi**, for additional copies of this report, contact:

Women's Political Network
PO Box 13529, Jackson, MS 39236
Tel: (601) 981-8359, Fax: (601) 981-6922

For the **National Report**, bulk copies of this report, or reports for other states, contact:

Institute for Women's Policy Research
1400 20th Street, NW, Suite 104
Washington, DC 20036
Tel: (202) 785-5100, Fax: (202) 833-4362
Web: <http://www.iwpr.org>

ISBN 1-878428-38-1 \$10.00

© Copyright 1998 by the Institute for Women's Policy Research, Washington, D.C. All rights reserved.
Printed in the United States of America.

Library of Congress Card Catalogue Number
98-075163.

Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Introduction | 1 |
| Goals of <i>The Status of Women in the States</i> Reports | 1 |
| About the Indicators and the Data | 1 |
| About IWPR | 2 |
| Overview of the Status of Women in Mississippi | 3 |
| Political Participation and Representation | 7 |
| Voter Registration and Turnout | 8 |
| Elected Officials | 9 |
| Institutional Resources | 9 |
| Employment and Earnings | 11 |
| Women’s Earnings | 11 |
| The Wage Gap | 12 |
| Labor Force Participation | 14 |
| Occupation and Industry | 18 |
| Economic Autonomy | 21 |
| Access to Health Insurance | 21 |
| Education | 21 |
| Women Business Owners and Self-Employment | 23 |
| Women’s Economic Security and Poverty | 24 |
| Reproductive Rights | 27 |
| Health and Vital Statistics | 29 |
| Basic Demographics | 33 |
| Conclusion | 37 |
| Appendices: | 39 |
| Appendix I: Methodology, Terms, and Sources for Chart I (the Composite Indices) | 39 |
| Appendix II: Terms and Sources for Chart II (Women’s Rights Checklist) | 42 |
| Appendix III: State-by-State Rankings on the Composite Indices and their Components | 45 |
| Appendix IV: State and National Resources | 49 |
| Appendix V: List of Census Bureau Regions | 55 |
| References | 57 |

Index of Charts, Tables and Figures

| Charts | Page |
|--|------|
| I. How Mississippi Ranks on Key Indicators | 3 |
| II. Women's Rights Checklist | 5 |
| III. Political Participation and Representation: National and Regional Ranks | 7 |
| IV. Employment and Earnings: National and Regional Ranks | 11 |
| V. Economic Autonomy: National and Regional Ranks | 21 |
| VI. Panel A, Reproductive Rights: National and Regional Ranks | 27 |
| VI. Panel B, Components of the Reproductive Rights Composite Index | 28 |

| Tables | Page |
|--|------|
| 1. Voter Registration for Women and Men in Mississippi and the United States | 8 |
| 2. Women's and Men's Voter Turnout in Mississippi and the United States | 8 |
| 3. Women in Elected Office in Mississippi and the United States, 1998 | 9 |
| 4. Institutional Resources for Women in Mississippi | 10 |
| 5. Women's Earnings and the Earnings Ratio in Mississippi by Educational Attainment, 1979 and 1995 (1997 Dollars) | 14 |
| 6. Personal Income Per Capita for Both Men and Women in Mississippi and the United States, 1996 | 16 |
| 7. Full-Time, Part-Time and Unemployment Rates for Women and Men in Mississippi and the United States, 1995 | 16 |
| 8. Labor Force Participation of Women in Mississippi and the United States by Race/Ethnicity, 1995 | 17 |
| 9. Labor Force Participation of Women in Mississippi and the United States by Age, 1995 | 17 |
| 10. Labor Force Participation of Women with Children in Mississippi and the United States, 1995 | 18 |
| 11. Percent of Women and Men without Health Insurance and with Different Sources of Health Insurance in Mississippi and the United States, 1994-95 | 22 |
| 12. Women-Owned Firms in Mississippi and the United States, 1992 | 23 |
| 13. Health and Vital Statistics for Mississippi and the United States, 1996 | 30 |
| 14. Percent of Total Population, Medicare and Medicaid Recipients Enrolled in Health Maintenance Organizations (HMOs) in Mississippi and the United States, 1996 | 31 |
| 15. Basic Demographic Statistics for Mississippi and the United States | 33 |

| Figures | Page |
|--|------|
| 1. Median Annual Earnings of Women and Men Employed Full-Time/Year-Round in Mississippi and the United States, 1995 (1997 Dollars) | 12 |
| 2. Ratio of Women's to Men's Full-Time/Year-Round Median Annual Earnings in States in the Region and the United States, 1995 | 13 |
| 3. Change in the Wage Ratio Between 1979 and 1995 in Mississippi and the United States | 13 |
| 4. Percent of Women and Men in the Labor Force in Mississippi and the United States, 1995 | 15 |
| 5. Unemployment Rates for Women and Men in Mississippi and the United States, 1995 | 15 |
| 6a. Distribution of Women Across Occupations in Mississippi and the United States | 19 |
| 6b. Distribution of Women Across Industries in Mississippi and the United States | 19 |
| 7. Educational Attainment of Women Aged 25 and Older in Mississippi and the United States, 1990 | 22 |
| 8. Distribution of Women-Owned Firms Across Industries in Mississippi and the United States, 1992 | 23 |
| 9. Median Annual Income for Selected Family Types and Single Women and Men in Mississippi and the United States, 1995 | 24 |
| 10. Percent of Women in Poverty and Percent Receiving AFDC, Aged 18 and Older in Mississippi and the United States | 25 |
| 11. Poverty Rates for Selected Family Types and Single Men and Women in Mississippi and the United States, 1995 | 26 |
| 12. Percent of Unemployed Women and Men with Unemployment Insurance in the Region and the United States, 1996 | 26 |
| 13. Distribution of Women by Marital Status in Mississippi and the United States, 1990 | 34 |
| 14. Percent of Households with Children Under Age 18 Headed by Women in Mississippi and the United States, 1990 | 34 |

Introduction

During the twentieth century, women have made significant economic, political and social advances that fundamentally challenge their traditional roles. They are still, however, far from achieving gender equality. To accomplish this goal, policymakers need reliable and relevant data about the issues affecting women's lives.

Recognizing this need, the Institute for Women's Policy Research (IWPR) issued a series of *The Status of Women in the States* reports in 1996. As many policymaking responsibilities shift to the states, advocates, researchers and policymakers need state-level data about women. IWPR designed its new project to provide them with relevant information. This year, IWPR staff produced a second series of state reports as well as a national report summarizing key 1998 findings for all 50 states and the District of Columbia.

Goals of *The Status of Women in the States* Reports

The staff of the Institute for Women's Policy Research prepared this report on *The Status of Women in Mississippi* to inform residents in Mississippi concerned about the progress of Mississippi's women relative to women in other states, to men and to the nation as a whole. Some aspects of the reports have changed since 1996 but the essence and goals of the reports remain the same: (1) analyzing and disseminating information about women's progress in achieving rights and opportunities, (2) identifying and measuring the remaining barriers to equality and (3) providing a continuing monitor of women's progress.

In each report, indicators describe women's status in political participation and representation, employment and earnings, economic autonomy and reproductive rights. In addition, the reports provide basic demographics and health information about women in each state. For the four major issue areas addressed in this report, IWPR compiled composite indices based on the indicators presented to provide an overall assessment of the status of women in each area. Because the amount of data on health care issues is vast, IWPR did not attempt to develop and summarize one index to measure women's health status.

Although state-by-state rankings provide important insights into women's rights throughout the country indicating where progress is greater or less, in no state

(including those ranked relatively highly on the indices compiled in this report) do women have adequate policies ensuring their equal rights. In no state have women achieved equity with men. All women continue to face important obstacles to achieving equity with men.

About the Indicators and the Data

IWPR looked at several sources for guidelines on what information to include in these reports. Many of the economic indicators chosen, such as median earnings or the wage gap, are standard indicators of women's status. The same is true of voter participation and women's electoral representation. In addition, IWPR used the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action from the U.N. Fourth World Conference on Women to guide its choices of indicators.

Ultimately, the IWPR research team made decisions based upon several principles and constraints: parsimony, representativeness and reliability, and comparability of data across all the states and the District of Columbia.

To facilitate comparisons among states, IWPR used data collected in the same way for each state. While most of the data are from federal government agencies, other organizations also provided data where relevant. Many figures rely on the U.S. Census Bureau's Current Population Survey (CPS), a monthly survey of a nationally representative sample of households. To ensure sufficiently large sample sizes for cross-state comparisons, several years of data were combined and then tabulated by IWPR researchers since few state breakdowns by gender are available in published form. One of the major changes to the state reports involved incorporating new data from the years 1994-97. Some data could not be updated and some figures necessarily rely on older data from the 1990 Census; historical data from 1980 or earlier are presented on some topics. When data were not available, this is indicated in the tables with 'N/A.'

The decennial censuses provide the most comprehensive data for states and local areas, but since they are conducted only every ten years, census data are often out of date. CPS data are therefore used to provide more timely information even though the smaller sample sizes require omitting much detail (for information on sample sizes, see Appendix I).

In some cases, differences reported between two states or between a state and the nation for a given

indicator are statistically significant (unlikely to have occurred by chance) and in other cases they are not (likely to have occurred by chance). Although IWPR did not calculate or report measures of statistical significance, the larger the difference relative to the base-value (for any given sample size), the more likely the difference is to be statistically significant.

In comparing indicators based on data from different years, the reader should keep in mind that the 1990-97 period encompassed a major economic recession at the start of the decade, followed by a slow and gradual recovery with strong economic growth (in most states) in the last few years.

The general decision to use more recent data despite smaller sample sizes is in no way meant to minimize how profoundly differences among women—for example, by race, ethnicity, age, sexuality and family structure—affect their status or how important it is to design policies that speak to these differences. Identifying and reporting on areas within the states (cities, counties, urban and rural areas) were also beyond the scope of this project. The lack of disaggregated data generally masks differences among women within the states. Pockets of poverty are not identified and groups with lower or higher status may be overlooked.

A lack of reliable and comparable data at the state level also necessarily limits the treatment of several important topics: domestic violence, older women's issues, pension coverage, lesbian rights legislation and issues concerning women with disabilities. The report also does not analyze women's unpaid labor or women in nontraditional occupations. In addition, income and poverty data across states are limited in their comparability by the lack of good indicators of differences in the cost of living by states—thus, poor states may look worse than they really are and rich states may look better than they really are. IWPR firmly believes all of these topics are of

utmost concern to women in the United States and continues to search for data that can address them. However, many of them do not receive sufficient treatment in national polls or other data collection efforts.

This highlights the sometimes problematic politics of data collection: researchers do not know enough about many of the serious issues affecting women's lives because women do not yet have sufficient political or economic power to demand the necessary data. As a research institute concerned with women, IWPR presses for changes in the way data are collected and analyzed in order to compile a more complete understanding of women's status. Currently, IWPR is leading a Working Group on Social Indicators of Women's Status designed to assess current measurement of women's status in the United States, determine how better indicators could be developed using existing data sets, make recommendations about gathering or improving data and develop short- and long-term research agendas for developing policy relevant research on evaluating women's well-being and status.

About IWPR

IWPR is an independent research institute dedicated to conducting and disseminating research that informs public policy debates affecting women. IWPR focuses on the issues that affect women's daily lives, including family/work policies, employment and job training, pay equity and the glass ceiling, poverty and welfare reform, violence against women, women's political participation and access to health care.

The Status of Women in the States reports seek to provide important insights into women's lives and to serve as useful tools to advocates, researchers and policymakers at the state and national levels. The demand for relevant and reliable data at the state level is growing. This report is designed to fill this need.

Overview of the Status of Women in Mississippi

Mississippi women continue to face serious obstacles in achieving equality with men and with attaining a standing equal to the average for women in the United States. Their problems are evident in extremely low rankings on all of the indicators calculated by IWPR. Of the 50 states and the District of Columbia, Mississippi ranks 49th in political participation and representation, employment and earnings and reproductive rights, and the state drops to 51st in economic autonomy (see Chart I). Mississippi clearly does not ensure equal rights for women, and the problems facing Mississippi women demand significant attention from policymakers, women's advocates and researchers concerned with women's status.

As part of the East South Central region, Mississippi joins Alabama, Kentucky and Tennessee and shares in a generally lower standard of living relative to other areas of the country. Moreover, women in the region do even worse than men do: they do not have many rights crucial to achieving equality. Further, the status of women in Mississippi is generally below average for women in its own region. Within the East South Central area, Mississippi ranks third in political participation and representation and employment and earnings and fourth in reproductive rights and economic autonomy.

Mississippi's consistently low rankings on most of the indicators calculated by IWPR illustrate the interrelation of

Chart I.
How Mississippi Ranks on Key Indicators

| Indicators | National Rank* | Regional Rank* |
|---|----------------|----------------|
| Composite Political Participation and Representation Index | 49 | 3 |
| • Women's Voter Registration, 1992-94 | 9 | 1 |
| • Women's Voter Turnout, 1992-96 | 38 | 4 |
| • Women in Elected Office Composite, 1998 | 50 | 4 |
| • Women's Institutional Resources, 1998 | 48 | 3 |
| Composite Employment and Earnings Index | 49 | 3 |
| • Women's Median Annual Earnings, 1995 | 51 | 4 |
| • Ratio of Women's to Men's Earnings, 1995 | 31 | 2 |
| • Women's Labor Force Participation, 1995 | 43 | 3 |
| • Women in Managerial and Professional Occupations, 1995 | 48 | 3 |
| Composite Economic Autonomy Index | 51 | 4 |
| • Percent with Health Insurance Among Nonelderly Women, 1994-95 | 47 | 4 |
| • Educational Attainment: Percent of Women with Four or More Years of College, 1990 | 47 | 3 |
| • Women's Business Ownership, 1992 | 51 | 4 |
| • Percent of Women Above the Poverty Level, 1995 | 50 | 4 |
| Composite Reproductive Rights Index | 49 | 4 |

See Appendix I for a detailed description of the methodology and sources used for the indices presented here.

* The national rankings are of a possible 51, referring to the 50 states and the District of Columbia except for the Political Participation and Representation indicators, which do not include the District of Columbia. The regional rankings are of a maximum of four and refer to the states in the East South Central Region (AL, KY, MS, TN). See Appendix V.

Calculated by the Institute for Women's Policy Research.

many of the variables presented in this report. Lower levels of educational attainment, for example, can contribute to lower earnings and more female poverty. A state with low women's labor force participation may also have low levels of health insurance coverage. Thus while the same problems do not always affect the same women, in many cases they can reinforce each other.

Finally, women in Mississippi do not all share the same life experiences. Differences exist with respect to age, race, education, rural or urban residence and other distinctions among women, and not all women enjoy equal access to Mississippi's political and economic resources. While this report relies primarily on aggregate data for the state, data which are comparable to that available for other states, it does not seek to deny important differences among Mississippi women. Recognizing these differences is important both to understanding the limitations of the aggregate data presented here and to developing policies that can benefit *all* of Mississippi's women.

Political Participation and Representation

Women in Mississippi vote at rates much lower than women in the rest of the country, and they lack both adequate political representation and institutional resources such as a commission on the status of women. Consequently, the state ranks 49th on the political participation and representation composite index. Women in Mississippi would benefit from more active voter participation and greater political representation in both the legislative and executive branches since such voices could encourage more women-friendly policies, enhancing their status in other areas.

Employment and Earnings

Women in Mississippi participate in the workforce much less, earn wages much lower and work as managers or professionals much less often than women in the nation as a whole. Their earnings in relation to men's are also lower than in most of the country. These factors combine to place Mississippi 49th in the nation on the employment and earnings composite index. More than 62 percent of Mississippi women with children under 18 are working. Mississippi's parents increasingly need adequate child care, a policy demand not yet adequately addressed in Mississippi or in the United States as a whole. In an economic era when all able or available parents must work for pay to support their children, public policies lag far behind reality.

Economic Autonomy

Ranking 51st in economic autonomy, Mississippi's women face serious obstacles in this category as well. Far fewer women than average own their own businesses or have a college education. In addition, more than 18 percent of Mississippi women lack health insurance and more than 21 percent live below the poverty line. These women lack the basic necessities of life.

Reproductive Rights

Mississippi women have few of the reproductive rights identified as important, and as a result the state ranked 49th of 51 on this measure. State policies restrict access to abortion by mandating parental consent and waiting periods, and poor women can receive public funding for abortion only under federally-mandated, limited circumstances. Moreover, for many women, especially those in rural areas, abortion is virtually inaccessible: only five percent of Mississippi counties have abortion providers. Finally, women in Mississippi are not legally guaranteed that their health insurers will provide coverage for contraception.

Women's Rights Checklist

The Fourth World Conference on Women, held in Beijing in September 1995, heightened awareness of women's status around the world and pointed to the importance of government action and public policy for the well-being of women. At the conference, representatives from 189 countries, including the United States, unanimously adopted the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action, pledging their governments to action on behalf of women. The Platform for Action outlines critical issues of concern to women and remaining obstacles to women's advancement.

In the United States, the President's Interagency Council on Women continues to follow up on U.S. commitments made at the Fourth World Conference on Women. According to the Council (1996), many of the laws, policies and programs that already exist in the United States meet the goals of the Platform for Action and establish the rights of women identified in the Platform. In other areas, however, the United States and many individual states have an opportunity to improve women's rights.

Chart II, the Women's Rights Checklist, shows how Mississippi rates on selected indicators of women's rights. Many of these rights derive from the Platform for Action.

Chart II. Women's Rights Checklist

| | Yes | No | Other |
|---|-----|----|---------------------------------|
| Reproductive Rights | | | |
| • Does Mississippi allow access to abortion services without mandatory parental consent laws? | | ✓ | |
| • Does Mississippi allow access to abortion services without a waiting period? | | ✓ | |
| • Does Mississippi provide public funding for abortions under any or most circumstances if a woman is eligible? | | ✓ | |
| • Does Mississippi require health insurers to provide coverage for contraceptives? | | ✓ | |
| • Does Mississippi offer public funding for infertility treatments? | | ✓ | |
| • Does Mississippi allow the non-biological parent in a gay/lesbian couple to adopt his/her partner's biological child? | | | No Legislation/ Rulings |
| Domestic Violence Legislation | | | |
| • Does Mississippi require law-enforcement officials to arrest under all or some circumstances?* | ✓ | | |
| Child Support | | | |
| • Percent of single-mother households receiving child support or alimony | | | 24.0% |
| • Percent of child support cases with orders for collection in which child support has actually been collected. | | | 29.2% |
| Welfare (as of July 1998)† | | | |
| • Child Exclusion/Family Caps: Does Mississippi extend TANF benefits to children who are born or conceived while the mother was on welfare? | | ✓ | |
| • Time Limits: How many consecutive months does Mississippi allow TANF recipients to receive benefits? | | | 60 months |
| • Work Requirements: When are welfare recipients required to work according to Mississippi's TANF plan? | | | 24 months |
| • Has Mississippi made provision for victims of family violence in its state TANF plan? | ✓ | | |
| Employment/Unemployment Benefits | | | |
| • Is Mississippi's minimum wage higher than the federal minimum wage as of January 1998?†† | | | No State Law on Minimum Wage |
| • Does Mississippi have mandatory temporary disability insurance? | | ✓ | |
| • Does Mississippi provide unemployment insurance benefits for low-wage earners? ... | ✓ | | |
| • Has Mississippi implemented adjustments to achieve pay equity in its civil service? | | ✓ | |
| Institutional Resources | | | |
| • Does Mississippi have a Commission on the Status of Women? | | ✓ | |
| <i>See Appendix II for a detailed description and sources for the items on this checklist.</i> | | | |
| * This indicator is only one of many potential measures of anti-domestic violence policies, but data are more difficult to find for other measures. | | | |
| † Under federal law, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) benefits are restricted to a five-year (60 month) lifetime limit and are contingent on work participation after 24 months; as allowed by the law, some states set more stringent time limits or work requirements or exempt victims of domestic violence from certain requirements. | | | |
| †† As of September 1, 1997, the federal minimum hourly wage was increased to \$5.15. | | | |
| Compiled by the Institute for Women's Policy Research. | | | |

They fall under several categories: reproductive rights, protection from domestic violence, access to income support (through welfare and child support collection), women-friendly employment protections and institutional representation of women's concerns. Many of the indicators directly result from state policy decisions (see Appendix II for detailed explanations of the indicators).

As the chart shows, Mississippi needs to improve on many of the rights identified with women's well-being. Some positive policies exist: Mississippi stipulates relatively broad criteria for eligibility for Unemployment Insurance benefits, for example, and welfare recipients have 24 months before they are required to work, allowing them time for upgrading of skills through training or education. Finally, the state has a pro-arrest policy on domestic violence.

But Mississippi currently falls short on many of the rights included in the checklist. When Mississippi's

restrictions on reproductive rights combine with its child-exclusion welfare penalties, women and their families who receive welfare are in double jeopardy of falling deeper into poverty with the conception or birth of a child. Failure to require mandatory TDI (Temporary Disability Insurance) coverage leaves many women, especially single mothers, vulnerable in case of injury or illness. Finally, since Mississippi women do not have a commission on the status of women, they lack one form of representation that might help change some of these policies.

Mississippi, then, truly illustrates many of the difficult obstacles still facing women in the United States. While Mississippi women and U.S. women as a whole are seeing important changes in their lives and their access to political, economic and social rights, they by no means enjoy equality with men, and they still lack many of the legal guarantees that would allow them to achieve it.

Political Participation and Representation

Participating in the political process is one way women can seek representation of their interests and influence policies affecting their lives. This section describes several aspects of political participation important to women. Voter registration and turnout, female state and federal elected representation and women's state institutional resources are all crucial to making women's political concerns visible.

In recent years, a growing gender gap in voter preferences—the tendency for women and men to vote differently—suggests that women's interests may differ from men's in important ways (Delli Carpini and Fuchs, 1993; Mueller, 1988; Sapiro, 1983; Tolleson and Rinehart, 1992). Women, for example, tend to support policies which promote accessible and affordable child care and measures combating violence against women, and they vote for candidates supporting these positions. Many women also give issues like education, health care, children's issues and reproductive rights a high priority. Because women often fill the role of primary care provider in families, these issues often affect women's lives more profoundly than men's, and voting is one way for women to express their political priorities.

Women's representation in political institutions also helps highlight their concerns in the public sphere.

Regardless of party affiliation, female officeholders are more likely than male ones to support women's agendas (e.g., Center for the American Woman and Politics [CAWP], 1991; Carroll, 1994; Thomas, 1994), and support for female candidates is growing among both male and female voters. Research shows that legislatures with larger proportions of female elected officials do, in fact, address women's issues more than those with fewer female representatives (Dodson, 1991; Thomas, 1994). In addition, representation by means of permanent institutions such as women's commissions can provide regular procedural channels for expressing women's concerns (Stetson and Mazur, 1995). These institutions also make government more accessible to women. Thus women need to be in both the executive and legislative branches to ensure that their perspectives are part of political debate.

Mississippi ranks in the bottom ten states on the political participation and representation index, although the rankings for individual indicators vary greatly. Its ranking on individual indicators range from ninth on women's voter registration to last place (50th) on women in elected office (see Chart III). Mississippi also falls below the midpoint on women's voter turnout (38th) and is near the bottom (48th) on women's institutional resources.

Chart III.
Political Participation and Representation: National and Regional Ranks

| Indicators | National Rank* (of 50) | Regional Rank* (of 4) |
|--|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| Composite Political Participation and Representation Index | 49 | 3 |
| • Women's Voter Registration (percent of women 18 and older who reported registering to vote in 1992 and 1994) ^a | 9 | 1 |
| • Women's Voter Turnout (percent of women 18 and older estimated to have voted in 1992 and 1996) ^b | 38 | 4 |
| • Women in Elected Office Composite Index (percent of state and national elected officeholders who are women, 1998) ^{c,e} | 50 | 4 |
| • Women's Institutional Resources (number of institutional resources for women in Mississippi, 1998) ^{d,e} | 48 | 3 |

See Appendix I for methodology.

* The national rank is of a possible 50, because the District of Columbia is not included in this ranking. The regional rankings are of a maximum of four and refer to the states in the East South Central Region (AL, KY, MS, TN). See Appendix V.

Source: ^a U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1993, 1996d; ^b Strategic Research Concepts, 1998; ^c CAWP, 1998a, 1998b, 1998c and 1998d; ^d Center for Policy Alternatives, 1995, National Association of Women's Commissions, 1997, CAWP, 1998e; ^e Compiled by IWPR, based on the Center for Policy Alternatives, 1995.

Calculated by the Institute for Women's Policy Research.

Voter Registration and Turnout

One of the basic democratic rights is the right to vote. The principle “one person one vote” helps different kinds of citizens have an equal voice in the democratic process. Recognizing this value, many early women’s movements made suffrage one of their first goals. Ratified in 1920, the Nineteenth Amendment gave women in the United States the right to vote, and in November of that year, about eight million out of 51.8 million women voted for the first time (National Women’s Political Caucus, 1995). African American and other minority women, however, were denied the right to vote in Mississippi and many other parts of the South until the Voting Rights Act of 1964 was passed. Nonetheless, even after women of all races were ensured the right to vote, many candidates (and political researchers) did not take women voters seriously. Instead, they assumed women would disregard politics and vote like their fathers or husbands (Carroll and Zerrilli, 1993; Evans, 1989). Neither assumption proved valid. Research shows women do not always vote like men.

Women now register and vote slightly more often than men. By 1994, over 63 million women, or 63.7 percent of those eligible, reported being registered to vote, compared with nearly 56 million or 61.2 percent of eligible men (see Table 1).

Table 1.
Voter Registration for Women and Men in Mississippi and the United States

| | Mississippi | | United States | |
|---|-------------|---------|---------------|------------|
| | Percent | Number | Percent | Number |
| 1994 Voter Registration^a | | | | |
| Women | 73.4 | 736,000 | 63.7 | 63,257,000 |
| Men | 71.7 | 617,000 | 61.2 | 55,737,000 |
| 1992 Voter Registration^a | | | | |
| Women | 79.8 | 784,000 | 69.8 | 67,324,000 |
| Men | 78.7 | 674,000 | 66.9 | 69,254,000 |
| Number of Unregistered Women Eligible to Vote, 1996^b | N/A | 173,550 | N/A | 23,775,050 |
| Percent and Number of Eligible Public Assistance Recipients Who Are Registered, 1996^b | 19.0 | 22,767 | 14.1 | 1,311,848 |

* Percent of all women and men aged 18 and older who reported registering, based on data from the 1993 and 1995 November Supplements of the Current Population Survey. These data are self-reports and tend to overstate actual voter registration.

Source: ^a U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1993, 1996d; ^b HumanSERVE, 1996.

Compiled by the Institute for Women’s Policy Research.

Table 2.
Women’s and Men’s Voter Turnout in Mississippi and the United States

| | Mississippi | | United States | |
|---|-------------|---------|---------------|------------|
| | Percent | Number | Percent | Number |
| 1996 Voter Turnout^a | | | | |
| Women | 46.6 | 482,700 | 49.0 | 50,062,800 |
| Men | 44.5 | 411,200 | 49.0 | 46,211,800 |
| 1992 Voter Turnout^a | | | | |
| Women | 54.5 | 540,000 | 57.3 | 56,391,300 |
| Men | 50.8 | 441,800 | 53.0 | 48,037,100 |
| Percent of Registered Women Who Did Not Vote in Any of the Presidential Elections in 1984, 1988 and 1992^b | 18.1 | N/A | 12.1 | N/A |

* Percent of all women and men aged 18 and older estimated to have voted based on certified presidential election returns from the Federal Election Commission, Census projections of the voting age population from the 1993 and 1997 November Supplements of the Current Population Survey, and Voter News Service nationwide exit polls. These data likely tend to understate actual voter turnout.

Source: ^a Strategic Research Concepts, 1998; ^b Women’s Vote Project, National Council of Women’s Organizations, 1996.

Compiled by the Institute for Women’s Policy Research.

Mississippi's voter registration rates are generally considerably higher for both men and women than national ones. In Mississippi, 73.4 percent of women reported being registered to vote in the November 1994 elections, while 71.7 percent of men did.

Women voters have been an actual majority of U.S. voters since 1964. In 1996, 52 percent of voters were women while in 1992, 54 percent were. Still, compared with other Western democracies, voter turnout is relatively low for both genders for a variety of reasons (Dalton and Wattenberg, 1993). Mississippi has lower voter turnout than the nation as a whole. In 1992, 54.5 percent of Mississippi women are estimated to have voted, and 46.6 percent are estimated to have voted in 1996 (see Table 2). As a result, Mississippi ranks 38th among all the states and fourth in the East South Central region for women's voter turnout in the 1992 and 1996 elections combined. Voter turnout dropped for both sexes in Mississippi and the nation in 1996. Although Mississippi women's turnout fell substantially in 1996, it remained slightly higher than the rate for men in Mississippi (and lower than for men and women in the United States as a whole).

Over the years, most states in the United States have developed relatively complicated systems of voter registration. Voting typically requires advance registration in a few specified locations. This system is one main cause of low voting rates, and two groups typically underserved by it are the poor and persons with disabilities (Wolfinger and Rosenstone, 1980). In addition, voting itself is more difficult for people with disabilities because of problems such as inadequate transportation to the polls. Effective January 1995, however, the National Voter Registration Act (NVRA) required states to allow citizens to register to vote when receiving or renewing a driver's license or applying for Aid for Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), Food Stamps, Medicaid, the Special

Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) and disability services. By 1996, the NVRA successfully enrolled or updated voting addresses for over 11 million people including 1.3 million through public assistance agencies (HumanSERVE, 1996). Under the new welfare system, applicants for TANF and related programs will continue to have the opportunity to register to vote when seeking welfare benefits. Still, nearly 24 million eligible women remain unregistered in the United States, with nearly 174,000 of them living in Mississippi. Finally, states need to recognize that without transportation and expanded numbers of accessible places for both registration and voting, people with disabilities will continue to be unable to exercise their right to vote.

Elected Officials

Although women constitute a minority of elected officials at both the national and state levels, their presence has grown steadily over the years, and as more women hold office, women's issues are also becoming more prominent in legislative agendas (Thomas, 1994). Nine women serve in the 1997-98 U.S. Senate (105th Congress). Women also fill 53 of the 435 seats in the 105th U.S. House of Representatives (not including Eleanor Holmes Norton, the non-voting delegate from the District of Columbia, and Donna Christian-Green, the non-voting delegate from the Virgin Islands). Women from Mississippi did not fill any seats in the U.S. House or the U.S. Senate, leading to rates which are well below the national average. In addition, no women were elected to serve in state-wide executive office in Mississippi, and women's proportion of the state legislature is quite low relative to the national average. Women, however, constitute 30.8 percent of public appointees in Mississippi (data not shown; Center for Women in Government, 1997).

Table 3.
Women in Elected Office in Mississippi and the United States, 1998

| | Mississippi | United States |
|--|-------------|---------------|
| Number of Women in Statewide Executive Elected Office | 0 | 82 |
| Number of Women in the U.S. Congress | | |
| U.S. Senate | 0 of 2 | 9 of 100 |
| U.S. House | 0 of 5 | 53 of 435* |
| Percent of State Legislators Who Are Women | 12.6% | 21.6% |

* Does not include delegates from the District of Columbia or the Virgin Islands.

Source: CAWP, 1998a, 1998b, 1998c, 1998d.

Compiled by the Institute for Women's Policy Research.

Institutional Resources

Women's institutional resources can play an important role in providing information about women's issues and attracting the attention of policymakers and the public. They can also serve as an access point for women and women's groups to express their interests to public officials. Thus such institutions can ensure that women's issues remain on

**Table 4.
Institutional Resources for Women in Mississippi**

| | Yes | No |
|--|----------|----|
| Does Mississippi Have a . . . | | |
| • Commission on the Status of Women? ^a | | ✓ |
| • Women's State Agenda Project? ^b | | ✓ |
| • Legislative Caucus in the State Legislature? ^c House? Senate? | Informal | |

Source: ^a National Association of Women's Commissions, 1997; ^b Center for Policy Alternatives, 1995; ^c CAWP, 1998e.

Compiled by the Institute for Women's Policy Research.

the political agenda. Mississippi is one of two states which lacks both a government-appointed commission on the status of women and a women's state agenda project—a non-governmental, state-based coalition group addressing a broad range of issues concerning women. While Mississippi does have a variety of women's organizations and activity around women's issues, women's state agenda projects can help increase the visibility of women's activism and provide resources like networking and support. Although Mississippi does not have a formal women's caucus in either the Senate or the House of Representatives of the state legislature, women legislators do meet informally (see Table 4).

Employment and Earnings

Earnings are the largest component of income for most families. Thus, earnings and economic well-being are closely linked. The topics addressed in this section include women's earnings; the female/male earnings ratio; women's earnings by educational attainment; labor force participation; unemployment rates; and the industries and occupations in which women work.

Families must often rely on women's earnings to remain out of poverty (Cancian, Danziger, and Gottschalk, 1993; Spalter-Roth et al., 1990). Women's employment status and earnings have grown in importance for the overall well-being of women and their families as demographic and economic changes have occurred—men have experienced stagnant or negative real wage growth during the 1980s and the early portion of the 1990s, more married couple families now rely on both the husband's and wife's earnings to survive, more women head their own households, and more women are in the labor force.

Women in Mississippi rank slightly below the national median of all the states and second in the East South Central region in their ratio of women's to men's earnings, and they rank even more poorly on other important measures of employment and earnings. Nationwide, women in Mississippi rank 43rd in labor force

participation, 48th in the percentage of women working in managerial and professional occupations and 51st (the last place) in the level of women's median annual earnings (see Chart IV).

Women's Earnings

Women in Mississippi working full-time, year-round have significantly lower median annual earnings than women in the United States as a whole (\$19,500 and \$24,900, respectively; see Figure 1. See Appendix I for the methodology used by IWPR to develop the earnings data). Similarly, median annual earnings for men in Mississippi are also substantially lower than for the United States as a whole (\$27,800 and \$34,400, respectively). The median annual earnings for women in Mississippi rank last in the East South Central region and last in the nation. Low earnings levels in Mississippi may overstate differences between workers' living standards in Mississippi and other states because low earnings may be partially offset by lower costs of living (cost-of-living data are not available by state, however, so no adjustments were made to state earnings data). Similarly in other states, high earnings may be partially offset by a high cost of living. (Alaska's women rank the highest at \$31,400.)

Chart IV.
Employment and Earnings: National and Regional Ranks

| Indicators | National Rank* (of 51) | Regional Rank* (of 4) |
|--|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| Composite Employment and Earnings Index | 49 | 3 |
| • Women's Median Annual Earnings (for full-time, year-round workers aged 16 and older, 1995) ^a | 51 | 4 |
| • Ratio of Women's to Men's Earnings (median yearly earnings of full-time, year-round women and men workers aged 16 and older, 1995) ^a | 31 | 2 |
| • Women's Labor Force Participation (percent of all women aged 16 and older in the civilian non-institutional population who are either employed or looking for work, 1995) ^b | 43 | 3 |
| • Women in Managerial and Professional Occupations (percent of all employed women aged 16 and older in managerial or professional specialty occupations, 1995) ^b | 48 | 3 |


See Appendix I for methodology.

* The national rank is out of a possible 51 including the 50 states and the District of Columbia. The regional rankings are of a maximum of four and refer to the states in the East South Central Region (AL, KY, MS, TN). See Appendix V.

Source: ^a IWPR, 1998b; ^b U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1997a.

Calculated by the Institute for Women's Policy Research.

Figure 1.
Median Annual Earnings of Women and Men
Employed Full-Time/Year-Round in Mississippi
and the United States, 1995 (1997 Dollars)



For women and men aged 16 and older. See Appendix I for methodology.

Source: IWPR, 1998b.

Calculated by the Institute for Women's Policy Research.

Between 1989 and 1995, women in Mississippi saw their median annual earnings increase by 7.6 percent, a rate of growth that within the East South Central region was behind both Kentucky and Tennessee and ahead of Alabama, but was higher than the national growth rate of 2.5 percent (data not shown; all growth rates are calculated for earnings that have been adjusted to remove the effects of inflation).

Unfortunately, the data set on which these state-level women's earnings estimates are based does not provide enough cases to reliably estimate earnings separately for women of different races and ethnicities. National data show, however, that in 1996 the median annual earnings of African American women were \$21,470, and those of Hispanic women were \$18,670, substantially below that of non-Hispanic white women who earn \$24,890. Asian American women earned the highest of all groups at \$25,560 (median earnings of full-time, year-round women workers aged 15 years or over; U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1998c). Earnings for Native American women are not available between decennial Census years, but in 1989, their earnings for year-round, full-time work were only 84 percent of white women's earnings (U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1990). In addition, in a 1994-95 national survey by the Census Bureau, data show that the median monthly income of women with disabilities is \$1,400 compared with \$1,750 for women with no

disability (for female full-time workers 21 to 64 years of age; U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1995a).

The Wage Gap

The Wage Gap and Women's Relative Earnings

According to IWPR's calculations based on three years of pooled data, the ratio of the median earnings of women to those of men in the United States for full-time, year-round workers in 1995 was 72.3 percent. In other words, women were earning about 72 cents for every dollar earned by their male counterparts. At the same time, women in Mississippi were earning about 70.2 percent of what men in

Mississippi were earning. Therefore, compared with the earnings ratio for the nation as whole, Mississippi women experience less earnings equality with men (see Figure 2). As a result, Mississippi ranks 31st in the nation in terms of the ratio between women's to men's earnings for full-time, year-round work. The District of Columbia has the highest earnings ratio at 87.5 percent. Compared with the other states in the East South Central region, Mississippi ranks second. Tennessee ranks first (72.0 percent wage ratio) and Alabama ranks fourth (63.3 percent wage ratio). Unfortunately, the wage gap remains large in Mississippi and elsewhere in the nation.

Narrowing the Wage Gap

Throughout the 1960s and 1970s, the ratio of women's earnings to men's in the United States remained fairly constant at around 60 percent. During the 1980s, however, women made progress in narrowing the gap between men's earnings and their own. Women increased their educational attainment and their time in the labor market and entered better-paying occupations in large numbers, partly because of equal opportunity laws. At the same time, however, adverse economic trends such as declining wages in the low-wage sector of the labor market began to make it more difficult to close the gap, since women still tend to be concentrated at the low end of the earnings distribution. Had women not increased their relative skill levels and work experience as much as they did during the 1980s, those adverse trends might have led


to a widening of the gap rather than the significant narrowing that did occur (Blau and Kahn, 1994).

One factor that most likely also helped to narrow the earnings gap between women and men is unionization. Women have increased their share of union membership, and being unionized tends to raise women's wages relatively more than men's, the wages of women of color relatively more than the wages of non-Hispanic white women, and the wages of low earners relatively more than the wages of high earners (Spalter-Roth, et al., 1993a).

Unfortunately, part of the narrowing that did occur was due to a fall in men's real earnings. According to research done by the Institute for Women's Policy Research, only about one-third (36 percent) of the narrowing of the national female/male earnings gap between 1979 and 1997 is due to women's rising real earnings, while about two-thirds (64 percent) is due to men's falling real earnings. More disturbing is the slowdown in real earnings growth for women during the later portion of this period. From 1989 to 1997, almost all of the narrowing of the gap was due to the fall in men's real earnings (Institute for Women's Policy Research, 1998a).

Mississippi fell behind the United States as a whole in increasing women's annual earnings

Figure 2.
Ratio of Women's to Men's Full-Time/Year-Round Median Annual Earnings in States in the East South Central Region and the United States, 1995




For women and men aged 16 and older. See Appendix I for methodology.

Source: IWPR, 1998b.

Calculated by the Institute for Women's Policy Research.

Figure 3.
Change in the Wage Ratio Between 1979 and 1995 in Mississippi and the United States



For women and men aged 16 and older. See Appendix I for methodology.

Source: IWPR, 1995a, 1998b.

Calculated by the Institute for Women's Policy Research.

relative to men's between 1979 and 1995 (see Figure 3). In Mississippi, the annual earnings ratio increased by only 8.6 percentage points, compared with an increase of 12.8 percentage points in the United States.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) also releases weekly earnings information. Unlike annual earnings data, the weekly data do not include earnings from self-employed workers, approximately seven percent of the labor force. Thus, because they are more complete, the annual earnings statistics are used in IWPR's employment and earnings composite indicator. Still, weekly earnings data provide an interesting comparison. In 1997, women in Mississippi earned 73.9 percent of men's weekly earnings for full-time work. This ratio indicates that Mississippi ranks below the national median (32nd in the nation) in this ratio of female-male median weekly earnings, virtually the same as its ranking based on annual earnings (31st). According to the weekly data series (Council of Economic Advisors, 1998), the District of Columbia ranked first in the ratio of women's to men's weekly earnings at 97.1 percent.

Earnings and Earnings Ratios by Educational Levels

Between 1979 and 1995, women with higher levels of education in both Mississippi and the United States saw their annual median earnings increase more than women with less educational attainment. As Table 5 shows, Mississippi experienced increases that ranged from 7.3 percent (in constant dollars) for women with some college to 17.3 percent for those with a four-year college education, while women who had not completed high school experienced an earnings decrease of 8.0 percent. Women's relative earnings (as measured by the female/

male earnings ratio) increased for those groups with more education. Those with the lowest educational attainment (less than high school completion) experienced a decrease in the wage ratio of 5.9 percent, and those with only high school attainment experienced essentially no progress in narrowing the earnings gap.

The low and falling earnings of women with less education make it especially important that all women have the opportunity to increase their education. For example, many welfare recipients lack a high school diploma or further education, yet in many cases they are being encouraged or required to leave the welfare rolls in favor of employment. These single mothers may be consigned to a lifetime of low earnings if they are not allowed the opportunity to complete high school and acquire a few years of education beyond high school (Institute for Women's Policy Research, 1997). As Table 5 shows, women with some college and who have completed college or have postgraduate training have much higher earnings than those without, and their earnings have generally been growing.

Labor Force Participation

One of the most notable changes in the U.S. economy over the past decades has been the rapid rise in women's participation in the labor force. Between 1965 and 1995, women's labor force participation (the proportion of the civilian non-institutional population aged 16 and older who are employed or looking for work) increased from 39 to 59 percent (U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1997a). Women now make up nearly half (46 percent) the U.S. labor force (full-time and part-time

combined). According to projections by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, women's share of the labor force will continue to increase, growing from 46 to 48 percent between 1995 and 2005 (U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1995a).

In 1995, 55.8 percent of women in Mississippi were in the labor force, compared with 58.9 percent of women in the United States, giving Mississippi the rank of 43rd in the nation. Men's labor force participation rate in Mississippi was also lower

Table 5.
Women's Earnings and the Earnings Ratio in Mississippi
by Educational Attainment, 1979 and 1995 (1997 Dollars)


| Educational Attainment | Women's Median Annual Earnings, 1995^a | Percent Growth in Real Earnings, 1979^b and 1995^a | Female/Male Earnings Ratio, 1995^a | Percent Change in Earnings Ratio, 1979^b and 1995^a |
|-------------------------------|---|---|---|--|
| Less than 12th Grade | \$13,108 | -8.0 | 60.5% | -5.9 |
| High School Only | \$16,245 | -7.6 | 60.7% | -0.1 |
| Some College | \$20,577 | +7.3 | 65.1% | +8.6 |
| College | \$26,750 | +17.3 | 74.3% | +22.9 |
| College Plus | \$31,594 | +16.0 | 72.9% | +12.5 |

For women and men working full-time year-round.

Source: ^a IWPR, 1998b; ^b IWPR, 1995a.

Calculated by the Institute for Women's Policy Research.

Figure 4.
Percent of Women and Men in the Labor Force
in Mississippi and the United States, 1995



For women and men in the civilian non-institutional population, aged 16 and older.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1997a, Table 12.

Compiled by the Institute for Women's Policy Research.

per capita in Mississippi grew 7.5 percentage points faster than the nation.

Part-Time and Full-Time Work

The percentage of women in the labor force who are “involuntary” part-time employees—that is, they would prefer full-time work were it available—is the same as in the United States (3.0 percent and 3.0 percent, respectively; see Table 7).¹ In contrast, a smaller proportion of Mississippi’s female labor force is working part-time voluntarily (16.4 percent in Mississippi and 21.0 percent in the United States as a whole). Because Mississippi’s labor force is less likely to work part-time than are women nationally, the percentage of the female

workforce in Mississippi employed full-time is larger than the national average (73.5 percent versus 68.5 percent).

Unemployment and Personal Income Per Capita


In Mississippi, a larger percentage of workers is unemployed than in the nation as a whole. In 1995, the unemployment rate for women in Mississippi was 6.2 percent and 6.1 percent for men compared with the nation’s 5.6 percent unemployment rate for both women and men (see Figure 5).

While Mississippi experienced slightly higher than average unemployment rates in 1995, they experienced much higher than average rates during the 1980s. As a result, personal income per capita in Mississippi grew more slowly that it did for the nation between 1980 and 1990 (13.7 percent versus 16.9 percent; see Table 6). From 1990 to 1996, as the unemployment rate decreased (approaching the national average) income

Labor Force Participation of Women by Race/Ethnicity

In 1995, women in Mississippi had a lower average labor force participation rate than women in the United States. According to U.S. Census Bureau data for 1995,

Figure 5.
Unemployment Rates for Women and Men
in Mississippi and the United States, 1995



For women and men in the civilian non-institutional population, aged 16 and older.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1997a.

Compiled by the Institute for Women's Policy Research.

Table 6.
Personal Income Per Capita for Both Men and Women
in Mississippi and the United States, 1996

| | Mississippi | United States |
|--|-------------|---------------|
| Personal Income Per Capita, 1996 | \$17,872 | \$24,787 |
| Personal Income Per Capita, Percent Change* | | |
| Between 1990 and 1996 | +12.7 | +5.2 |
| Between 1980 and 1990 | +13.7 | +16.9 |
| Between 1980 and 1996 | +24.6 | +21.2 |

* In constant dollars.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1997e, Table 706.

Calculated by the Institute for Women's Policy Research.

Labor Force Participation of Women by Age

Workforce participation varies across the life cycle, with the highest participation occurring between the ages of 25 and 44, which are also generally considered the prime earning years. Table 9 shows the relationship between labor force participation and age for women in Mississippi and in the United States as a whole. Women in Mississippi generally have lower labor force

55.8 percent of women in Mississippi aged 16 and older were in the labor force regardless of race. White women's labor force participation rate was lower in Mississippi than in the United States as a whole (56.3 percent compared with 59.0 percent, see Table 8). African American women historically have had a higher labor force participation rate than white and Hispanic women and did so in 1995 in the United States (see Table 8). In Mississippi, however, African American women had an average labor force participation rate that was 1.3 percentage points lower than white women. Hispanic women traditionally have the lowest average participation rates among women. Data for Hispanic women in Mississippi were not available, but in the United States, only 52.6 percent of Hispanic women were in the workforce in 1995. The national labor force participation rate for Native American women was 55.4 percent in 1990. Data for Asian American women were also not available for 1995; however, in 1990, Asian American women had the highest participation rate (60.2 percent) of women in the United States (Population Reference Bureau, 1993).

participation than their U.S. counterparts. Nationally, the highest labor force participation of women occurs between the ages of 35 and 44, with just over 77 percent of these women working. In Mississippi, on the other hand, the highest level of labor force participation occurs between the ages of 25 and 34, with 75.5 percent in the workforce (compared with 74.9 percent in the United States as a whole). Young women in

Table 7.
Full-Time, Part-Time and Unemployment Rates for Women
and Men in Mississippi and the United States, 1995

| | Mississippi | | United States | |
|--|--------------------|------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| | Female Labor Force | Male Labor Force | Female Labor Force | Male Labor Force |
| Total Number in the Labor Force | 599,000 | 660,000 | 60,944,000 | 71,360,000 |
| Percent Employed Full-Time | 73.5 | 84.4 | 68.5 | 84.0 |
| Percent Employed Part-Time* | 20.4 | 9.4 | 25.9 | 10.4 |
| Percent Voluntary Part-Time | 16.4 | 7.6 | 21.0 | 7.9 |
| Percent Involuntary Part-Time | 3.0 | 1.7 | 3.0 | 2.0 |
| Percent Unemployed | 6.2 | 6.1 | 5.6 | 5.6 |

For men and women aged 16 and older.

* Percent part-time includes workers normally employed part-time who were temporarily absent from work the week of the survey. Those who were absent that week are not included in the numbers for voluntary and involuntary part-time. Thus, these two categories do not add to the total percent working part-time.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1997, Tables 12 and 13.

Calculated by the Institute for Women's Policy Research.

Table 8.
Labor Force Participation of Women in Mississippi and the United States by Race/Ethnicity, 1995

| Race/Ethnicity | Mississippi | | United States | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|
| | Number of Women in Labor Force | Percent in Labor Force | Number of Women in Labor Force | Percent in Labor Force |
| All Races | 599,000 | 55.8 | 60,944,000 | 58.9 |
| White* | 382,000 | 56.3 | 50,804,000 | 59.0 |
| African American* | 212,000 | 55.0 | 7,634,000 | 59.5 |
| Hispanic† | N/A | N/A | 4,891,000 | 52.6 |
| Asian American/ Other*†† | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

For women aged 16 and older.

* Non-Hispanic.

† Hispanics may be of any race.

†† Data are unavailable for 1995; however, in 1990, Asian American women had the highest participation rate (60.2 percent) of women in the United States (Population Reference Bureau, 1993).

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1997, Table 12.

Compiled by the Institute for Women's Policy Research.

Labor Force Participation of Women with Children

Mothers represent the fastest growing group in the U.S. labor market (Brown, 1994). In 1995, 55 percent of women with children under age one were in the labor force, compared with 31 percent in 1976 (U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1997f).

In general, the workforce participation rate for women with children in the United States tends to be higher than the rate for all women. This is partially explained by the fact that the overall labor force participation rate is for all women aged 16 and older; thus both teenagers and retirement age women are

their teens (16-19) are much less likely to participate in the labor market than any other age group except the pre-retirement and retired cohorts. In Mississippi, only 39.4 percent of teenage women reported being in the labor force, considerably lower than the reported 52.2 percent for female teens in United States as a whole.

included in the statistics even though they have much lower labor force participation. Mothers, in contrast, tend to be in age groups with higher labor force participation. This is also true in Mississippi, with 62.0 percent of women with children under age 18 in the workforce

As women near retirement age, they are much less likely to work than younger women. In the United States, women aged 55 to 64 have labor participation rates of only 48.2 percent. Unfortunately, data for women aged 55 to 64 in Mississippi are not available. In addition, data from women aged 65 and older are not available for Mississippi, but for the United States as a whole, fewer than nine percent are working or looking for work in that age group.

Table 9.
Labor Force Participation of Women in Mississippi and the United States by Age, 1995

| Age Groups | Mississippi | | United States | |
|------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|
| | Number of Women in Labor Force | Percent in Labor Force | Number of Women in Labor Force | Percent in Labor Force |
| All Ages | 599,000 | 55.8 | 60,944,000 | 58.9 |
| Ages 16-19 | 38,000 | 39.4 | 3,729,000 | 52.2 |
| Ages 20-24 | 77,000 | 71.7 | 6,349,000 | 70.3 |
| Ages 25-34 | 156,000 | 75.5 | 15,528,000 | 74.9 |
| Ages 35-44 | 160,000 | 75.0 | 16,562,000 | 77.2 |
| Ages 45-54 | 108,000 | 69.3 | 11,801,000 | 74.4 |
| Ages 55-64 | N/A | N/A | 5,356,000 | 48.2 |
| Over 65 | N/A | N/A | 1,618,000 | 8.8 |

For women aged 16 and older.

Source: IWPR, 1998b

Calculated by the Institute for Women's Policy Research.

compared with 55.8 percent of all women in Mississippi. Nevertheless, women with children are less likely to engage in labor market activity in Mississippi than are mothers in the United States as a whole (see Table 10).

The high and growing rates of labor force participation of women with children suggest that the demand for child care is also growing. Many women report a variety of problems finding suitable child care (affordable, good quality and conveniently located), and women use a wide variety of types of child care. These include doing shift work to allow both parents to provide the care; having the child accompany the parent to work or working at home; using another family member (usually a sibling or grandparent) to provide care; using a babysitter in one's own home or in the babysitter's home; using a group child care center; or leaving the child unattended (U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1996e). As full-time work among women has grown, so has the use of formal child care centers. Child care costs are a significant barrier to employment for many women and child care expenditures use up a large percentage of earnings, especially for lower-income mothers. For example, among single mothers with family incomes within 200 percent of the poverty level, the costs for those who paid for child care amounted to 19 percent of the mother's earnings on average; among married mothers at the same income level, child care costs amounted to 30 percent of the mother's earnings on average (Institute for Women's Policy Research, 1996). Thus as more and more low-income women are encouraged or required (through welfare reform) to enter the labor market, the growing need for affordable child care must be addressed. Child care subsidies for low income mothers are essential to enable them to purchase good quality child care without sacrificing their families' economic well-being.

Occupation and Industry

The distribution of women in Mississippi across occupations diverges somewhat from the distribution found in the United States as a whole. In the United States, technical, sales and administrative support occupations provide 41.4 percent of all jobs held by women (see Figure 6a). In contrast, women in Mississippi are less likely to be in technical, sales and administrative support

Table 10.
Labor Force Participation of Women with Children
in Mississippi and the United States, 1995

| | Mississippi Percent in Labor Force | United States Percent in Labor Force |
|----------------------------|--|--|
| Women with Children | | |
| Under Age 18* | 62.0 | 67.3 |
| Under Age 6* | 59.6 | 61.5 |

For women aged 16 and older.

* Children under age 6 are also included in children under 18.

Source: IWPR, 1998b.


Calculated by the Institute for Women's Policy Research.

occupations than women in the United States as a whole (38.0 percent and 41.4 percent, respectively). When compared to the United States, women in Mississippi are more likely to work in service occupations (19.1 percent versus 17.5 percent) and substantially more likely to work as operators, fabricators and laborers (14.2 percent versus 7.6 percent, respectively). Women in Mississippi are, however, considerably less likely to work in managerial and professional specialty occupations than are women in the United States (25.1 percent versus 30.3 percent). As a result, Mississippi ranks 48th of the 50 states and the District of Columbia for the proportion of its female labor force employed in professional and managerial occupations and third of the four states in the East South Central region.

Women in Mississippi tend to work more in the lower-wage occupations, but even when working in the higher paid occupations, such as managers, women earn substantially less than men. For example, in 1995, for the United States as a whole, Bureau of Labor Statistics data show that weekly earnings for women managers were only 68.4 percent of the earnings of men working as managers, well below the average female/male earnings ratio for all occupations. An IWPR (1995b) study also shows that women managers are unlikely to be among the top earners. Only one percent of women managers had earnings that placed them in the top ten percent of all managers by earnings (had women had equal access to top earning jobs, 10 percent of them would have earned in the top ten percent); only six percent had earnings that placed them in the top fifth. A Catalyst (1996) study shows that only 1.9 percent (just 47) of the 2,500 highest earning high-level executives in the Fortune 500 companies were women.

The distribution of women in Mississippi across industries is similar in many ways to that of the United States as a whole (see Figure 6b). In Mississippi 29.7


Figure 6a.
Distribution of Women Across Occupations
in Mississippi and the United States, 1995



For employed women aged 16 and older.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1997a, Table 15.

Figure 6b.
Distribution of Women Across Industries
in Mississippi and the United States



For employed women aged 16 and older.

* Percentages do not add up to 100 percent because 'self-employed' and 'unpaid family workers' are excluded.

(a) Durables and non-durables are included in manufacturing.

(b) Private household workers are included in services.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1997a, Table 17; 1995b, Table 17.

percent of all women are employed in the service industries (including business, professional and personnel services), close to the United States average of 31.3 percent. About 20 percent of employed women in the United States work in the wholesale and retail trade industries, and a similar proportion—19.0 percent—of women in Mississippi work in these industries. Almost 18 percent of the nation's women work in government, while slightly more than 20 percent of the women in Mississippi work in government. Mississippi women are much more likely to work in the manufacturing (durables or nondurables) industries and considerably less likely to work in the finance, insurance, and real estate industry

than are women in the United States as a whole, echoing the pattern shown in the occupational distribution above—a disproportionately blue-collar economic base with correspondingly less white-collar work.

¹ *Workers are considered involuntary part-time workers if they responded when interviewed that their reason for working part-time (fewer than 35 hours per week) was slack work (usually reduced hours at one's normally full-time job), unfavorable business conditions, reduced seasonal demand or inability to find full-time work. Reasons for part-time work such as lack of child care are not considered involuntary by the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics (1997b) since workers must indicate they are available for full-time work to be considered involuntarily employed part-time. This definition therefore likely understates the extent to which women would prefer to work full-time.*

Economic Autonomy

This section highlights the issues that allow women to act independently, exercise choice and control their lives. It excludes labor force participation and earnings since these are measured in the previous section and clearly merit separate analysis.

Health insurance coverage, educational attainment, women's business ownership and women living above poverty were selected to measure economic autonomy. Access to health insurance plays a role in determining the overall quality of health care for women in a state and governs the extent of choice women have in selecting health care services. Educational attainment relates to economic autonomy in many ways: through labor force participation, hours of work, earnings, child-bearing decisions and career advancement. Women who own their own businesses control many aspects of their working lives. Women in poverty unfortunately have limited choices: if they receive public income support, they must answer to their caseworkers; they do not have the economic means to travel freely; and they often do not have the skills and tools necessary to improve their economic situation.

With its composite index of 51st among the states, Mississippi ranks at the bottom or near the bottom of all states in all of the individual indicators of economic autonomy. This is especially true of women's business ownership and of women's poverty levels (see Chart V). Although Mississippi ranks slightly higher in women's

health insurance coverage and educational attainment (the state ranks 47th for both indicators), these higher rankings do not raise the composite economic autonomy index.

Access to Health Insurance

Women in Mississippi are much less likely than women in the nation as a whole to have health insurance. In Mississippi, 18.4 percent of women, compared with only 13.8 percent in the United States, are not insured (see Table 11). On average, women and men in Mississippi have less access to employer-based health insurance than do women and men in the United States as a whole (56.2 percent and 66.0 percent, respectively, for women; 57.6 percent and 66.2 percent, respectively, for men). Thus, among all the states, Mississippi ranks 47th in the proportion of women insured and last in the East South Central region.

Education

In the United States, women have made steady progress in achieving higher levels of education. Between 1980 and 1997, the percentage of women in the United States with a high school education or more increased by about one-fifth, with comparable percentages of women and men having completed high school in 1997 (82.2 percent of women and 82.0 percent of men). During the same period, the percentage of women with four or more

**Chart V.
Economic Autonomy: National and Regional Ranks**

| Indicators | National Rank* (of 51) | Regional Rank* (of 4) |
|---|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| Composite Economic Autonomy Index | 51 | 4 |
| • Percent with Health Insurance (among nonelderly women, 1994–1995) ^a | 47 | 4 |
| • Educational Attainment (percent of women aged 25 and older with four or more years of college, 1990) ^b | 47 | 3 |
| • Women's Business Ownership (percent of all firms owned by women, 1992) ^c | 51 | 4 |
| • Percent of Women Above Poverty (percent of women living above the poverty threshold, 1995) ^d | 50 | 4 |

See Appendix I for methodology.

* The national rank is of a possible 51 including the 50 states and the District of Columbia. The regional rankings are of a maximum of four and refer to the states in the East South Central Region (AL, KY, MS, TN). See Appendix V.

Source: ^a Liska et al., 1998; ^b Population Reference Bureau, 1993; ^c U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1996a; ^d IWPR, 1998b.

Calculated by the Institute for Women's Policy Research

Table 11.
Percent of Women and Men without Health Insurance
and with Different Sources of Health Insurance
in Mississippi and the United States, 1994-95

| | Mississippi | | United States | |
|--|-------------|-----------|---------------|-------------|
| | Women | Men | Women | Men |
| Number | 1,193,000 | 1,088,000 | 114,857,000 | 113,867,000 |
| Percent Uninsured | 18.4 | 21.8 | 13.8 | 17.2 |
| Percent with Employer-Based Health Insurance | 56.2 | 57.6 | 66.0 | 66.2 |
| Percent with Other Coverage | 25.5 | 20.4 | 20.2 | 16.6 |

Women and men below age 65 (including those under 18).

Source: Liska et al., 1998.

Compiled by the Institute for Women's Policy Research.


educational attainment than residents of other areas of the country. This is especially true for Mississippi, which ranked 47th in the proportion of the female population aged 25 years and older who attained four or more years of college. In 1990, only 35.2 percent of women in Mississippi had more than a high school education, compared with 42.6 percent of women in the United States as a whole (see Figure 7). The proportion of women older than 25 in Mississippi without high school diplomas was substantially larger than that

years of college increased by three-fifths, from 13.6 percent in 1980 to 21.7 percent in 1997 (compared with 26.2 percent of men in 1997), bringing women closer to closing the education gap (U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1998a and 1998d).

Regional differences in education are conspicuous, with residents of the South achieving lower levels of

of women in the United States as a whole (35.7 percent and 25.2 percent, respectively). At 21.9 percent, the proportion of women with one to three years of college in Mississippi was about three percentage points lower than the national average, while the percentage of women with four or more years of college, at 13.3 percent, is more than four percentage points lower than the national average.

Figure 7.
Educational Attainment of Women Aged 25 and Older
in Mississippi and the United States, 1990



Source: Population Reference Bureau, 1993.

Compiled by the Institute for Women's Policy Research.

Women Business Owners and Self-Employment

Between 1987 and 1992, the number of women-owned businesses grew 41.1 percent in Mississippi, somewhat lower than the 43.1 percent growth of women-owned businesses in the United States as a whole (for purposes of comparability over time, these data exclude type C Corporations; for a definition of type C corporations, see Appendix I). By 1992, women owned 40,879 firms in Mississippi (see Table 12). In Mississippi, 48.0 percent of women-owned firms were in the service industries, and the next highest proportion (24.3 percent) was in retail trade (see Figure 8). Business receipts of women-owned businesses in Mississippi rose by 35.6 percent (in constant dollars) between 1987 and 1992. This growth is substantially lower than the increase of 87.0 percent in business receipts for women-owned firms (but slightly higher than the 34.9 percent increase for all firms, data not shown) in the United

States during the same time period, also adjusted for inflation.

In 1992, the U.S. Bureau of the Census reported that women owned more than 6.4 million firms nationwide, employing over 13 million persons and generating \$1.6 trillion in business revenues (unlike the figures in Table 12, these numbers include all women-owned businesses, including type C corporations; U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1996a). Projecting

Table 12.
Women-Owned Firms in Mississippi and the United States, 1992


| | Mississippi | United States |
|---|-------------|---------------|
| Number of Women-Owned Firms* | 40,879 | 5,888,883 |
| Percent of All Firms that Are Women-Owned | 30.2% | 34.1% |
| Percent Increase, 1987–1992 | 41.1% | 43.1% |
| Total Sales & Receipts (in billions, 1992 dollars) | \$3.5 | \$642.5 |
| Percent Increase (in constant dollars), 1987–1992 | 35.6% | 87.0% |
| Number Employed by Women-Owned Firms | 40,226 | 6,252,029 |

* For reasons of comparability between 1987 and 1992, these statistics do not include data on type C corporations; see Appendix I.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1996a.

Compiled by the Institute for Women's Policy Research.

Figure 8.
Distribution of Women-Owned Firms Across Industries in Mississippi and the United States, 1992



Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1996a.

Compiled by the Institute for Women's Policy Research.

women's business growth rates from 1987 to 1992 forward and including type C corporations, the National Foundation for Women Business Owners (NFWBO) estimates the 1996 number of firms for Mississippi to be 55,000 of the 8 million women-owned firms estimated for the United States as a whole (NFWBO, 1996).

Like women's business ownership, self-employment for women (one kind of business ownership) has also been rising over recent decades. In 1975, women represented one in every four self-employed workers in the United States, and in 1990 they were one in three. The decision to become self-employed is influenced by many factors. An IWPR study shows that self-employed women tend to be older and married, have no young children and have higher levels of education than the average. They are also more likely to be covered by another person's health insurance (Spalter-Roth, et al., 1993b). Self-employed women are more likely to work part-time, with 42 percent of married self-employed women and 34 percent of non-married self-employed women working part-time (Devine, 1994).


Unfortunately, most self-employment is not especially well-paying for women, and about half of self-employed women combine this work with another job, either a wage and salary job or a second type of self-employment (for example, babysitting and catering). In 1986-87 in the United States as a whole, women who worked full-time, year-round at only one type of self employment had the lowest median hourly earnings of all full-time, year-round workers (\$3.75); those with two or more types of self-employment with full-time schedules earned somewhat more (\$4.41 per hour). In contrast, those who held only one full-time, year-round wage or salaried job earned the most (\$8.08 per hour at the median). Those who combined wage and salaried work with self-employment had median earnings that ranged between these extremes. Many low-income women package earnings from many sources in an effort to raise their family incomes (Spalter-Roth and Hartmann, 1993). Some self-employed workers are independent contractors; independent contracting is often viewed as a form of contingent work—temporary or on-call work that does not provide job security, fringe benefits or opportunity for

advancement. Even when they work primarily for one client, independent contractors may be denied the fringe benefits (such as health insurance and employer-paid pension contributions) that wage and salaried workers employed by that same client firm receive. Indeed, the average self-employed woman who works full-time, year-round at just one type of self-employment has health insurance an average of only 1.7 months out of 12, while full-time wage and salaried women average 9.6 months (those who lack health insurance entirely are assigned a value of 0 and are included in the averages; Spalter-Roth et al., 1993b).

Fortunately, recent research finds that the rising earnings potential of women in self-employment compared to wage and salary work explains most of the upward trend in the self-employment of married women between 1970 and 1990. This suggests that the growing movement of women into self-employment represents an expansion in their opportunities (Lombard, 1996). Women in Mississippi are less likely to be self-employed than women in the United States. In 1994, 5.2 percent of employed women in Mississippi were self-employed, compared with 6.1 percent of women nationwide (U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1995b).

Women's Economic Security and Poverty

As women's responsibility for their families' economic well-being grows, the continuing wage gap and women's prevalence in low-paid, female-dominated



occupations impedes women's ability to ensure their families' financial security, particularly for single mothers. In the United States, the median family income for single-mother families was \$16,600 in 1995, while that for married couples with children was \$51,700 (see Figure 9). Figure 9 also shows that family incomes were lower on average than for all family types in Mississippi than in the United States as a whole, including single-mother families.


In 1995, the proportion of women in poverty in Mississippi was substantially larger than that of women in the United States—21.4 percent and 13.7 percent, respectively (see Figure 10). Thus Mississippi ranks 50th in the nation for women above poverty and last of the four states in its region. Figure 10 also shows the proportion of adult women receiving AFDC (the form of welfare in place in 1996) for Mississippi and the nation as a measure of how effective the state and national safety nets for poor women are. Obviously, the poverty of many women is not alleviated by welfare alone; many also receive food stamps or other forms of non-cash benefits, but research shows that even adding the value of these non-cash benefits, many women remain poor (U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1997d).

The proportion of women receiving AFDC in Mississippi is less than the proportion of women receiving AFDC in the United States (see Figure 10). Along with Mississippi's higher overall rate of female poverty, the poverty rate for single mothers is considerably higher than the nationwide rate (54.3 percent and 41.5 percent, respectively) and much higher than for any other family type (see Figure 11). It is likely that even these high rates of poverty among single mother families understate the degree of hardship among these families, especially among working mother families. While counting noncash benefits would reduce their poverty rates, adding the cost of child care for working mothers (which was not included in family expenditures when the federal poverty thresholds were developed) would increase the calculated poverty rates both in Mississippi and the nation (Renwick and Bergmann, 1993). Renwick and

Bergmann found that single parents who do not work have basic cash needs at about 64 percent of the poverty line, while those who work have basic cash needs ranging from 113 to 186 percent of the poverty line depending on the number and ages of their children. The net effect of the under- and over-estimation of poverty for the different types of single parent families as measured by the official poverty lines for the nation was a significant underestimation. Renwick and Bergmann estimated a national poverty rate of 47 percent compared to an official estimate of 39 percent in 1989. (Renwick and Bergmann, 1993). Low-income, married-couple families with working mothers would also be measured as experiencing higher poverty rates if childcare costs were included (Renwick, 1993).

Mississippi does a worse than average job of providing a safety net for working women. The unemployment rate for women in Mississippi (6.2 percent) is slightly more than the national average of 5.6 percent (see Figure 5). However, the percentage of unemployed women in Mississippi receiving unemployment insurance benefits is lower than in the United States as a whole (see Figure 12). And the same is true for unemployed men in Mississippi—the percentage of unemployed men is higher and the rate of unemployment insurance benefit receipt for men is lower in Mississippi than nationwide. However, Mississippi is the only state in the East South Central region whose rate of unemployment insurance benefit receipt for women is approximately the same as the rate of unemployment insurance benefit receipt for men.


Figure 10.
Percent of Women in Poverty and Percent Receiving AFDC
Aged 18 and Older in Mississippi and the United States



Source: ^a IWPR 1998b; ^b U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1997, U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1997b.

Calculated by the Institute for Women's Policy Research.


Figure 11.
Poverty Rates for Selected Family Types and Single Men and Women in Mississippi and the United States, 1995



Source: IWPR, 1998b.

Calculated by the Institute for Women's Policy Research.

Figure 12.
Percent of Unemployed Women and Men with Unemployment Insurance in the East South Central Region and the United States, 1996



Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Unemployment Insurance Service, 1997.

Compiled by the Institute for Women's Policy Research.

Reproductive Rights

This section includes information on legislation relating to access to legal abortion, public funding for abortion, public funding for the treatment of infertility, the position of the governor and state legislature on reproductive choice, bills that would require health insurers to cover contraception and the right of gay and lesbian couples to adopt children, among other factors related to reproductive rights.

While issues pertaining to reproductive rights and health can be controversial, national and international human rights documents identify them as integral to women's physical and mental well-being. The Platform for Action from the United Nations Fourth World Conference on Women, which was adopted by consensus by 189 countries including the United States, stresses that reproductive health includes the ability to have a safe, satisfying sex life, to reproduce and to decide if, when, and how often to do so (U.N. Fourth World Conference on Women, 1995). The document also stresses that adolescent girls in particular need information and access to relevant services.

In the United States, reproductive rights as defined for federal law in the 1973 Supreme Court case *Roe v. Wade* include the legal right to abortion and also the ability to exercise that right. Legal issues relating to access to abortion include parental notification and mandatory waiting periods as well as the availability of providers in each county in the state. The stances of the governor and state legislative bodies are also important, considering the fact that serious efforts to overturn federal law are ongoing. Economic issues relating to abortion include public funding for women who qualify. Moreover, abortion is not the only reproductive issue. Bills requiring health insurers to cover contraception, the right of gay and lesbian couples to adopt children and public funding for infertility treatments all affect women's reproductive lives.

The reproductive rights composite index shows that Mississippi, which ranks last in its region and in the

bottom three states in the nation, clearly lacks adequate policies promoting the reproductive rights of women when compared to other states (see Chart VI, Panels A and B).

Mandatory consent laws require that minors notify one or both parents of the decision to have an abortion or gain the consent of one or both parents before a physician can perform the procedure. Of the 39 states with such laws on the books as of January 1998, 31 enforce their laws. Of these 31 states, 27 allow for a judicial bypass of notification if the minor appears before a judge and provides a reason that parental notification would place an undue burden on the decision to have an abortion. Four states provide for physician bypass of notification, and three states allow for both judicial and physician bypass. Of the 31 states that enforce consent laws, only Idaho and Utah have no bypass procedure. As of January 1998, Mississippi still enforces its mandatory consent law but allows for a judicial bypass (NARAL and NARAL Foundation, 1998).

Waiting-period legislation mandates that a physician cannot perform an abortion until a certain number of hours after the woman has been notified of her options in dealing with a pregnancy. The waiting periods range from one to 72 hours. Of the 19 states with mandatory waiting periods, as of January 1998, Mississippi is one of 12 states (with waiting periods ranging from one to 24 hours) that enforce their laws (NARAL and NARAL Foundation, 1998).

In some states, public funding for abortions is available only under specific circumstances, such as rape or incest, life endangerment to the woman or limited health circumstances of the fetus. Fifteen states fund abortions in all or most circumstances. Mississippi does not provide public funding for abortions under any circumstances other than those required by the federal Medicaid law, which are when the pregnancy results from reported rape or incest or when the pregnancy threatens the life of the woman (NARAL and NARAL Foundation, 1998).

| Chart VI. Panel A Reproductive Rights: National and Regional Ranks | | |
|---|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| | National Rank* (of 51) | Regional Rank* (of 4) |
| Composite Reproductive Rights Index | 49 | 4 |
| <i>See Appendix I for methodology.</i> | | |
| * The national rank is of a possible 51 including the 50 states and the District of Columbia. The regional rankings are of a maximum of four and refer to the states in the East South Central Region (AL, KY, MS, TN). See Appendix V. | | |
| Calculated by the Institute for Women's Policy Research. | | |

Chart VI. Panel B Components of the Reproductive Rights Composite Index

| | Yes | No |
|--|-------------------|----|
| • Does Mississippi allow access to abortion services without mandatory parental consent laws for minors? ^a | | ✓ |
| • Does Mississippi allow access to abortion services without a waiting period? ^a | | ✓ |
| • Does Mississippi provide public funding for abortions under any circumstances if a woman is eligible? ^a | | ✓ |
| • What percent of counties in Mississippi have abortion providers? ^b | 5.0% | |
| • Is Mississippi's state government pro-choice? ^a | | |
| Governor | | ✓ |
| Senate | | ✓ |
| Assembly | | ✓ |
| • Does public funding cover infertility treatments? ^c | | ✓ |
| • Does Mississippi require health insurers to provide coverage for contraceptives? ^d | | ✓ |
| • Does Mississippi allow the non-biological parent in a gay/lesbian couple to adopt his/her partner's biological child? ^e | No Legislation | |

Source: ^a NARAL Foundation, 1997, 1998; ^b Henshaw and Van Vort, 1994; ^c King and Meyer, 1996; ^d Planned Parenthood, 1998; ^e National Center for Lesbian Rights, 1998.

Compiled by the Institute for Women's Policy Research.

The percentage of counties with abortion providers includes all counties that had at least one abortion provider in 1992. This proportion ranges from two to 100 percent across the states. At five percent, Mississippi's proportion of counties falls near the bottom of the nation (Henshaw and Van Vort, 1994).

About 49 percent of traditional health plans do not cover any reversible method of contraception such as the pill or IUD. Others will pay for one or two types but not all five types of prescription methods—the pill, implants and injectables, IUD and diaphragms. About 38 percent of HMOs cover all five prescription methods (Gold and Daley, 1994). The controversy is leading lawmakers in 19 states to introduce bills that would require health insurers to cover contraception; Mississippi is not one of these states (Planned Parenthood, 1998). Maryland recently became the first state to pass a bill requiring contraception coverage. Six states, not including Mississippi, have provisions that require each insurance company to offer at least one insurance package that covers some or all birth control prescription methods. The U.S. Congress also had a similar bill pending as of July 1998.

The National Abortion and Reproductive Rights Action League (NARAL) polled governors and members of state legislatures to determine whether they would support a criminal ban on abortion or restrictions making it more difficult for women to obtain abortions. These restrictions included (but were not limited to) provisions concerning parental consent, mandatory waiting periods,

prohibitions on Medicaid funding for abortion and bans on certain abortion procedures. NARAL also gathered official comments from governors' offices to determine their positions on abortion (NARAL and NARAL Foundation, 1997). For this study, governors and legislators who supported restrictions on abortion rights are considered anti-choice, and those who would oppose them are considered pro-choice. In Mississippi, neither the Governor nor the majority of members of the State Senate and State House of Representatives were pro-choice.

While increasing numbers of private health insurance plans cover infertility treatments, few states in the United States allow for infertility treatments under publicly funded health plans such as Medicaid. Mississippi does not provide publicly funded infertility treatments for the poor (King and Meyer, 1996).

Second-parent adoption allows the non-biological parent in a gay or lesbian couple to adopt the biological child of his or her partner. In many states, courts or legislatures have supported or limited the right to second-parent adoption. As of April 1998, lower courts have approved second-parent adoption petitions in 19 states, intermediate appellate courts have done so in three states and the District of Columbia, and state supreme courts have explicitly permitted lesbians and gay men to adopt the children of their partners in three states. Legislation prohibits or substantially restricts such adoption in four states. Mississippi has no ruling or legislation regarding second-parent adoption (National Center for Lesbian Rights, 1998).

Health and Vital Statistics

This section focuses on the quality of health of the population in Mississippi. Topics include fertility and infant health, the consumption of preventive health services, environmental and cancer risks and Health Maintenance Organization (HMO) enrollment. Health is an important aspect of the economic status of women and a critical indicator of women's overall well-being. Illness can be costly and painful and can interrupt daily tasks people take for granted. The healthier the inhabitants of an area are, the better is their quality of life, and the more productive those inhabitants are likely to be.

As stated in the 1994 Policy Report of the Commonwealth Fund Commission on Women's Health, women and men face different health problems even outside reproductive differences. Women tend to see physicians more routinely, and they use preventive services at twice the rate men do. Women also suffer more from chronic illness and disabilities, are more likely to suffer from depression and are prescribed more drugs by their physicians, but they do live longer than men (Commonwealth Fund, 1994). Women experience depression at about twice the rate that men do. Average life expectancy in the United States in 1996 was 79 years for women and 73 years for men. The median age for women at the time of their first marriage (1996) was 24.8 years and the median age at first birth (1994) was 23.8 years (U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1998b; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 1997b).

As women, particularly mothers, have entered the labor force in record numbers, their health care needs have changed. Many studies have focused on the link between women's work and their health, and many have found a positive relationship between women's employment and better health. This research suggests the link may result both because work provides health benefits to women and because healthier women "self-select" to work (Hartmann, et al., 1996). For some women, such as those with difficult health problems or with disabilities, work presents more difficult challenges. As women's employment rates continue to rise, studies have increasingly looked at the extent and type of access women have to health insurance coverage. The Institute for Women's Policy Research has found that about 12 million women of working age lack health insurance of any kind (Yoon et al., 1994). Women in Mississippi are less likely to have insurance than women nationally and less likely than women nationally to have access through their employment (see Table 11).

Current trends in the United States reveal a decline in the birth rate for all women. However, fertility and infant

mortality rates in Mississippi are higher than the nation as a whole. Table 13 shows 66.5 live births per 1,000 women in Mississippi and 65.6 births per 1,000 women in the United States. It also shows 10.5 infant deaths per 1,000 births in Mississippi and 7.6 infant deaths per 1,000 in the United States. The percentage of white infants with low birth weights is also higher in Mississippi and the United States (7.0 in Mississippi and 6.2 in the United States). In general in the United States, African American infants have much higher percentages of low birth weights than white infants and this is also the case in Mississippi. The variances in infant mortality and low birth weight rates between racial and ethnic groups is likely due to socioeconomic differences between white and African American families, which can lead to less access to resources like adequate prenatal care. The low birth weight rates for African American infants in Mississippi and the United States as a whole are virtually identical (13.0 percent versus 13.1 percent). Births to teenage mothers accounted for a substantially larger proportion of all births in Mississippi (22.2 percent) than they did nationally (13.2 percent). Births to unmarried mothers also accounted for a larger proportion of all births in Mississippi than they did nationally (45.3 percent in Mississippi compared to 32.2 percent for the nation as a whole).

Mississippi does well on some preventive health care measures. Eighty percent of all young children in Mississippi have been vaccinated, higher than the national percentage of 75.0 percent. In addition, a higher percentage of women 45 to 54 years old have had blood pressure screenings in Mississippi (97.8 percent) than the rest of the United States (95.5 percent). However, of women over age 40, 72.6 percent have had a mammogram, lower than the median rate for all women in the United States. Likewise, of adult women, Mississippi women have lower rates of pap tests, cholesterol screenings and proctoscopies than the median rates for women in the nation. Mississippi does not have a mastectomy stay law.

Measures of environmental and cancer risks are important when assessing the overall health of women in the states. In Mississippi, the percentage of women 45 to 54 years old who smoke is less than the national average (17.1 percent and 21.6 percent, respectively). Likewise, the average annual mortality rates due to breast and ovarian cancer in Mississippi are lower than the average annual mortality rates for these same causes in the United States as a whole. However, the average annual mortality rate due to cervical and uterine cancer in Mississippi (3.7

Table 13.
Health and Vital Statistics for Mississippi and the United States, 1996

| | Mississippi | United States |
|--|-------------|---------------|
| Fertility and Infant Health | | |
| • Fertility Rate in 1995 (live births per 1,000 women aged 15-44) ^a | 66.5 | 65.6 |
| • Infant Mortality Rate in 1995 (deaths of infants under age one per 1,000 live births) ^b | 10.5 | 7.6 |
| • Percent of Counties with at Least One Abortion Provider, 1992 ^c | 5.0% | 16.0% |
| • Percent of Low Birth Weight Babies (less than 5 lbs., 8 oz.), 1995 ^d | | |
| Among Whites | 7.0% | 6.2% |
| Among African Americans | 13.0% | 13.1% |
| • Births to Teenage Women as a Percent of All Births, 1995 ^e | 22.2% | 13.2% |
| • Births to Unmarried Women as a Percent of All Births, 1995 ^d | 45.3% | 32.2% |
| Preventive Health Care | | |
| • Percent of Women Who Have Ever Had a: | | |
| Mammogram (Aged 40 and Older), 1995 ^f | 72.6% | 81.8%* |
| Pap Test (Aged 18 and Older), 1995 ^g | 92.2% | 93.6%* |
| • Percent of Women Aged 45-54 Who Have Been Screened for Blood Pressure in the Previous Two Years, 1993 ^h | 97.8% | 95.5% |
| • Percent of Women Aged 45-54 Who Have Been Screened for Cholesterol in the Previous Two Years, 1993 ^h | 92.5% | 97.1% |
| • Percent of Women Aged 45-54 Who Have Ever Had a Proctoscopy, 1993 ⁱ | 23.6% | 25.6% |
| • Vaccination Coverage of Children Aged 19-35 Months (estimated percentage of those receiving four doses of diphtheria and tetanus toxoids and pertussis vaccine, three doses of polio virus vaccine and one dose of measles-mumps-rubella vaccine), 1995 ^j | 80.0% | 75.0% |
| Environmental and Cancer Risks | | |
| • Percent of Women Aged 45-54 Who Smoke, 1993 ^k | 17.1% | 21.6% |
| • Toxic Chemicals that Could Cause Birth Defects (pounds per person), 1992 ^l | 57.8 lbs | 36.0 lbs |
| • Average Annual Mortality Rate (per 100,000) Due to: | | |
| Female Breast Cancer, 1990-94 ^m | 23.7 | 26.4 |
| Cervical and Uterine Cancer, 1990-94 ^m | 3.7 | 2.9 |
| Ovarian Cancer, 1990-94 ^m | 6.2 | 7.8 |
| • Estimated Number of New Cases of Female Breast, Cervical and Uterine Cancers, 1997 ⁿ | 2,120 | 229,600 |
| Other | | |
| • Does Mississippi have a mastectomy stay law? ^o | No | |

* Median rate for the 50 states and the District of Columbia.

Source: ^a Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 1997b, Table 8; ^b Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 1997a, Table 30; ^c Henshaw and Van Vort, 1994; ^d Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 1997b, Table 16; ^e U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1997e, Table 98; ^f American Cancer Society, 1997b, Table III-B; ^g Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 1997c, Table 13; ^h Costello et al., 1998, Table A-6; ⁱ Costello et al., 1998, Table A-9; ^j McCloskey, et al., 1996, p.226; ^k Costello et al., 1998, Table A-3; ^l McCloskey, et al., 1995, p.222; ^m National Cancer Institute, National Institutes of Health, 1997, Tables IV-10, V-7, XX-7; ⁿ American Cancer Society 1997a, p.5; ^o Miller, 1998.

Compiled by the Institute for Women's Policy Research.

**Table 14.
Percent of Total Population, Medicare and Medicaid Recipients
Enrolled in Health Maintenance Organizations (HMOs)
in Mississippi and the United States, 1996**

| | Mississippi | United States |
|--|--------------------|----------------------|
| Total Population^a | 2,716,000 | 265,284,000 |
| Percent of Total Population Enrolled in HMOs ^b | 1.2 | 22.0 |
| Percent of Total Population Receiving Medicare ^c | 14.7 | 14.0 |
| Percent of Medicare Recipients Enrolled in HMOs ^c | 0.0 | 13.0 |
| Percent of Total Population Receiving Medicaid ^c | 19.3 | 13.4 |
| Percent of Medicaid Recipients Enrolled in HMOs ^d | 6.9 | 40.1 |

Source: ^a U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1997a; ^b McCloskey et al., 1996; ^c U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Health Care Financing Administration, 1997, pp 110-113; ^d Lamphere et al., 1997.

Compiled by the Institute for Women's Policy Research.

about how well HMOs meet the needs of heavy medical users, such as the disabled or those with severe or long-term illnesses.

Similarly, there has been an increasing trend toward HMOs among Medicaid and Medicare beneficiaries, although the impact of managed-care systems on cost-effectiveness and quality of service for Medicare and Medicaid programs is still in question (Urban Institute, 1996; Jacobs Institute of Women's Health, 1996).

deaths per 100,000 women) is higher than the national rate (2.9 deaths per 100,000 women).

In recent years, the trend toward HMOs has grown, with national enrollment rising from 9.1 million in 1980 to 58.4 million at the end of 1996 (U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1997e). This major trend requires monitoring to ascertain how well the new arrangements meet the health care needs of women and their families. In addition, concerns have been raised

HMO membership varies dramatically across the states. HMOs tend to play a more important role in the states of California, Maryland, Massachusetts and Oregon and are much less prevalent throughout the South (Liska et al., 1998). Mississippi has one of the lowest HMO membership rates in the United States; the percentage of the population enrolled in HMOs is considerably lower in the state than in the nation as a whole (1.2 percent and 22.0 percent, respectively; see Table 14).

Basic Demographics

This section includes data on different populations within Mississippi. Statistics on age, the sex ratio and the elderly female population are presented, as are the distribution of women by race/ethnicity and family types and information on women in prison. These data present an image of the state's female population and can be used to provide insight on the topics covered in this report. For example, compared with the United States as a whole, Mississippi has a higher ratio of women to men, a slightly younger population, a much larger proportion of African

American women, much smaller proportions of Hispanic, Asian and Native American women and foreign born women and a considerably lower proportion of women living in urban areas (see Table 15). Demographic factors also have implications for the location of economic activity, the types of jobs that are available, the growth of markets and the types of public services that are needed.

Mississippi has the 31st largest population among all the states in the United States. There were over 1.4

Table 15.
Basic Demographic Statistics for Mississippi and the United States

| | Mississippi | United States |
|---|-------------|---------------|
| Total Population, 1996^a | 2,716,115 | 265,283,783 |
| • Number of Women, All Ages ^b | 1,411,669 | 135,473,568 |
| • Sex Ratio (women to men aged 18 and older) ^b | 1.13:1 | 1.08:1 |
| • Median Age of All Women ^b | 34.4 | 35.8 |
| • Proportion of Women Over Age 65 ^b | 14.3% | 14.7% |
| Distribution of Women by Race and Ethnicity, 1995, All Ages^c | | |
| • White* | 61.5% | 73.0% |
| • African American* | 36.9% | 12.8% |
| • Hispanic [†] | 0.7% | 9.8% |
| • Asian American* | 0.6% | 3.6% |
| • Native American* | 0.3% | 0.8% |
| Distribution of Households by Type, 1990^d | | |
| • Total Number of Family and Non-Family Households | 906,960 | 91,770,958 |
| • Married-Couple Families (with and without their own children) | 55.7% | 56.2% |
| • Female-Headed Families (with and without their own children) | 15.7% | 11.3% |
| • Male-Headed Families (with and without their own children) | 3.1% | 3.2% |
| • Non-Family Households: Single-Person Households | 23.1% | 24.4% |
| • Non-Family Households: Other | 2.4% | 4.9% |
| Proportion of Women Living in Metropolitan Areas, All Ages, 1990^e | 39.4% | 83.1% |
| Proportion of Women Who Are Foreign-Born, All Ages, 1990^f | 0.9% | 7.9% |
| Percent of Federal and State Prison Population Who Are Women, 1996^g | 6.6% | 6.3% |


* Non-Hispanic.

† Hispanics may be of any race.

Source: ^a U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1997a; ^b U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1997b, Tables 5 and 6; ^c U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1997c; ^d Population Reference Bureau, 1993, Table 7; ^e Population Reference Bureau, 1993, Table 6; ^f Population Reference Bureau, 1993, Table 3; ^g U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1997, Table 7.

Calculated by the Institute for Women's Policy Research.

Figure 13.
Distribution of Women by Marital Status
in Mississippi and the United States, 1990



For women aged 15 and older.

Source: Population Reference Bureau, 1993.


Compiled by the Institute for Women's Policy Research.

million women of all ages in Mississippi in 1996. Between 1990 and 1996, the population of Mississippi grew by 5.5 percent, less than the growth of the nation as a whole (6.7 percent; U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1997a). Compared with its region, Mississippi's population growth rate is the third highest, behind that of Tennessee and Alabama. The increase in female population growth from 1990 to 1996 showed similar patterns (5.1 percent for Mississippi and 6.3 percent for the United States). White women are a smaller share of the female population in Mississippi than they are in rest of the United States as a whole, with minorities making up almost 39 percent of women in the state (compared with 27.0 percent for the nation as a whole). Of all the racial/ethnic groups in Mississippi, African American women (36.9 percent) constitute a proportion substantially higher than the national average (12.8 percent). The other minority groups combined make up less than two percent of the female

population in Mississippi, over 12 percentage points lower than the rest of the United States.

The proportion of single women in Mississippi is approximately the same as that in the country as a whole, while the proportion of divorced women is slightly lower and the proportion of widowed women is slightly higher

Figure 14.
Percent of Households with Children Under
Age 18 Headed by Women
in Mississippi and the United States, 1990



Source: IWPR, 1995a.

Calculated by the Institute for Women's Policy Research.

than nationally (see Figure 13). The proportion of women in Mississippi who are married is slightly smaller than the proportion nationally (53.8 percent compared with 55.6 percent of women in the United States). Mississippi's distribution of family types diverges slightly from that in the nation as a whole (see Table 15). The proportion of single-person households is smaller than in the nation as a whole, while the proportion of female-headed families in Mississippi (15.7 percent) is larger than in the United States as a whole (11.3 percent). The proportion of married-couple families in Mississippi is smaller than nationally, while other family types have similar proportions as in the nation as a whole. However, female-headed families with children under age 18 constitute 24.9 percent

of all families with children in Mississippi, a larger proportion than the 19.5 percent nationwide (see Figure 14).

Mississippi's proportion of women living in metropolitan areas is substantially lower than in the nation as a whole (39.4 percent compared with 83.1 percent of women in the United States). The percentage of Mississippi's prison population that is female is about the same as the national average (see Table 15). There is, however, a large difference between Mississippi and the nation as a whole in terms of the proportion of the population that is foreign born. Mississippi has a much smaller foreign-born female population than does the United States as a whole (0.9 percent compared with 7.9 percent).

Conclusion

Women in the United States have made a great deal of progress in recent decades. Women are more educated, they are more active in the workforce, and they have made important strides in narrowing the wage gap. In other areas, however, women face substantial and persistent obstacles to attaining equality. Women are far from achieving political representation in proportion to their share of the population, and the need to defend and expand their reproductive rights persists. Moreover, many improvements in women's status are complicated by larger economic and political factors. For example, while women are approaching parity with men in labor force participation, women's added earnings are in many cases simply compensating for earnings losses among married men in the last two decades. And since women's median earnings still lag behind men's, they cannot contribute equally to supporting their families, much less achieve economic autonomy.

Clearly, many of the factors affecting women's status are interrelated. Educational attainment often directly relates to earnings; full-time work often correlates with health insurance coverage. Studies show that greater female political representation can result in women-friendly policies. But today's costly campaign process presents another barrier to women, who often have less access to the economic resources required to make them more competitive candidates. Thus, in many cases, the issues covered by this report are interdependent and mutually reinforcing.

In a time when the federal government is transferring many responsibilities to the state and local level, women need state-based public policies to adequately address these complex issues:

- Women's wages need to be raised by policies such as stronger enforcement of equal employment opportunity laws, improved educational opportunities, higher minimum wages or the implementation of pay equity adjustments in the state civil service.
- Rates of women's business ownership and business success could be increased by ensuring that state and local government contracts are accessible to women-owned businesses.
- Women workers would benefit from the greater availability of adequate and affordable child care, mandatory temporary disability insurance and paid parental and dependent care leave policies.

- Women's physical security can be enhanced by increasing public safety generally and by better protecting women from domestic violence via anti-stalking and other legislation and better police and judicial training.
- Women's economic security can be improved by greater state emphasis on child support collections and by implementing welfare reform programs that maximize women's educational and earning opportunities while still providing a basic safety net for those who cannot work.

National policies also remain important in improving women's status in the states and in the country as a whole:

- The federal minimum wage, federal equal employment opportunity legislation and federal health and safety standards are all critical in ensuring minimum levels of decency and fairness for women workers.
- Because union representation correlates strongly with higher wages for women and improved pay equity, benefits and working conditions, federal laws that protect and encourage unionization efforts would assist women workers.
- Policies such as paid family leave could be legislated nationally as well as at the state level through, for example, mandatory insurance.
- Because most income redistribution occurs at the national level, federal legislation on taxes, entitlements and income security programs (such as the Earned Income Tax Credit, Social Security, Medicaid, Medicare, food stamps and welfare) will continue to profoundly affect women's lives.

In most cases, both state and national policies lag far behind the changing realities of women's lives.

The Institute for Women's Policy Research's series of reports on the *Status of Women in the States* establishes baseline measures for the status of women in the fifty states and the District of Columbia. In accordance with IWPR's purpose—to meet the need for women-centered, policy-relevant research—these reports describe women's lives and provide the tools to analyze the policies that can and do affect them.

In addition to providing data for comparison, *The Status of Women in the States* report series is designed to strengthen relationships between IWPR, a nationally-based organization, and advocates, researchers and policymakers in the states. To that end, IWPR turned to state advisory committee members to provide feedback on each report and to help disseminate its results. The contributions of the advisory committees both improved the reports by

providing insights into the data about their states and offered valuable feedback on the types of data necessary to help women evaluate and further their status. As the cooperative model represented by the advisory committees continues to evolve, IWPR's directors and staff hope that it will become a new model for state-national partnerships. These partnerships can only strengthen efforts to improve women's status across the country.

Appendix I: Methodology, Terms, and Sources for Chart I (the Composite Indices)

Composite Political Participation and Representation Index. This composite index reflects four areas of political participation and representation: voter registration; voter turnout; women in elective office, including state legislatures, state-wide elective office and positions in the U.S. Congress; and institutional resources available for women (such as a state agenda project, a commission on the status of women or a legislative caucus).

To construct this composite index, each of the component indicators was standardized to remove the effects of different units of measurement for each state's score on the resulting composite index. Each component was standardized by subtracting the mean value (for all 50 states) from the observed value and dividing by the standard deviation. The standardized scores were then given different weights. Voter registration and voter turnout were each given a weight of 1.0. The component indicator for women in elected office is itself a composite reflecting different levels of office holding and was given a weight of 3.0. The last component indicator, women's institutional resources, is also a composite of scores indicating the presence or absence of each of three resources: a women's agenda project, a commission on the status of women and a women's legislative caucus. It received a weight of 1.0. The resulting weighted, standardized values for each of the four component indicators were summed for each state to create the composite political participation index.

Women's Voter Registration: This component indicator is the average percent (for the elections of 1992 and 1994) of all women aged 18 and older (in the civilian noninstitutionalized population) who reported registering. Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census (1993, 1996d) based on the Current Population Survey. More recent data are not available from this source.

Women's Voter Turnout: This component indicator is the average estimated percent turnout (for the presidential elections of 1992 and 1996) of all women aged 18 and older. Turnout figures are calculated by first multiplying the total number of votes from the Federal Election Commission by the percentage of female voters provided by the Voter News Service exit polls in order to determine the number of female voters. The number of female voters is then divided by the projected female voting age population from the U.S. Bureau of the Census, resulting in the overall turnout rate for women. IWPR recognizes that these data on voter turnout (based on data produced

by Strategic Research Concepts) vary from government data collected by the Bureau of the Census. According to the Bureau of the Census, national voter turnout is higher than indicated by the numbers IWPR cites in this report. While national data are available from the Bureau of the Census, state level data on turnout in 1996 were not available at the time of production of this report and thus data from Strategic Research Concepts was used instead. In general, the data from Strategic Research Concepts tends to underestimate voter turnout while data from the Bureau of the Census tends to overestimate it. Source: Strategic Research Concepts (1998) based on certified presidential election returns from the Federal Election Commission, Census projections of the voting age population from the Current Population Survey (in 1992 and 1996) and Voter News Service nationwide exit polls.

Women in Elected Office: This composite indicator is based on a methodology developed by the Center for Policy Alternatives (1995).

This composite indicator has four components and reflects office-holding at the state and national levels as of April 1998. For each state, the proportion of office holders who are women was computed for four levels: state representatives; state senators; state-wide elected executive officials and U.S. Representatives; and U.S. Senators and governors. The percentages were then converted to scores that ranged from 0 to 1 by dividing the observed value for each state by the highest value for all states. The scores were then weighted according to the degree of political influence of the position—state representatives were given a weight of 1.0, state senators were given a weight of 1.25, statewide executive elected officials and U.S. Representatives were each given a weight of 1.5 and U.S. Senators and state governors were each given a weight of 1.75. The resulting weighted scores for the four components were added to yield the total score on this composite for each state. The highest score of any state for this composite office-holding indicator is 3.74. These scores were then used to rank the states on the indicator for women in elected office. Source: Data were compiled by the Institute for Women's Policy Research (IWPR) from several sources including the Center for the American Woman and Politics (1998a, 1998b, 1998c, 1998d, and 1998e).

Women's Institutional Resources: This indicator measures the number of institutional resources for women available in the state from a maximum of three, including commissions on the status of women (which are estab-

lished by legislation or executive order), women's state agenda projects (usually a voluntary, nongovernmental, state-based coalition group addressing a broad range of issues concerning women) and legislative caucuses for women (organized by women legislators in either or both houses of the state legislature). States receive 1.0 point for each institutional resource present in their state except that partial credit is given if a bipartisan legislative caucus does not exist in both houses. States receive a score of 0.25 if informal or partisan meetings are held by women legislators in either house, 0.5 if a formal legislative caucus exists in one house but not the other and 1.0 if a formal legislative caucus is present in both houses or is bicameral. Source: Center for Policy Alternatives, 1995, updated in 1998 by IWPR and Center for the American Woman and Politics, 1998e.

Composite Employment and Earnings Index. This composite index consists of four component indicators: median annual earnings for women, the ratio of the earnings of women to the earnings of men, women's labor force participation and the percent of employed women in managerial and professional specialty occupations.

To construct this composite index, each of the four component indicators was "standardized"—i.e., for each of the four indicators, the observed value for the state was divided by the comparable value for the entire United States. The resulting ratios were summed for each state to create the composite index; thus, each of the four component indicators has equal weight in the composite.

Women's Median Annual Earnings: Median yearly earnings (in 1997 dollars) of noninstitutionalized women aged 16 and older who worked full-time, year-round (more than 49 weeks during the year and more than 34 hours per week) in 1994, 1995 and 1996. Earnings were converted to constant 1997 dollars using the Consumer Price Index and the median was selected from the merged file for all three years. Three years of data were used in order to ensure a sufficiently large sample for each state. The sample size for women ranges from 431 in New Hampshire to 4,039 in California; for men, the sample size for men ranges from 564 in the District of Columbia to 4,521 in New York. For Mississippi, the sample size is 619 for women and 757 for men. These earnings data have not been adjusted for cost of living differences between the states because the federal government does not produce an index of such differences. Source: IWPR calculations of the 1995-97 Annual Demographic Files (March) from the Current Population Survey, for the 1994-96 calendar years; IWPR, 1998b.

Ratio of Women's to Men's Earnings: Median yearly earnings (in 1997 dollars) of noninstitutionalized women aged 16 and older who worked full-time, year-round (more than 49 weeks during the year and more than 34

hours per week) in 1994-96 divided by the median yearly earnings (in 1997 dollars) of noninstitutionalized men aged 16 and older who worked full-time, year-round (more than 49 weeks during the year and more than 34 hours per week) in 1994-96. Earnings were converted to constant 1997 dollars using the Consumer Price Index and the medians were selected from the merged file for all three years. Three years of data were used in order to ensure a sufficiently large sample for each state. The sample size for women ranges from 431 in New Hampshire to 4,039 in California; for men, the sample size ranges from 564 in the District of Columbia to 4,521 in New York. For Mississippi, the sample size is 619 for women and 757 for men. Source: IWPR calculations of the 1995-97 Annual Demographic Files (March) from the Current Population Survey; IWPR 1998b.

Women's Labor Force Participation (proportion of the adult female population that is in the labor force): Percent of civilian noninstitutionalized women aged 16 and older who were employed or looking for work (in 1995). This includes those employed full-time, part-time voluntarily or part-time involuntarily and those who are unemployed. Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1997a (based on the Current Population Survey).

Women in Managerial and Professional Occupations: Percent of civilian noninstitutionalized women aged 16 and older who were employed in executive, administrative, managerial or professional specialty occupations (in 1995). Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1997a (based on the Current Population Survey).

Composite Economic Autonomy Index. This composite index reflects four aspects of women's economic well-being: access to health insurance, educational attainment, business ownership and percent of women above the poverty level.

To construct this composite index, each of the four component indicators was "standardized"—i.e., for each indicator, the observed value for the state was divided by the comparable value for the United States as a whole. The resulting ratios were summed for each state to create the composite index; thus, each of the four components has equal weight in the composite.

Percent with Health Insurance: Percent of civilian noninstitutionalized women under age 65 who are insured. The state-by-state percentages are based on the averages of two years of pooled data from the 1994 and 1995 Current Population Survey from the Bureau of the Census. Source: Liska et al., 1998.

Educational Attainment: In 1989, the percent of women aged 25 and older with four or more years of college. Source: Population Reference Bureau, 1993,

based on the Public Use Microdata Sample of the 1990 Census of Population.

Women's Business Ownership: In 1992, the percent of all firms (legal entities engaged in economic activity during any part of 1992 that filed an IRS form 1040, Schedule C; 1065 or 1120S) that were owned by women. This indicator excludes type C corporations; the Census Bureau estimates that there were approximately 517,000 type C corporations in 1992. The Bureau of the Census was required to provide data on women's ownership of type C corporations by the Women's Business Ownership Act of 1988. The Bureau's methodology for doing so differs from the methods used for other forms of business ownership—individual proprietorships and self employment, partnerships and Subchapter S corporations (those with fewer than 35 shareholders who can elect to be taxed as individuals). Type C corporations are non-subchapter S corporations. The Bureau of the Census determines the sex of business owners by matching the social security numbers of individuals who file business tax returns (Form 1040, Schedule C; 1065; or 1120S) with Social Security Administration records that provide the sex codes indicated by individuals on their original applications for social security numbers. For partnerships and corporations, a business is classified as women-owned based on the sex of the majority of the owners. Data for type C corporations do not come from tax returns and because of the limitations of the sample are apparently considered less reliable. Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, 1996a based on the 1992 Economic Census. (Please note that results of the 1997 Economic Census were not available at the time of production of this report.)

Percent of Women Above Poverty: In 1994-96, the percent of women living above the official poverty threshold, which varies by family size and composition. The average percent of women above the poverty level for the three years is used; three years of data ensure a sufficiently large sample for each state. In 1995, the poverty level for a family of four was \$15,569. Source: IWPR calculations of the 1995-97 Annual Demographic Files (March) from the Current Population Survey for the calendar years 1994-96; IWPR, 1998b.

Composite Reproductive Rights Index. This composite index reflects a variety of indicators of women's reproductive well-being and autonomy. These include access to abortion services without mandatory parental consent laws for minors, access to abortion services without a waiting period, public funding for abortions under any circumstances if a woman is eligible, percent of counties that have at least one abortion provider, whether the governor or state legislature is pro-choice, public funding of infertility treatments, existence of state laws requiring health insurers to provide coverage of contraceptives and whether second parent adoption is legal for gay/lesbian couples. For more complete definitions of the components of this index and sources, see Appendix II.

To construct this composite index, each component indicator was rated on a scale of 0 to 1 and assigned a weight. The notification and waiting-period indicators were each given a weight of 0.5. The indicator of public funding for abortions was given a weight of 1.0. For the indicator of the percent of counties with abortion providers, states were given a scaled score ranging from 0 to 1. For the indicator of whether the Governor, upper house or lower house is pro-choice, each state receives 0.33 points per governmental body (up to a maximum of 1.0 point). The indicator for public funding for infertility treatments was given a weight of 1.0. For the health insurance coverage of contraceptives law, the state received a score of 0.5 if legislation had been proposed and a score of 1.0 if it had a contraceptive coverage law or provision. For the indicator of whether the nonbiological partner in a gay/lesbian couple can adopt the partner's child, states were given 1.0 point if the state supreme court has prohibited discrimination against these couples in adoption, 0.75 point if an appellate court has, 0.5 if a lower court has approved a petition for second parent adoption, 0.25 if a state has no official position on the subject, and no points if the state has banned second parent adoption. The contraceptive coverage law and gay/lesbian adoption law were each given a weight of 0.5. The weighted scores for each component indicator were summed to arrive at the value of the composite index score for each state. The states and the District of Columbia were then ranked according to those values.

Appendix II: Terms and Sources for Chart II (Women's Rights Checklist)

Reproductive Rights

Mandatory Consent. Mandatory consent laws require that minors notify one or both parents of the decision to have an abortion or gain the consent of one or both parents before a physician can perform the procedure. Of the 39 states with such laws on the books as of January 1998, 31 enforce their laws. Of the 31, 27 allow for a judicial bypass of notification if the minor appears before a judge and provides a reason that notification would place an undue burden on the decision to have an abortion. Four states provide for physician bypass of notification and three allow both physician and judicial bypass. Of the 31 states that enforce their laws, only Idaho and Utah had no bypass procedure as of January 1998 (NARAL and NARAL Foundation, 1998).

Waiting Period. Waiting-period legislation mandates that a physician cannot perform an abortion until a certain number of hours after the woman has been notified of her options in dealing with a pregnancy. The waiting periods range from one to 72 hours. Of the 19 states with mandatory waiting periods as of January 1998, 12 (with waiting periods ranging from one to 24 hours) enforced their laws (NARAL and NARAL Foundation, 1998).

Restrictions on Public Funding. In some states, public funding for abortions is available only under specific circumstances such as rape or incest, endangerment to the mother's life or limited health circumstances of the fetus, for women who meet income eligibility standards. As of January 1998, 15 states funded abortions for eligible women in all or most circumstances (NARAL and NARAL Foundation, 1998).

Contraceptive Coverage Laws. Contraceptive coverage laws require that health insurers who provide coverage for prescription drugs extend coverage to FDA-approved contraceptives (e.g., drugs and devices) and related medical services, including exams and insertion/removal treatments. As of June 1998, 18 states had proposed to enact legislation requiring health insurers to provide coverage of contraceptives. Six states had some provisions for the insurance coverage of contraceptives; Maryland was the only state to have a contraceptive coverage law as of June 1998 (Planned Parenthood, 1998).

Fertility Treatments and Public Funding. While increasing numbers of private health insurance plans cover infertility treatments, few states in the United States allow

for infertility treatments under publicly-funded health plans such as Medicaid (King and Meyer, 1996).

Same-Sex Couples and Adoption. Second parent adoption allows the nonbiological parent in a gay or lesbian couple to adopt the biological child of his or her partner. At the state level, courts and/or legislatures have upheld or limited the right to second parent adoption. As of April 1998, a lower court has approved second parent adoption petitions in 19 states, intermediate appellate courts have done so in three states and the District of Columbia and state supreme courts have explicitly permitted lesbians and gay men to adopt the children of their partners in three states. Legislation prohibits or substantially restricts such adoption in four states, including Florida (National Center for Lesbian Rights, 1998).

Domestic Violence

Mandatory Arrest. Generally, arrest is mandated only under specific circumstances; for instance, when an assault results in bodily injury to the victim, when the intent of the abuser was to cause fear of serious injury or death or when the officer believes that domestic violence is likely to continue (Hart, 1992). As of 1997, law enforcement officials must arrest domestic violence perpetrators under all circumstances in five states and the District of Columbia. Law enforcement officials must arrest under certain circumstances and may arrest under other circumstances in 12 states. Twenty-eight states permit but do not require that law enforcement officials arrest domestic violence offenders; only five states do not have legislation indicating that arrest is the preferred response in domestic violence cases (National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, 1997). Some domestic violence activists and experts question the usefulness of this approach since sometimes the victim is arrested, not the original intent of the laws.

Child Support

Single-Mother Households Receiving Child Support or Alimony. This is defined as a family headed by a nonmarried woman with one or more of her own children (by birth, marriage or adoption) who has received full or partial payment of child support or alimony during the past year (Annie E. Casey Foundation, 1997). Figures based on an average of data from the Current Population Survey for 1992 through 1996. Nationwide, only one-third (33 percent) of single-mother families received child support or alimony in 1994.

Cases with Collection. According to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Office of Child Support Enforcement, 55 percent of all child support cases that go to trial are granted a support order by a judge. Only in 33 percent of the cases with orders (or 18 percent of all child support cases) was child support actually collected. A case is counted as having a collection if as little as one cent is collected during the year. The enforcement efforts made by state and local agencies can affect the extent of collections (Gershenson, 1993). Source: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1996b.

Welfare

The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (PRWORA) enacted the most sweeping changes to the federal welfare system since it was established in the 1930's. PRWORA ended entitlements to federal cash assistance, replacing Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) with the new Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Program. Where AFDC provided minimal guaranteed income support for all eligible families (most frequently those headed by low-income single mothers), TANF benefits are restricted to a five-year lifetime limit and are contingent on work participation after 24 months. TANF funds are distributed to states in the form of block grants, and states are free to devise their own eligibility rules, participation requirements and sanction policies within the federal restrictions.

Child Exclusion/Family Caps. As of July 1998, 23 states have Child Exclusion policies, or Family Caps, which restrict the extension of TANF benefits to children conceived while the mother was on welfare. Of these states, two have a modified Family Cap and therefore give partial increases in benefits. In addition, Idaho has a flat rate regardless of family size, increases in benefits are given to a third party in Maryland and vouchers rather than cash are given in Oklahoma. Twenty-seven states and the District of Columbia do not have Family Caps (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, 1998).

Time Limits. As of July 1998, 11 states have both a periodic and lifetime limit for the receipt of TANF funds. Thirty-six states and the District of Columbia have a time limit of 60 months (the maximum allowed under federal law). Nine other states report lifetime time limits less than 60 months. Michigan, Vermont and Illinois are the only states which do not have a lifetime time limit for those individuals who are complying with TANF requirements; these states supplement their federal funds with state monies. Massachusetts reports that it has no lifetime limits, but extensions beyond its 24-month periodic limit

may be granted only at the Commissioner's discretion. Oregon does not report any lifetime limits but restricts benefits to 24 months out of an 84-month period. Twenty-seven states offer limited extensions for a variety of reasons (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, 1998).

Work Requirements. Federal law requires non-exempt residents to participate in work activities within two years of receiving cash assistance. States have the option of establishing stricter guidelines, and many have elected to do so. In 24 states, nonexempt recipients are required to engage in work activities immediately under TANF. Five states have work requirements within 24 months (the federally allowed maximum); another 10 states and the District of Columbia require recipients to work within 24 months or when determined able to work, whichever comes first. Nine states have work requirements within less than 24 months. In Arizona, work requirements are evaluated on an individual basis. Vermont requires unemployed two-parent families to work within 15 months and single parents to work within 30 months (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, 1998).

What constitutes "work activities" is a contentious issue at both the state and federal level. State policies around these issues continue to evolve and are subject to caseworker discretion. This report uses each state's self-reported policy to identify which states require immediate work activities. To receive the full amount of their block grants, states must demonstrate that a specific portion of the states' TANF caseload is participating in activities that meet the federal definition of work. In fiscal year 1998, states must show that 30 percent of their TANF caseload is working. The required proportion grows each year until 2002 when states must demonstrate that 50 percent of the TANF caseload is engaged in work. PRWORA also restricts the amount of the caseload that may be engaged in basic education or vocational training to be counted in the state's work participation figures and only allows job training to count as work for a limited period of time for any individual.

Family Violence Provisions in TANF plans. As of March 1998, 26 states are recognized by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Administration for Children and Families as having adopted the Family Violence Option (which allows victims of violence to be exempted from work requirements, lifetime time limits or both) as a part of their TANF plans (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1998). In addition, 23 other states and the District of Columbia have language in their state TANF plans that addresses domestic violence; only Oklahoma has not taken steps to incorporate domestic violence language or adopt the Family Violence Option into its TANF plan (NOW LDEF, 1998).

Employment/Unemployment Benefits

Minimum Wage. As of January 1998, six states and the District of Columbia had minimum wage rates that were higher than the federal level. Twelve states had minimum wage rates lower than the federal level (but the federal level generally applies to most employers in these states). Seven states had no minimum wage law, and 25 states had state minimum wages that were the same as the federal level. According to the Fair Labor Standards Act, the state minimum wage is controlling if the state minimum wage is higher than the federal minimum wage (U.S. Department of Labor, Wage and Hour Division, Employment Standards Administration, 1998). A federal minimum wage increase was signed into law on August 20, 1996. The federal standard rose to \$5.15 per hour on September 1, 1997.

Temporary Disability Insurance (TDI). Temporary Disability Insurance provides partial income replacement to employees who leave work because of an illness or accident that is not related to their jobs. In five states with mandated programs (California, Hawaii, New Jersey, New York and Rhode Island), employees and/or their employers pay a small percentage of the employee's salary into an insurance fund and, in return, employees are provided with partial wage replacement if they become ill or disabled. In states with TDI programs, women workers typically receive eight to 12 weeks of partial wage replacement for maternity leaves through TDI (Hartmann, et al., 1995).

Access to Unemployment Insurance (UI). In order to receive UI, potential recipients must meet several eligibility requirements. Two of these are high quarter earnings and base period earnings requirements. The "base period" is a 12-month period preceding the start of a spell of unemployment. This, however, excludes the current calendar quarter and often the previous full calendar quarter. This has serious consequences for low-wage and contingent workers who need to count more recent earnings to qualify. The base period criterion states that the individual must have earned a minimum amount

during the base period. The high quarter earnings criterion requires that individuals earn a total reaching a specified threshold amount in one of the quarters within the base period. IWPR research has shown that women are less likely to meet the two earnings requirements than are men and thus are more likely to be disqualified from receipt of UI benefits. IWPR found that nearly 14 percent of unemployed women workers were disqualified from receiving UI by the two earnings criteria—this is more than twice the rate for unemployed men (Yoon, et al., 1995). States typically set eligibility standards for UI and can enact policies that are more or less inclusive and more or less generous to claimants. For example, some states have implemented a "moveable" base period, allowing flexibility to the advantage of the claimant. Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Unemployment Insurance Service, 1998.

Since states have the power to decide who receives unemployment insurance benefits, some states set high requirements, thereby excluding many low earners. A state was scored "yes" if it was relatively generous to low earners, such that base period wages were less than or equal to \$1,300 and high quarter wages were less than or equal to \$800. If the base period wages were more than \$2,000 or if high quarter wages were more than \$1,000, the state was scored "no;" "sometimes" was defined as base period and high quarter wages which fell between the "yes" and "no" ranges.

Pay Equity. The concept of pay equity (also known as "comparable worth") refers to a set of remedies designed to raise the wages of jobs that are undervalued at least partly because of the gender or race of the workers who hold those jobs. By 1997, 20 states had implemented programs to raise the wages of workers in female-dominated jobs in their states' civil services (National Committee on Pay Equity, 1997). A study by the Institute for Women's Policy Research found that for states that implemented pay equity remedies, the remedies improved female/male wage ratios (Hartmann and Aaronson, 1994).

Appendix III: State-by-State Rankings on the Composite Indices and their Components

| State | POLITICAL PARTICIPATION AND REPRESENTATION | | WOMEN IN Elected Office | | PERCENT OF WOMEN Registered to Vote in 1992 and 1994 | | PERCENT OF WOMEN Who Voted in 1992 and 1994 | | NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONAL Resources Available to Women in the State | |
|----------------------|--|------|-------------------------|------|--|------|---|------|---|-----------------|
| | Score | Rank | Score | Rank | Percent | Rank | Percent | Rank | Score | Rank |
| Alabama | -3.10 | 41 | 0.66 | 48 | 73.2% | 17 | 54.0% | 28 | 2.5 | 11 |
| Alaska | 1.30 | 20 | 1.81 | 20 | 73.8% | 16 | 64.0% | 4 | 1 | 41 |
| Arizona | 3.16 | 13 | 3.07 | 4 | 65.0% | 34 | 51.7% | 34 | 1 | 41 |
| Arkansas | -5.45 | 45 | 1.03 | 40 | 65.2% | 33 | 51.7% | 34 | 0.5 | 47 |
| California | 5.27 | 3 | 3.37 | 2 | 58.1% | 48 | 48.4% | 42 | 3 | 1 |
| Colorado | 3.55 | 12 | 2.55 | 6 | 72.4% | 19 | 59.0% | 18 | 1.25 | 38 |
| Connecticut | 4.72 | 5 | 2.38 | 10 | 74.9% | 12 | 61.0% | 15 | 2.25 | 13 |
| Delaware | 3.81 | 6 | 2.90 | 5 | 65.0% | 34 | 52.6% | 31 | 2 | 21 |
| District of Columbia | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 73.9% | N/A | 50.6% | N/A | 2 | N/A |
| Florida | -1.92 | 37 | 1.47 | 30 | 61.3% | 45 | 47.7% | 44 | 3 | 1 |
| Georgia | -4.63 | 43 | 0.93 | 42 | 60.9% | 46 | 44.3% | 49 | 3 | 1 |
| Hawaii | -0.73 | 29 | 2.40 | 9 | 57.8% | 49 | 42.4% | 50 | 2 | 21 |
| Idaho | 2.35 | 14 | 1.93 | 16 | 70.2% | 25 | 61.5% | 10 | 2.25 | 13 |
| Illinois | 2.00 | 16 | 2.24 | 12 | 69.2% | 26 | 54.0% | 28 | 2 | 21 |
| Indiana | -1.22 | 32 | 1.63 | 24 | 63.3% | 42 | 53.9% | 30 | 2 | 21 |
| Iowa | -0.35 | 26 | 1.31 | 33 | 76.8% | 7 | 61.7% | 9 | 1.25 | 38 |
| Kansas | 1.58 | 19 | 2.33 | 11 | 72.6% | 18 | 61.3% | 12 | 0 | 50 |
| Kentucky | -5.84 | 46 | 0.54 | 49 | 62.9% | 43 | 52.3% | 33 | 2 | 21 |
| Louisiana | -0.39 | 27 | 1.48 | 28 | 74.0% | 15 | 61.4% | 11 | 1 | 41 |
| Maine | 9.10 | 1 | 3.27 | 3 | 83.8% | 2 | 68.1% | 2 | 1 | 41 |
| Maryland | 3.81 | 6 | 2.52 | 7 | 68.9% | 27 | 50.9% | 37 | 3 | 1 |
| Massachusetts | -0.96 | 30 | 1.03 | 40 | 70.3% | 24 | 57.1% | 22 | 3 | 1 |
| Michigan | 0.71 | 23 | 1.45 | 31 | 75.4% | 10 | 58.4% | 21 | 2.25 | 13 |
| Minnesota | 5.21 | 4 | 2.08 | 14 | 83.3% | 3 | 64.3% | 3 | 2.25 | 13 |
| Mississippi | -6.43 | 49 | 0.51 | 50 | 76.6% | 9 | 50.5% | 38 | 0.25 | 48 |
| Missouri | 2.16 | 15 | 1.59 | 26 | 75.2% | 11 | 58.6% | 20 | 3 | 1 |
| Montana | 3.65 | 8 | 1.83 | 18 | 76.7% | 8 | 68.5% | 1 | 2 | 21 |
| Nebraska | -1.62 | 34 | 1.05 | 39 | 74.4% | 14 | 60.2% | 16 | 1.5 | 35 |
| Nevada | -2.18 | 38 | 1.84 | 17 | 57.1% | 50 | 48.0% | 43 | 2 | 21 |
| New Hampshire | 3.60 | 10 | 2.47 | 8 | 68.0% | 30 | 59.5% | 17 | 2 | 21 |
| New Jersey | -0.22 | 24 | 1.76 | 22 | 65.8% | 32 | 54.8% | 27 | 2 | 21 |
| New Mexico | -1.84 | 36 | 1.48 | 28 | 63.4% | 39 | 49.8% | 40 | 2.5 | 11 |
| New York | -2.50 | 39 | 1.29 | 34 | 60.9% | 46 | 48.8% | 41 | 3 | 1 |
| North Carolina | -2.98 | 40 | 1.08 | 38 | 66.1% | 31 | 46.4% | 46 | 3 | 1 |
| North Dakota | 3.60 | 10 | 1.39 | 32 | 92.4% | 1 | 63.5% | 7 | 2.25 | 13 |
| Ohio | -0.60 | 28 | 1.51 | 27 | 68.1% | 29 | 56.8% | 24 | 2 | 21 |
| Oklahoma | -1.43 | 33 | 1.10 | 37 | 72.1% | 20 | 56.4% | 25 | 2.25 | 13 |
| Oregon | 3.61 | 9 | 2.01 | 15 | 77.2% | 6 | 61.2% | 13 | 2.25 | 13 |
| Pennsylvania | -6.23 | 48 | 0.69 | 46 | 62.2% | 44 | 50.4% | 39 | 1.5 | 35 |
| Rhode Island | -0.33 | 25 | 1.61 | 25 | 68.6% | 28 | 55.6% | 26 | 2 | 21 |
| South Carolina | -4.88 | 44 | 0.70 | 45 | 64.4% | 36 | 45.4% | 48 | 3 | 1 |
| South Dakota | 1.20 | 21 | 1.71 | 23 | 79.3% | 5 | 61.1% | 14 | 1 | 41 |
| Tennessee | -7.31 | 50 | 0.78 | 44 | 64.0% | 37 | 51.1% | 36 | 0 | 50 |
| Texas | -1.70 | 35 | 1.83 | 18 | 63.4% | 39 | 45.7% | 47 | 2 | 21 |
| Utah | -1.06 | 31 | 1.23 | 36 | 70.7% | 23 | 58.8% | 19 | 2 | 21 |
| Vermont | 1.87 | 17 | 1.80 | 21 | 74.7% | 13 | 63.2% | 8 | 1.5 | 35 |
| Virginia | -3.58 | 42 | 0.79 | 43 | 63.4% | 39 | 52.5% | 32 | 3 | 1 |
| Washington | 7.77 | 2 | 3.74 | 1 | 70.8% | 21 | 57.1% | 22 | 1.25 | 38 |
| West Virginia | -6.03 | 47 | 0.68 | 47 | 63.6% | 38 | 46.8% | 45 | 2 | 21 |
| Wisconsin | 1.66 | 18 | 1.24 | 35 | 82.2% | 4 | 63.9% | 5 | 2.25 | 13 |
| Wyoming | 0.95 | 22 | 2.17 | 13 | 70.8% | 21 | 63.6% | 6 | 1 | 41 |
| United States | | | 1.65 | | 66.5% | | 53.2% | | 2.0 | (Median) |

Appendix III: State-by-State Rankings on the Composite Indices and their Components (continued)

| State | EMPLOYMENT AND EARNINGS Composite Index | | Median Annual Earnings Full-Time, Year-Round for Employed Women | | Earnings Ratio Between Full-Time, Year-Round Employed Women and Men | | Percent of Women in the Labor Force | | Percent of Employed Women, Managerial or Professional Occupations | |
|----------------------|---|------|---|------|---|------|-------------------------------------|------|---|------|
| | Score | Rank | Dollars | Rank | Percent | Rank | Percent | Rank | Percent | Rank |
| Alabama | 3.45 | 51 | \$20,577 | 45 | 63.3% | 50 | 55.3% | 46 | 24.6% | 51 |
| Alaska | 4.46 | 3 | \$31,380 | 1 | 66.3% | 44 | 66.4% | 6 | 34.9% | 4 |
| Arizona | 3.80 | 38 | \$21,906 | 35 | 69.7% | 33 | 59.6% | 33 | 28.5% | 26 |
| Arkansas | 3.72 | 42 | \$20,577 | 45 | 76.7% | 4 | 58.4% | 37 | 25.6% | 46 |
| California | 4.20 | 8 | \$28,158 | 7 | 66.8% | 5 | 76.4% | 41 | 32.0% | 10 |
| Colorado | 4.11 | 11 | \$24,749 | 21 | 70.7% | 42 | 67.2% | 4 | 31.8% | 13 |
| Connecticut | 4.34 | 6 | \$30,541 | 3 | 75.8% | 29 | 60.7% | 7 | 33.4% | 7 |
| Delaware | 4.10 | 12 | \$25,721 | 13 | 75.8% | 7 | 62.9% | 17 | 28.9% | 21 |
| District of Columbia | 5.06 | 1 | \$30,865 | 2 | 87.5% | 1 | 61.4% | 20 | 47.4% | 1 |
| Florida | 3.86 | 26 | \$23,169 | 28 | 75.9% | 6 | 54.5% | 48 | 28.9% | 21 |
| Georgia | 3.86 | 26 | \$23,169 | 28 | 71.0% | 27 | 59.2% | 35 | 28.6% | 24 |
| Hawaii | 4.08 | 15 | \$25,276 | 16 | 74.8% | 10 | 61.2% | 21 | 30.0% | 17 |
| Idaho | 3.81 | 35 | \$22,223 | 33 | 70.3% | 30 | 62.1% | 18 | 27.0% | 36 |
| Illinois | 4.03 | 18 | \$26,329 | 11 | 70.8% | 28 | 60.3% | 28 | 29.3% | 19 |
| Indiana | 3.70 | 43 | \$21,606 | 37 | 66.5% | 43 | 64.2% | 13 | 24.8% | 50 |
| Iowa | 3.85 | 28 | \$21,606 | 37 | 68.3% | 37 | 66.6% | 5 | 27.4% | 35 |
| Kansas | 4.03 | 18 | \$23,581 | 26 | 72.6% | 19 | 63.4% | 15 | 30.5% | 15 |
| Kentucky | 3.69 | 44 | \$22,635 | 31 | 69.7% | 33 | 56.0% | 42 | 26.2% | 44 |
| Louisiana | 3.55 | 47 | \$20,235 | 48 | 64.4% | 48 | 53.6% | 49 | 28.4% | 27 |
| Maine | 3.84 | 30 | \$21,906 | 35 | 67.5% | 41 | 61.6% | 19 | 29.6% | 1 |
| Maryland | 4.56 | 2 | \$29,241 | 4 | 75.0% | 9 | 64.5% | 12 | 37.9% | 2 |
| Massachusetts | 4.38 | 5 | \$28,808 | 5 | 73.7% | 15 | 60.8% | 23 | 35.4% | 3 |
| Michigan | 3.84 | 30 | \$25,721 | 13 | 66.0% | 45 | 57.9% | 40 | 27.7% | 31 |
| Minnesota | 4.09 | 14 | \$24,909 | 18 | 71.2% | 25 | 69.6% | 1 | 27.9% | 30 |
| Mississippi | 3.53 | 49 | \$19,494 | 51 | 70.2% | 31 | 55.8% | 43 | 25.1% | 48 |
| Missouri | 4.00 | 20 | \$23,663 | 25 | 74.6% | 11 | 65.0% | 10 | 27.7% | 31 |
| Montana | 3.78 | 39 | \$21,606 | 37 | 73.3% | 17 | 59.6% | 33 | 26.8% | 37 |
| Nebraska | 3.84 | 30 | \$20,577 | 45 | 71.4% | 23 | 68.4% | 2 | 26.3% | 42 |
| Nevada | 3.93 | 24 | \$24,909 | 18 | 73.9% | 14 | 60.5% | 27 | 26.8% | 37 |
| New Hampshire | 4.28 | 7 | \$25,992 | 12 | 73.6% | 16 | 65.3% | 8 | 33.6% | 6 |
| New Jersey | 4.15 | 9 | \$28,435 | 6 | 67.9% | 40 | 58.7% | 36 | 32.6% | 8 |
| New Mexico | 3.84 | 30 | \$21,606 | 37 | 72.5% | 21 | 55.6% | 45 | 31.0% | 14 |
| New York | 4.08 | 15 | \$27,400 | 8 | 74.4% | 12 | 52.8% | 50 | 31.9% | 12 |
| North Carolina | 3.82 | 34 | \$22,635 | 31 | 74.1% | 13 | 59.8% | 32 | 26.3% | 42 |
| North Dakota | 3.66 | 46 | \$19,548 | 50 | 64.0% | 49 | 64.9% | 11 | 26.8% | 37 |
| Ohio | 3.81 | 35 | \$24,692 | 22 | 69.1% | 36 | 58.3% | 39 | 26.6% | 40 |
| Oklahoma | 3.55 | 47 | \$19,852 | 49 | 63.3% | 50 | 55.7% | 44 | 28.4% | 27 |
| Oregon | 3.95 | 22 | \$24,909 | 18 | 69.6% | 35 | 60.8% | 23 | 29.1% | 20 |
| Pennsylvania | 3.85 | 28 | \$25,450 | 15 | 71.2% | 25 | 55.0% | 47 | 27.6% | 33 |
| Rhode Island | 4.14 | 10 | \$26,750 | 10 | 72.6% | 19 | 58.4% | 37 | 32.3% | 9 |
| South Carolina | 3.68 | 45 | \$21,606 | 37 | 70.0% | 32 | 59.9% | 31 | 25.1% | 48 |
| South Dakota | 3.89 | 25 | \$21,063 | 42 | 76.9% | 3 | 65.8% | 7 | 26.2% | 44 |
| Tennessee | 3.77 | 40 | \$22,743 | 30 | 72.0% | 22 | 60.3% | 28 | 25.4% | 47 |
| Texas | 3.98 | 21 | \$23,196 | 27 | 75.2% | 8 | 60.0% | 30 | 30.1% | 16 |
| Utah | 3.81 | 35 | \$22,116 | 34 | 68.1% | 39 | 61.2% | 21 | 28.6% | 24 |
| Vermont | 4.40 | 4 | \$25,276 | 16 | 81.9% | 2 | 65.3% | 8 | 34.6% | 5 |
| Virginia | 4.10 | 12 | \$24,692 | 22 | 71.3% | 24 | 63.0% | 16 | 32.0% | 11 |
| Washington | 4.08 | 15 | \$27,075 | 9 | 73.1% | 18 | 60.6% | 26 | 28.8% | 23 |
| West Virginia | 3.46 | 50 | \$21,063 | 42 | 64.8% | 46 | 46.3% | 51 | 28.3% | 29 |
| Wisconsin | 3.95 | 22 | \$24,201 | 24 | 68.3% | 37 | 68.2% | 3 | 26.6% | 40 |
| Wyoming | 3.74 | 41 | \$21,063 | 42 | 64.8% | 46 | 64.1% | 14 | 27.6% | 33 |
| United States | | | \$24,909 | | 72.3% | | 58.9% | | 30.3% | |

Appendix III: State-by-State Rankings on the Composite Indices and their Components (continued)

| State | Composite Index | | Percent of Women with Four or More Years of College | | Percent of Women without Health Insurance | | Percent of Women in Poverty | | Percent of Businesses that are Women-Owned | |
|----------------------|-----------------|--------------|---|--------------|---|--------------|-----------------------------|--------------|--|--------------|
| | Score | Rank | Percent | Rank | Percent | Rank | Percent | Rank | Percent | Rank |
| Alabama | 3.63 | 46 | 13.5% | 45 | 15.6% | 40 | 16.9% | 45 | 31.5% | 47 |
| Alaska | 4.31 | 8 | 22.2% | 7 | 12.1% | 27 | 8.1% | 2 | 32.9% | 35 |
| Arizona | 4.01 | 22 | 17.2% | 25 | 17.2% | 44 | 15.5% | 38 | 37.6% | 3 |
| Arkansas | 3.50 | 50 | 11.9% | 50 | 19.9% | 49 | 16.8% | 44 | 31.6% | 45 |
| California | 4.13 | 16 | 20.1% | 13 | 16.9% | 43 | 15.1% | 37 | 35.5% | 12 |
| Colorado | 4.50 | 2 | 23.5% | 4 | 12.4% | 29 | 9.4% | 6 | 37.6% | 3 |
| Connecticut | 4.44 | 4 | 23.8% | 3 | 8.6% | 5 | 9.5% | 7 | 33.6% | 28 |
| Delaware | 4.15 | 15 | 18.7% | 16 | 13.2% | 32 | 9.8% | 9 | 35.3% | 14 |
| District of Columbia | 4.84 | 1 | 30.6% | 1 | 16.1% | 42 | 20.1% | 48 | 41.3% | 1 |
| Florida | 3.84 | 38 | 15.1% | 36 | 17.3% | 45 | 14.8% | 35 | 35.2% | 16 |
| Georgia | 3.92 | 31 | 16.8% | 27 | 14.9% | 37 | 14.0% | 33 | 33.6% | 28 |
| Hawaii | 4.40 | 7 | 20.9% | 11 | 6.7% | 1 | 11.1% | 18 | 37.6% | 3 |
| Idaho | 3.85 | 36 | 14.6% | 41 | 12.1% | 27 | 12.1% | 25 | 33.8% | 25 |
| Illinois | 4.11 | 19 | 18.4% | 17 | 10.2% | 14 | 12.2% | 26 | 34.5% | 21 |
| Indiana | 3.83 | 41 | 13.4% | 46 | 11.1% | 17 | 10.9% | 15 | 34.4% | 22 |
| Iowa | 3.95 | 28 | 15.0% | 38 | 8.8% | 7 | 10.7% | 14 | 34.3% | 23 |
| Kansas | 4.09 | 20 | 18.4% | 17 | 12.0% | 25 | 13.4% | 31 | 34.7% | 19 |
| Kentucky | 3.56 | 48 | 12.2% | 49 | 15.0% | 38 | 16.9% | 45 | 31.4% | 48 |
| Louisiana | 3.62 | 47 | 14.5% | 42 | 19.2% | 48 | 21.3% | 49 | 32.5% | 37 |
| Maine | 3.98 | 26 | 17.2% | 25 | 11.4% | 20 | 10.9% | 15 | 32.2% | 40 |
| Maryland | 4.46 | 3 | 23.1% | 6 | 12.5% | 30 | 9.7% | 8 | 37.1% | 6 |
| Massachusetts | 4.42 | 6 | 24.1% | 2 | 10.8% | 16 | 10.2% | 11 | 33.3% | 31 |
| Michigan | 3.95 | 28 | 15.1% | 36 | 9.6% | 10 | 12.6% | 29 | 35.2% | 16 |
| Minnesota | 4.20 | 12 | 19.2% | 15 | 8.0% | 4 | 10.9% | 15 | 34.6% | 20 |
| Mississippi | 3.49 | 51 | 13.3% | 47 | 18.4% | 47 | 21.4% | 50 | 30.2% | 51 |
| Missouri | 3.90 | 32 | 15.2% | 35 | 11.9% | 23 | 11.6% | 25 | 33.8% | 25 |
| Montana | 4.00 | 23 | 18.0% | 20 | 12.0% | 25 | 14.8% | 35 | 33.2% | 32 |
| Nebraska | 4.06 | 21 | 16.7% | 28 | 9.4% | 9 | 10.6% | 13 | 35.1% | 18 |
| Nevada | 3.84 | 38 | 12.8% | 48 | 15.1% | 39 | 10.1% | 10 | 36.9% | 7 |
| New Hampshire | 4.25 | 10 | 21.1% | 9 | 10.7% | 15 | 7.6% | 1 | 32.2% | 40 |
| New Jersey | 4.19 | 13 | 21.0% | 10 | 12.8% | 31 | 9.0% | 4 | 31.9% | 42 |
| New Mexico | 3.90 | 32 | 17.8% | 22 | 24.1% | 5 | 21.6% | 51 | 37.8% | 2 |
| New York | 4.13 | 16 | 20.7% | 12 | 14.5% | 36 | 16.6% | 42 | 34.1% | 24 |
| North Carolina | 3.87 | 34 | 15.7% | 32 | 11.9% | 23 | 13.4% | 31 | 32.4% | 38 |
| North Dakota | 3.94 | 30 | 16.7% | 28 | 8.6% | 5 | 13.1% | 30 | 31.7% | 44 |
| Ohio | 3.84 | 38 | 14.4% | 43 | 11.6% | 21 | 12.4% | 28 | 33.7% | 27 |
| Oklahoma | 3.76 | 43 | 15.0% | 38 | 17.4% | 46 | 16.3% | 40 | 33.6% | 28 |
| Oregon | 4.16 | 14 | 18.1% | 19 | 11.8% | 22 | 11.3% | 19 | 36.8% | 8 |
| Pennsylvania | 3.85 | 36 | 15.3% | 34 | 9.7% | 11 | 11.9% | 23 | 31.2% | 49 |
| Rhode Island | 4.00 | 23 | 18.0% | 20 | 11.1% | 17 | 12.3% | 27 | 31.6% | 45 |
| South Carolina | 3.76 | 43 | 14.7% | 40 | 13.9% | 34 | 16.3% | 40 | 32.8% | 36 |
| South Dakota | 3.87 | 34 | 15.5% | 33 | 8.8% | 7 | 14.1% | 34 | 31.9% | 42 |
| Tennessee | 3.75 | 45 | 14.0% | 44 | 7.8% | 2 | 15.9% | 39 | 31.1% | 50 |
| Texas | 3.82 | 42 | 17.4% | 24 | 21.9% | 50 | 16.7% | 43 | 33.0% | 34 |
| Utah | 4.13 | 16 | 17.5% | 23 | 10.1% | 12 | 8.2% | 3 | 35.3% | 14 |
| Vermont | 4.44 | 4 | 23.2% | 5 | 10.1% | 12 | 10.2% | 11 | 35.7% | 11 |
| Virginia | 4.27 | 9 | 21.3% | 8 | 13.4% | 33 | 11.8% | 21 | 35.4% | 13 |
| Washington | 4.24 | 11 | 19.7% | 14 | 11.1% | 17 | 12.0% | 24 | 36.5% | 9 |
| West Virginia | 3.51 | 49 | 10.9% | 51 | 14.3% | 35 | 18.1% | 47 | 32.3% | 39 |
| Wisconsin | 3.99 | 25 | 16.0% | 31 | 7.9% | 3 | 9.3% | 5 | 33.1% | 33 |
| Wyoming | 3.96 | 27 | 16.1% | 30 | 15.8% | 41 | 11.8% | 21 | 35.9% | 10 |
| United States | 4.00 | | 17.6% | | 13.8% | | 13.7% | | 34.1% | |

Appendix III: State-by-State Rankings on the Composite Indices and their Components (continued)

| REPRODUCTIVE RIGHTS | Composite Index | | Notification | | Waiting Period | | Public Funding | | Providers | | Contraceptive Coverage | | Pro-Choice Government | | Infertility | | Adoption | |
|----------------------|-----------------|------|--------------|------|----------------|------|----------------|------|-----------|------|------------------------|------|-----------------------|------|-------------|------|----------|------|
| | Score | Rank | Score | Rank | Score | Rank | Score | Rank | Score | Rank | Score | Rank | Score | Rank | Score | Rank | Score | Rank |
| Alabama | 1.09 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.09 | 0 | 0.50 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.50 | 0 | 0.50 | 0 |
| Alaska | 2.36 | 15 | 0* | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.28 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.33 | 0 | 0.50 | 0 | 0.50 | 0 |
| Arizona | 0.90 | 34 | 0* | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.27 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.25 | 0 |
| Arkansas | 0.67 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.04 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.25 | 0 |
| California | 2.67 | 13 | 0* | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.67 | 0 | 0.50 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.50 | 0 | 0.50 | 0 |
| Colorado | 1.07 | 31 | 0* | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.24 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.33 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Connecticut | 4.50 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.88 | 0 | 0.50 | 0 | 1.00 | 0 | 0.75 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Delaware | 0.80 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.67 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.25 | 0 |
| District of Columbia | 3.04 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.67 | 0 | 0.75 | 0 | 0.25 | 0 |
| Florida | 1.89 | 18 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.31 | 0 | 0.50 | 0 | 0.33 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Georgia | 1.02 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.14 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.25 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Hawaii | 5.62 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | 0 | 1.00 | 0 | 1.00 | 0 | 0.25 | 0 | 0.25 | 0 |
| Idaho | 1.49 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.11 | 0 | 0.50 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.25 | 0 |
| Illinois | 2.22 | 16 | 0* | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.09 | 0 | 0.50 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.75 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Indiana | 0.60 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.10 | 0 | 0.50 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.50 | 0 | 0.50 | 0 |
| Iowa | 1.79 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.04 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.50 | 0 |
| Kansas | 0.19 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.06 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.25 | 0 |
| Kentucky | 0.48 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.02 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.33 | 0 | 0.25 | 0 | 0.25 | 0 |
| Louisiana | 1.21 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.08 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.25 | 0 |
| Maine | 1.46 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.50 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.33 | 0 | 0.25 | 0 | 0.25 | 0 |
| Maryland | 3.08 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.50 | 0 | 1.00 | 0 | 0.33 | 0 | 0.50 | 0 | 0.50 | 0 |
| Massachusetts | 2.94 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.86 | 0 | 0.50 | 0 | 0.33 | 0 | 1.00 | 0 | 0.50 | 0 |
| Michigan | 0.47 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.22 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.50 | 0 |
| Minnesota | 2.80 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.50 | 0 |
| Mississippi | 0.18 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.25 | 0 | 0.25 | 0 |
| Missouri | 1.25 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.04 | 0 | 0.50 | 0 | 0.33 | 0 | 0.25 | 0 | 0.25 | 0 |
| Montana | 1.76 | 21 | 0* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.13 | 0 | 1.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.25 | 0 | 0.25 | 0 |
| Nebraska | 0.16 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.03 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.25 | 0 |
| Nevada | 0.93 | 33 | 0* | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.18 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.50 | 0 | 0.50 | 0 |
| New Hampshire | 3.50 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.50 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| New Jersey | 3.47 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.76 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.33 | 0 | 0.75 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| New Mexico | 2.43 | 14 | 0* | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.18 | 0 | 1.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.50 | 0 | 0.50 | 0 |
| New York | 4.68 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.60 | 0 | 0.50 | 0 | 0.33 | 0 | 1.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| North Carolina | 1.30 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.34 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.33 | 0 | 0.25 | 0 | 0.25 | 0 |
| North Dakota | 0.15 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.02 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.25 | 0 |
| Ohio | 0.35 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.10 | 0 | 0.50 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.50 | 0 | 0.50 | 0 |
| Oklahoma | 1.43 | 24 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.50 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.25 | 0 | 0.25 | 0 |
| Oregon | 3.83 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.25 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.33 | 0 | 0.50 | 0 | 0.50 | 0 |
| Pennsylvania | 0.88 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.30 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.33 | 0 | 0.50 | 0 | 0.50 | 0 |
| Rhode Island | 1.15 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.40 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.50 | 0 | 0.50 | 0 |
| South Carolina | 0.60 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.22 | 0 | 0.50 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.25 | 0 | 0.25 | 0 |
| South Dakota | 0.40 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.02 | 0 | 0.50 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.25 | 0 | 0.25 | 0 |
| Tennessee | 0.24 | 47 | 0* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.11 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.25 | 0 | 0.25 | 0 |
| Texas | 1.82 | 19 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.07 | 0 | 1.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.50 | 0 | 0.50 | 0 |
| Utah | 0.45 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.07 | 0 | 0.50 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.25 | 0 | 0.25 | 0 |
| Vermont | 4.32 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.57 | 0 | 0.50 | 0 | 1.00 | 0 | 1.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Virginia | 1.38 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.25 | 0 | 1.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.25 | 0 | 0.25 | 0 |
| Washington | 3.11 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.28 | 0 | 0.50 | 0 | 0.33 | 0 | 0.50 | 0 | 0.25 | 0 |
| West Virginia | 2.17 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.04 | 0 | 1.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.25 | 0 | 0.25 | 0 |
| Wisconsin | 0.32 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 0* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.07 | 0 | 0.50 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Wyoming | 0.76 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.13 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.25 | 0 |

* Indicates the legislation is not enforced but remains part of the statutory code.

Appendix IV: State and National Resources

Selected Mississippi Resources

AFL-CIO
760 N. West Street
Jackson, MS 39202
Tel: (601) 948-0517

American Association of Retired Persons
500 W. County Line Road
Tougaloo, MS 39213
Tel: (601) 956-3210

American Civil Liberties Union,
Mississippi Chapter
PO Box 2242
Jackson, MS 39225
Tel: (601) 355-6464

American Federation of Teachers
1140 Pass Road
Gulfport, MS 39501
Tel: (228) 868-1397

Business and Professional Women -
Mississippi
PO Box 1451
Clarksdale, MS 38614
Tel: (601) 627-7215

Catholic Charities
748 N. President Street
Jackson, MS 39202
Tel: (601) 355-8634
Tel: (800) 273-9012

Child Abuse Hotline
Tel: (800) 222-8000

Children's Defense Fund
207 W. Amite Street #13
Jackson, MS 39201
Tel: (601) 355-1213
Fax: (601) 355-0957

Coalition Against Sexual Assault
PO Box 4172
Jackson, MS 39296
Tel: (888) 987-9011

Coalition of Labor Union Women
PO Box 3379
Jackson, MS 39207
Tel: (601) 948-0517

Congregations for Children
A Project of Moore Community House
406 Davis Street
Biloxi, MS 39530
Tel: (601) 436-3741
Fax: (601) 436-5580

Department of Human Services
Tel: (800) 345-6347
Children's Health, Medicaid, Food
Stamps, Welfare Reform
Tel: (800) 948-3050

Employment Security Commission
Employment and Unemployment Services
PO Box 1699
Jackson, MS 39215
Tel: (601) 354-8711

First Call
Crisis Hotline
Tel: (601) 352-4357

Girl Scouts, Middle Mississippi Council
1471 W. County Line Road
Jackson, MS 39213
Tel: (601) 366-0607

Grace House Hospice for People with
AIDS
236 Millsaps Avenue
Jackson, MS 39202
Tel: (601) 353-1038

Gulf Coast Women's Center
PO Box 333
Biloxi, MS 39533
Crisis: (228) 435-1968
Bus: (228) 436-3809

Institutions of Higher Learning
Center for Policy Research and Planning
3825 Ridgewood Road
Jackson, MS 39211
Tel: (601) 982-6376

Jackson Metro Housing Partnership
1217 N. West Street
Jackson, MS 39202
Tel: (601) 969-1895

Jackson Urban League
3405 Medgar Evers Boulevard
Jackson, MS 39213
Tel: (601) 981-4211

Kids Count
Forum on Children and Families
737 N. President Street
Jackson, MS 39202
Tel: (601) 355-4911

League of Women Voters of Mississippi
Tel: (601) 352-4616

Living Independent for Everyone (LIFE)
754 N. President Street
Jackson, MS 39202
Tel: (601) 969-4009

Mississippi Alliance of State Employees
809 N. State Street
Jackson, MS 39202
Tel: (601) 352-4939

Mississippi Association of Educators
775 N. State Street
Jackson, MS 39202
Tel: (601) 354-4463

Mississippi Food Network
440 Beatty Street
Jackson, MS 39201
Tel: (601) 353-7286

Mississippi Gay and Lesbian Alliance
2541 Coronet Place
Jackson, MS 39204
Tel: (601) 371-3019

Mississippi Human Services Agenda
921 N. Congress Street
Jackson, MS 39202
Tel: (601) 355-7495

Mississippi State Department of Health
2423 North State Street
Jackson, MS 39215
Tel: (601) 960-7470
Fax: (601) 354-6104

Mississippi Women Lawyers Association
PO Box 862
Jackson, MS 39205
Tel: (601) 949-4785
Fax: (601) 981-0065

Mississippi Women's Resource Center
PO Box 3833
Jackson, MS 39209
Tel: (601) 992-5432

NAACP
1072 W. Lynch Street
Jackson, MS 39203
Tel: (601) 353-6906
Fax: (601) 353-8452

National Association of Social Workers
PO Box 4228
Jackson, MS 39296-4228
Tel: (601) 981-8359

National Organization for Women
1546 Torrence Drive
Jackson, MS 39212
Tel: (601) 373-7547

New Horizons (formerly Displaced
Homemakers)
Mississippi Gulf Coast Community
College
2226 Switzer Road
Gulfport, MS 39507
Tel: (228) 896-2509

Pro-Choice Mississippi
PO Box 3833
Jackson, MS 39207
Tel: (601) 992-4143

Resource Center Network
PO Box 6279
Pearl, MS 39288
Tel: (601) 932-4198

Sarah Isom Center for Women's Studies
University of Mississippi
University, MS 38677
Tel: (601) 232-5916

Small Business Administration
Women's Program
101 W. Capital Street
Jackson, MS 39201
Tel: (601) 965-4378

Stewpot Community Services
Matt's House Women's Shelter
343 Adele Street
Jackson, MS 39202
Tel: (601) 354-5799

Take Care
Maternal and Child Health Services
Information
Tel: (800) 721-7222

U.S. Small Business Association
Mississippi Women's Prequalification
Pilot Loan Program
101 W. Capitol St., Suite 400
Jackson, MS 39201
Tel: (601) 965-4378

Volunteer Resource Center
843 N. President Street
Jackson, MS 39202
Tel: (601) 354-1765

Women's Legal Rights in Mississippi
Women and the Law Committee
Young Lawyers' Division
Mississippi Bar Association
P.O. Box 2168
Jackson, MS 39225
Tel: (601) 948-4471

Women's Political Network
PO Box 13529
Jackson, MS 39236
Tel: (601) 981-8359

Women's Studies, Millsaps College
PO Box 150071
Jackson, MS 39210
Tel: (601) 974-1306

National Resources

AFL-CIO Department of Working Women
815 16th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006
Tel: (202) 637-5064
Fax: (202) 637-6902
<http://www.aflcio.org>

African American Women's Association
PO Box 55122
Washington, DC 20011
Tel/Fax: (202) 882-8263

Alan Guttmacher Institute
1120 Connecticut Avenue, Suite 460
Washington, DC 20036
Tel: (202) 296-4012
Fax: (202) 223-5756
<http://www.agi-usa.org>

American Association of Retired Persons
601 E Street, NW
Washington, DC 20049
Tel: (202) 434-2277
Fax: (202) 434-6477
<http://www.aarp.org>

American Association of University Women
1111 16th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036
Tel: (202) 785-7700
Fax: (202) 872-1425
<http://www.aauw.org>

American Medical Women's Association
801 North Fairfax Street, #400
Alexandria, VA 22314
Tel: (703) 838-0500
Fax: (703) 549-3864
<http://www.amwa-doc.org>

American Nurses Association
600 Maryland Avenue, SW, Suite 100W
Washington, DC 20024-2571
Tel: (202) 651-7000
Fax: (202) 651-7001

American Women's Economic Development Corporation
71 Vanderbilt Avenue, Suite 320
New York, NY 10169
Tel: (212) 692-9100
Fax: (212) 692-2718

The Annie E. Casey Foundation
701 St. Paul Street
Baltimore, MD 21202
Tel: (410) 547-6600
Fax: (410) 223-2927
<http://www.aecf.org>

Asian Women in Business/Asian American Professional Women
One West 34th Street, Suite 1201
New York, NY 10001
Tel: (212) 868-1368
Fax: (212) 868-1373

Association of Black Women Entrepreneurs, Inc.
PO Box 49368
Los Angeles, CA 90049
Tel/Fax: (213) 624-8639

Black Women United for Action
6551 Loisdale Court, Suite 222
Springfield, VA 22150
Tel: (703) 922-5757
Fax: (703) 971-5892

Business and Professional Women/USA
2012 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036
Tel: (202) 293-1100
Fax: (202) 861-0298
<http://www.bpwusa.org>

Catalyst
250 Park Avenue South
New York, NY 10003-1459
Tel: (212) 777-8900

Center for Advancement of Public Policy, Washington Feminist Faxnet
1735 S Street, NW
Washington, DC 20009
Tel: (202) 797-0606
Fax: (202) 265-6245
<http://www.essential.org/capp>

Center for the American Woman and Politics
Eagleton Institute of Politics,
Rutgers University
191 Riders Lane
New Brunswick, NJ 08901
Tel: (732) 828-2210
Fax: (732) 932-6778

Center for the Child Care Workforce
733 15th Street, NW, Suite 1037
Washington, DC 20005-2112
Tel: (202) 737-7700 or
(800) U-R-WORTHY
Fax: (202) 737-0370
<http://www.ccw.org>

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Health Statistics
6525 Belcrest Road
Hyattsville, MD 20782
Tel: (301) 436-8500
<http://www.cdc.gov>

Center for Law and Social Policy
1616 P Street, NW, Suite 150
Washington, DC 20036
Tel: (202) 328-5140
Fax: (202) 328-5195
<http://www.clasp.org>

Center for Policy Alternatives
1875 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 710
Washington, DC 20009
Tel: (800) 935-0699
Fax: (202) 387-2539
<http://www.cfpa.org>

Center for Reproductive Law and Policy
120 Wall Street
New York, NY 10005
Tel: (212) 514-5534
Fax: (212) 514-5538
<http://www.crlp.org>

Center for Research on Women
University of Memphis
Clement Hall, Room 339
Memphis, TN 38152
Tel: (901) 678-2770
Fax: (901) 678-3652

Center for Women's Policy Studies
1211 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 312
Washington, DC 20036
Tel: (202) 872-1770
Fax: (202) 296-8962

Center on Budget and Policy Priorities
820 First Street, NE, Suite 510
Washington, DC 20002
Tel: (202) 408-1080
Fax: (202) 408-1056
<http://www.cbpp.org>

Child Care Action Campaign
330 Seventh Avenue, 7th Floor
New York, NY 10001
Tel: (212) 239-0138
Fax: (212) 268-6515

Children's Defense Fund
25 E Street, NW
Washington, DC 20001
Tel: (202) 628-8787
or (800) CDF-1200
Fax: (202) 662-3540
<http://www.childrensdefense.org>

Church Women United
475 Riverside Drive, Suite 500
New York, NY 10115
Tel: (212) 870-2347
Fax: (212) 870-2338
<http://www.churchwomen.org>

Coalition of Labor Union Women
1126 16th Street, NW, Suite 104
Washington, DC 20036
Tel: (202) 466-4610
Fax: (202) 776-0537

Coalition on Human Needs
1000 Wisconsin Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20007
Tel: (202) 342-0726
Fax: (202) 342-1856
<http://www.chn.org>

Economic Policy Institute
1660 L Street, NW, Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20036
Tel: (202) 775-8810
Fax: (202) 775-0819
<http://www.epinet.org>

Equal Rights Advocates
1663 Mission Street, Suite 550
San Francisco, CA 94103
Tel: (415) 621-0672
Fax: (415) 621-6744
<http://www.equalrights.org>

Family Violence Prevention Fund
383 Rhode Island Street, Suite 304
San Francisco, CA 94103-5133
Tel: (415) 252-8900
Fax: (415) 252-8991

The Feminist Majority Foundation
1600 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 801
Arlington, VA 22209
Tel: (703) 522-2214
Fax: (703) 522-2219
<http://www.feminist.org>

General Federation of Women's Clubs
1734 N Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036-2990
Tel: (202) 347-3168
Fax: (202) 835-0246

Hadassah
50 West 58th Street
New York, NY 10019
Tel: (212) 303-8136
Fax: (212) 303-4525
<http://www.hadassah>

Hispanic Women's Council
3509 West Beverly Boulevard
Montebello, CA 90640
Tel: (213) 728-9991
Fax: (213) 725-0939

HumanSERVE
Campaign for Universal Voter Registration
622 West 113th Street, Suite 410
New York, NY 10025
Tel: (212) 854-4053
Fax: (212) 854-8727
<http://www.igc.org/humanserve>

Institute for Women's Policy Research
1400 20th Street, NW, Suite 104
Washington, DC 20036
Tel: (202) 785-5100
Fax: (202) 833-4362
<http://www.iwpr.org>

Jacobs Institute of Women's Health
409 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20024-2188
Tel: (202)863-4990
Fax: (202)554-0453
<http://www.jiwh.org>

Joint Center for Political and
Economic Studies
1090 Vermont Avenue, NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005-4961
Tel: (202) 789-3500
Fax: (202) 789-6390
<http://www.jointctr.org>

League of Women Voters
1730 M Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036
Tel: (202) 429-1965
Fax: (202) 429-0854
<http://www.lwv.org>

MANA - A National Latina Organization
1725 K Street, NW, Suite 501
Washington, DC 20006
Tel: (202) 833-0060
Fax: (202) 496-0588
<http://www.hermana.org>

Ms. Foundation for Women
120 Wall Street, 33rd Floor
New York, NY 10005
Tel: (212) 742-2300
Fax: (212) 742-1653
<http://www.msfoundation.org>

National Abortion and Reproductive
Rights Action League
1156 15th Street, NW, Suite700
Washington, DC 20005
Tel: (202) 973-3000
Fax: (202) 973-3097
<http://www.naral.org>

National Association of Women Business
Owners
1100 Wayne Avenue, Suite 830
Silver Spring, MD 20910
Tel: (301) 608-2590
Fax: (301) 608-2596
<http://www.nawbo.org>

National Association of Commissions for
Women
8630 Fenton Street, Suite 934
Silver Spring, MD 20910
Tel: (301) 585-8101
Fax: (301) 585-3445
<http://www.nacw.org>

National Association of Negro Business
and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc.
1806 New Hampshire Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20009
Tel: (202) 483-4206
Fax: (202) 462-7253
<http://www.nanbpwc.org>

National Center for American Indian
Enterprise Development
953 East Juanita Avenue
Mesa, AZ 85204
Tel: (602) 545-1298
Fax: (602) 545-4208
<http://www.ncied.org>

National Committee on Pay Equity
1126 16th Street, NW, Suite 411
Washington, DC 20036
Tel: (202) 331-7343
Fax: (202) 331-7406
<http://www.feminist.com/fairpay.htm>

National Conference of Puerto Rican
Women
5 Thomas Circle, NW
Washington, DC 20005
Tel: (202) 387-4716

National Council for Research on Women
11 Hanover Square, 20th Floor
New York, NY 10005
Tel: (212) 785-7335
Fax: (212) 785-7350
<http://www.ncrw.org>

National Council of Negro Women
1001 G Street, NW, Suite 800
Washington, DC 20001
Tel: (202) 628-0015
Fax: (202) 628-0233

National Council of Women's Organizations
c/o National Committee on Pay Equity
1126 16th Street, NW, Suite 411
Washington, DC 20036
Tel: (202) 331-7343
Fax: (202) 331-7406

National Education Association
1201 16th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036
Tel: (202) 833-4000
Fax: (202) 822-7397
<http://www.nea.org>

National Employment Law Project, Inc.
55 John Street, 7th Floor
New York, NY 10038
Tel: (212) 285-3025
Fax: (212) 285-3044

National Foundation of Women Business Owners
1180 Wayne Avenue, Suite 830
Silver Spring, MD 20910
Tel: (301) 495-4975
Fax: (301) 495-4979
<http://www.www.nfwbo.org>

National Gay and Lesbian Task Force
2520 17th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20009
Tel: (202) 332-6482
Fax: (202) 332-0207
<http://www.nglwf.org>

National Organization for Women
1000 16th Street, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036
Tel: (202) 331-0066
Fax: (202) 785-8576
<http://www.now.org>

NOW Legal Defense and Education Fund
99 Hudson Street, 12th Floor
New York, NY 10013
Tel: (212) 925-6635
Fax: (212) 226-1066
<http://www.nowldef.org>

National Partnership for Women and Families
1875 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 710
Washington, DC 20009
Tel: (202) 986-2600
Fax: (202) 986-2539
<http://www.nationalpartnership.org>

National Political Congress of Black Women
8401 Colesville Road, Suite 400
Silver Spring, MD 20910
Tel: (301) 562-8000
Fax: (301) 562-8303
<http://www.natpolcongbblackwomen.org>

National Resource Center on Domestic Violence
6400 Flank Drive
Harrisburg, PA 17112-2778
Tel: (800) 932-4632
Fax: (717) 671-8149

National Women's Business Council
409 Third Street, SW, Suite 5850
Washington, DC 20024
Tel: (202) 205-3850
Fax: (202) 205-6825
<http://www.womenconnect.com>

National Women's Health Network
514 10th Street, NW, Suite 400
Washington, DC 20004
Tel: (202) 347-1140
Fax: (202) 347-1168

National Women's Law Center
11 Dupont Circle, NW, Suite 800
Washington, DC 20036
Tel: (202) 588-5180
Fax: (202) 588-5185

National Women's Political Caucus
1211 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 501
Washington, DC 20008
Tel: (202) 785-1100
Fax: (202) 785-3605
<http://www.nwpc.org>

National Women's Studies Association
7100 Baltimore Avenue, Suite 301
College Park, MD 20740
Tel: (301) 403-0525
Fax: (301) 403-4137
<http://www.nwsa.org>

9 to 5, National Association of Working Women
231 Wisconsin Avenue, Suite 900
Milwaukee, WI 53203
Tel: (414) 274-0925
Fax: (414) 272-2870
<http://www.members.aol.com/nwsa925>

Older Women's League
666 11th Street, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20001
Tel: (202) 783-6686
Fax: (202) 638-2356

Pension Rights Center
918 16th Street, NW, Suite 704
Washington, DC 20006
Tel: (202) 296-3776
Fax: (202) 833-2472

Planned Parenthood Federation of America
810 Seventh Avenue
New York, NY 10019
Tel: (212) 347-8500
Fax: (212) 783-1007
<http://www.plannedparenthood.org>

Population Reference Bureau, Inc.
1875 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 520
Washington, DC 20009-5728
Tel: (202) 483-1100
Fax: (202) 483-3937
<http://www.prb.org>

The Urban Institute
2100 M Street, NW
Washington, DC 20037
Tel: (202) 833-7200
Fax: (202) 659-8985
<http://www.urban.org>

U.N. Secretariat of the Fourth World Conference on Women
Division for the Advancement of Women
Two United Nations Plaza
New York, NY 10017
Tel: (212) 963-8385
Fax: (212) 963-3463

U.S. Department of Commerce,
Bureau of the Census
Population Division
Washington, DC 20233
Tel: (301) 457-2422
Fax: (301) 457-2643
<http://www.census.gov>

U.S. Department of Education
600 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20202
Tel: (202) 401-1576
Fax: (202) 401-0596
<http://www.ed.gov>

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
200 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20201
Tel: (202) 690-7204
<http://www.os.dhhs.gov>

U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of
Labor Statistics
Washington, DC 20212
Tel: (202) 606-6392 for State Labor
Force Data
<http://stats.bls.gov>

Victim Services, Inc.
2 Lafayette Street, 3rd Floor
New York, NY 10007
Tel: (212) 577-7700
Fax: (212) 985-0331

White House Office for Women's
Initiatives & Outreach
Old Executive Office Building, Room 15
Washington, DC 20502
Tel: (202) 456-7300
Fax: (202) 456-7311
<http://www.whitehouse.gov>

Wider Opportunities for Women
815 15th Street, NW, Suite 916
Washington, DC 20005
Tel: (202) 638-3143
Fax: (202) 638-4885
<http://www.w-o-w.org>

Women Employed
22 West Monroe, Suite 1400
Chicago, IL 60603
Tel: (312) 782-3902
Fax: (312) 782-5249

Women Work!
1625 K Street, NW, Suite 300
Washington, DC 20006
Tel: (202) 467-6346
Fax: (202) 467-5366

Women's Bureau
U.S. Department of Labor
200 Constitution Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20210
Tel: (800) 219-6611
Fax: (202) 219-5529
<http://www.dol.gov/dol/wb>

Women's Environmental and
Development Organization
845 Third Avenue, 15th Floor
New York, NY 10022
Tel: (212) 759-7982
Fax: (212) 759-8647

Women's Institute for a Secure
Retirement
1201 Pennsylvania Ave., NW, Suite 619
Washington, DC 20004
Tel: (202) 393-5452
Fax: (202) 638-1336

Women's Research and Education
Institute
1750 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 350
Washington, DC 20006
Tel: (202) 628-0444
Fax: (202) 628-0458

YWCA USA
726 Broadway
New York, NY 10003
Tel: (212) 614-2700
Fax: (212) 667-9716

Young Women's Project
923 F Street, NW, 3rd Floor
Washington, DC 20004
Tel: (202) 393-0461
Fax: (202) 393-0065

Appendix V: List of Census Bureau Regions

East South Central

Alabama
Kentucky
Mississippi
Tennessee

West South Central

Arkansas
Louisiana
Oklahoma
Texas

West North Central

Iowa
Kansas
Minnesota
Missouri
Nebraska
North Dakota
South Dakota

East North Central

Illinois
Indiana
Michigan
Ohio
Wisconsin

Pacific West

Alaska
California
Hawaii
Oregon
Washington

Mountain West

Arizona
Colorado
Idaho
Montana
New Mexico
Nevada
Utah
Wyoming

New England

Connecticut
Maine
Massachusetts
New Hampshire
Rhode Island
Vermont

Middle Atlantic

New Jersey
New York
Pennsylvania

South Atlantic

Delaware
Florida
Georgia
Maryland
North Carolina
South Carolina
Virginia
West Virginia
District of Columbia

References

- American Cancer Society. 1997a. *Cancer Facts and Figures: 1997*. Atlanta, GA: American Cancer Society.
- American Cancer Society. 1997b. *Cancer Risk Report: Prevention and Control, 1995*. Atlanta, GA: American Cancer Society.
- The Annie E. Casey Foundation. 1997. *Kids Count Data Book 1997*. Baltimore, MD: Annie E. Casey Foundation.
- Blank, Rebecca. 1990. "Are Part-Time Jobs Bad Jobs?" In *A Future of Lousy Jobs: The Changing Structure of U.S. Wages*. G. Burtless (ed). Washington, DC: The Brookings Institute.
- Blau, Francine, and Lawrence Kahn. 1994. "Rising Wage Inequality and the U.S. Gender Gap." *American Economic Review* 84(2).
- Brown, Robin. 1994. *Children in Crisis*. New York: The H. W. Wilson Company.
- Cancian, Maria, Sheldon Danziger and Peter Gottschalk. 1993. "Working Wives and Family Income Inequality Among Married Couples." In *Uneven Tides: Rising Inequality in America*, Sheldon Danziger and Peter Gottschalk (eds). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Carroll, Susan J. 1994. *Women as Candidates in American Politics*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Carroll, Susan J., and Linda M.G. Zerilli. 1993. "Feminist Challenges to Political Science." In *Political Science: The State of the Discipline*, Ada W. Finifter (ed). Washington, DC: American Political Science Association.
- Catalyst. 1996. *The 1996 Catalyst Census of Women Corporate Officers and Top Earners*. New York: Catalyst.
- Center for the American Woman and Politics (CAWP), Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University. 1998a. *Statewide Elective Executive Women 1998 Fact Sheet*. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for the American Woman and Politics.
- Center for the American Woman and Politics (CAWP), Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University. 1998b. *Women in the U.S. House of Representatives 1998 Fact Sheet*. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for the American Woman and Politics.
- Center for the American Woman and Politics (CAWP), Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University. 1998c. *Women in the U.S. Senate 1922-1998 Fact Sheet*. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for the American Woman and Politics.
- Center for the American Woman and Politics (CAWP), Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University. 1998d. *Women in State Legislatures 1998 Fact Sheet*. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for the American Woman and Politics.
- Center for the American Woman and Politics (CAWP), Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University. 1998e. *Women's Caucuses in State Legislatures*, CAWP News and Notes 11(3).
- Center for the American Woman and Politics (CAWP), Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University. 1991. *The Impact of Women in Public Office: Findings at a Glance*. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for the American Woman and Politics.
- Center for Policy Alternatives. 1995. *A Matter of Simple Justice: Beijing Blue Book*. Washington, DC: Center for Policy Alternatives.
- Center for Women in Government. 1997. *Appointed Policy Makers in State Government: The Regional Profile*. Albany, NY: Center for Women in Government.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. 1997a. *Report of Final Mortality Statistics, 1995*. Monthly Vital Statistics Report 45 (11S2), June 12.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. 1997b. *Report of Final Natality Statistics, 1995*. Monthly Vital Statistics Report 45 (11S), June 10.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. 1997c. *State- and Sex-Specific Prevalence of Selected Characteristics—Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System, 1994 and 1995*. Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report 46 (SS-3), August 1.
- Commonwealth Fund, Commission on Women's Health. July 1994. *Health Care Reform: What Is at Stake for Women?* New York: The Commonwealth Fund.

- Costello, Cynthia B., Jennifer E. Griffith, Angela Wilbon and Ashley Redfearn. 1998. *The Health of Mid-Life Women in the States: A Report Prepared for the Women's Research and Education Institute*. Washington, DC: Women's Research and Education Institute.
- Council of Economic Advisors. 1998. Data released at the celebration of the 35th anniversary of the Equal Pay Act. Washington, DC: The White House.
- Dalton, Russell J., and Martin P. Wattenberg. 1993. "The Not So Simple Act of Voting." In *Political Science: The State of the Discipline*, Ada W. Finifter (ed). Washington, DC: American Political Science Association.
- Delli Carpini, Michael X., and Ester R. Fuchs. 1993. "The Year of the Woman? Candidates, Voters and the 1992 Elections." *Political Science Quarterly* 108.
- Devine, Theresa J. 1994. "Characteristics of Self-Employed Women in the United States." *Monthly Labor Review* 117(3).
- Dodson, Debra L. (ed). 1991. *Gender and Policy Making: Studies of Women in Office*. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for the American Woman and Politics.
- Edmondson, Brad. 1998. "State Profiles: 1990-96." *American Demographics*. April.
- Evans, Sara. 1989. *Born for Liberty*. New York: Knopf, 1989.
- Gershenson, Leora. 1993. *U.S. Child Support Performance*. San Francisco, CA: The Child Support Reform Initiative.
- Gold, R. B., and D. Daley. 1994. *Uneven and Unequal: Insurance Coverage of Reproductive Health Services*. New York: The Alan Guttmacher Institute.
- Hart, Barbara J. 1992. "State Codes on Domestic Violence: Analysis, Commentary and Recommendations." *Juvenile and Family Court Journal* 43 (4).
- Hartmann, Heidi, Joan A. Kuriansky and Christine L. Owens. 1996. "Employment and Women's Health," in *Women's Health: The Commonwealth Survey*, Marilyn M. Falik and Karen Scott Collins (eds). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Hartmann, Heidi, Young-Hee Yoon, Roberta Spalter-Roth and Lois Shaw. 1995. *Temporary Disability Insurance: A Model to Provide Income Security Over the Life Cycle*. Paper presented at the 1995 Annual Meetings of the American Economics Association of the Allied Social Science Associations. Washington, DC: Institute for Women's Policy Research.
- Hartmann, Heidi I., and Stephanie Aaronson. 1994. "Pay Equity and Women's Wage Increases: Success in the States, A Model for the Nation." *Duke Journal of Gender Law and Policy*, Volume 1.
- Henshaw, Stanley K., and Jennifer Van Vort. 1994. "Abortion Services in the United States, 1991 and 1992," *Family Planning Perspectives* 26(3).
- HumanSERVE. 1996. *The National Voter Registration Act of 1993: 1995, The First Year*. Prepared for the National Motor Voter Coalition. New York, NY: HumanSERVE.
- Institute for Women's Policy Research (IWPR). 1998a. *Stall in Women's Real Wage Growth Slows Progress in Closing the Wage Gap*. Briefing Paper. Washington DC: Institute for Women's Policy Research.
- Institute for Women's Policy Research (IWPR). 1998b. Unpublished calculations based on the 1995-97 Current Population Survey March Demographic Supplements, for calendar years 1994-96.
- Institute for Women's Policy Research (IWPR). 1997. "Education and Job Training Under Welfare Reform." *Welfare Reform Network News* 9/10. August/September.
- Institute for Women's Policy Research (IWPR). 1996. *Research-in-Brief: Childcare Usage Among Low-Income and AFDC Families*. Washington, DC: Institute for Women's Policy Research. October.
- Institute for Women's Policy Research (IWPR). 1995a. *A Cross-State Comparison of the Economic Status of Women*. Calculations are based on the U.S. Bureau of the Census Public Use Microdata Sample, 1990 and 1980. Prepared by Susan M. Dynarski under the Public Policy Masters Program at the John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University.
- Institute for Women's Policy Research (IWPR). 1995b. *Research-in-Brief: Restructuring Work: How Have Women and Minority Managers Fared?* Washington, DC: Institute for Women's Policy Research. January.

- Jacobs, Eva E., (ed). 1997. *Handbook of U.S. Labor Statistics*. Lanham, MD: Bernan Press.
- Jacobs Institute of Women's Health. 1996. *In Touch* 4(2).
- King, Leslie, and Madonna Harrington Meyer. 1996. *The Politics of Reproductive Benefits: U.S. Insurance Coverage of Contraceptive and Infertility Treatments*. Presented at the 1996 American Sociological Association Annual Meeting, held in New York City. August.
- Lamphere, JoAnn, Danielle Holahan, Normandy Brangan and Robin Burke. 1997. *Reforming the Health Care System: State Profiles 1997*. Washington, DC: Public Policy Institute, American Association of Retired Persons.
- Liska, David W., Niall J. Brennan and Brian K. Bruen. 1998. *State-Level Databook on Health Care Access and Financing (Third Edition)*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.
- Lombard, Karen. 1996. *Female Self-Employment and the Demand for Flexible, Non-Standard Work Schedules*. Working Paper. Miami: University of Miami.
- McCloskey, Amanda H., Danielle Holahan, Normandy Brangan and Evelyn Yee. 1996. *Reforming the Health Care System: State Profiles 1996*. Washington, DC: Public Policy Institute, American Association of Retired Persons.
- McCloskey, Amanda H., Jennifer Woolwich and Danielle Holahan. 1995. *Reforming the Health Care System: State Profiles 1995*. Washington, DC: Public Policy Institute, American Association of Retired Persons.
- Miller, Patricia, (ed). 1998. *American Health Line 50-State Report: Fourteenth Edition*. Alexandria, VA: National Journal Group, Inc.
- Mueller, Carol M. (ed.) 1988. *The Politics of the Gender Gap: The Social Construction of Political Influence*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- NARAL and NARAL Foundation. 1998. *A State-by-State Review of Abortion and Reproductive Rights: Who Decides?* Washington, DC: NARAL.
- NARAL and NARAL Foundation. 1997. *A State-by-State Review of Abortion and Reproductive Rights: Who Decides?* Washington, DC: NARAL.
- National Association of Women's Commissions. 1997. *Membership Roster of State and Local Commissions, Part I*. Tables from website. <www.nacw.org/memros1.htm>
- National Cancer Institute, National Institutes of Health. 1997. *SEER Cancer Statistics Review, 1973-1994: Tables and Graphs*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
- National Center for Lesbian Rights (NCLR). 1998. *Lesbians and Gay Men as Adoptive Parents: An Overview of Current Law*. San Francisco, CA: National Center for Lesbian Rights.
- National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges. 1997. Unpublished data. *Family Violence Legislative Update: Volume II*. Reno, NV: University of Nevada—Reno.
- National Committee on Pay Equity. 1997. *State Government Pay Equity Activity*. Washington, DC: National Committee on Pay Equity.
- National Foundation for Women Business Owners. 1996. *Women-Owned Businesses in the United States: A Fact Sheet*. Silver Spring, MD: National Foundation for Women Business Owners.
- National Organization for Women, Legal Defense and Education Fund (NOW LDEF). 1998. *Summary of State Activity Regarding Family Violence Provisions in Their State Welfare Reforms*. Washington, DC: NOW LDEF.
- National Women's Political Caucus (NWPC). 1995. *Factsheet on Women's Political Progress*. Washington, DC: National Women's Political Caucus.
- Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc. 1998. *Equity in Prescription Insurance and Contraceptive Coverage Fact Sheet*. New York: Planned Parenthood Federation.
- Population Reference Bureau. 1993. *What the 1990 Census Tells Us About Women: A State Factbook*. Washington, DC: Population Reference Bureau.
- President's Interagency Council on Women. May 1996. *U.S. Follow-up to the U.N. Fourth World Conference*. Washington, DC: White House Office of Women's Initiatives and Outreach.
- Renwick, Trudi J. 1993. "Budget-based Poverty Measurement: 1992 Basic Needs Budgets." Proceedings of the Social Statistics Section. Alexandria, VA: American Statistical Association.
- Renwick, Trudi J., and Barbara R. Bergmann. 1993. "A Budget-Based Definition of Poverty With an Application to Single-Parent Families." *Journal of Human Resources* 28 (1).

- Rinehart, Sue Tolleson. 1992. *Gender Consciousness and Politics*. New York: Routledge, Chapman and Hall.
- Sapiro, Virginia. 1983. *The Political Integration of Women: Roles, Socialization and Politics*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Spalter-Roth, Roberta M., and Heidi I. Hartmann. 1993. "Dependence on Men, the Market or the State: The Rhetoric and Reality of Welfare Reform." Washington, DC: Institute for Women's Policy Research.
- Spalter-Roth, Roberta, Heidi Hartmann and Linda M. Andrews. 1990. *Mothers, Children and Low-Wage Work: The Ability to Earn a Family Wage*. Washington, DC: Institute for Women's Policy Research.
- Spalter-Roth, Roberta, Heidi Hartmann and Nancy Collins. 1993. *What Do Unions Do for Women?* Washington, DC: Institute for Women's Policy Research.
- Spalter-Roth, Roberta, Heidi Hartmann and Lois B. Shaw, with Linda Andrews, Jill Braunstein, and Lili Zandniapour. 1993b. *Exploring the Characteristics of Self-Employment and Part-Time Work Among Women*. Washington, DC: Institute for Women's Policy Research.
- Stetson, Dorothy McBride, and Amy Mazur (eds). 1995. *Comparative State Feminism*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Strategic Research Concepts. 1998. *Estimates of National Voter Turnout for 1992 and 1996: Using Voter News Service Exit Poll Proportions, Census Estimates of Voting Age Population, and Certified Election Returns*. Rockville, MD: Strategic Research Concepts.
- Thomas, Sue. 1994. *How Women Legislate*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- U.N. Fourth World Conference on Women. 1995. *Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action*. New York: United Nations.
- Urban Institute. 1996. "Health Reform and Its Implications for Employers." *Update* 21.
- U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. 1998a. "Educational Attainment in the United States: March 1997." *Current Population Reports* P20-505. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.
- U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. 1998b. *Estimated Median Age at First Marriage, by Sex: 1890 to the Present*. Table from website. <<http://www.census.gov/population/socdemo/ms-la/tabms-2.txt>>
- U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. 1998c. *Historical Income Tables—Persons 15 Years and Over by Median Earnings and Sex: 1967 to 1996*. Tables from website. <<http://www.census.gov/hhes/income/histinc/p31b>>
- U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. 1998d. *Percent of People 25 Years Old and Over Who Have Completed High School by Race, Hispanic Origin and Gender: Selected Years 1940 to 1997; published June 1998*. Table from website. <<http://www.census.gov/population/socdemo/education/tablea-02.txt>>
- U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. 1998e. *Race by Sex by Employment Status*. Table from website. <<http://www.census.gov/cdrom.lookup/902775823>>
- U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. 1997a. *Estimates of the Population of States: Annual Time Series, July 1, 1990, to July 1, 1996*. Washington, DC: Population Estimates Program.
- U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. 1997b. *Estimates of the Population of States by Age Group and Sex: 1990 and 1996*. Population Paper Listing 68. Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of the Census.
- U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. 1997c. *Population Projections for States, by Age, Sex, Race, and Hispanic Origin: 1995 and 2025*. Population Paper Listing 47. Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of the Census.
- U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. 1997d. "Poverty in the U.S.: 1996." *Current Population Reports* P60-198.
- U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. 1997e. *Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1997 (117th edition)*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. 1997f. *Women 15 to 44 Years Old Who Have Had a Child in the Last Year and Their Percentage in the Labor Force: Selected Years, June 1976 to Present*. Table from website. <<http://www.census.gov/population/socdemo/fertility/fert95/tabH4.txt>>
- U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. 1996a. *1992 Economic Census: Women-Owned Businesses*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

- U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. 1996b. "Median Weekly Earnings of Full-Time Wage and Salary Workers by Detailed Occupation and Sex." *Employment and Earnings* 43 (1).
- U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. 1996c. "Poverty in the United States: 1995." *Current Population Reports* P60-194.
- U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. 1996d. *Voting and Registration in the Election of November 1994* PPL-25RV. Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of the Census.
- U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. 1996e. "Who's Minding Our Preschoolers?" *Current Population Reports* P-70-53. March.
- U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. 1995a. *Americans with Disabilities: 1994-95 - Table 10C - Number of Full-Time Female Workers 21 to 64 Years Old and Median Monthly Earnings: 1994-95 Data from the Survey of Income and Program Participation*. Table from website. <<http://www.census.gov/hhes/disable/sipp/disbl9495/ds94t10c>>
- U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. 1995b. "What Does it Cost to Mind Our Preschoolers?" *Current Population Reports* P-70-52. September.
- U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. 1993. *Voting and Registration in the Election of November 1992* PPL-25RV. Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of the Census.
- U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. 1991. *Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1991 (111th edition)*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. 1990. *Earnings by Occupation and Education 1990*. Table from website. <<http://govinfo.library.orst.edu>>
- U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. 1984. *Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1985 (105th edition)*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. 1998. *Family Violence Option*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. 1997. *Characteristics and Financial Circumstances of AFDC Recipients: FY 1996*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. 1996. Unpublished data. *Average CSE caseloads by AFDC/FC and AFDC Arrears only, Fiscal Year 1995. Average annual CSE Caseloads with Orders Established, FY 1995. Average Number of CSE Cases in which a Collection was made on an Obligation by AFDC/FC Arrears Only, FY 1995*.
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families. 1998. *Selected Provisions of State TANF Plans, Parts I and II*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Health Care Financing Administration. 1997. *1997 Data Compendium*. Baltimore, MD: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. 1997. *Prisoners in 1996*. Report No. NCJ-164619, (June). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. 1997a. *Geographic Profile of Employment and Unemployment, 1995*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. 1997b. Unpublished Tabulations from the Current Population Survey, 1997 annual averages.
- U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. 1995a. "BLS Releases New 1994-2005 Employment Projections." News Release No. 95-485. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor.
- U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. 1995b. *Geographic Profile of Employment and Unemployment, 1994*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Unemployment Insurance Service. 1998. *Unpublished IUTU Tables for 1998*.
- U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Unemployment Insurance Service. 1997. *Unpublished IUTU Tables for 1996*.

U.S. Department of Labor, Wage and Hour Division, Employment Standards Administration. 1998. *Minimum Wage and Overtime Premium Pay Standards Applicable to Nonsupervisory Nonfarm Private Sector Employment Under State and Federal Laws*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor.

Wolfinger, Raymond, and Steven Rosenstone. 1980. *Who Votes?* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Women's Vote Project, National Council of Women's Organizations (formerly Council of Presidents). 1996. *Where Are the Women Voting?* Washington, DC: Women's Vote Project '96, March 13.

Yoon, Young-Hee, Stephanie Aaronson, Heidi Hartmann, Lois Shaw and Roberta Spalter-Roth. 1994. *Women's Access to Health Insurance*. Washington, DC: Institute for Women's Policy Research.

THE INSTITUTE FOR WOMEN'S POLICY RESEARCH

presents


The Status of Women in the States

The second in a series of reports which examine the status of women across the nation.

Find out how your state ranks relative to its neighbors and the country as a whole.

This series includes ten state specific reports and one national report.

Connecticut ♦ Florida ♦ Kentucky ♦ Louisiana ♦ Mississippi ♦



Nebraska ♦ Ohio ♦ Oregon ♦ Pennsylvania ♦ Vermont

Political Participation

- ♦ voter registration and turnout
- ♦ women in elected office
- ...and more!

Economic Autonomy

- ♦ access to health insurance
- ♦ educational attainment
- ♦ business ownership
- ♦ women in poverty
- ...and more!

Health

- ♦ fertility and infant health
- ♦ preventive health services
- ♦ environmental and cancer risks
- ...and more!

Employment & Earnings

- ♦ women's earnings and the wage gap
- ♦ labor force participation
- ♦ unemployment rates
- ...and more!

Reproductive Rights

- ♦ legislative access to abortion
- ♦ maternity stay laws
- ...and more!

STATES REPORTS ORDER FORM

Name: _____
 Organization/Affiliation: _____
 Street Address: _____
 City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____
 Phone: _____ Fax: _____
 E-mail _____

Please send me the following (specify state & number of copies) at \$10.00 per report (IWPR members receive a 20% discount on all publications—check here if you are an IWPR Member)

The Status of Women in...

Connecticut _____ Louisiana _____ Ohio _____ Vermont _____
 Florida _____ Mississippi _____ Oregon _____ National Report _____
 Kentucky _____ Nebraska _____ Pennsylvania _____

I am enclosing a check/money order for \$ _____ (DC residents please add 5.75% sales tax)

Please charge my (circle one): VISA/MASTERCARD in the amount of \$ _____

Name on Card: _____
 Account Number: _____ Expiration Date: _____
 Authorization Signature: _____

Mail this form to: IWPR **Fax:** (202) 833-4362
 1400 20th Street NW, Suite 104 (credit card orders only)
 Washington, DC, 20036 **Phone:** (202) 785-5100

IWPR MEMBERSHIP

Name: _____
 Organization/Affiliation: _____
 Street Address: _____
 City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____
 Phone: _____ Fax: _____
 E-mail _____

Yes, I would like to join IWPR:

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Individual Sustaining Member @ \$150 | <input type="checkbox"/> Organizational Affiliate @ \$245 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Individual Supporting Member @ \$50 | <input type="checkbox"/> Organizational Member @ \$115 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Individual Member @ \$40 | <input type="checkbox"/> Corporate Affiliate @ \$345 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Graduate Student Member @ \$30 | |

I am enclosing a check/money order for \$ _____

Please charge my (circle one): VISA/MASTERCARD in the amount of \$ _____

Name on Card: _____
 Account Number: _____ Expiration Date: _____
 Authorization Signature: _____

Mail this form to: IWPR **Fax:** (202) 833-4362
 1400 20th Street NW, Suite 104 (credit card orders only)
 Washington, DC, 20036 **Phone:** (202) 785-5100

Institute for Women's Policy Research *Board of Directors*

Martha Blaxall, Chair
Development Alternatives, Inc.

Barbara Bick
Friends of St. Elizabeths

Terry Odendahl
National Network of Grantmakers

Mariam Chamberlain, Vice Chair
National Council for Research on Women

Lynn Burbridge
Rutgers University

Margaret Simms
Joint Center for Political and Economic
Studies

Evan Stark, Secretary
Rutgers University

Linda Chavez-Thompson
AFL-CIO

Lt. Gov. Kathleen Kennedy Townsend
State of Maryland

Cheryl Lehman, Treasurer
Hofstra University

Ellen Delany
Delany, Siegel, Zorn & Associates, Inc.

Sheila Wellington
Catalyst

Heidi Hartmann, President
Institute for Women's Policy Research

Constance Morella
U.S. House of Representatives

Marcia L. Worthing
Mullin and Associates, Ltd.

Institute for Women's Policy Research *Information Network*

The IWPR Information Network is a service designed to make IWPR products available on a regular basis to the widest possible audience and to facilitate communication among its members. Individual and organizational members may receive complimentary or discounted publications, discounted registration to IWPR's policy conferences, and Research News Reporter, a monthly service that disseminates research in the news relevant to women and families and includes citation and ordering information.

Individual Memberships

Individual Sustaining Members receive Research News Reporter (a monthly compilation of research in the news which includes full citation and ordering information), Quarterly Products Mailings (including all current IWPR briefing papers, fact sheets, and working papers), a 20% discount on publications, and a 50% discount on one registration to IWPR conferences.

Renewal Rate: \$175 *Introductory Rate: \$150*

Individual Supporting Members receive Quarterly Products Mailings (including all current IWPR briefing papers, fact sheets, and working papers), a 20% discount on publications, and a 20% discount on one registration to IWPR conferences.

Renewal Rate: \$60 *Introductory Rate: \$50*

Individual Members receive Quarterly one-page IWPR updates, announcements of IWPR activities and publications, a 20% discount on publications, and a 20% discount on one registration to IWPR conferences.

Regular Rate: \$40

Graduate Student Members receive Quarterly Products Mailings, a 20% discount on publications, and a 20% discount on one registration to IWPR conferences. (Must send copy of student identification with photo.)

Regular Rate: \$30

Organizational and Corporate Memberships

Organizational Affiliates receive Research News Reporter (a monthly compilation of research in the news which includes full citation and ordering information), Quarterly Products Mailings (including all current IWPR, briefing papers, fact sheets, and working papers), all new major publications free of charge, a 20% discount on all other publications, a 50% discount on one registration to IWPR conferences, and a 20% discount on conference fees for additional organizational attendees.

Renewal Rate: \$295 *Introductory Rate: \$245*

Organizational Members receive Quarterly Products Mailings (including all current IWPR briefing papers, fact sheets, and working papers), a 20% discount on all publications, and a 20% discount on conference registration fees for all organizational attendees.

Renewal Rate: \$140 *Introductory Rate: \$115*

Corporate Affiliates receive Research News Reporter, Quarterly Products Mailings, all new major reports, a 20% discount on all other publications, a 50% discount on one IWPR conference registration, and a 20% discount on conference registration fees for additional corporate attendees.

Renewal Rate: \$395 *Introductory Rate: \$345*

*Contact the membership coordinator at (202) 785-5100
for more information on membership or publications.*



INSTITUTE FOR WOMEN'S POLICY RESEARCH

1400 20th Street, NW, Suite 104, Washington, DC 20036
(Tel) 202-785-5100 ■ (Fax) 202-833-4362 ■ (web) www.iwpr.org