variance

The Center For Sexual Pleasure and Health
Education. Pleasure. Health. Advocacy.

SEXUAL HEALTH RANKINGS™

A Composite Index and Ranking of Sexual Health in the United States—50 States and the District of Columbia

Technical Report

December 2012

Sexual Health Rankings™ is produced by Variance, LLC (www.variance-llc.com), in partnership with the Center for Sexual Pleasure and Health (www.thecsph.org). It is an independent initiative and receives no other source of funding or support. Variance, LLC is a limited liability company formed in New Hampshire. The Center for Sexual Pleasure and Health is a recognized 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization in Rhode Island.

SUGGESTED CITATION

Downs M. *Sexual Health Rankings: A Composite Index and Ranking of Sexual Health in the United States—50 States and the District of Columbia, 2012*. Lebanon, NH: Variance, LLC; December 2012.

DATA SOURCES

Data contained within this document were obtained from the following sources and used in accordance with the "fair use" doctrine of U.S. copyright law:

- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), National Center for Health Statistics
- HHS, CDC, National Center for HIV/AIDS, Viral Hepatitis, STD, and TB Prevention
- HHS, CDC, Office of Surveillance, Epidemiology, and Laboratory Services
- HHS, CDC, Division of Adolescent and School Health
- HHS, National Institutes of Health, National Cancer Institute
- U.S. Department of Commerce, Census Bureau
- U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation
- Council of the District of Columbia
- Council of State and Territorial Epidemiologists
- Guttmacher Institute
- Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation
- Human Rights Campaign
- National Archive of Criminal Justice Data
- National Conference of State Legislatures, Women's Legislative Network

COPYRIGHT INFORMATION

CORRESPONDENCE

Please direct questions and comments about Sexual Health Rankings™ to info@sexualhealthrankings.com

Mailing address:

Variance, LLC
29 School Street
Suite 202
Lebanon, NH 03770

WEB SITE

For more information about *Sexual Health Rankings*™ and to download an electronic copy of this report, visit www.sexualhealthrankings.com

SEXUAL HEALTH RANKINGS™ PROJECT TEAM

Martin Downs, MPH
Director, Research Lead
Variance, LLC

Megan Andelloux, AASECT, ACS
Co-Director, Education and Outreach Lead
Center for Sexual Pleasure and Health

Alicia Gauvin
Project Coordinator
Center for Sexual Pleasure and Health

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Sexual Health Rankings™ is inspired and informed by *America's Health Rankings*, published jointly by the United Health Foundation, American Public Health Association, and Partnership for Prevention; and *County Health Rankings & Roadmaps*, a collaboration between the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation and the University of Wisconsin Population Health Institute.

Table of Contents

Abstract

Sexual Health Rankings™ is an effort to construct a composite indicator to measure and rate the sexual health of U.S. state populations. We intend to inform and promote the development of population-based sexual health measures, and engage diverse stakeholders in improving sexual health in the United States. The primary platform for *Sexual Health Rankings*™ is our Web site, www.sexualhealthrankings.com, which allows users to explore the data, participate in interactive public discussion of our research methods, build community, and connect with additional resources to inform positive, evidence-based approaches to sexual health promotion.

There is a recognized need to measure sexual health at the population level. The World Health Organization has developed a comprehensive definition of sexual health that emphasizes wellness, accounts for the determinants of health, and encompasses human rights, sexual expression and identity, and sexual pleasure.

Composite indicators are useful for measuring multidimensional and multifactorial concepts, such as sexual health. Composite indices of overall health and human development already exist. We demonstrate that it is feasible to construct a composite indicator of sexual health using published data only.

Sexual Health Rankings™ shows that sexual health varies dramatically across the United States. There is considerable state-level variation in sexual health outcomes—including measures of sexual satisfaction, morbidity, reproduction, and violence—and in factors that influence sexual health. Differences in state laws, health systems, and social and economic conditions contribute to variation in the overall sexual health of state populations.

Our first edition of *Sexual Health Rankings*™, for the year 2012, ranks Vermont highest (no.1) in sexual health, and Mississippi as the least sexually healthy state (no. 51).

The composite index is made up of 26 individual indicators. Indicator values are normalized to standard scores to enable comparison. The standard scores are weighted before being aggregated into a composite score. We developed an original weighting scheme focused on enabling comprehensive measurement of sexual health and reducing bias based on availability of data.

We identify limitations of the available data and suggest future directions for development of population-based sexual health measures and indicators. We expect the development of *Sexual Health Rankings*™ to be iterative and ongoing, and we hope to engage multidisciplinary interest in the process.

Sexual Health Rankings™ 2012

MARTIN DOWNS, MPH Variance, LLC

Introduction

Throughout the 20th century, the health sciences defined sexual health primarily in terms of reproduction, the epidemiology of sexually transmitted diseases, and sexual dysfunction in individuals. From a public health perspective, framing sexual health in terms of disease and dysfunction, or the absence thereof, is clearly inadequate. In the first decade of the present century, the World Health Organization (WHO) began to advance a much broader definition of sexual health that emphasizes wellness, accounts for the determinants of health, and encompasses human rights, sexual expression and identity, and sexual pleasure. The WHO working definition has been widely accepted in the public health field. However, to date, little has been done to develop summary measures of population sexual health. The lack of such measures presents a challenge to developing public health policies and programs to promote and improve sexual health.

The *Sexual Health Rankings*™ project aims to: construct a composite indicator to measure and rate the sexual health of U.S. state populations; inform and promote the development of population-based sexual health measures; and engage diverse stakeholders in improving sexual health.

Why construct a composite index of sexual health?

Composite indicators are useful for measuring multidimensional and multifactorial concepts such as sexual health. Composite indices of overall health, and of similarly broad concepts such as human development, already exist. Numerous aspects of sexual health are already measured individually. More measures are needed and hopefully will be developed. No matter how sophisticated and well informed they are, professionals—including researchers, policymakers, program managers, activists, and journalists—and the general public can have difficulty keeping track of many scattered statistics and understanding how they are interrelated. A composite index folds these data into a simple, functional measure, and provides a framework to facilitate analyses of the component data.

Why rank the sexual health of states?

In our federal system of government, individual states have powers to control conditions that affect sexual health. Differences in state laws, health systems, and social and economic conditions can produce variation in the overall sexual health of state populations. National policies and programs should account for variation across states. Comparing states by ranking them also helps stakeholders at the state level identify strengths, challenges, and opportunities for action in their states.

Our intentions

This report details the methods used to construct the *Sexual Health Rankings*™ index. The principal result reported is a set of 51 composite scores for the 50 U.S. states and the District of Columbia, ranked highest (no. 1) to lowest (no. 51). These scores are for the year 2012.

Sexual Health Rankings™ is conceived to be an ongoing project. We aim to update the results and technical report on an annual basis.

We intend to continually review our methods and data, and revise them as needed to improve upon the reliability and usefulness of the composite index. To this end, we welcome and encourage feedback from our peers across the many professional and scientific disciplines that intersect with sexual health.

Methods

Our methods are chiefly guided by the *Handbook on Constructing Composite Indicators: Methodology and User Guide*, a publication of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development and the Joint Research Centre of the European Commission. [1]

1. Theoretical Framework

Sexual Health Rankings™ is based on a holistic, positive concept of sexual health that the World Health Organization began to advance in the early 2000s, and that now underlies the development of a comprehensive strategy to promote sexual health in the United States. [2]

The World Health Organization's current working definition of sexual health is, "a state of physical, emotional, mental and social well-being in relation to sexuality; it is not merely the absence of disease, dysfunction or infirmity. Sexual health requires a positive and respectful approach to sexuality and sexual relationships, as well as the possibility of having pleasurable and safe sexual experiences, free of coercion, discrimination and violence. For sexual health to be attained and maintained, the sexual rights of all persons must be respected, protected and fulfilled." [3]

This definition is widely cited on its own, but it contains nested terms—"sexuality" and "sexual rights"—that need to be unpacked in order to appreciate the full scope of the concept. WHO's working definitions of sexuality and sexual rights are:

> Sexuality
>
> Sexuality is a central aspect of being human throughout life and encompasses sex, gender identities and roles, sexual orientation, eroticism, pleasure, intimacy and reproduction. Sexuality is experienced and expressed in thoughts, fantasies, desires, beliefs, attitudes, values, behaviours, practices, roles and relationships. While sexuality can include all of these dimensions, not all of them are always experienced or expressed. Sexuality is influenced by the interaction of biological, psychological, social, economic, political, cultural, ethical, legal, historical, religious and spiritual factors.
>
> Sexual Rights
>
> Sexual rights embrace human rights that are already recognized in national laws, international human rights documents and other consensus statements. They include the right of all persons, free of coercion, discrimination and violence, to:
>
> - the highest attainable standard of sexual health, including access to sexual and reproductive health care services;
> - seek, receive and impart information related to sexuality;
> - sexuality education;
> - respect for bodily integrity;
> - choose their partner;
> - decide to be sexually active or not;
> - consensual sexual relations;
> - consensual marriage;
> - decide whether or not, and when, to have children; and
> - pursue a satisfying, safe and pleasurable sexual life.
>
> The responsible exercise of human rights requires that all persons respect the rights of others. [3]

For the purpose of constructing this composite index, we have condensed the WHO definition into five fundamental elements. These five elements of sexual health are listed in the box below.

ELEMENTS OF SEXUAL HEALTH

1. Ability of individuals to have control over, and freely decide on, their own sexual behavior and experiences
2. Ability of individuals to decide freely on whether, and when, to procreate
3. Freedom from discrimination and violence related to sexuality and gender
4. Experience of sexual pleasure and satisfaction
5. Freedom from sexual morbidity, including HIV/AIDS and other sexually transmitted infections.

2. Indicator Selection

2.1. Categories

In 2007, WHO and the United Nations Population Fund held a joint technical consultation to recommend country-level indicators of sexual health. [4] The majority of indicators proposed as a result of this meeting are not appropriate for state-level monitoring of sexual health in the United States. Most indicators pertain to country-level laws and policies, and tend to be more applicable to countries that have a centralized national system of health care delivery. Furthermore, some indicators address practices such as forced marriage and female genital mutilation, which are not widespread in the United States. Although such practices may affect certain subsets of the U.S. population, such as immigrants and refugees, cases are not reliably documented, and the relatively small number of individuals affected would likely preclude state-level comparisons. [5, 6] Other proposed indicators concern laws regarding sexual behavior, such as homosexual acts, that do not vary by state in the U.S., since a U.S. Supreme Court decision in 2003 invalidated all state "sodomy" laws. [7]

The published report summarizing the outcome of the 2007 technical consultation does suggest a useful way to categorize indicators of sexual health. These categories are:

- Policy and social indicators
- Access to services—availability, information and demand, quality
- Use of services
- Indicators of output and impact (health status). [4]

Sexual Health Rankings™ adapts these categories to structure the logical relationships of selected indicators.

The *Sexual Health Rankings*™ indicators are categorized as "outcomes" or "factors."

Outcomes are states of wellbeing or changes in health status that directly impact sexual health, and are attributable to modifiable factors. They may be positive or negative.

Factors are conditions in which people live that influence sexual health—also known as social determinants of health. The influence of factors may be positive or negative, and they are by definition modifiable. Non-modifiable factors such as heredity, race/ethnicity, and age are not included on their own, although these variables may affect some indicators.

Factors are grouped into five subcategories corresponding to five "domains" identified by WHO:

- Laws, policies and human rights
- Education
- Society and culture
- Economics
- Health systems. [8]

2.2. Criteria

The selection of indicators to be included in the *Sexual Health Rankings*™ composite index is guided by standards developed for the International Monetary Fund (IMF) General Data Dissemination System (GDDS). These standards are not specific to health indicators, but are considered broadly applicable to health-related data collection and dissemination. [9]

The four "dimensions" of the GDDS are adapted to more clearly outline the *Sexual Health Rankings*™ selection criteria. These criteria are grouped into three categories: 1) relevance; 2) availability; 3) data quality.

2.2.1. RELEVANCE

Selected indicators are relevant and important to sexual health. Relevance is determined by mapping potential indicators to the WHO working definition of sexual health using an evidence-based approach. A relevant indicator influences (as a factor) or manifests (as an outcome) one or more defined elements of sexual health, and the importance of the relationship is supported by evidence.

2.2.2. AVAILABILITY

Selection was limited to indicators for which state-level analyses of data were available in published reports, or reports accessible by querying public databases. No

original research or analyses of raw data have been conducted to construct new indicators; however, with some indicators it was necessary to convert categorical variables (e.g., the status of laws and policies) into quantitative variables. A dichotomous categorical variable may be assigned a value of 1 or 0. In some instances, a measure may be composed of two or more dichotomous categorical variables. In such cases, each of the component categorical variables is assigned a value of 1 or 0; then these values are added together to represent the measure as a continuous variable.

2.2.3. DATA QUALITY

Selection criteria based on the quality of indicator data are adapted from the IMF Data Quality Assessment Framework. [10] The *Sexual Health Rankings*™ criteria are categorized as:

- Integrity
- Accuracy
- Timeliness
- Consistency.

2.2.3.a. Integrity

Indicator data collection, analysis, and reporting practices must be objective, transparent, and adhere to professional and ethical principles.

2.2.3.b. Accuracy

Indicator data collection and analysis use "sound statistical techniques" and the outputs "sufficiently portray reality." [10] Data should have been evaluated for accuracy by the organization responsible for their collection, analysis, and dissemination. Detailed documentation of metadata should be readily available.

Indicators that include complete data for all 50 states and the District of Columbia are strongly preferred. Imputation of missing values is to be avoided if a complete data set can be obtained using older data within the stated time frame limit (e.g. 2008 instead of 2010), or by combining multiple years of data to obtain a state value when single-year data are suppressed due to small sample size, or if another comparable indicator with complete data exists.

2.2.3.c. Timeliness

Timeliness refers to the time frame that an indicator covers and to the frequency with which data are reported. The limits imposed on timeliness are subjective, and were influenced by the availability of data for some indicators. Indicators were selected according to the following criteria:

Selection was limited to indicators with available single-year data no earlier than 2008—i.e., four years prior to the current calendar year. The latest available single-year data were selected.

Combining multiple years of data is sometimes necessary to increase sample sizes for small populations and uncommon outcomes. Multiple consecutive years of data may be combined for a pooled analysis, which estimates the average value of the indicator over that time period. Indicators based on multi-year data were included if the latest available year was 2008 or later, and the earliest year in the pooled analysis was 2004 or later.

Preference was given to indicators that report data on an annual basis; however, an allowance was made for indicators that are not reported on a regular basis, if a reasonable assumption could be made that the indicator would be updated periodically; therefore, an indicator based on a one-off study would be excluded.

2.2.3.d. Consistency

Data must be "consistent within the dataset, over time, and with major datasets" [10] to be included in the *Sexual Health Rankings*™ composite index. The organization producing the indicator data should address geographic differences in the way variables are defined and recorded, or other issues that could affect comparisons between states.

3. Selected Indicators

3.1. Outcomes

3.1.1. SEXUALLY TRANSMITTED INFECTIONS AND HIV/AIDS

Indicator	AIDS diagnoses, estimated rate per 100,000 population
Year(s)	2010
Frequency	Annual
Source	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. HIV Surveillance Report, 2010; vol. 22. Table 20. March 2012.

The estimated rate of AIDS diagnoses is the only HIV/AIDS surveillance indicator available for all 50 states and D.C. This indicator does not necessarily correspond to the incidence of HIV infection. Due to improved treatment of HIV infection, many infected people are living longer without developing AIDS. In 2010, the estimated rate of HIV infection in the United States was 16.1 per 100,000 population; whereas the rate of AIDS diagnoses was 10.8. [11]

Ideally, a composite index of sexual health would include HIV incidence data, because HIV infection is a serious cause of morbidity even when it does not progress to AIDS. [12] Stopping the spread of HIV is also a major public health concern. The latest available state-level estimates of HIV infection include only the 46 states that implemented standardized HIV infection reporting systems and began reporting these data to CDC by June 2007 (a length of time considered adequate "to allow for stabilization of data collection and for adjustment of the data"). [11] All 50 states and D.C. have implemented uniform confidential, name-based reporting of HIV infection as of April 2008. The HIV Surveillance Report for 2012, to be published in 2014, will be the first to include HIV infection estimates for all 50 states and D.C. [13]

Although HIV incidence data may be desirable, the estimated rate of AIDS diagnoses may be less biased by factors that influence diagnosis of asymptomatic HIV infection, such as geographic variation in the promotion and availability of HIV testing services, as well as patterns in the use of anonymous HIV testing services. State and local HIV registries do not capture anonymous HIV test results. [11]

Indicator	Gonorrhea cases, rate per 100,000 population
Year(s)	2010
Frequency	Annual
Source	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. STD Surveillance 2010. Table 14. November 2011.

Gonorrhea is listed a "nationally notifiable infectious disease."[14] STD control programs and health departments in all 50 states and DC report data on gonorrhea cases to the CDC. Reporting by states is voluntary, and each state sets its own policies regarding which diseases must be reported, and in what circumstances. States update their lists of reportable diseases annually. If a state does not mandate reporting of a disease, the reported incidence rate in that state may not be representative of the population. Therefore, CDC states that comparisons of rates between states "should be interpreted with caution." [15]

The Council of State and Territorial Epidemiologists conducts an annual State Reportable Conditions Assessment (SRCA). This assessment summarizes the status of "reporting requirements for infectious and non-infectious conditions that must be reported to public health according to a jurisdiction's regulations or legislation." SRCA also details reporting requirements pertaining to clinical health care providers, hospitals, and laboratories. [16]

A SRCA query shows that the reporting status of gonorrhea in 2010 was generally consistent throughout the United States. In 2010, all 50 states and D.C. "explicitly" required health care providers and laboratories to report gonorrhea cases. In 48 states, gonorrhea was designated as a reportable disease for hospitals; however, gonorrhea was not reportable for hospitals in two states (Kansas and California).

Considering that gonorrhea infection is usually diagnosed by a positive laboratory test result, it is arguable that the reportable status for laboratories is most relevant to whether state incidence statistics could be considered comparable to one another. [17]

In the absence of any other known differences in states' reporting practices, gonorrhea incidence rates are presumed to be comparable across states.

Indicator	Syphilis cases, rate per 100,000 population
Year(s)	2010
Frequency	Annual
Source	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. STD Surveillance 2010. Table 23. November 2011.

"All stages of syphilis" includes the primary, secondary, latent, and late stages of syphilis, neurosyphilis, and congenital syphilis. As discussed above, differences in reporting rules may limit comparisons of incidence rates across states. The reportable status of syphilis varies by state, depending on the stage of the disease and the reporting entity.

A SRCA query shows that in 2010, all 50 states and D.C. explicitly designated all stages of syphilis as reportable for laboratories. Reporting mandates varied for clinicians and hospitals depending on the stage of syphilis; however, the vast majority of states designated all stages of syphilis as reportable for clinicians and hospitals (Alaska, California, and Colorado being the exceptions).

A diagnosis of syphilis infection is confirmed by a positive laboratory test result. [18] The fact that all laboratory test results for syphilis were reportable in all states in 2010 suggests incidence rate estimates are likely to be comparable across states.

››› Chlamydia incidence data were also reviewed for inclusion in the composite index, and excluded due to broad inconsistencies in reportable status by state.

Indicator	Cervical cancer incidence, rate per 100,000 population
Year(s)	2004-2008 (combined years)
Frequency	Annual
Source	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and National Cancer Institute. United States Cancer Statistics: 1999–2008 Incidence and Mortality Web-based Report.

Combined data for years 2004-2008 are used for this indicator. The combined incidence rate report was generated by the Web-based system. Multiple years were combined in order to obtain a complete set of data. Single-year data for the state of Vermont were suppressed due to small cell sizes. Combining years provided a sufficiently large sample to calculate a rate for Vermont.

Cervical cancer is included as a sexual health outcome because persistent infection with human papillomavirus (HPV), a sexually transmitted virus, causes almost all cases of cervical cancer. [19]

3.1.2. REPRODUCTIVE

Indicator	Births to mothers aged 15-19 years, rate per 1,000 population
Year(s)	2010
Frequency	Annual
Source	National Center for Health Statistics. NCHS data brief, no 89. 2012.

Ideally, a composite index of sexual health would include teen pregnancy rates; however, recent state-level data on teen pregnancy is not available. Teen birth data are available and are also important.

Adolescent childbearing has numerous negative economic, social, and health impacts. It contributes significantly to low educational achievement and low income for the mother. Children of teen mothers are also "more likely to have lower school achievement and drop out of high school, have more health problems, be incarcerated at some time during adolescence, give birth

as a teenager, and face unemployment as a young adult." [20, 21]

Knowledge about sexual health and access to contraception are important factors that influence teen birth rates. [20, 22]

3.1.3. SEXUAL VIOLENCE

Indicator	Forcible rape incidents, rate per 100,000 population
Year(s)	2010
Frequency	Annual
Source	Federal Bureau of Investigation, Uniform Crime Reports, prepared by the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data

An indicator of sexual violence ought to include all forms of sexual assault perpetrated against females and males of all ages. Until 2011, the Federal Bureau of Investigation's Uniform Crime Reporting Program only collected data on incidents of "forcible rape," defined as "the carnal knowledge of a female, forcibly and against her will." [23] This definition was first established in 1927. In December 2011, the FBI redefined rape as: "The penetration, no matter how slight, of the vagina or anus with any body part or object, or oral penetration by a sex organ of another person, without the consent of the victim." This definition is intended to include "any gender of victim or perpetrator," and any case in which a person is not capable of consenting to sex "because of temporary or permanent mental or physical incapacity, including due to the influence of drugs or alcohol or because of age."

The Uniform Crime Reporting Program is scheduled to begin collecting data using the new definition of rape in January 2013. [24]

3.1.4. SEXUAL SATISFACTION

3.1.4.a. Proxy Indicators of Sexual Satisfaction

A widely accepted population-based measure of sexual satisfaction does not currently exist, although the public health field recognizes the need for such a measure. *Sexual Health Rankings*™ uses self-reported health status and relationship status as proxy indicators of sexual satisfaction.

Indicator	Percentage of adults reporting good or better health
Year(s)	2011
Frequency	Annual
Source	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System Survey Data. 2011.

Numerous studies show that self-reported health is positively associated with sexual satisfaction, and that worse self-reported health is a strong predictor of sexual dysfunction. [25-29]

Studies demonstrating significant associations between health status and sexual satisfaction have focused on married and partnered adults in midlife (ages 40-55) and older. The largest of these is an analysis of data from the Global Study of Sexual Attitudes and Behaviors, a survey of 27,500 men and women aged 40-80 years in 29 countries, including the United States. The study assessed four subjective measures of "sexual well-being": emotional and physical satisfaction with sexual relationships, satisfaction with sexual health or function, and the importance of sex in one's life. Self-reported health status "positively and consistently affected all measures of sexual well-being," across all countries, in both men and women. [26]

Another study of 1,009 couples (median age of men, 55; women, 52) in the United States, Brazil, Germany, Japan, and Spain shows a significant association between self-reported health status and sexual satisfaction for men, but not for women. [29] Significant positive associations between sexual functioning and sexual satisfaction were observed for both men and women; however, the magnitude of the association was greater in women than in men.

If better health status and sexual functioning correlate with increased sexual satisfaction, then data showing a positive association between health status and sexual

functioning would further support the use of health status as a proxy indicator of sexual satisfaction.

The National Health and Social Life Survey (NHSLS), a nationally representative probability sample study of adults aged 18-59, examines health status and sexual dysfunction. The study shows that fair-to-poor health status is significantly associated with sexual dysfunction —premature ejaculation, erectile dysfunction, and low sexual desire in men; and sexual pain in women. [28, 30]

Correlates of sexual satisfaction may differ for younger adults and adolescents, as Higgins et al. note in a 2011 study of sexual satisfaction among U.S. university students; however, they did not include health status as an independent variable in their study. [31]

Frequency of sexual intercourse is another demonstrated predictor of overall sexual satisfaction in adult men and women. [25, 31-33] The National Survey of Sexual Health and Behavior (NSSHB), a nationally representative probability sample study including adults aged 18-94, shows that among women, "better perceived health status was significantly associated with a higher likelihood of reporting vaginal intercourse in the past 90 days for most age cohorts."

Self-reported health status was significantly associated with frequency of vaginal intercourse for men aged 60 and older, but not for men in younger age groups. For men and women in most age groups, health status was not significantly associated with frequency of solo masturbation, partnered masturbation, oral sex, or anal sex. [34, 35]

Indicator	Percentage of adults married or a member of an unmarried couple
Year(s)	2011
Frequency	Annual
Source	Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System Survey Data. Atlanta, GA: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2011.

A strong positive association between sexual satisfaction and being married or in a partnered relationship has been observed. Some findings pertain to the association between relationship status and subjective measures of sexual satisfaction; others may be inferred from associations between relationship status and frequency of sexual intercourse.

In a 1994 report on findings from the NHSLS, Laumann et al. conclude that, "a monogamous sexual partnership embedded in a formal marriage evidently produces the greatest satisfaction and pleasure." [30]

The 2009 AARP survey of midlife and older adults in the United States, however, reports that, "groups who are partnered but unmarried showed higher rates of both sexual intercourse and satisfaction than those who are married." [25]

Regarding frequency of sex, the NSSHB shows that partnered (married, in a relationship and cohabiting, or in a relationship but not living together) men and women in most age groups reported engaging in penile-vaginal intercourse, oral sex (giving and receiving), and anal intercourse more frequently than those were single and not dating, or single and dating. Frequency of solo masturbation was not significantly associated with relationship status in women, but partnered men were less likely to report having masturbated within the past 90 days. [34-36]

3.2. Factors

3.2.1. LAWS, POLICIES, AND HUMAN RIGHTS

3.2.1.a. Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity

Indicator	Status of statewide employment, housing, and school non-discrimination laws and policies based on sexual orientation and gender identity
Year(s)	2012
Frequency	Continually updated
Source	Maps of State Laws & Policies. Washington, DC: The Human Rights Campaign. June 12 and 14, 2012.

This indicator is composed of binary numerical scores representing whether state law prohibits employment discrimination, housing discrimination based on sexual orientation and/or gender identity; and whether statewide law or school policy addresses discrimination against students based on sexual orientation and/or gender identity.

States can achieve numerical scores of 0 to 6. States that achieve the maximum score have enacted legislation prohibiting discrimination based on both sexual orientation and gender identity in employment, housing, and schools.

Indicator	Status of state law on marriage equality for same-sex couples
Year(s)	2012
Frequency	Continually updated
Source	Maps of State Laws & Policies. Washington, DC: The Human Rights Campaign. May 10 and June 12, 2012.

This indicator is composed of binary numerical scores representing two variables: 1) whether state law grants full marriage equality to same-sex couples; and 2) whether no state law or constitutional amendment prohibits same-sex marriage. This allows states that have not sanctioned same-sex marriage, but not have not taken action to preclude it, to achieve a higher score than states that have codified discrimination against same-sex couples legislatively or constitutionally.

This indicator treats marriage equality as a dichotomous variable, in order to avoid subjectively scoring the relative value of "partial equality" through measures such as civil unions.

States can achieve numerical score of 0 to 2. A state that scores 0 has a constitutional or legislative ban on same-sex marriage in effect. A state that scores 1 may or may not confer some degree of legal recognition and rights to same-sex couples.

A state that mandates full and equal recognition of same-sex marriages receives a score of 2.

Indicator	Status of state laws addressing bias or hate crimes based on sexual orientation and gender identity
Year(s)	2012
Frequency	Continually updated
Source	Maps of State Laws & Policies. Washington, DC: The Human Rights Campaign. June 25, 2012.

This indicator is composed of binary numerical scores representing whether a state has a law that addresses bias or hate crime based on sexual orientation and/or gender identity. The maximum possible score is 2; the minimum, 0.

States with laws that address bias or hate crimes based on sexual orientation and gender identity receive the maximum score.

3.2.1.b. Contraception

Indicator	Status of state laws on emergency contraception in hospital emergency departments
Year(s)	2012
Frequency	Continually updated
Source	State Policies in Brief: Emergency Contraception. New York: Guttmacher Institute. November 1, 2012.

This indicator is composed of binary numerical scores representing two variables: 1) whether state law requires hospital emergency rooms to provide information about emergency contraception; and 2) whether state law requires hospital emergency rooms to dispense emergency contraception to sexual assault victims upon request.

States with laws requiring both receive a maximum score of 2; states with no such laws receive the minimum score of 0.

3.2.1.c. Abortion

Indicator	Status of state laws restricting private insurance coverage of abortion
Year(s)	2012
Frequency	Continually updated
Source	State Policies in Brief: Restricting Insurance Coverage of Abortion. New York: Guttmacher Institute. November 1, 2012.

This indicator is composed of binary numerical scores representing two variables: 1) whether state law imposes any restriction on private insurance coverage of abortion; and 2) whether state law imposes any restriction on abortion coverage in insurance plans of state employees. Any restriction of abortion coverage in private insurance plans includes restrictions applicable to all private insurance sold in the state.

A restriction is defined as any provision that prohibits abortion coverage, or limits coverage to any or all of the following circumstances: pregnancy endangers the woman's life; pregnancy resulting from rape; pregnancy resulting from incest; fetal impairment; to prevent "substantial and irreversible impairment of a major bodily function" of the pregnant woman. For this indicator, a higher score is less desirable.

States that restrict abortion coverage in both private insurance and state employee's plans receive maximum score of 2; states that do not impose any such restrictions receive the minimum score of 0. (Normalized scores are reverse-coded for aggregation.)

Indicator	Status of state laws imposing barriers to obtaining an abortion
Year(s)	2012
Frequency	Continually updated
Source	State Policies in Brief: Counseling and Waiting Periods for Abortion; Requirements for Ultrasound. New York: Guttmacher Institute. November 1, 2012.

This indicator is composed of binary numerical scores representing three variables: 1) whether state law requires that women seeking abortion receive counseling intended to discourage abortion before undergoing the procedure; 2) whether state law requires a waiting period (typically 24 hours) between counseling and the abortion procedure; and 3) whether state law requires that women seeking abortion undergo an ultrasound before the procedure. For this indicator, a higher score is less desirable.

States that have all three legal provisions in place receive maximum score of 3; states that do not have such provisions receive the minimum score of 0. (Normalized scores are reverse-coded for aggregation.)

3.2.1.d. Sex Education

Indicator	Status of sex education mandates and content requirements for contraception and STI/HIV education
Year(s)	2012
Frequency	Continually updated
Source	State Policies in Brief: Sex and HIV Education. New York: Guttmacher Institute. November 1, 2012.

This indicator is composed of binary numerical scores representing four variables: 1) whether a state mandates sex education in schools; 2) whether a state mandates STI/HIV education in schools; 3) whether sex education in schools must cover contraception; and 4) whether STI/HIV education must cover contraception. The maximum possible score is 4; the minimum, 0.

The maximum score is given to states that mandate sex education and STI/HIV education in schools, and require that contraception be covered as part of sex and STI/HIV education.

3.2.2. EDUCATION

3.2.2.a. Sexual Health Education in Schools

Indicator	Percentage of schools in which teachers taught all 17 HIV, STD, or pregnancy prevention topics in a required course in any of grades 6, 7, or 8
Year(s)	2010
Frequency	Biennial
Source	Brenner, ND, et al. School Health Profiles 2010: Characteristics of Health Programs Among Secondary Schools in Selected U.S. Sites. Atlanta: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. 2011.

Indicator	Percentage of schools in which teachers taught all 17 HIV, STD, or pregnancy prevention topics in a required course in any of grades grades 9, 10, 11, or 12
Year(s)	2010
Frequency	Biennial
Source	Brenner, ND, et al. School Health Profiles 2010: Characteristics of Health Programs Among Secondary Schools in Selected U.S. Sites. Atlanta: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. 2011.

The School Health Profiles is a system of surveys developed by CDC to assess school health policies and practices at the state and local level. The surveys are conducted biennially among middle and high school principals and lead health education teachers. The system is designed to allow comparison across state and local jurisdictions. Only weighted data—i.e. surveys completed by at least 70 percent of principals or lead health teachers in the sample—are included in the biennial report. In 2010, weighted data from lead health teacher surveys were obtained for 47 states and D.C. These data for Colorado, Illinois, and New Mexico are not included in the 2010 report. In order to include School Health Profiles data in the composite index, values for these states were imputed using the state median value.

In 2010, School Health Profiles surveys evaluated the teaching of 17 topics related to HIV, STD, and pregnancy prevention:

- The differences between HIV and AIDS
- How HIV and other STDs are transmitted
- How HIV and other STDs are diagnosed and treated
- Health consequences of HIV, other STDs, and pregnancy
- The relationship among HIV, other STDs, and pregnancy
- The relationship between alcohol and other drug use and risk for HIV, other STDs, and pregnancy
- The benefits of being sexually abstinent
- How to prevent HIV, other STDs, and pregnancy
- How to access valid and reliable health information, products, and services related to HIV, other STDs, and pregnancy
- The influences of media, family, and social and cultural norms on sexual behavior
- Communication and negotiation skills related to eliminating or reducing risk for HIV, other STDs, and pregnancy
- Goal-setting and decision-making skills related to eliminating or reducing risk for HIV, other STDs, and pregnancy
- Compassion for persons living with HIV or AIDS
- Efficacy of condoms, that is, how well condoms work and do not work
- The importance of using condoms consistently and correctly
- How to obtain condoms
- How to correctly use a condom

3.2.3. SOCIETY AND CULTURE

3.2.3.a. Gender Equality

Gender inequality is recognized as a primary cause of sexual violence against women, and a major factor generally influencing vulnerability to sexual ill-health,

including HIV infection and unintended pregnancy. [3, 8, 37-40]

Indicator	Proportion of seats held by women in state legislatures and DC Council
Year(s)	2012
Frequency	Corresponds to election cycles
Source	Women's Legislative Network of NCSL. Women in State Legislatures: 2012 Legislative Session. Denver, CO and Washington, DC: National Conference of State Legislatures. 2012. Council of the District of Columbia. Council Directory for Council Period 19. Washington, DC: Council of the District of Columbia. June 18, 2012.

The proportion of seats in legislative bodies held by women is an indicator of gender equality. The ratio of seats held by women to seats held by men in national legislatures is a component of the United Nations Development Program's Gender Inequality Index. [41] The World Economic Forum also includes the ratio of women to men among legislators, senior officials, and managers as a variable in its Global Gender Gap Index. [42]

Indicator	Percentage of women aged ≥25 years with high school diploma and higher education
Year(s)	2008-2010
Frequency	Annual
Source	U.S. Census Bureau. 2008-2010 American Community Survey 3-Year Estimates

For women, having a high school diploma or higher education is associated with more intended births, [43] increased use of reproductive health and contraceptive services, [44] and decreased likelihood of engaging in HIV risk-related behaviors in the past 12 months. [45]

In a 1999 analysis of data from the National Health and Social Life Survey, Laumann et al. report that, "High educational attainment is negatively associated with experience of sexual problems for both sexes. These differences are especially marked between women who do not have high school diplomas and those who have college degrees." Specific problems associated with educational attainment were low sexual desire, problems achieving orgasm, sexual pain, and sexual anxiety. [28]

3.2.4. ECONOMICS

3.2.4.a. Poverty

Indicator	Percentage of people in poverty
Year(s)	2009-2011
Frequency	Annual
Source	U.S. Census Bureau. 2010, 2011, and 2011 March Current Population Survey

Annual household income less than 100 percent of the federal poverty level is associated with a wide range of adverse sexual health behaviors and outcomes for men and women, including fewer intended births, [43] lower contraception use, [46] increased likelihood of engaging in HIV risk-related behaviors, [45] increased STD infection rates, [47] higher prevalence of HIV infection, [48] higher rates of rape and sexual assault victimization. [40, 49, 50]

3.2.4.b. Health Insurance

Indicator	Percentage of women aged 15-44 uninsured
Year(s)	2009-2010
Frequency	Annual
Source	State Data Center. New York: Guttmacher Institute.

Indicator	Percentage of women aged 15-44 covered by Medicaid
Year(s)	2009-2010
Frequency	Annual
Source	State Data Center. New York: Guttmacher Institute.

An analysis by researchers at the Guttmacher Institute found variation in state unintended pregnancy rates to be strongly associated with the proportion of women without health insurance, and the proportion receiving Medicaid, after controlling for demographic characteristics and contraceptive use: "An increase in the proportion of women uninsured was associated with elevated unintended pregnancy rates, and an increase in the proportion receiving Medicaid coverage was associated with reduced rates." [51]

The Guttmacher Institute publishes state-level estimates of the percentage of women of reproductive age (15-44 years) without health insurance and covered by Medicaid. These data are obtained from the U.S. Census Current Population Survey. Survey data for 2009 and 2010 were combined to produce the state-level estimates, in order to improve statistical reliability.

3.2.5 HEALTH SYSTEMS

3.2.5.a. Access to Services

Indicator	Percentage of contraceptive need met by all publicly funded clinics
Year(s)	2008
Frequency	Biennial
Source	Frost JJ, Henshaw SK and Sonfield A, Contraceptive needs and services: national and state data, 2008 update, New York: Guttmacher Institute, 2010.

Guttmacher Institute researchers estimate that in 2008, 36 million females in the United States were in need of contraceptive services and supplies—e.g. those aged 13-44 years who, "were sexually active and able to become pregnant, but were not pregnant and did not wish to become pregnant." [52] Of these, an estimated 17.4 million were considered to be in need of publicly funded contraceptive services and supplies. An individual in need of publicly funded contraception is defined as a female who meets the criteria of need for contraception stated above, and who is aged 20 years or older, with a family income less than 250 percent of the federal poverty level; or younger than 20, regardless of income.

As Frost et al. note, this indicator is not a complete measure of unmet need because it does not capture "women who receive Medicaid-covered services from private physicians, as well as users of nonprescription methods who have not made a (clinic) visit for contraceptive services."

Indicator	Percentage of people aged 18-64 years who reported ever receiving a HIV test
Year(s)	2010
Frequency	Annual
Source	Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation. Statehealthfacts.org. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System Survey Data, 2010, unpublished data.

Since 2006, the CDC has recommended routine HIV screening for people aged 13-64 years in all health care settings, including hospitals, clinics, and primary care settings; and as part of the panel of routine prenatal screening tests for pregnant women. [53]

HIV screening tests identify people with asymptomatic HIV infection. HIV-infected people who know their infection status can seek medical treatment to forestall progression of HIV infection to AIDS, and take actions to prevent transmitting the virus to others. [11]

Indicator	Percentage of women aged 15-44 living in a county without an abortion provider
Year(s)	2008
Frequency	Periodic
Source	Jones RK, Kooistra K. Abortion incidence and access to services in the United States, 2008. Perspect Sex Reprod Health. 2011 Mar;43(1):41-50.

These data are derived from an analysis, sponsored by the Guttmacher Institute, published in 2011. [54] The researchers conducted a nationwide census of all

facilities providing abortions. To obtain state-level percentages of women living in a county without an abortion provider (a provider is defined as "a physical site where abortion services are offered"), the researchers combined the provider census data with National Center for Health Statistics bridged-race population estimates.

The need to travel long distances to a provider may be a barrier to obtaining an abortion. An earlier Guttmacher-sponsored study showed that in the year 2000, abortion rate among women residing in metropolitan counties, where abortion providers tended to be concentrated, was two times the rate of abortions among women residing in non-metropolitan counties. [55]

In 2008, 97 percent of non-metropolitan counties nationwide lacked an abortion provider. [54]

The national census of abortion providers conducted in 2009 was the 15th such census the Guttmacher Institute has conducted since 1973. [54] Research articles reporting these data have been published regularly, with varying frequency. Articles similar to the latest one cited here were published in 2008, [56] 2005, [57] and 2002. [55] As such, it is reasonable to expect to be able to update this indicator with new data in the near future.

Indicator	Estimated vaccination coverage, ≥3 doses HPV, females aged 13-17 years
Year(s)	2010
Frequency	Annual
Source	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. National and state vaccination coverage among adolescents aged 13 through 17 years--United States, 2010. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep. 2011 Aug 26;60(33):1117-23.

HPV infection causes practically all cervical cancers, 90 percent of cancers of the anus, and 40 percent of cancers of the vagina, vulva, and penis.[58] A vaccine against the most common cancer-causing types of HPV was first licensed by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration in 2006.[59] In 2007, the CDC Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices (ACIP) recommended routine HPV vaccination, using a three-dose series, for females aged 9-26 years. In 2009, the ACIP released guidance stating that males aged 9-26 years could also receive HPV vaccination. In 2011, the ACIP replaced this guidance statement with a recommendation for routine HPV vaccination of males aged 9-26 years.

The National Immunization Survey – Teen shows that in 2010, 69.6 percent of females aged 13-17 years nationwide had received the full three-dose HPV vaccine series; whereas only 1.4 percent of males aged 13-17 had received one or more doses of HPV vaccine. [60]

The CDC reports that in 2010, "... adolescent vaccination coverage varied widely among states and other reporting areas, which could reflect differing vaccination-promotion initiatives among local health agencies and communities ... Additional factors that might play an important role in vaccination coverage include vaccine financing, health-care infrastructure, local outbreaks, and communication efforts leading to increased consumer demand."

4. Multivariate Analysis

4.1. Principal Component Analysis

Principal component analysis (PCA) was used to describe the underlying structure of the data set. Unweighted standardized scores for the 26 selected indicators were analyzed.

The PCA results are shown in table 5.

4.2. Indicator-Dimension Grouping

As discussed in Section 1, *Sexual Health Rankings*™ is based on a conceptual model of sexual health comprising five elements: 1) ability of individuals to have control over, and freely decide on, their own sexual behavior and experiences; 2) ability of individuals to decide freely on whether, and when, to procreate; 3) freedom from discrimination and violence related to sexuality and gender; 4) experience of sexual pleasure

and satisfaction; and 5) freedom from sexual morbidity, including HIV/AIDS and other sexually transmitted infections.

For the sake of convenience, the five elements are given the following labels:

I. Autonomy

II. Reproductive choice

III. Inequity/violence

IV. Pleasure/satisfaction

V. Morbidity.

Based on considerations discussed in the previous section, the indicators are grouped according to their relationships to the five elements of sexual health. Individual indicators may be related to more than one element. If an indicator is grouped with a given element, it is assumed that it measures some aspect of that element. These groupings do not make assumptions about causation, direction, or strength of association. Table 3 presents a matrix of these relationships.

4.3. Correlation Coefficients

For descriptive purposes, correlation analysis was performed using standardized scores for all 26 indicators, and for sets of indicators grouped by element. The correlation coefficient matrixes for these analyses are shown in tables 6-11.

5. Ranking System

5.1. Standardization of Data

Indicator data are standardized in order to make them comparable. Standardization is necessary because the indicators have different units of measurement (e.g. rates and proportions). Indicator data are converted to standard scores (*z*-scores), using the following formula:

$$Z = \frac{Y - \bar{x}}{s}$$

where:

Y = the state value

$\bar{x}$ = the national mean; or, when a national statistic is not reported, the calculated mean of all state values (n=51)

s = the standard deviation of all 51 state values.

For most indicators, the sample standard deviation (*s*) is calculated. For indicators that are not based on sample data (e.g. state laws and policies), the population standard deviation (σ) is calculated.

The standard score (*Z*) for each state represents the number of standard deviations of the state value above or below the national mean. A score of 0.000 denotes that the state value and national mean are the same. Scores higher than the national mean are positive; and scores lower than the national mean are negative.

Reverse coding is applied to indicators for which a higher value (reflecting a higher rate, proportion, or compound statistic) is less desirable—e.g. disease incidence, poverty, detrimental legislation. To reverse-code these indicators, *z*-scores are simply multiplied by -1.

5.2. Composite Scores

Each state's composite score (Composite) is the sum of the weighted scores for all indicators.

A weighted score is a standard score (*Z*) multiplied by an assigned weight (*w*).

$$\text{Composite} = \sum w_i Z_i$$

5.3. Weights

The weighting of indicators in a composite index significantly influences rankings, and therefore must be considered carefully.

America's Health Rankings (AHR) and *County Health Rankings* (CHR), the two projects from which *Sexual Health Rankings*™ draws its inspiration, take the same basic approach to weighting indicators. Weights are assigned as percentages, with the weights of all indicators totaling 100 percent. Portions of the total weight are allotted between indicators measuring health outcomes and health factors (i.e. determinants of health). Individual health factors are assigned weights based on

their relative contribution to a set of population health outcomes. The degree to which each indicator contributes to these health outcomes is determined using a variety of approaches, including referencing evidence-based estimates published in the scientific literature, statistical analysis of the indicator data, and input from expert advisory panels. [61, 62]

Each of the 26 indicators included in the *Sexual Health Rankings*™ composite index is related to one or more of the five elements of sexual health. Eight indicators are classified as outcomes, and 18 are classified as factors.

At present, valid and generally accepted outcome measures for all five elements of sexual health do not exist. Therefore the weighting scheme does not calculate relative contributions of factors to outcomes, as AHR and CHR do.

The weighting scheme does, however, distinguish between indicators of outcomes—i.e., measures of sexual health status—and factors that influence sexual health. Each category is weighted according to the number of indicators in the category. Outcome indicator scores make up approximately 31 percent (8/26) of each state's composite score, and factors account for approximately 69 percent (18/26) of the composite score.

Weights assigned to individual indicators are determined by indicator category (outcome or factor), relevance to each of the five elements of sexual health, and the number of indicators related to each of the five elements.

5.3.1. WEIGHTING SCHEME

A weight (*w*) is calculated for each indicator according the following process. Weights for the two categories of indicators—outcomes and factors—are calculated separately.

Table 4 presents the calculations in detail.

The five elements of sexual health are assumed to be of equal importance. The weighting formula therefore must be adjusted to prevent overrepresentation of elements to which a greater number of indicators are related. Each of the five elements is assigned a weight (*R*) equal to 0.2 divided by the number (*n*) of indicators related to that dimension.

$$R = 0.2 / n$$

Not all indicators included in the composite index measure every element of sexual health. The weighting formula must therefore account for each indicator's relevance to the five elements.

The final weight (*w*) for each indicator is calculated as the sum of the *R* values of the dimensions to which the indicator is related, multiplied by the value of *y*, which is the proportion of indicators in its respective category to the total number of indicators in the composite.

$$w = y\,(\sum R_{\mathrm{i}})$$

The *y* values for outcomes and factors are 8/26 and 18/26, respectively.

5.4. Ranking

States are ranked 1 to 51 by their composite scores, from highest (no. 1, best sexual health) to lowest (no. 51, worst sexual health).

Table 1 presents the weighted ranking and aggregate scores of the 50 states and D.C. The unweighted ranking and scores are presented in the same table to illustrate the effect of weighting.

Table 12 shows rankings and scores for each individual indicator.

References

1. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, E.C.J.R.C., Handbook on Constructing Composite Indicators: Methodology and User Guide. 2008, Paris: OECD.
2. CDC, A Public Health Approach for Advancing Sexual Health in the United States: Rationale and Options for Implementation, Meeting Report of an External Consultation, 2010, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention: Atlanta.
3. WHO, Defining Sexual Health: Report of a Technical Consultation on Sexual Health, 28–31 January 2002, 2006, World Health Organization: Geneva.
4. WHO, Measuring Sexual Health: Conceptual and Practical Considerations and Related Indicators, 2010, World Health Organization: Geneva.
5. Forced Marriage in Immigrant Communities in the United States: 2011 National Survey Results, 2011, Tahirih Justice Center: Falls Church, VA.
6. Women living in the United States estimated to be at risk of FGC, by state, 2000, Brigham and Women's Hospital.
7. Lawrence v. Texas, in West's Encyclopedia of American Law, S. Phelps and J. Lehman, Editors. 2005, Gale: Detroit. p. 217-219.
8. WHO, Developing Sexual Health Programmes: A Framework for Action, 2010, World Health Organization: Geneva.
9. WHO, Framework and Standards for Country Health Information Systems, 2008, World Health Organization: Geneva.
10. IMF, Data Quality Assessment Framework -- Generic Framework, 2003, International Monetary Fund.
11. CDC, HIV Surveillance Report, 2010, in HIV Surveillance Reports2012, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention: Atlanta.
12. Battegay, M. and L. Elzi, Morbidity and mortality in HIV-infected individuals - a shift towards comorbidities. Swiss Med Wkly, 2009. 139(39-40): p. 564-70.
13. CDC Summary of Changes to the National HIV Surveillance Report. 2010.
14. CDC, Summary of notifiable diseases--United States, 2010. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep, 2012. 59(53): p. 1-111.
15. CDC. Interpreting STD Surveillance Data. November 17, 2011; Available from: http://www.cdc.gov/std/stats10/app-interpret.htm.
16. CSTE, State Reportable Conditions Assessment (SRCA).
17. KG, G., Gonorrhea, in Conn's Current Therapy 2012, K. Bope ET, RD, Editor. 2012, Elsevier Saunders: Philadelphia.
18. CDC, Discordant results from reverse sequence syphilis screening--five laboratories, United States, 2006-2010. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep, 2011. 60(5): p. 133-7.
19. Schiffman, M., et al., Human papillomavirus and cervical cancer. The Lancet, 2007. 370(9590): p. 890-907.
20. CDC Improving the Lives of Young People and Strengthening Communities by Reducing Teen Pregnancy: At a Glance 2011.
21. CDC. About Teen Pregnancy. 2012 March 12 [cited 2012 October 3]; Available from: http://www.cdc.gov/teenpregnancy/aboutteenpreg.htm#_edn6.
22. Martin JA, H.B., Ventura SJ, Osterman MJK, Wilson EC, Mathews TJ Births: final data for 2010. Natl Vital Stat Rep, 2012. 61.
23. Attorney General Eric Holder Announces Revisions to the Uniform Crime Report's Definition of Rape, 2012, Federal Information & News Dispatch, Inc.: Lanham, United States, Lanham.
24. FBI, UCR Program Changes Definition of Rape. CJIS Link, 2012. 14(1).
25. LL, F., Sex, Romance, and Relationships: AARP Survey of Midlife and Older Adults, 2010, AARP: Washington, DC.

26. Laumann, E.O., et al., A cross-national study of subjective sexual well-being among older women and men: findings from the Global Study of Sexual Attitudes and Behaviors. Arch Sex Behav, 2006. 35 (2): p. 145-61.
27. Gallicchio, L., et al., Correlates of sexual functioning among mid-life women. Climacteric, 2007. 10(2): p. 132-42.
28. Laumann, E.O., A. Paik, and R.C. Rosen, Sexual dysfunction in the United States: prevalence and predictors. JAMA, 1999. 281(6): p. 537-44.
29. Heiman, J.R., et al., Sexual satisfaction and relationship happiness in midlife and older couples in five countries. Arch Sex Behav, 2011. 40(4): p. 741-53.
30. Laumann, E.O., et al., The Social Organization of Sexuality: Sexual Practices in the United States, ed. E.O. Laumann. 1994: U of Chicago Press. xxxii +718.
31. Higgins, J.A., et al., Sexual satisfaction and sexual health among university students in the United States. Am J Public Health, 2011. 101(9): p. 1643-54.
32. Haavio-Mannila, E. and O. Kontula, Correlates of increased sexual satisfaction. Arch Sex Behav, 1997. 26(4): p. 399-419.
33. Michael, Y., et al., Correlates of sexual satisfaction in marriage. The Canadian Journal of Human Sexuality, 1998. 7(2): p. 115-127.
34. Herbenick, D., et al., Sexual Behavior in the United States: Results from a National Probability Sample of Men and Women Ages 14–94. The Journal of Sexual Medicine, 2010. 7: p. 255-265.
35. Herbenick, D., et al., Sexual Behaviors, Relationships, and Perceived Health Status Among Adult Women in the United States: Results from a National Probability Sample. The Journal of Sexual Medicine, 2010. 7: p. 277-290.
36. Reece, M., et al., Sexual Behaviors, Relationships, and Perceived Health Among Adult Men in the United States: Results from a National Probability Sample. The Journal of Sexual Medicine, 2010. 7: p. 291-304.
37. UN, Report of the International Conference on Population and Development, Cairo, 5-13 September 1994, 1995, United Nations: New York.
38. Ghanotakis, E., D. Peacock, and R. Wilcher, The importance of addressing gender inequality in efforts to end vertical transmission of HIV. Journal of the International AIDS Society, 2012. 15(4(Suppl 2)).
39. Yodanis, C.L., Gender inequality, violence against women, and fear: a cross-national test of the feminist theory of violence against women. J Interpers Violence, 2004. 19(6): p. 655-75.
40. Krug, E.G., et al., World report on violence and health. 2002, Switzerland; Suisse: World Health Organization. 0.
41. UN, Human Development Report, 2011, 2011, United Nations: New York.
42. Hausmann, R., Tyson, LD, Zahidi, S, The Global Gender Gap Report 2011, 2011, World Economic Forum: Geneva.
43. Mosher WD, J.J., Abma JC, Intended and Unintended Births in the United States: 1982–2010, in National Health Statistics Reports2012, National Center for Health Statistics: Hyattsville, MD.
44. Hall, K.S., C. Moreau, and J. Trussell, Determinants of and disparities in reproductive health service use among adolescent and young adult women in the United States, 2002-2008. Am J Public Health, 2012. 102(2): p. 359-67.
45. Chandra A, B.V., Copen CE, Sionean C, HIV Risk-Related Behaviors in the United States Household Population Aged 15–44: Data from the National Survey of Family Growth, 2002 and 2006–2010, 2012, National Center for Health Statistics: Hyattsville, MD.
46. Mosher, W.D. and J. Jones, Use of contraception in the United States: 1982-2008. Vital Health Stat 23, 2010(29): p. 1-44.
47. Hogben, M. and J.S. Leichliter, Social determinants and sexually transmitted disease disparities. Sex Transm Dis, 2008. 35(12 Suppl): p. S13-8.
48. CDC, Characteristics associated with HIV infection among heterosexuals in urban areas with high AIDS prevalence --- 24 cities, United States, 2006-2007. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep, 2011. 60(31): p. 1045-9.
49. Victimization rates for persons age 12 and over, by type of crime and annual family income of victims, 2010, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
50. Greco D, D.S., Poverty and Sexual Violence: Building Prevention and Intervention Responses, A Guide for Counselors and Advocates, 2007, Pennsylvania Coalition Against Rape: Encola, PA.

51. Kost, K., L.B. Finer, and S. Singh, Variation in state unintended pregnancy rates in the United States. Perspect Sex Reprod Health, 2012. 44(1): p. 57-64.
52. Frost JJ, H.S., Sonfield A, Contraceptive needs and services: national and state data, 2008 update, 2010, Guttmacher Institute: New York.
53. Branson, B.M., et al., Revised recommendations for HIV testing of adults, adolescents, and pregnant women in health-care settings. MMWR Recomm Rep, 2006. 55(RR-14): p. 1-17; quiz CE1-4.
54. Jones, R.K. and K. Kooistra, Abortion incidence and access to services in the United States, 2008. Perspect Sex Reprod Health, 2011. 43(1): p. 41-50.
55. Jones, R.K., J.E. Darroch, and S.K. Henshaw, Patterns in the socioeconomic characteristics of women obtaining abortions in 2000-2001. Perspect Sex Reprod Health, 2002. 34(5): p. 226-35.
56. Jones, R.K., et al., Abortion in the United States: incidence and access to services, 2005. Perspect Sex Reprod Health, 2008. 40(1): p. 6-16.
57. Harper, C.C., J.T. Henderson, and P.D. Darney, Abortion in the United States. Annu Rev Public Health, 2005. 26: p. 501-12.
58. CDC, Recommendations on the use of quadrivalent human papillomavirus vaccine in males--Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices (ACIP), 2011. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep, 2011. 60(50): p. 1705-8.
59. Markowitz, L.E., et al., Quadrivalent Human Papillomavirus Vaccine: Recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices (ACIP). MMWR Recomm Rep, 2007. 56(RR-2): p. 1-24.
60. CDC, National and state vaccination coverage among adolescents aged 13 through 17 years--United States, 2010. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep, 2011. 60(33): p. 1117-23.
61. America's Health Rankings 2011, 2011, United Health Foundation: Minnetonka, MN.
62. Booske BC, A.J., Kindig DA, Park H, Remington PL, County Health Rankings Working Paper: Different Perspectives for Assigning Weights to Determinants of Health, 2010, University of Wisconsin Population Health Institute: Madison, WI.

Table 1. Sexual Health Rankings and Composite Scores, 50 U.S. States and District of Columbia, 2012

WEIGHTED				*UNWEIGHTED*		
Rank	**State**	**Score**		*Rank*	*State*	*Score*
1	Vermont	1.240		*1*	*Vermont*	*29.374*
2	Connecticut	0.986		*2*	*Massachusetts*	*20.556*
3	New Hampshire	0.958		*3*	*Connecticut*	*20.425*
4	New Jersey	0.898		*4*	*New Hampshire*	*17.259*
5	Massachusetts	0.876		*5*	*Maine*	*17.217*
6	Maine	0.793		*6*	*Hawaii*	*15.682*
7	Iowa	0.731		*7*	*New Jersey*	*15.153*
8	Minnesota	0.726		*8*	*Washington*	*13.694*
9	Hawaii	0.670		*9*	*Oregon*	*12.957*
10	Wisconsin	0.655		*10*	*Iowa*	*12.905*
11	Oregon	0.645		*11*	*Rhode Island*	*12.397*
12	Washington	0.641		*12*	*Minnesota*	*11.045*
13	Maryland	0.582		*13*	*New York*	*10.849*
14	New York	0.475		*14*	*Colorado*	*10.756*
15	Colorado	0.370		*15*	*Maryland*	*9.989*
16	Delaware	0.345		*16*	*Wisconsin*	*9.267*
17	Wyoming	0.305		*17*	*Delaware*	*8.796*
18	Montana	0.300		*18*	*California*	*7.982*
19	Rhode Island	0.269		*19*	*Montana*	*2.370*
20	District of Columbia	0.233		*20*	*Illinois*	*0.465*
21	Nebraska	0.155		*21*	*Nebraska*	*0.190*
22	Pennsylvania	0.147		*22*	*District of Columbia*	*0.030*
23	Utah	0.147		*23*	*Pennsylvania*	*-0.392*
24	Virginia	0.128		*24*	*New Mexico*	*-0.467*
25	Illinois	0.101		*25*	*Virginia*	*-1.300*
26	California	0.086		*26*	*Wyoming*	*-2.348*

Table 1. Sexual Health Rankings and Composite Scores, 50 U.S. States and District of Columbia, 2012

WEIGHTED				*UNWEIGHTED*		
Rank	**State**	**Score**		*Rank*	*State*	*Score*
27	North Dakota	0.057		*27*	*Nevada*	*-3.083*
28	South Dakota	-0.011		*28*	*Utah*	*-3.359*
29	Ohio	-0.088		*29*	*North Dakota*	*-3.405*
30	Idaho	-0.115		*30*	*South Dakota*	*-3.769*
31	Florida	-0.122		*31*	*Idaho*	*-4.472*
32	Kansas	-0.146		*32*	*Ohio*	*-4.610*
33	Michigan	-0.148		*33*	*Alaska*	*-4.843*
34	Alaska	-0.151		*34*	*Kansas*	*-5.112*
35	Nevada	-0.190		*35*	*North Carolina*	*-5.230*
36	Missouri	-0.196		*36*	*Missouri*	*-5.996*
37	Indiana	-0.210		*37*	*Tennessee*	*-6.170*
38	North Carolina	-0.211		*38*	*Michigan*	*-6.339*
39	West Virginia	-0.294		*39*	*Arizona*	*-6.520*
40	New Mexico	-0.334		*40*	*West Virginia*	*-7.153*
41	Tennessee	-0.366		*41*	*Florida*	*-7.453*
42	South Carolina	-0.389		*42*	*Indiana*	*-8.454*
43	Georgia	-0.422		*43*	*Kentucky*	*-8.778*
44	Oklahoma	-0.466		*44*	*Oklahoma*	*-9.977*
45	Arizona	-0.492		*45*	*South Carolina*	*-11.402*
46	Alabama	-0.535		*46*	*Georgia*	*-12.663*
47	Kentucky	-0.602		*47*	*Alabama*	*-12.857*
48	Arkansas	-0.774		*48*	*Texas*	*-16.522*
49	Texas	-0.780		*49*	*Arkansas*	*-18.759*
50	Louisiana	-0.797		*50*	*Louisiana*	*-21.880*
51	Mississippi	-1.037		*51*	*Mississippi*	*-23.272*

Table 2. Summary Table of Sexual Health Indicators

Category	Domain	Topic	Indicator	Year	Source
Outcomes	Sexually transmitted infections	HIV/AIDS	Estimated rate of AIDS diagnoses per 100,000 population	2010	CDC, HIV Surv.
		Gonorrhea	Rate of gonorrhea cases per 100,000 population	2010	CDC, STD Surv.
		Syphilis	Rate of syphilis cases per 100,000 population	2010	CDC, STD Surv.
		Cervical cancer	Cervical cancer incidence rate per 100,000 population, age adjusted	2004-08	CDC/NCI, USCS
	Reproductive	Teen births	Births to mothers aged 15-19 years, rates per 1,000 population	2010	CDC, NCHS
	Sex. violence	Rape	Forcible rape incident rate per 100,000 population	2010	FBI, UCR
	Sexual satisfaction	Proxy indicators of satisfaction	Percentage of adults reporting good or better health	2011	CDC, BRFSS
			Percentage of adults married or a member of an unmarried couple	2011	CDC, BRFSS
Factors	Laws, policies & human rights	Sexual orientation & gender identity	Status of statewide employment, housing, and school non-discrimination laws and policies based on sexual orientation and gender identity	2012	HRC
			Status of state law on marriage equality for same-sex couples	2012	HRC
			Status of state laws addressing bias or hate crimes based on sexual orientation and gender identity	2012	HRC
		Contraception	Status of state laws on emergency contraception in hospital emergency departments	2012	Guttmacher Inst.
		Abortion	Status of state laws restricting private insurance coverage of abortion	2012	Guttmacher Inst.
			Status of state laws imposing barriers to obtaining an abortion -- mandated counseling to discourage abortion, waiting period, ultrasound required	2012	Guttmacher Inst.
		Sex education	Status of sex education mandates and content requirements for contraception and STI/HIV education	2012	Guttmacher Inst.
	Education	Sexual health education in schools	Percentage of schools in which teachers taught all 17 HIV, STD, or pregnancy prevention topics in a required course in any of grades 6, 7, or 8	2010	CDC, School Health Profiles
			Percentage of schools in which teachers taught all 17 HIV, STD, or pregnancy prevention topics in a required course in any of grades 9, 10, 11, or 12	2010	CDC, School Health Profiles
	Society & culture	Gender equality	Proportion of seats held by women in state legislatures and DC Council	2012	NCSL/WLN; DCC
			Percentage of women aged ≥25 years with high school diploma and higher education	2008-10	Census, ACS 3yr
	Economics	Poverty	Percentage of people in poverty	2009-11	Census, CPS
		Health insurance	Percentage of women aged 15-44 uninsured	2009-10	Guttmacher Inst.
			Percentage of women aged 15-44 covered by Medicaid	2009-10	Guttmacher Inst.
	Health systems	Access to services	Percentage of contraceptive need met by all publicly funded clinics	2008-10	Guttmacher Inst.
			Percentage of people aged 18-64 years who reported ever receiving a HIV test	2010	KFF (BRFSS)
			Percentage of women aged 15-44 living in a county without an abortion provider	2008	Guttmacher Inst.
			Estimated vaccination coverage, ≥3 doses HPV, females aged 13-17 years	2010	CDC, NIS-Teen

CDC—Centers for Disease Control and Prevention HIV Surv.—HIV Surveillance Reports STD Surv.—STD Surveillance NCI—National Cancer Institute USCS—United States Cancer Statistics NCHS—National Center for Health Statistics FBI—Federal Bureau of Investigation UCR—Uniform Crime Reports BRFSS—Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System HRC—Human Rights Campaign NCSL/WLN—National Conference of State Legislatures/Women's Legislative Network DCC—District of Columbia Council ACS 3yr—American Community Survey 3-year estimates CPS—Current Population Survey KFF—Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation NIS-Teen—National Immunization Survey–Teen

Table 3. Summary Table of Indicators and Related Elements of Sexual Health

			Sexual Health Elements				
Category	**Domain**	**Indicator**	**I**	**II**	**III**	**IV**	**V**
Outcomes	STIs	Estimated rate of AIDS diagnoses per 100,000 population					●
		Rate of gonorrhea cases per 100,000 population					●
		Rate of syphilis cases per 100,000 population					●
		Cervical cancer incidence rate per 100,000 population, age adjusted					●
	Reproductive	Births to mothers aged 15-19 years, rates per 1,000 population	●	●			
	Sexual violence	Forcible rape incident rate per 100,000 population	●		●		
	Sexual satisfaction	Percentage of adults reporting good or better health				●	
		Percentage of adults married or a member of an unmarried couple				●	
Factors	Laws, policies & human rights	Status of statewide employment, housing, and school non-discrimination laws and policies based on sexual orientation and gender identity	●		●		
		Status of state law on marriage equality for same-sex couples	●		●		
		Status of state laws addressing bias or hate crimes based on sexual orientation and gender identity	●		●		
		Status of state laws on emergency contraception in hospital emergency departments		●	●		
		Status of state laws restricting private insurance coverage of abortion	●	●	●		
		Status of state laws imposing barriers to obtaining an abortion -- mandated counseling to discourage abortion, waiting period, ultrasound required	●	●			
		Status of sex education mandates and content requirements for contraception and STI/HIV education		●			●
	Education	Percentage of schools in which teachers taught all 17 HIV, STD, or pregnancy prevention topics in a required course in any of grades 6, 7, or 8	●	●			●
		Percentage of schools in which teachers taught all 17 HIV, STD, or pregnancy prevention topics in a required course in any of grades 9, 10, 11, or 12	●	●			●
	Society & culture	Proportion of seats held by women in state legislatures and DC Council			●		
		Percentage of women aged ≥25 years with high school diploma and higher education	●	●	●	●	●
	Economics	Percentage of people in poverty	●	●	●		●
		Percentage of women aged 15-44 uninsured		●			
		Percentage of women aged 15-44 covered by Medicaid		●			
	Health systems	Percentage of contraceptive need met by all publicly funded clinics	●	●			
		Percentage of people aged 18-64 years who reported ever receiving a HIV test					●
		Percentage of women aged 15-44 living in a county without an abortion provider		●			
		Estimated vaccination coverage, ≥3 doses HPV, females aged 13-17 years					●

Elements of Sexual Health: **I.** Autonomy **II.** Reproductive choice **III.** Inequity/violence **IV.** Pleasure/satisfaction **V.** Morbidity

Table 4. Calculation of Indicator Weights

y = (8/26)			V	IV	III	II	I	
$w = y(\sum R_i)$	$\sum R_i$		R_5	R_4	R_3	R_2	R_1	
0.015	0.050		0.050					aids
0.015	0.050		0.050					gon
0.015	0.050		0.050					syph
0.015	0.050		0.050					cerv
0.092	0.300					0.200	0.100	teenbir
0.092	0.300				0.200		0.100	rape
0.031	0.100			0.100				healthstat
0.031	0.100			0.100				partner
30.8%	100%		0.200	0.200	0.200	0.200	0.200	
		n=	4	2	1	1	2	
y = (18/26)								
$w = y(\sum R_i)$	$\sum R_i$		R_5	R_4	R_3	R_2	R_1	
0.031	0.045				0.025		0.020	nondisc
0.031	0.045				0.025		0.020	gaymar
0.031	0.045				0.025		0.020	hatecrime
0.029	0.042				0.025	0.017		erec
0.043	0.062				0.025	0.017	0.020	insabort
0.025	0.037					0.017	0.020	barabort
0.031	0.045		0.029			0.017		sexedman
0.045	0.065		0.029			0.017	0.020	taught678
0.045	0.065		0.029			0.017	0.020	taught912
0.017	0.025				0.025			womleg
0.201	0.290		0.029	0.200	0.025	0.017	0.020	womhs
0.062	0.090		0.029		0.025	0.017	0.020	poverty
0.012	0.017					0.017		womunins
0.012	0.017					0.017		womedicaid
0.025	0.037					0.017	0.020	contraneed
0.020	0.029		0.029					hivtest
0.012	0.017					0.017		countyabort
0.020	0.029		0.029					hpvax
69.2%	100%		0.200	0.200	0.200	0.200	0.200	
100%		n=	7	1	8	12	10	

E ements of Sexua Hea th: I. Autonomy II. Reproduct ve cho ce III. Inequ ty/v o ence IV. P easure/sat sfact on V. Morb d ty

Table 4. Calculation of Indicator Weights, *continued*

Weight	Label	Indicator
0.015	aids	Estimated rates of AIDS diagnoses per 100,000 population
0.015	gon	Rates of gonorrhea cases per 100,000 population
0.015	syph	Rates of syphilis cases per 100,000 population
0.015	cerv	Cervical cancer incidence rates per 100,000 population, age adjusted
0.092	teenbir	Births to mothers aged 15-19 years, rates per 1,000 population
0.092	rape	Forcible rape incident rates per 100,000 population
0.031	healthstat	Percentage of adults reporting good or better health
0.031	partner	Percentage of adults married or a member of an unmarried couple
0.031	nondisc	Status of statewide employment, housing, and school non-discrimination laws and policies based on sexual orientation and gender identity
0.031	gaymar	Status of state law on marriage equality for same-sex couples
0.031	hatecrime	Status of state laws addressing bias or hate crimes based on sexual orientation and gender identity
0.029	erec	Status of state laws on emergency contraception in hospital emergency departments
0.043	insabort	Status of state laws restricting private insurance coverage of abortion
0.025	barabort	Status of state laws imposing barriers to obtaining an abortion -- mandated counseling to discourage abortion, waiting period, ultrasound required
0.031	sexedman	Status of sex education mandates and content requirements for contraception and STI/HIV education
0.045	taught678	Percentage of schools in which teachers taught all 17 HIV, STD, or pregnancy prevention topics in a required course in any of grades 6, 7, or 8
0.045	taught912	Percentage of schools in which teachers taught all 17 HIV, STD, or pregnancy prevention topics in a required course in any of grades 9, 10, 11, or 12
0.017	womleg	Proportion of seats held by women in state legislatures and DC Council
0.201	womhs	Percentage of women aged ≥25 years with high school diploma and higher education
0.062	poverty	Percentage of people in poverty
0.012	womunins	Percentage of women aged 15-44 uninsured
0.012	womedicaid	Percentage of women aged 15-44 covered by Medicaid
0.025	contraneed	Percentage of contraceptive need met by all publicly funded clinics
0.02	hivtest	Percentage of people aged 18-64 years who reported ever receiving a HIV test
0.012	countyabort	Percentage of women aged 15-44 living in a county without an abortion provider
0.02	hpvax	Estimated vaccination coverage, ≥3 doses HPV, females aged 13-17 years

Table 5. Principal Component Analysis

Principal components/correlation — Number of obs = 51
Number of comp. = 26
Trace = 26
Rotation: (unrotated = principal) — Rho = 1.0000

Component	Eigenvalue	Difference	Proportion	Cumulative
Comp1	7.46134	.799579	0.2870	0.2870
Comp2	6.66176	4.79218	0.2562	0.5432
Comp3	1.86958	.284597	0.0719	0.6151
Comp4	1.58498	.325149	0.0610	0.6761
Comp5	1.25984	.189143	0.0485	0.7245
Comp6	1.07069	.143111	0.0412	0.7657
Comp7	.927581	.084376	0.0357	0.8014
Comp8	.843205	.142772	0.0324	0.8338
Comp9	.700433	.0552095	0.0269	0.8607
Comp10	.645224	.087795	0.0248	0.8856
Comp11	.557429	.105471	0.0214	0.9070
Comp12	.451957	.0945207	0.0174	0.9244
Comp13	.357436	.0666828	0.0137	0.9381
Comp14	.290754	.0364917	0.0112	0.9493
Comp15	.254262	.0723623	0.0098	0.9591
Comp16	.1819	.0123214	0.0070	0.9661
Comp17	.169578	.0166359	0.0065	0.9726
Comp18	.152942	.0192812	0.0059	0.9785
Comp19	.133661	.0296498	0.0051	0.9836
Comp20	.104011	.0207579	0.0040	0.9876
Comp21	.0832534	.0147433	0.0032	0.9908
Comp22	.0685101	.00871105	0.0026	0.9935
Comp23	.0597991	.0027704	0.0023	0.9958
Comp24	.0570287	.0297182	0.0022	0.9980
Comp25	.0273105	.00178339	0.0011	0.9990
Comp26	.0255271	.	0.0010	1.0000

Table 6. Correlation Coefficient Matrix—All Indicators

	aids	gon	syph	cerv	teenbir	rape	health~t
aids	1.0000						
gon	0.6769*	1.0000					
syph	0.8510*	0.7727*	1.0000				
cerv	0.4636*	0.6715*	0.6138*	1.0000			
teenbir	0.1646	0.5398*	0.3863*	0.6750*	1.0000		
rape	-0.1203	0.0995	-0.1518	-0.0093	0.3221*	1.0000	
healthstat	-0.0607	0.3615*	0.2581	0.6805*	0.7096*	-0.0316	1.0000
partner	0.8592*	0.7755*	0.8589*	0.6129*	0.2888*	-0.1613	0.2239
nondisc	-0.1802	0.2405	-0.0318	0.2121	0.4952*	0.2130	0.4417*
gaymar	-0.1555	0.1700	-0.0331	0.2073	0.4820*	0.2964*	0.3516*
hatecrime	-0.2406	0.1592	-0.1443	0.1111	0.3725*	0.2309	0.3510*
erec	-0.2678	0.0179	-0.1834	0.0761	0.2462	0.1635	0.2325
insabort	-0.1440	-0.0281	-0.1738	-0.0895	0.1190	0.0593	0.0222
barabort	-0.1586	0.3072*	0.0682	0.1253	0.4651*	0.0972	0.3890*
sexedman	-0.1310	0.0674	0.0150	-0.0525	0.1727	0.3318*	-0.0102
taught678	-0.6540*	-0.4027*	-0.5011*	-0.4061*	-0.0505	0.2571	-0.0376
taught912	-0.4462*	-0.0926	-0.2651	-0.2179	0.3471*	0.3927*	0.1283
womleg	0.0014	0.3232*	0.1527	0.3507*	0.4411*	0.0529	0.4630*
womhs	0.1881	0.4690*	0.4797*	0.7198*	0.6320*	-0.1933	0.8121*
poverty	0.2982*	0.5514*	0.5445*	0.6459*	0.8039*	0.0896	0.7371*
womunins	-0.0637	0.2520	0.1984	0.5313*	0.7447*	0.1762	0.7027*
womedicaid	-0.2324	-0.0945	-0.2063	-0.1567	0.0942	0.2235	-0.0733
contraneed	-0.3783*	-0.1716	-0.1383	-0.1302	-0.0179	-0.2936*	0.1384
hivtest	-0.7208*	-0.6809*	-0.7206*	-0.4897*	-0.1415	0.1558	-0.1647
countyabort	-0.3321*	0.0140	-0.1842	0.0920	0.4509*	0.0959	0.3835*
hpvax	0.0032	0.2932*	0.1273	0.3639*	0.5058*	0.1244	0.4721*

	partner	nondisc	gaymar	hatecr~e	erec	insabort	barabort
partner	1.0000						
nondisc	-0.1305	1.0000					
gaymar	-0.1333	0.4759*	1.0000				
hatecrime	-0.2226	0.7774*	0.4108*	1.0000			
erec	-0.1521	0.5912*	0.2971*	0.4783*	1.0000		
insabort	-0.1545	0.3344*	0.2721	0.2361	0.2459	1.0000	
barabort	-0.0860	0.7001*	0.4855*	0.5918*	0.2931*	0.4125*	1.0000
sexedman	-0.1654	0.3977*	0.1267	0.3206*	0.1786	0.2053	0.3946*
taught678	-0.6678*	0.4328*	0.2475	0.3847*	0.2399	0.2293	0.3036*
taught912	-0.4601*	0.6013*	0.5033*	0.5806*	0.3793*	0.3425*	0.6058*

Table 6. Correlation Coefficient Matrix, All Indicators, *continued*

	partner	nondisc	gaymar	hatecr~e	erec	insabort	barabort
womleg	0.1015	0.6667*	0.2166	0.6866*	0.2441	0.2109	0.5372*
womhs	0.4475*	0.2372	0.1699	0.0632	-0.0027	0.0301	0.2961*
poverty	0.4887*	0.3221*	0.3126*	0.1975	0.0883	0.0039	0.3500*
womunins	-0.0020	0.4709*	0.4015*	0.3691*	0.1963	0.0063	0.3420*
womedicaid	-0.3981*	0.3439*	0.3173*	0.2908*	0.1777	0.1951	0.2635
contraneed	-0.2674	0.3007*	0.2693	0.1527	0.2090	0.2984*	0.4139*
hivtest	-0.7546*	0.0772	0.1349	0.1983	0.1651	0.3203*	0.1682
countyabort	-0.2770*	0.5953*	0.4149*	0.6243*	0.3663*	0.3394*	0.6189*
hpvax	-0.0018	0.3707*	0.3685*	0.3771*	0.1927	0.0888	0.3442*

	sexedman	taug~678	taug~912	womleg	womhs	poverty	womunins
sexedman	1.0000						
taught678	0.3367*	1.0000					
taught912	0.4661*	0.6568*	1.0000				
womleg	0.1947	0.1660	0.3279*	1.0000			
womhs	-0.1145	-0.1849	-0.0870	0.3193*	1.0000		
poverty	0.0039	-0.1438	0.1435	0.2520	0.7803*	1.0000	
womunins	0.0906	0.1871	0.3346*	0.3520*	0.6226*	0.6549*	1.0000
womedicaid	0.2856*	0.3802*	0.3705*	0.2030	-0.1678	-0.2636	0.3674*
contraneed	0.2837*	0.4086*	0.3460*	0.0721	0.1352	0.0278	0.0776
hivtest	0.2253	0.4434*	0.4704*	0.0311	-0.3803*	-0.3341*	-0.1384
countyabort	0.2391	0.3904*	0.5944*	0.6085*	0.0917	0.2280	0.2863*
hpvax	0.0928	0.0829	0.2188	0.2165	0.3601*	0.4338*	0.5504*

	womedi~d	contra~d	hivtest	county~t	hpvax
womedicaid	1.0000				
contraneed	0.1939	1.0000			
hivtest	0.1663	0.2668	1.0000		
countyabort	0.1357	0.2131	0.4527*	1.0000	
hpvax	0.1518	0.1217	-0.0743	0.2994*	1.0000

* P ≤ 0.05

Label	**Indicator**
aids	Estimated rates of AIDS diagnoses per 100,000 population
gon	Rates of gonorrhea cases per 100,000 population
syph	Rates of syphilis cases per 100,000 population
cerv	Cervical cancer incidence rates per 100,000 population, age adjusted
teenbir	Births to mothers aged 15-19 years, rates per 1,000 population
rape	Forcible rape incident rates per 100,000 population

Table 6. Correlation Coefficient Matrix, All Indicators, *continued*

Label	Indicator
healthstat	Percentage of adults reporting good or better health
partner	Percentage of adults married or a member of an unmarried couple
nondisc	Status of statewide employment, housing, and school non-discrimination laws and policies based on sexual orientation and gender identity
gaymar	Status of state law on marriage equality for same-sex couples
hatecrime	Status of state laws addressing bias or hate crimes based on sexual orientation and gender identity
erec	Status of state laws on emergency contraception in hospital emergency departments
insabort	Status of state laws restricting private insurance coverage of abortion
barabort	Status of state laws imposing barriers to obtaining an abortion -- mandated counseling to discourage abortion, waiting period, ultrasound required
sexedman	Status of sex education mandates and content requirements for contraception and STI/HIV education
taught678	Percentage of schools in which teachers taught all 17 HIV, STD, or pregnancy prevention topics in a required course in any of grades 6, 7, or 8
taught912	Percentage of schools in which teachers taught all 17 HIV, STD, or pregnancy prevention topics in a required course in any of grades 9, 10, 11, or 12
womleg	Proportion of seats held by women in state legislatures and DC Council
womhs	Percentage of women aged ≥25 years with high school diploma and higher education
poverty	Percentage of people in poverty
womunins	Percentage of women aged 15-44 uninsured
womedicaid	Percentage of women aged 15-44 covered by Medicaid
contraneed	Percentage of contraceptive need met by all publicly funded clinics
hivtest	Percentage of people aged 18-64 years who reported ever receiving a HIV test
countyabort	Percentage of women aged 15-44 living in a county without an abortion provider
hpvax	Estimated vaccination coverage, ≥3 doses HPV, females aged 13-17 years

Table 7. Correlation Coefficient Matrix, Indicators Grouped by Element—Autonomy

	teenbir	rape	nondisc	gaymar	hatecr~e	insabort	barabort
teenbir	1.0000						
rape	0.3221*	1.0000					
nondisc	0.4952*	0.2130	1.0000				
gaymar	0.4820*	0.2964*	0.4759*	1.0000			
hatecrime	0.3725*	0.2309	0.7774*	0.4108*	1.0000		
insabort	0.1190	0.0593	0.3344*	0.2721	0.2361	1.0000	
barabort	0.4651*	0.0972	0.7001*	0.4855*	0.5918*	0.4125*	1.0000
taught678	-0.0505	0.2571	0.4328*	0.2475	0.3847*	0.2293	0.3036*
taught912	0.3471*	0.3927*	0.6013*	0.5033*	0.5806*	0.3425*	0.6058*
womhs	0.6320*	-0.1933	0.2372	0.1699	0.0632	0.0301	0.2961*
poverty	0.8039*	0.0896	0.3221*	0.3126*	0.1975	0.0039	0.3500*
contraneed	-0.0179	-0.2936*	0.3007*	0.2693	0.1527	0.2984*	0.4139*

	taug~678	taug~912	womhs	poverty	contra~d
taught678	1.0000				
taught912	0.6568*	1.0000			
womhs	-0.1849	-0.0870	1.0000		
poverty	-0.1438	0.1435	0.7803*	1.0000	
contraneed	0.4086*	0.3460*	0.1352	0.0278	1.0000

* P ≤ 0.05

Label	**Indicator**
teenbir	Births to mothers aged 15-19 years, rates per 1,000 population
rape	Forcible rape incident rates per 100,000 population
nondisc	Status of statewide employment, housing, and school non-discrimination laws and policies based on sexual orientation and gender identity
gaymar	Status of state law on marriage equality for same-sex couples
hatecrime	Status of state laws addressing bias or hate crimes based on sexual orientation and gender identity
insabort	Status of state laws restricting private insurance coverage of abortion
barabort	Status of state laws imposing barriers to obtaining an abortion -- mandated counseling to discourage abortion, waiting period, ultrasound required
taught678	Percentage of schools in which teachers taught all 17 HIV, STD, or pregnancy prevention topics in a required course in any of grades 6, 7, or 8
taught912	Percentage of schools in which teachers taught all 17 HIV, STD, or pregnancy prevention topics in a required course in any of grades 9, 10, 11, or 12
womhs	Percentage of women aged ≥25 years with high school diploma and higher education
poverty	Percentage of people in poverty
contraneed	Percentage of contraceptive need met by all publicly funded clinics

Table 8. Correlation Coefficient Matrix, Indicators Grouped by Element—Reproductive Choice

	teenbir	erec	insabort	barabort	sexedman	taug~678	taug~912
teenbir	1.0000						
erec	0.2462	1.0000					
insabort	0.1190	0.2459	1.0000				
barabort	0.4651*	0.2931*	0.4125*	1.0000			
sexedman	0.1727	0.1786	0.2053	0.3946*	1.0000		
taught678	-0.0505	0.2399	0.2293	0.3036*	0.3367*	1.0000	
taught912	0.3471*	0.3793*	0.3425*	0.6058*	0.4661*	0.6568*	1.0000
womhs	0.6320*	-0.0027	0.0301	0.2961*	-0.1145	-0.1849	-0.0870
poverty	0.8039*	0.0883	0.0039	0.3500*	0.0039	-0.1438	0.1435
womunins	0.7447*	0.1963	0.0063	0.3420*	0.0906	0.1871	0.3346*
womedicaid	0.0942	0.1777	0.1951	0.2635	0.2856*	0.3802*	0.3705*
contraneed	-0.0179	0.2090	0.2984*	0.4139*	0.2837*	0.4086*	0.3460*
countyabort	0.4509*	0.3663*	0.3394*	0.6189*	0.2391	0.3904*	0.5944*

	womhs	poverty	womunins	womedi~d	contra~d	county~t
womhs	1.0000					
poverty	0.7803*	1.0000				
womunins	0.6226*	0.6549*	1.0000			
womedicaid	-0.1678	-0.2636	0.3674*	1.0000		
contraneed	0.1352	0.0278	0.0776	0.1939	1.0000	
countyabort	0.0917	0.2280	0.2863*	0.1357	0.2131	1.0000

* P ≤ 0.05

Label	**Indicator**
teenbir	Births to mothers aged 15-19 years, rates per 1,000 population
erec	Status of state laws on emergency contraception in hospital emergency departments
insabort	Status of state laws restricting private insurance coverage of abortion
barabort	Status of state laws imposing barriers to obtaining an abortion -- mandated counseling to discourage abortion, waiting period, ultrasound required
sexedman	Status of sex education mandates and content requirements for contraception and STI/HIV education
taught678	Percentage of schools in which teachers taught all 17 HIV, STD, or pregnancy prevention topics in a required course in any of grades 6, 7, or 8
taught912	Percentage of schools in which teachers taught all 17 HIV, STD, or pregnancy prevention topics in a required course in any of grades 9, 10, 11, or 12
womleg	Proportion of seats held by women in state legislatures and DC Council
womhs	Percentage of women aged ≥25 years with high school diploma and higher education
poverty	Percentage of people in poverty
womunins	Percentage of women aged 15-44 uninsured
womedicaid	Percentage of women aged 15-44 covered by Medicaid
contraneed	Percentage of contraceptive need met by all publicly funded clinics
countyabort	Percentage of women aged 15-44 living in a county without an abortion provider

Table 9. Correlation Coefficient Matrix, Indicators Grouped by Element—Inequity/violence

	rape	nondisc	gaymar	hatecr~e	erec	insabort	womleg
rape	1.0000						
nondisc	0.2130	1.0000					
gaymar	0.2964*	0.4759*	1.0000				
hatecrime	0.2309	0.7774*	0.4108*	1.0000			
erec	0.1635	0.5912*	0.2971*	0.4783*	1.0000		
insabort	0.0593	0.3344*	0.2721	0.2361	0.2459	1.0000	
womleg	0.0529	0.6667*	0.2166	0.6866*	0.2441	0.2109	1.0000
womhs	-0.1933	0.2372	0.1699	0.0632	-0.0027	0.0301	0.3193*
poverty	0.0896	0.3221*	0.3126*	0.1975	0.0883	0.0039	0.2520

	womhs	poverty
womhs	1.0000	
poverty	0.7803*	1.0000

* P ≤ 0.05

Label	**Indicator**
rape	Forcible rape incident rates per 100,000 population
nondisc	Status of statewide employment, housing, and school non-discrimination laws and policies based on sexual orientation and gender identity
gaymar	Status of state law on marriage equality for same-sex couples
hatecrime	Status of state laws addressing bias or hate crimes based on sexual orientation and gender identity
erec	Status of state laws on emergency contraception in hospital emergency departments
insabort	Status of state laws restricting private insurance coverage of abortion
womleg	Proportion of seats held by women in state legislatures and DC Council
womhs	Percentage of women aged ≥25 years with high school diploma and higher education
poverty	Percentage of people in poverty

Table 10. Correlation Coefficient Matrix, Indicators Grouped by Element—Pleasure/satisfaction

	health~t	partner	womhs
healthstat	1.0000		
partner	0.2239	1.0000	
womhs	0.8121*	0.4475*	1.0000

* P ≤ 0.05

Label	**Indicator**
healthstat	Percentage of adults reporting good or better health
partner	Percentage of adults married or a member of an unmarried couple
womhs	Percentage of women aged ≥25 years with high school diploma and higher education

Table 11. Correlation Coefficient Matrix, Indicators Grouped by Element—Morbidity

	aids	gon	syph	cerv	sexedman	taug~678	taug~912
aids	1.0000						
gon	0.6769*	1.0000					
syph	0.8510*	0.7727*	1.0000				
cerv	0.4636*	0.6715*	0.6138*	1.0000			
sexedman	-0.1310	0.0674	0.0150	-0.0525	1.0000		
taught678	-0.6540*	-0.4027*	-0.5011*	-0.4061*	0.3367*	1.0000	
taught912	-0.4462*	-0.0926	-0.2651	-0.2179	0.4661*	0.6568*	1.0000
womhs	0.1881	0.4690*	0.4797*	0.7198*	-0.1145	-0.1849	-0.0870
poverty	0.2982*	0.5514*	0.5445*	0.6459*	0.0039	-0.1438	0.1435
hivtest	-0.7208*	-0.6809*	-0.7206*	-0.4897*	0.2253	0.4434*	0.4704*
hpvax	0.0032	0.2932*	0.1273	0.3639*	0.0928	0.0829	0.2188

	womhs	poverty	hivtest	hpvax
womhs	1.0000			
poverty	0.7803*	1.0000		
hivtest	-0.3803*	-0.3341*	1.0000	
hpvax	0.3601*	0.4338*	-0.0743	1.0000

* P ≤ 0.05

Label	**Indicator**
aids	Estimated rates of AIDS diagnoses per 100,000 population
gon	Rates of gonorrhea cases per 100,000 population
syph	Rates of syphilis cases per 100,000 population
cerv	Cervical cancer incidence rates per 100,000 population, age adjusted
sexedman	Status of sex education mandates and content requirements for contraception and STI/HIV education
taught678	Percentage of schools in which teachers taught all 17 HIV, STD, or pregnancy prevention topics in a required course in any of grades 6, 7, or 8
taught912	Percentage of schools in which teachers taught all 17 HIV, STD, or pregnancy prevention topics in a required course in any of grades 9, 10, 11, or 12
womhs	Percentage of women aged ≥25 years with high school diploma and higher education
poverty	Percentage of people in poverty
hivtest	Percentage of people aged 18-64 years who reported ever receiving a HIV test
hpvax	Estimated vaccination coverage, ≥3 doses HPV, females aged 13-17 years

Table 12. State Unweighted Ranks and Scores, by Indicator

Rank	aids	Rate	Score	Rank	gon	Rate	Score	Rank	syph	Rate	Score	Rank	cerv	Rate	Score
	U.S.	10.8			U.S.	100.8			U.S.	14.9			U.S.	8.1	
21	Alabama	6.1	0.301	46	Alabama	168.5	-1.024	37	Alabama	16.6	-0.121	24	Alabama	8.5	-0.302
17	Alaska	5.3	0.353	48	Alaska	182.3	-1.232	9	Alaska	2.1	0.913	22	Alaska	8.3	-0.151
26	Arizona	8.4	0.154	15	Arizona	49.3	0.779	34	Arizona	13.7	0.086	15	Arizona	7.1	0.755
18	Arkansas	5.4	0.346	45	Arkansas	165.0	-0.971	40	Arkansas	18.5	-0.257	35	Arkansas	10.0	-1.434
36	California	11.5	-0.045	24	California	71.5	0.443	36	California	16.5	-0.114	22	California	8.3	-0.151
22	Colorado	6.5	0.276	16	Colorado	55.5	0.685	22	Colorado	6.8	0.578	10	Colorado	6.6	1.132
35	Connecticut	11.3	-0.032	25	Connecticut	73.0	0.420	21	Connecticut	6.7	0.585	7	Connecticut	6.3	1.358
39	Delaware	15.1	-0.276	35	Delaware	114.1	-0.201	17	Delaware	5.0	0.706	26	Delaware	8.8	-0.528
45	D.C.	112.5	-6.518	51	D.C.	350.9	-3.781	48	D.C.	82.5	-4.822	36	D.C.	10.9	-2.113
41	Florida	19.7	-0.570	33	Florida	108.8	-0.121	42	Florida	21.9	-0.499	29	Florida	9.2	-0.830
28	Georgia	9.7	0.071	44	Georgia	161.3	-0.915	43	Georgia	23.9	-0.642	21	Georgia	8.2	-0.075
14	Hawaii	4.8	0.385	18	Hawaii	58.6	0.638	18	Hawaii	5.6	0.663	17	Hawaii	7.6	0.377
9	Idaho	3.1	0.494	3	Idaho	9.5	1.380	5	Idaho	1.3	0.970	8	Idaho	6.4	1.283
33	Illinois	10.6	0.013	38	Illinois	122.2	-0.324	38	Illinois	17.3	-0.171	26	Illinois	8.8	-0.528
20	Indiana	5.6	0.333	31	Indiana	101.1	-0.005	19	Indiana	6.4	0.606	18	Indiana	7.9	0.151
8	Iowa	2.9	0.506	19	Iowa	59.9	0.618	10	Iowa	2.3	0.899	14	Iowa	6.9	0.906
10	Kansas	3.6	0.461	26	Kansas	73.9	0.407	14	Kansas	3.9	0.785	12	Kansas	6.8	0.981
16	Kentucky	5.2	0.359	30	Kentucky	100.7	0.002	23	Kentucky	7.2	0.549	28	Kentucky	9.1	-0.755
42	Louisiana	20.0	-0.590	49	Louisiana	198.4	-1.476	47	Louisiana	55.3	-2.882	32	Louisiana	9.6	-1.132
7	Maine	2.7	0.519	7	Maine	12.3	1.338	11	Maine	3.1	0.842	15	Maine	7.1	0.755
44	Maryland	22.1	-0.724	40	Maryland	130.1	-0.443	39	Maryland	17.8	-0.207	15	Maryland	7.1	0.755
37	Mass.	12.8	-0.128	12	Mass.	37.7	0.954	29	Mass.	9.7	0.371	4	Mass.	6.0	1.585
20	Michigan	5.6	0.333	41	Michigan	136.7	-0.543	22	Michigan	6.8	0.578	16	Michigan	7.3	0.604
12	Minnesota	4.0	0.436	13	Minnesota	40.2	0.916	20	Minnesota	6.6	0.592	5	Minnesota	6.1	1.509
38	Miss.	14.1	-0.212	50	Miss.	209.9	-1.649	46	Miss.	27.9	-0.927	34	Miss.	9.9	-1.358
25	Missouri	6.9	0.250	37	Missouri	119.6	-0.284	27	Missouri	8.6	0.449	20	Missouri	8.1	0.000
3	Montana	2.1	0.558	4	Montana	10.5	1.365	1	Montana	0.5	1.027	3	Montana	5.6	1.887
19	Nebraska	5.5	0.340	22	Nebraska	66.1	0.525	8	Nebraska	1.8	0.935	14	Nebraska	6.9	0.906
31	Nevada	10.3	0.032	21	Nevada	65.4	0.535	35	Nevada	15.6	-0.050	25	Nevada	8.6	-0.377
5	N.H.	2.5	0.532	6	N.H.	11.4	1.352	12	N.H.	3.2	0.835	6	N.H.	6.2	1.434
40	New Jersey	15.5	-0.301	23	New Jersey	67.4	0.505	31	New Jersey	10.9	0.285	27	New Jersey	9.0	-0.679
17	New Mexico	5.3	0.353	20	New Mexico	61.2	0.599	25	New Mexico	7.5	0.528	23	New Mexico	8.4	-0.226
43	New York	20.6	-0.628	28	New York	93.7	0.107	44	New York	24.9	-0.713	24	New York	8.5	-0.302
32	N.Carolina	10.4	0.026	43	N.Carolina	150.4	-0.750	33	N.Carolina	13.1	0.128	18	N.Carolina	7.9	0.151
2	N.Dakota	0.9	0.635	10	N.Dakota	31.5	1.048	3	N.Dakota	0.9	0.999	5	N.Dakota	6.1	1.509
24	Ohio	6.8	0.256	42	Ohio	142.9	-0.636	28	Ohio	9.3	0.399	18	Ohio	7.9	0.151
13	Oklahoma	4.1	0.429	36	Oklahoma	118.5	-0.268	24	Oklahoma	7.4	0.535	30	Oklahoma	9.4	-0.981
16	Oregon	5.2	0.359	9	Oregon	28.1	1.099	15	Oregon	4.5	0.742	12	Oregon	6.8	0.981
27	Penn.	8.5	0.147	32	Penn.	102.2	-0.021	26	Penn.	8.0	0.492	18	Penn.	7.9	0.151
23	R.I.	6.6	0.269	8	R.I.	27.6	1.107	25	R.I.	7.5	0.528	20	R.I.	8.1	0.000
40	S. Carolina	15.5	-0.301	47	S. Carolina	174.7	-1.117	32	S. Carolina	12.7	0.157	19	S. Carolina	8.0	0.075
6	S. Dakota	2.6	0.526	17	S. Dakota	57.6	0.653	7	S. Dakota	1.5	0.956	9	S. Dakota	6.5	1.208
30	Tennessee	10.1	0.045	34	Tennessee	113.1	-0.186	41	Tennessee	18.9	-0.285	25	Tennessee	8.6	-0.377
34	Texas	11.1	-0.019	39	Texas	128.3	-0.416	45	Texas	25.9	-0.785	31	Texas	9.5	-1.057
4	Utah	2.3	0.545	5	Utah	11.1	1.356	16	Utah	4.8	0.720	2	Utah	5.5	1.962
1	Vermont	0.5	0.660	2	Vermont	9.3	1.383	2	Vermont	0.6	1.020	1	Vermont	5.3	2.113
29	Virginia	9.8	0.064	29	Virginia	93.9	0.104	30	Virginia	10.1	0.342	11	Virginia	6.7	1.057
15	Washington	5.1	0.365	14	Washington	43.0	0.874	26	Washington	8.0	0.492	13	Washington	6.8	0.981
11	W. Virginia	3.9	0.442	11	W. Virginia	31.8	1.043	6	W. Virginia	1.4	0.963	33	W. Virginia	9.7	-1.208
9	Wisconsin	3.1	0.494	27	Wisconsin	90.0	0.163	13	Wisconsin	3.3	0.828	6	Wisconsin	6.2	1.434
5	Wyoming	2.5	0.532	1	Wyoming	7.3	1.414	4	Wyoming	1.1	0.984	25	Wyoming	8.6	-0.377

Table 12. State Ranks and Unweighted Scores, by Indicator, *continued*

Rank	teenbir	Rate	Score	Rank	rape	Rate	Score	Rank	healthstat	Percent	Score	Rank	partner	Percent	Score
	U.S.	34.3			U.S.	27.5			U.S.	83.1			U.S.	56.0	
40	Alabama	43.6	-0.920	19	Alabama	28.2	-0.068	39	Alabama	76.8	-1.928	36	Alabama	53.2	-0.617
32	Alaska	38.3	-0.396	47	Alaska	75.0	-4.595	15	Alaska	84.5	0.428	13	Alaska	58.0	0.441
37	Arizona	42.4	-0.801	33	Arizona	33.9	-0.619	25	Arizona	82.1	-0.306	18	Arizona	57.0	0.220
47	Arkansas	52.5	-1.800	43	Arkansas	45.0	-1.693	41	Arkansas	75.1	-2.448	20	Arkansas	56.6	0.132
22	California	31.5	0.277	9	California	22.4	0.493	28	California	81.3	-0.551	26	California	55.4	-0.132
26	Colorado	33.4	0.089	42	Colorado	43.7	-1.567	6	Colorado	86.2	0.948	10	Colorado	58.6	0.573
4	Connecticut	18.9	1.523	3	Connecticut	16.3	1.084	12	Connecticut	85.1	0.612	22	Connecticut	56.2	0.044
20	Delaware	30.5	0.376	35	Delaware	34.7	-0.697	10	Delaware	85.4	0.704	31	Delaware	54.2	-0.397
42	D.C.	45.4	-1.098	24	D.C.	31.1	-0.348	5	D.C.	86.3	0.979	41	D.C.	32.6	-5.157
23	Florida	32.0	0.227	20	Florida	28.6	-0.106	35	Florida	79.4	-1.132	34	Florida	53.9	-0.463
36	Georgia	41.4	-0.702	8	Georgia	21.6	0.571	29	Georgia	81.1	-0.612	34	Georgia	53.9	-0.463
24	Hawaii	32.5	0.178	13	Hawaii	26.8	0.068	13	Hawaii	85.0	0.581	37	Hawaii	53.0	-0.661
25	Idaho	33.0	0.129	31	Idaho	33.5	-0.580	14	Idaho	84.6	0.459	1	Idaho	63.9	1.741
25	Illinois	33.0	0.129	10	Illinois	23.6	0.377	23	Illinois	82.6	-0.153	32	Illinois	54.1	-0.419
31	Indiana	37.3	-0.297	15	Indiana	27.2	0.029	29	Indiana	81.1	-0.612	17	Indiana	57.1	0.242
17	Iowa	28.6	0.564	17	Iowa	27.4	0.010	3	Iowa	87.0	1.193	5	Iowa	60.2	0.926
35	Kansas	39.2	-0.485	41	Kansas	38.8	-1.093	13	Kansas	85.0	0.581	9	Kansas	59.1	0.683
43	Kentucky	46.2	-1.177	28	Kentucky	31.8	-0.416	37	Kentucky	77.6	-1.683	24	Kentucky	56.0	0.000
44	Louisiana	47.7	-1.325	16	Louisiana	27.2	0.029	38	Louisiana	77.0	-1.866	40	Louisiana	49.1	-1.521
6	Maine	21.4	1.276	22	Maine	29.3	-0.174	16	Maine	84.1	0.306	6	Maine	59.6	0.793
13	Maryland	27.2	0.702	7	Maryland	21.3	0.600	8	Maryland	85.8	0.826	38	Maryland	52.9	-0.683
2	Mass.	17.1	1.701	12	Mass.	26.7	0.077	7	Mass.	86.0	0.887	35	Mass.	53.6	-0.529
19	Michigan	30.1	0.415	45	Michigan	47.3	-1.916	22	Michigan	82.8	-0.092	28	Michigan	54.7	-0.287
8	Minnesota	22.5	1.167	33	Minnesota	33.9	-0.619	1	Minnesota	88.0	1.499	8	Minnesota	59.3	0.727
49	Miss.	55.0	-2.047	25	Miss.	31.2	-0.358	40	Miss.	76.0	-2.172	40	Miss.	49.1	-1.521
30	Missouri	37.1	-0.277	11	Missouri	23.9	0.348	27	Missouri	81.8	-0.398	21	Missouri	56.3	0.066
29	Montana	35.0	-0.069	30	Montana	32.4	-0.474	22	Montana	82.8	-0.092	6	Montana	59.6	0.793
21	Nebraska	31.1	0.316	38	Nebraska	36.8	-0.900	9	Nebraska	85.7	0.795	7	Nebraska	59.5	0.771
33	Nevada	38.6	-0.425	37	Nevada	35.7	-0.793	34	Nevada	79.8	-1.010	30	Nevada	54.3	-0.375
1	N.H.	15.7	1.839	26	N.H.	31.3	-0.368	5	N.H.	86.3	0.979	4	N.H.	60.3	0.948
5	New Jersey	20.3	1.384	1	New Jersey	11.2	1.577	18	New Jersey	83.8	0.214	25	New Jersey	55.7	-0.066
48	New Mexico	52.9	-1.839	44	New Mexico	46.5	-1.838	33	New Mexico	80.1	-0.918	33	New Mexico	54.0	-0.441
9	New York	22.6	1.157	2	New York	14.3	1.277	21	New York	83.1	0.000	39	New York	51.2	-1.058
32	N.Carolina	38.3	-0.396	6	N.Carolina	21.1	0.619	32	N.Carolina	80.4	-0.826	23	N.Carolina	56.1	0.022
18	N.Dakota	28.8	0.544	36	N.Dakota	35.2	-0.745	11	N.Dakota	85.3	0.673	12	N.Dakota	58.3	0.507
27	Ohio	34.2	0.010	29	Ohio	32.1	-0.445	26	Ohio	82.0	-0.337	24	Ohio	56.0	0.000
45	Oklahoma	50.4	-1.592	40	Oklahoma	38.7	-1.084	34	Oklahoma	79.8	-1.010	19	Oklahoma	56.9	0.198
16	Oregon	28.1	0.613	27	Oregon	31.7	-0.406	24	Oregon	82.4	-0.214	9	Oregon	59.1	0.683
12	Penn.	27.0	0.722	14	Penn.	26.9	0.058	19	Penn.	83.3	0.061	27	Penn.	55.2	-0.176
7	R.I.	22.3	1.187	18	R.I.	28.1	-0.058	23	R.I.	82.6	-0.153	38	R.I.	52.9	-0.683
38	S. Carolina	42.5	-0.811	27	S. Carolina	31.7	-0.406	31	S. Carolina	80.9	-0.673	38	S. Carolina	52.9	-0.683
28	S. Dakota	34.9	-0.059	46	S. Dakota	47.9	-1.974	10	S. Dakota	85.4	0.704	10	S. Dakota	58.6	0.573
39	Tennessee	43.2	-0.880	32	Tennessee	33.7	-0.600	36	Tennessee	79.1	-1.224	29	Tennessee	54.5	-0.331
46	Texas	52.2	-1.770	23	Texas	30.3	-0.271	30	Texas	81.0	-0.643	16	Texas	57.4	0.309
15	Utah	27.9	0.633	34	Utah	34.3	-0.658	4	Utah	86.6	1.071	2	Utah	63.4	1.631
3	Vermont	17.9	1.622	6	Vermont	21.1	0.619	2	Vermont	87.1	1.224	14	Vermont	57.9	0.419
14	Virginia	27.4	0.682	4	Virginia	19.1	0.813	20	Virginia	83.2	0.031	22	Virginia	56.2	0.044
11	Washington	26.7	0.752	39	Washington	38.1	-1.026	17	Washington	83.9	0.245	11	Washington	58.4	0.529
41	W. Virginia	44.8	-1.038	4	W. Virginia	19.1	0.813	42	W. Virginia	74.9	-2.509	18	W. Virginia	57.0	0.220
10	Wisconsin	26.2	0.801	5	Wisconsin	20.9	0.639	10	Wisconsin	85.4	0.704	15	Wisconsin	57.6	0.353
34	Wyoming	39.0	-0.465	21	Wyoming	29.1	-0.155	14	Wyoming	84.6	0.459	3	Wyoming	60.7	1.036

Table 12. State Ranks and Unweighted Scores, by Indicator, *continued*

Rank	nondisc	#/6	Score	Rank	gaymar	#/2	Score	Rank	hatecrime	#/2	Score	Rank	erec	#/2	Score
7	Alabama	0	-0.813	3	Alabama	0	-0.467	3	Alabama	0	-1.096	3	Alabama	0	-0.697
7	Alaska	0	-0.813	3	Alaska	0	-0.467	3	Alaska	0	-1.096	3	Alaska	0	-0.697
7	Arizona	0	-0.813	3	Arizona	0	-0.467	2	Arizona	1	0.119	3	Arizona	0	-0.697
7	Arkansas	0	-0.813	3	Arkansas	0	-0.467	3	Arkansas	0	-1.096	2	Arkansas	1	0.488
1	California	6	1.470	3	California	0	-0.467	1	California	2	1.335	1	California	2	1.672
1	Colorado	6	1.470	3	Colorado	0	-0.467	1	Colorado	2	1.335	2	Colorado	1	0.488
1	Connecticut	6	1.470	1	Connecticut	2	2.512	1	Connecticut	2	1.335	1	Connecticut	2	1.672
6	Delaware	1	-0.433	3	Delaware	0	-0.467	2	Delaware	1	0.119	3	Delaware	0	-0.697
1	D.C.	6	1.470	2	D.C.	1	1.022	1	D.C.	2	1.335	1	D.C.	2	1.672
7	Florida	0	-0.813	3	Florida	0	-0.467	2	Florida	1	0.119	3	Florida	0	-0.697
7	Georgia	0	-0.813	3	Georgia	0	-0.467	3	Georgia	0	-1.096	3	Georgia	0	-0.697
1	Hawaii	6	1.470	3	Hawaii	0	-0.467	1	Hawaii	2	1.335	3	Hawaii	0	-0.697
7	Idaho	0	-0.813	3	Idaho	0	-0.467	3	Idaho	0	-1.096	3	Idaho	0	-0.697
1	Illinois	6	1.470	3	Illinois	0	-0.467	2	Illinois	1	0.119	2	Illinois	1	0.488
7	Indiana	0	-0.813	3	Indiana	0	-0.467	3	Indiana	0	-1.096	3	Indiana	0	-0.697
1	Iowa	6	1.470	1	Iowa	2	2.512	2	Iowa	1	0.119	3	Iowa	0	-0.697
7	Kansas	0	-0.813	3	Kansas	0	-0.467	2	Kansas	1	0.119	3	Kansas	0	-0.697
7	Kentucky	0	-0.813	3	Kentucky	0	-0.467	2	Kentucky	1	0.119	3	Kentucky	0	-0.697
7	Louisiana	0	-0.813	3	Louisiana	0	-0.467	2	Louisiana	1	0.119	3	Louisiana	0	-0.697
1	Maine	6	1.470	3	Maine	0	-0.467	2	Maine	1	0.119	3	Maine	0	-0.697
5	Maryland	2	-0.052	3	Maryland	0	-0.467	1	Maryland	2	1.335	3	Maryland	0	-0.697
1	Mass.	6	1.470	1	Mass.	2	2.512	1	Mass.	2	1.335	1	Mass.	2	1.672
7	Michigan	0	-0.813	3	Michigan	0	-0.467	3	Michigan	0	-1.096	3	Michigan	0	-0.697
1	Minnesota	6	1.470	3	Minnesota	0	-0.467	1	Minnesota	2	1.335	1	Minnesota	2	1.672
7	Miss.	0	-0.813	3	Miss.	0	-0.467	3	Miss.	0	-1.096	3	Miss.	0	-0.697
7	Missouri	0	-0.813	3	Missouri	0	-0.467	1	Missouri	2	1.335	3	Missouri	0	-0.697
7	Montana	0	-0.813	3	Montana	0	-0.467	3	Montana	0	-1.096	3	Montana	0	-0.697
7	Nebraska	0	-0.813	3	Nebraska	0	-0.467	2	Nebraska	1	0.119	3	Nebraska	0	-0.697
3	Nevada	4	0.709	3	Nevada	0	-0.467	2	Nevada	1	0.119	3	Nevada	0	-0.697
5	N.H.	2	-0.052	1	N.H.	2	2.512	2	N.H.	1	0.119	3	N.H.	0	-0.697
1	New Jersey	6	1.470	2	New Jersey	1	1.022	1	New Jersey	2	1.335	1	New Jersey	2	1.672
2	New Mexico	5	1.090	2	New Mexico	1	1.022	1	New Mexico	2	1.335	1	New Mexico	2	1.672
5	New York	2	-0.052	1	New York	2	2.512	2	New York	1	0.119	1	New York	2	1.672
7	N.Carolina	0	-0.813	3	N.Carolina	0	-0.467	3	N.Carolina	0	-1.096	3	N.Carolina	0	-0.697
7	N.Dakota	0	-0.813	3	N.Dakota	0	-0.467	3	N.Dakota	0	-1.096	3	N.Dakota	0	-0.697
7	Ohio	0	-0.813	3	Ohio	0	-0.467	3	Ohio	0	-1.096	3	Ohio	0	-0.697
7	Oklahoma	0	-0.813	3	Oklahoma	0	-0.467	3	Oklahoma	0	-1.096	3	Oklahoma	0	-0.697
1	Oregon	6	1.470	3	Oregon	0	-0.467	1	Oregon	2	1.335	1	Oregon	2	1.672
6	Penn.	1	-0.433	3	Penn.	0	-0.467	3	Penn.	0	-1.096	2	Penn.	1	0.488
3	R.I.	4	0.709	2	R.I.	1	1.022	1	R.I.	2	1.335	3	R.I.	0	-0.697
7	S. Carolina	0	-0.813	3	S. Carolina	0	-0.467	3	S. Carolina	0	-1.096	2	S. Carolina	1	0.488
7	S. Dakota	0	-0.813	3	S. Dakota	0	-0.467	3	S. Dakota	0	-1.096	3	S. Dakota	0	-0.697
7	Tennessee	0	-0.813	3	Tennessee	0	-0.467	2	Tennessee	1	0.119	3	Tennessee	0	-0.697
7	Texas	0	-0.813	3	Texas	0	-0.467	2	Texas	1	0.119	2	Texas	1	0.488
6	Utah	1	-0.433	3	Utah	0	-0.467	3	Utah	0	-1.096	1	Utah	2	1.672
1	Vermont	6	1.470	1	Vermont	2	2.512	1	Vermont	2	1.335	3	Vermont	0	-0.697
7	Virginia	0	-0.813	3	Virginia	0	-0.467	3	Virginia	0	-1.096	3	Virginia	0	-0.697
1	Washington	6	1.470	3	Washington	0	-0.467	1	Washington	2	1.335	1	Washington	2	1.672
7	W. Virginia	0	-0.813	3	W. Virginia	0	-0.467	3	W. Virginia	0	-1.096	3	W. Virginia	0	-0.697
4	Wisconsin	3	0.328	3	Wisconsin	0	-0.467	2	Wisconsin	1	0.119	1	Wisconsin	2	1.672
7	Wyoming	0	-0.813	3	Wyoming	0	-0.467	3	Wyoming	0	-1.096	3	Wyoming	0	-0.697

Table 12. State Ranks and Unweighted Scores, by Indicator, *continued*

Rank	insabort	#/2	Score	Rank	barabort	#/3	Score	Rank	sexedman	#/4	Score	Rank	taught678	Percent	Score
1	Alabama	0	0.679	4	Alabama	3	-1.610	2	Alabama	3	0.846	4	Alabama	27.7	0.984
1	Alaska	0	0.679	2	Alaska	1	0.156	5	Alaska	0	-1.275	37	Alaska	8.0	-0.875
2	Arizona	1	-0.653	3	Arizona	2	-0.727	5	Arizona	0	-1.275	44	Arizona	3.7	-1.281
1	Arkansas	0	0.679	3	Arkansas	2	-0.727	5	Arkansas	0	-1.275	12	Arkansas	22.8	0.522
1	California	0	0.679	1	California	0	1.039	2	California	3	0.846	5	California	26.6	0.880
2	Colorado	1	-0.653	1	Colorado	0	1.039	4	Colorado	1	-0.568	24	Colorado	16.2	-0.101
1	Connecticut	0	0.679	1	Connecticut	0	1.039	4	Connecticut	1	-0.568	20	Connecticut	18.1	0.078
1	Delaware	0	0.679	1	Delaware	0	1.039	1	Delaware	4	1.553	30	Delaware	13.3	-0.375
1	D.C.	0	0.679	1	D.C.	0	1.039	2	D.C.	3	0.846	1	D.C.	64.7	4.475
1	Florida	0	0.679	2	Florida	1	0.156	5	Florida	0	-1.275	7	Florida	25.0	0.729
1	Georgia	0	0.679	3	Georgia	2	-0.727	3	Georgia	2	0.139	43	Georgia	4.7	-1.186
1	Hawaii	0	0.679	1	Hawaii	0	1.039	3	Hawaii	2	0.139	2	Hawaii	47.6	2.862
3	Idaho	2	-1.985	3	Idaho	2	-0.727	5	Idaho	0	-1.275	41	Idaho	6.6	-1.007
2	Illinois	1	-0.653	1	Illinois	0	1.039	4	Illinois	1	-0.568	24	Illinois	16.2	-0.101
1	Indiana	0	0.679	3	Indiana	2	-0.727	4	Indiana	1	-0.568	40	Indiana	7.2	-0.950
1	Iowa	0	0.679	1	Iowa	0	1.039	3	Iowa	2	0.139	16	Iowa	19.7	0.229
3	Kansas	2	-1.985	4	Kansas	3	-1.610	5	Kansas	0	-1.275	35	Kansas	9.8	-0.705
3	Kentucky	2	-1.985	3	Kentucky	2	-0.727	3	Kentucky	2	0.139	27	Kentucky	14.1	-0.299
1	Louisiana	0	0.679	4	Louisiana	3	-1.610	5	Louisiana	0	-1.275	36	Louisiana	9.5	-0.733
1	Maine	0	0.679	1	Maine	0	1.039	1	Maine	4	1.553	10	Maine	24.1	0.644
1	Maryland	0	0.679	1	Maryland	0	1.039	1	Maryland	4	1.553	18	Maryland	19.1	0.172
1	Mass.	0	0.679	1	Mass.	0	1.039	5	Mass.	0	-1.275	19	Mass.	19.0	0.163
1	Michigan	0	0.679	3	Michigan	2	-0.727	4	Michigan	1	-0.568	41	Michigan	6.6	-1.007
1	Minnesota	0	0.679	3	Minnesota	2	-0.727	3	Minnesota	2	0.139	33	Minnesota	11.0	-0.592
2	Miss.	1	-0.653	4	Miss.	3	-1.610	5	Miss.	0	-1.275	14	Miss.	20.6	0.314
3	Missouri	2	-1.985	3	Missouri	2	-0.727	4	Missouri	1	-0.568	29	Missouri	13.6	-0.347
1	Montana	0	0.679	1	Montana	0	1.039	3	Montana	2	0.139	39	Montana	7.3	-0.941
3	Nebraska	2	-1.985	3	Nebraska	2	-0.727	5	Nebraska	0	-1.275	17	Nebraska	19.3	0.191
1	Nevada	0	0.679	1	Nevada	0	1.039	3	Nevada	2	0.139	22	Nevada	17.6	0.031
1	N.H.	0	0.679	1	N.H.	0	1.039	4	N.H.	1	-0.568	30	N.H.	13.3	-0.375
1	New Jersey	0	0.679	1	New Jersey	0	1.039	1	New Jersey	4	1.553	9	New Jersey	24.2	0.654
1	New Mexico	0	0.679	1	New Mexico	0	1.039	1	New Mexico	4	1.553	24	New Mexico	16.2	-0.101
1	New York	0	0.679	1	New York	0	1.039	3	New York	2	0.139	3	New York	28.5	1.059
2	N.Carolina	1	-0.653	3	N.Carolina	2	-0.727	1	N.Carolina	4	1.553	21	N.Carolina	17.9	0.059
3	N.Dakota	2	-1.985	3	N.Dakota	2	-0.727	4	N.Dakota	1	-0.568	38	N.Dakota	7.9	-0.884
2	Ohio	1	-0.653	3	Ohio	2	-0.727	3	Ohio	2	0.139	23	Ohio	16.9	-0.035
3	Oklahoma	2	-1.985	3	Oklahoma	2	-0.727	3	Oklahoma	2	0.139	8	Oklahoma	24.9	0.720
1	Oregon	0	0.679	1	Oregon	0	1.039	1	Oregon	4	1.553	15	Oregon	20.1	0.267
2	Penn.	1	-0.653	3	Penn.	2	-0.727	4	Penn.	1	-0.568	32	Penn.	11.6	-0.535
2	R.I.	1	-0.653	1	R.I.	0	1.039	1	R.I.	4	1.553	25	R.I.	15.8	-0.139
2	S. Carolina	1	-0.653	3	S. Carolina	2	-0.727	2	S. Carolina	3	0.846	19	S. Carolina	19.0	0.163
1	S. Dakota	0	0.679	3	S. Dakota	2	-0.727	5	S. Dakota	0	-1.275	34	S. Dakota	10.9	-0.601
1	Tennessee	0	0.679	1	Tennessee	0	1.039	3	Tennessee	2	0.139	24	Tennessee	16.2	-0.101
1	Texas	0	0.679	4	Texas	3	-1.610	4	Texas	1	-0.568	26	Texas	14.2	-0.290
3	Utah	2	-1.985	3	Utah	2	-0.727	3	Utah	2	0.139	45	Utah	0.0	-1.630
1	Vermont	0	0.679	1	Vermont	0	1.039	1	Vermont	4	1.553	11	Vermont	23.6	0.597
2	Virginia	1	-0.653	4	Virginia	3	-1.610	3	Virginia	2	0.139	28	Virginia	13.7	-0.337
1	Washington	0	0.679	1	Washington	0	1.039	2	Washington	3	0.846	31	Washington	12.9	-0.413
1	W. Virginia	0	0.679	3	W. Virginia	2	-0.727	1	W. Virginia	4	1.553	6	W. Virginia	25.7	0.795
1	Wisconsin	0	0.679	3	Wisconsin	2	-0.727	4	Wisconsin	1	-0.568	13	Wisconsin	22.0	0.446
1	Wyoming	0	0.679	1	Wyoming	0	1.039	5	Wyoming	0	-1.275	42	Wyoming	5.7	-1.092

Table 12. State Ranks and Unweighted Scores, by Indicator, *continued*

Rank	taught912	Percent	Score	Rank	womleg	Percent	Score	Rank	womhs	Percent	Score	Rank	poverty	Percent	Score
									U.S.	85.9			U.S.	14.8	
34	Alabama	31.4	-0.648	47	Alabama	13.6	-1.541	48	Alabama	82.6	-1.005	38	Alabama	16.4	-0.497
42	Alaska	23.2	-1.119	28	Alaska	23.3	-0.066	6	Alaska	91.6	1.744	16	Alaska	12.0	0.892
46	Arizona	14.9	-1.595	4	Arizona	33.3	1.446	36	Arizona	85.5	-0.122	48	Arizona	19.1	-1.348
24	Arkansas	41.1	-0.092	31	Arkansas	22.2	-0.234	45	Arkansas	83.5	-0.731	44	Arkansas	17.6	-0.895
6	California	65.8	1.324	13	California	28.3	0.690	50	California	80.9	-1.522	37	California	16.2	-0.436
24	Colorado	41.1	-0.092	1	Colorado	40.0	2.454	15	Colorado	90.0	1.250	20	Colorado	12.6	0.689
8	Connecticut	59.6	0.969	9	Connecticut	29.9	0.934	21	Connecticut	89.0	0.946	2	Connecticut	9.0	1.817
4	Delaware	67.9	1.445	17	Delaware	25.8	0.308	25	Delaware	88.1	0.679	21	Delaware	12.7	0.650
1	D.C.	85.7	2.466	21	D.C.	25.0	0.186	30	D.C.	87.1	0.359	49	D.C.	19.1	-1.351
25	Florida	38.3	-0.253	19	Florida	25.6	0.281	34	Florida	86.3	0.122	33	Florida	15.1	-0.110
41	Georgia	23.8	-1.084	26	Georgia	23.7	-0.006	37	Georgia	85.1	-0.256	46	Georgia	18.5	-1.175
7	Hawaii	64.5	1.250	3	Hawaii	34.2	1.578	18	Hawaii	89.6	1.132	18	Hawaii	12.3	0.785
33	Idaho	31.7	-0.631	14	Idaho	27.6	0.582	22	Idaho	88.9	0.913	28	Idaho	14.4	0.119
24	Illinois	41.1	-0.092	7	Illinois	31.1	1.104	31	Illinois	87.0	0.346	23	Illinois	13.8	0.300
36	Indiana	29.4	-0.763	36	Indiana	20.7	-0.469	29	Indiana	87.1	0.378	36	Indiana	16.0	-0.378
19	Iowa	46.3	0.206	33	Iowa	21.3	-0.368	8	Iowa	91.0	1.561	7	Iowa	10.5	1.365
29	Kansas	34.1	-0.494	16	Kansas	26.7	0.438	16	Kansas	89.9	1.237	26	Kansas	14.2	0.203
12	Kentucky	54.8	0.694	38	Kentucky	18.8	-0.745	47	Kentucky	82.8	-0.945	43	Kentucky	16.9	-0.657
32	Louisiana	31.8	-0.625	49	Louisiana	11.1	-1.913	46	Louisiana	83.1	-0.872	47	Louisiana	18.9	-1.305
14	Maine	53.5	0.619	10	Maine	29.6	0.877	7	Maine	91.3	1.641	19	Maine	12.5	0.727
11	Maryland	56.8	0.808	8	Maryland	30.9	1.071	23	Maryland	88.8	0.876	4	Maryland	9.9	1.543
13	Mass.	54.1	0.653	23	Mass.	24.5	0.111	19	Mass.	89.3	1.043	11	Mass.	10.8	1.274
28	Michigan	34.5	-0.471	35	Michigan	20.9	-0.427	20	Michigan	89.1	0.967	31	Michigan	14.9	-0.031
30	Minnesota	33.2	-0.545	5	Minnesota	32.8	1.371	4	Minnesota	92.0	1.877	10	Minnesota	10.6	1.315
26	Miss.	38.0	-0.270	43	Miss.	16.7	-1.073	49	Miss.	81.9	-1.222	51	Miss.	21.0	-1.957
31	Missouri	31.9	-0.620	25	Missouri	23.9	0.014	32	Missouri	87.0	0.329	34	Missouri	15.3	-0.165
40	Montana	25.7	-0.975	24	Montana	24.0	0.035	2	Montana	92.1	1.900	30	Montana	14.8	-0.006
37	Nebraska	27.1	-0.895	29	Nebraska	22.4	-0.199	10	Nebraska	90.9	1.543	5	Nebraska	10.1	1.475
9	Nevada	59.3	0.952	20	Nevada	25.4	0.246	41	Nevada	84.5	-0.430	32	Nevada	15.0	-0.068
5	N.H.	67.6	1.428	22	N.H.	24.5	0.115	3	N.H.	92.0	1.881	1	N.H.	7.3	2.359
2	New Jersey	83.2	2.322	11	New Jersey	29.2	0.816	27	New Jersey	87.9	0.622	9	New Jersey	10.6	1.322
24	New Mexico	41.1	-0.092	15	New Mexico	26.8	0.456	43	New Mexico	83.8	-0.646	50	New Mexico	19.9	-1.613
3	New York	76.0	1.909	32	New York	22.2	-0.242	39	New York	84.8	-0.326	35	New York	15.9	-0.350
43	N.Carolina	20.4	-1.279	30	N.Carolina	22.4	-0.214	35	N.Carolina	85.7	-0.051	41	N.Carolina	16.6	-0.555
44	N.Dakota	17.6	-1.440	45	N.Dakota	14.9	-1.342	11	N.Dakota	90.9	1.523	13	N.Dakota	11.2	1.146
27	Ohio	36.7	-0.344	27	Ohio	23.5	-0.043	24	Ohio	88.3	0.726	29	Ohio	14.6	0.060
35	Oklahoma	30.8	-0.683	48	Oklahoma	12.8	-1.665	33	Oklahoma	86.5	0.175	27	Oklahoma	14.4	0.139
13	Oregon	54.1	0.653	12	Oregon	28.9	0.774	17	Oregon	89.7	1.172	24	Oregon	14.0	0.248
20	Penn.	45.3	0.149	42	Penn.	17.0	-1.024	26	Penn.	88.1	0.670	17	Penn.	12.0	0.885
17	R.I.	49.2	0.372	18	R.I.	25.7	0.287	40	R.I.	84.8	-0.332	22	R.I.	13.5	0.422
16	S. Carolina	51.0	0.476	50	S. Carolina	9.4	-2.170	38	S. Carolina	84.9	-0.300	40	S. Carolina	16.6	-0.552
45	S. Dakota	17.2	-1.463	37	S. Dakota	20.0	-0.570	12	S. Dakota	90.7	1.479	25	S. Dakota	14.1	0.228
23	Tennessee	41.3	-0.081	39	Tennessee	18.2	-0.844	42	Tennessee	84.2	-0.535	39	Tennessee	16.5	-0.533
38	Texas	27.0	-0.901	34	Texas	21.0	-0.419	51	Texas	80.8	-1.555	45	Texas	17.7	-0.917
47	Utah	8.9	-1.939	44	Utah	16.3	-1.122	9	Utah	91.0	1.554	6	Utah	10.2	1.440
10	Vermont	57.2	0.831	2	Vermont	38.9	2.286	5	Vermont	92.0	1.874	8	Vermont	10.6	1.328
22	Virginia	41.8	-0.052	41	Virginia	17.9	-0.894	28	Virginia	87.3	0.439	12	Virginia	10.9	1.225
15	Washington	52.5	0.562	6	Washington	32.0	1.240	14	Washington	90.2	1.307	15	Washington	11.9	0.903
18	W. Virginia	47.8	0.292	40	W. Virginia	17.9	-0.885	44	W. Virginia	83.6	-0.689	42	W. Virginia	16.7	-0.601
21	Wisconsin	44.1	0.080	21	Wisconsin	25.0	0.186	13	Wisconsin	90.5	1.407	14	Wisconsin	11.3	1.095
39	Wyoming	26.6	-0.924	46	Wyoming	14.4	-1.409	1	Wyoming	92.5	2.011	3	Wyoming	9.8	1.569

Table 12. State Ranks and Unweighted Scores, by Indicator, *continued*

Rank	womunins	Percent	Score	Rank	womedicaid	Percent	Score	Rank	contraneed	Percent	Score	Rank	hivtest	Percent	Score
									U.S.	40.8			U.S.	40.3	
17	Alabama	24.0	-0.715	13	Alabama	12.0	-0.540	14	Alabama	50	0.601	10	Alabama	45.5	0.635
14	Alaska	22.0	-0.374	15	Alaska	10.0	-0.957	2	Alaska	89.9	3.205	9	Alaska	46.2	0.723
15	Arizona	23.0	-0.545	6	Arizona	19.0	0.920	49	Arizona	22.4	-1.201	33	Arizona	34.6	-0.701
21	Arkansas	28.0	-1.397	11	Arkansas	14.0	-0.123	23	Arkansas	45.9	0.333	28	Arkansas	35.4	-0.602
18	California	25.0	-0.885	8	California	17.0	0.503	4	California	64.5	1.547	15	California	41.5	0.151
9	Colorado	17.0	0.478	15	Colorado	10.0	-0.957	21	Colorado	46.6	0.379	24	Colorado	37.8	-0.304
5	Connecticut	13.0	1.159	11	Connecticut	14.0	-0.123	13	Connecticut	50.4	0.627	18	Connecticut	40.4	0.007
8	Delaware	16.0	0.648	7	Delaware	18.0	0.711	8	Delaware	53.3	0.816	6	Delaware	47.5	0.880
6	D.C.	14.0	0.989	4	D.C.	22.0	1.545	1	D.C.	95.6	3.577	1	D.C.	68.2	3.407
23	Florida	30.0	-1.737	14	Florida	11.0	-0.748	35	Florida	32.5	-0.542	5	Florida	48.4	0.988
19	Georgia	26.0	-1.056	14	Georgia	11.0	-0.748	39	Georgia	30.2	-0.692	3	Georgia	49.5	1.124
3	Hawaii	11.0	1.500	9	Hawaii	16.0	0.294	39	Hawaii	30.2	-0.692	43	Hawaii	32.4	-0.971
18	Idaho	25.0	-0.885	15	Idaho	10.0	-0.957	34	Idaho	35.2	-0.366	40	Idaho	33.3	-0.856
11	Illinois	19.0	0.137	8	Illinois	17.0	0.503	40	Illinois	29.9	-0.712	37	Illinois	33.8	-0.797
12	Indiana	20.0	-0.033	9	Indiana	16.0	0.294	38	Indiana	30.9	-0.646	31	Indiana	34.6	-0.694
9	Iowa	17.0	0.478	12	Iowa	13.0	-0.331	12	Iowa	50.8	0.653	47	Iowa	26.8	-1.647
10	Kansas	18.0	0.307	15	Kansas	10.0	-0.957	41	Kansas	29.8	-0.718	44	Kansas	31.3	-1.102
14	Kentucky	22.0	-0.374	8	Kentucky	17.0	0.503	22	Kentucky	46	0.339	25	Kentucky	37.7	-0.312
19	Louisiana	26.0	-1.056	10	Louisiana	15.0	0.086	47	Louisiana	24.5	-1.064	8	Louisiana	46.4	0.741
3	Maine	11.0	1.500	1	Maine	28.0	2.796	20	Maine	46.7	0.385	38	Maine	33.5	-0.834
8	Maryland	16.0	0.648	15	Maryland	10.0	-0.957	32	Maryland	37.5	-0.215	2	Maryland	51.5	1.375
1	Mass.	6.0	2.352	2	Mass.	24.0	1.962	30	Mass.	39.3	-0.098	12	Mass.	44.5	0.513
10	Michigan	18.0	0.307	7	Michigan	18.0	0.711	43	Michigan	27.1	-0.894	23	Michigan	38.0	-0.278
4	Minnesota	12.0	1.330	9	Minnesota	16.0	0.294	33	Minnesota	36.8	-0.261	45	Minnesota	29.3	-1.339
20	Miss.	27.0	-1.226	6	Miss.	19.0	0.920	29	Miss.	40.4	-0.026	14	Miss.	42.1	0.224
13	Missouri	21.0	-0.204	11	Missouri	14.0	-0.123	42	Missouri	28.6	-0.796	39	Missouri	33.4	-0.840
18	Montana	25.0	-0.885	13	Montana	12.0	-0.540	7	Montana	57.2	1.071	34	Montana	34.4	-0.725
8	Nebraska	16.0	0.648	16	Nebraska	9.0	-1.165	48	Nebraska	23.3	-1.142	48	Nebraska	26.8	-1.648
21	Nevada	28.0	-1.397	17	Nevada	8.0	-1.374	36	Nevada	31.6	-0.601	16	Nevada	41.4	0.133
6	N.H.	14.0	0.989	17	N.H.	8.0	-1.374	18	N.H.	48.6	0.509	29	N.H.	35.3	-0.608
11	New Jersey	19.0	0.137	13	New Jersey	12.0	-0.540	31	New Jersey	37.6	-0.209	13	New Jersey	43.9	0.436
22	New Mexico	29.0	-1.567	6	New Mexico	19.0	0.920	9	New Mexico	53.2	0.809	21	New Mexico	38.5	-0.220
9	New York	17.0	0.478	3	New York	23.0	1.754	28	New York	40.7	-0.007	4	New York	49.0	1.065
17	N.Carolina	24.0	-0.715	11	N.Carolina	14.0	-0.123	37	N.Carolina	31.2	-0.627	11	N.Carolina	45.3	0.612
8	N.Dakota	16.0	0.648	15	N.Dakota	10.0	-0.957	16	N.Dakota	48.9	0.529	49	N.Dakota	23.8	-2.018
9	Ohio	17.0	0.478	8	Ohio	17.0	0.503	45	Ohio	24.9	-1.038	27	Ohio	36.3	-0.492
19	Oklahoma	26.0	-1.056	12	Oklahoma	13.0	-0.331	6	Oklahoma	57.8	1.110	36	Oklahoma	34.1	-0.754
14	Oregon	22.0	-0.374	13	Oregon	12.0	-0.540	5	Oregon	60.3	1.273	26	Oregon	36.7	-0.443
7	Penn.	15.0	0.819	10	Penn.	15.0	0.086	19	Penn.	47.6	0.444	30	Penn.	34.7	-0.683
7	R.I.	15.0	0.819	5	R.I.	20.0	1.128	24	R.I.	44.5	0.242	32	R.I.	34.6	-0.696
19	S. Carolina	26.0	-1.056	13	S. Carolina	12.0	-0.540	25	S. Carolina	44.4	0.235	17	S. Carolina	40.9	0.075
10	S. Dakota	18.0	0.307	15	S. Dakota	10.0	-0.957	11	S. Dakota	51.8	0.718	51	S. Dakota	23.5	-2.054
10	Tennessee	18.0	0.307	5	Tennessee	20.0	1.128	26	Tennessee	42.7	0.124	22	Tennessee	38.1	-0.274
24	Texas	34.0	-2.419	15	Texas	10.0	-0.957	35	Texas	32.5	-0.542	19	Texas	39.9	-0.054
10	Utah	18.0	0.307	17	Utah	8.0	-1.374	46	Utah	24.6	-1.058	50	Utah	23.7	-2.033
5	Vermont	13.0	1.159	2	Vermont	24.0	1.962	3	Vermont	70.8	1.958	35	Vermont	34.3	-0.737
10	Virginia	18.0	0.307	17	Virginia	8.0	-1.374	44	Virginia	25.8	-0.979	7	Virginia	46.4	0.744
10	Washington	18.0	0.307	13	Washington	12.0	-0.540	15	Washington	49.4	0.561	20	Washington	39.7	-0.070
17	W. Virginia	24.0	-0.715	7	W. Virginia	18.0	0.711	10	W. Virginia	51.9	0.725	46	W. Virginia	29.1	-1.365
2	Wisconsin	10.0	1.671	6	Wisconsin	19.0	0.920	27	Wisconsin	41.4	0.039	42	Wisconsin	32.5	-0.953
16	Wyoming	23.0	-0.545	15	Wyoming	10.0	-0.957	17	Wyoming	48.8	0.522	41	Wyoming	32.6	-0.947

Table 12. State Ranks and Unweighted Scores, by Indicator, *continued*

Rank	countyabort	Percent	Score	Rank	hpvax	Percent	Score
	U.S.	35			U.S.	32	
30	Alabama	61	-0.984	43	Alabama	20	-1.327
12	Alaska	22	0.492	38	Alaska	25	-0.774
9	Arizona	17	0.681	22	Arizona	33.1	0.122
41	Arkansas	79	-1.666	44	Arkansas	19.6	-1.371
2	California	1	1.287	24	California	32	0.000
13	Colorado	23	0.454	10	Colorado	40.9	0.984
3	Connecticut	5	1.136	4	Connecticut	45.5	1.493
10	Delaware	19	0.606	11	Delaware	40.4	0.929
1	D.C.	0	1.325	20	D.C.	33.8	0.199
15	Florida	25	0.379	39	Florida	24.9	-0.785
28	Georgia	57	-0.833	41	Georgia	22.8	-1.017
1	Hawaii	0	1.325	13	Hawaii	39.9	0.874
36	Idaho	69	-1.287	44	Idaho	17.6	-1.592
18	Illinois	37	-0.076	31	Illinois	26	-0.664
35	Indiana	66	-1.174	40	Indiana	24.8	-0.796
24	Iowa	51	-0.606	19	Iowa	36.2	0.464
28	Kansas	57	-0.833	37	Kansas	25.1	-0.763
40	Kentucky	77	-1.590	28	Kentucky	27.3	-0.520
34	Louisiana	65	-1.136	15	Louisiana	39.3	0.807
24	Maine	51	-0.606	23	Maine	32.9	0.100
11	Maryland	20	0.568	26	Maryland	30.8	-0.133
7	Mass.	10	0.946	3	Mass.	46.8	1.637
16	Michigan	32	0.114	36	Michigan	25.2	-0.752
31	Minnesota	62	-1.022	18	Minnesota	37.8	0.641
43	Miss.	91	-2.120	43	Miss.	20	-1.327
37	Missouri	73	-1.439	33	Missouri	25.5	-0.719
22	Montana	48	-0.492	21	Montana	33.2	0.133
20	Nebraska	43	-0.303	6	Nebraska	42.5	1.161
5	Nevada	8	1.022	32	Nevada	25.9	-0.675
10	N.H.	19	0.606	7	N.H.	42.2	1.128
6	New Jersey	9	0.984	34	New Jersey	25.4	-0.730
23	New Mexico	50	-0.568	25	New Mexico	31.1	-0.100
4	New York	7	1.060	14	New York	39.7	0.852
23	N.Carolina	50	-0.568	15	N.Carolina	39.3	0.807
38	N.Dakota	74	-1.477	30	N.Dakota	26.3	-0.630
26	Ohio	55	-0.757	25	Ohio	31.1	-0.100
27	Oklahoma	56	-0.795	25	Oklahoma	31.1	-0.100
13	Oregon	23	0.454	17	Oregon	38.2	0.686
21	Penn.	46	-0.416	8	Penn.	41.7	1.073
19	R.I.	38	-0.114	1	R.I.	55.1	2.555
37	S. Carolina	73	-1.439	27	S. Carolina	29.5	-0.276
39	S. Dakota	76	-1.552	2	S. Dakota	54.5	2.488
29	Tennessee	59	-0.909	30	Tennessee	26.3	-0.630
17	Texas	33	0.076	29	Texas	27	-0.553
33	Utah	64	-1.098	42	Utah	22.2	-1.084
14	Vermont	24	0.416	16	Vermont	38.6	0.730
25	Virginia	54	-0.719	9	Virginia	41.5	1.051
8	Washington	11	0.909	4	Washington	45.5	1.493
42	W. Virginia	84	-1.855	35	W. Virginia	25.3	-0.741
32	Wisconsin	63	-1.060	5	Wisconsin	44.1	1.338
44	Wyoming	96	-2.309	12	Wyoming	40.3	0.918