

Testimony

Of

Dr. Jon S. Wainwright

Vice President

NERA Economic Consulting

Information Policy, Census, and National Archives Subcommittee

Oversight and Government Reform Committee

Thursday, September 24, 2008

2154 Rayburn HOB

2:00 p.m.

“How Information Policy Affects the Competitive Viability in Minority Contracting”

Chairman Clay, Ranking Member Turner, and Members of the Subcommittee:

Thank you for the invitation to appear here today. My name is Jon Wainwright. I hold a Ph.D. in economics from the University of Texas at Austin. Currently, I am a Vice President with NERA Economic Consulting, in Chicago, Illinois and Austin, Texas.

NERA is an international firm of economists who understand how markets work. We provide economic analysis and advice to corporations, governments, law firms, regulatory agencies, trade associations, and international agencies. Our global team of more than 600 professionals operates in over 20 offices across North America, Europe, and Asia Pacific. NERA provides practical economic advice related to highly complex business and legal issues arising from competition, regulation, public policy, strategy, finance, and litigation. Founded in 1961 as National Economic Research Associates, our more than 45 years of experience creating strategies, studies, reports, expert testimony, and policy recommendations reflects our specialization in industrial and financial economics. Because of our commitment to deliver unbiased findings, we are widely recognized for our independence. Our clients come to us expecting integrity and the unvarnished truth.

Introduction

For almost twenty years, I have devoted the greater part of my professional life to studying race and sex discrimination and its impact on business enterprise and entrepreneurship in the United States.

I have served as the project director and principal investigator for 28 studies of business discrimination against minorities and women completed since 2000 and prior to that time worked on perhaps a dozen more. I have authored a book on the subject and provided expert testimony in federal and state courts on these and other labor and business related matters on 13 occasions. With your permission, I would be pleased to submit copies of eight of NERA's recently completed business discrimination studies for entry into the record.¹

I was fortunate to have been mentored at the start of my career by two of the country's leading scholars in this field—Dr. Ray Marshall, Professor Emeritus at the Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs at The University of Texas at Austin and former United States Secretary of Labor, and Dr. Andrew Brimmer, former member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve, former Assistant Secretary of Commerce, and Professor Emeritus at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

A key lesson I absorbed from these men was expressed by Professor Marshall in this way:

“Institutionalized discrimination in business transactions is deeply rooted in the American economy. There can be no doubt that business discrimination inflicts serious damage on the society, polity, and economy. Governments have a responsibility to improve public understanding of the seriousness of this problem and to take positive steps to address it. These positive steps must include public education, specifically outlawing this form of discrimination, using governments' purchasing power to help

¹ *Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Availability Study*, prepared for the Missouri Department of Transportation, November 2004.; *Race, Sex, and Business Enterprise: Evidence from the St. Louis Metropolitan Statistical Area*, prepared for the Bi-State Development Agency (Metro), March 2005.; *Race, Sex, and Business Enterprise: Evidence from Denver, Colorado*, prepared for the City and County of Denver, May 2006.; *Race, Sex, and Business Enterprise: Evidence from the State of Maryland*, prepared for the Maryland Department of Transportation, March 2006.; *Race, Sex, and Business Enterprise: Evidence from the State of Minnesota*, prepared for the Minnesota Department of Transportation, September 2005.; *Race, Sex, and Business Enterprise: Evidence from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Vol. I*, prepared for the Massachusetts Housing Finance Agency, November 2006.; *Race, Sex, and Business Enterprise: Evidence from the State of Illinois and the Chicago Metropolitan Area*, prepared for the Illinois State Toll Highway Authority, June 2006.; *Race, Sex, and Business Enterprise: Evidence from the City of Austin*, prepared for the City of Austin, Texas, May 2008. All eight studies by NERA Economic Consulting in collaboration with Colette Holt & Associates.

those who are being discriminated against while rewarding those who do not discriminate, and developing race neutral programs to help all small businesses.”²

If you accept that discrimination in business transactions is indeed deeply rooted in the American economy, then it is difficult to argue with the logic of Dr. Marshall’s conclusions.

During the last twenty years, the primary bulwark against business discrimination has been the policy of using public sector purchasing power to support the entrepreneurial endeavors of minority-owned and women-owned business enterprises (M/WBEs) and to promote fair and full access to government contracting and procurement opportunities. Programs such as 8(a) and 8(d) at the Small Business Administration, the Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) Program at the Department of Transportation, and the Small Disadvantaged Business (SDB) Program at the Defense Department are key examples of such policies at the federal level.

I would like to address myself today to the current state of M/WBEs across the United States as documented in several key federal databases, and implications for the continuing need for the public sector to use its purchasing power to help remedy the ill effects of business discrimination.

I will also offer some suggested modifications to key federal statistical data collection programs that would enhance the ability of social scientists and public policy makers to meet the strict scrutiny standard that the Supreme Court applies to such programs.

Before continuing, it is important to acknowledge the enormous amount of relevant evidence that already appears in the Congressional record. A useful synopsis of this evidence was provided by the Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals in their 2000 decision in *Adarand Constructors*.³

The disparities between minorities and Whites are much greater in business than they are in other economic activities, even though these other disparities remain considerable. The gap is particularly wide with respect to income and wealth. African-Americans, for example, comprise approximately 13 percent of the general population, but only 12 percent of the civilian labor force, and only 11 percent of total employment. Further,

² Ray Marshall, “Minority and Female Business Development After *Croson*,” Working Paper, 2000.

³ *Adarand Constructors, Inc. v. Slater*, 228 F.3d 1147, 1166-1175 (10th Cir. 2000) (discussing evidence before Congress of business discrimination against minorities in the construction industry in enacting the Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Program for federal-aid transportation contracts, Pub.L. No. 100-17, 101 Stat. 132 (1987), Pub.L. No. 102-240, 105 Stat. 1914 (1991) and Pub.L. No. 105-178, 112 Stat. 107 (1998), and the implementing regulations at 49 CFR Part 26 (1999)).

African-Americans earned only 7 percent of total money income, owned only 5 percent of the nation's businesses, and made only 1 percent of business sales.⁴

At NERA, we create many original and custom data sets in our research studies of M/WBEs. Today I would like to focus on statistics from several key data sources produced within the federal government, that we utilize regularly in our research. These are the *Survey of Business Owners* (SBO), produced by the Census Bureau; the *Public Use Microdata Samples from the Decennial Census* (DCPUMS), also produced by the Census Bureau; the *Current Population Survey* (CPS), produced jointly by the Census Bureau and the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS); and the *Survey of Small Business Finances* (SSBF) produced by the Federal Reserve and the SBA. Along with the Census Bureau's *American Community Survey Public Use Microdata Samples* (ACPUMS), these are the key publicly available data sources that are currently able to shed light on the state of M/WBEs.

Survey of Business Owners (SBO)

The most recent SBO data from 2002 counted just under 22.5 million privately held business enterprises in the United States. Those firms, in total, made \$8.78 trillion in sales and receipts, or almost \$391,000 per firm on average.

Large disparities are observed in the SBO between the share of minorities in the general population and their share of the business population.

- Although African Americans comprised 12.7 percent of the U.S. population in 2002, they accounted for only 5.3 percent of its businesses.
- Although Hispanics and Latinos comprised 13.4 percent of the population, they accounted for only 7.0 percent of the businesses.
- Although women comprised 50.9 percent of the population, they accounted for only 28.9 percent of the businesses.

Moreover, the minority and female share of business sales and receipts is far lower than their share of the business population.

- Although African Americans comprised 5.3 percent of all U.S. businesses in 2002, they earned only 1.0 percent of sales and receipts.
- Although Hispanics and Latinos comprised 7.0 percent of all businesses, they earned only 2.5 percent of sales and receipts.

⁴ Bureau of the Census, *Statistical Abstract of the United States: 2008*, various tables, and *Survey of Business Owners: 2002*. A similar pattern is evident for Native Americans, Hispanics and Latinos, and Asians and Pacific Islanders.

- Although women comprised 28.9 percent of all businesses, they earned only 10.7 percent of sales and receipts.

Similar disparities are observed for other minority groups in the SBO. Asians and Pacific Islanders comprised 5.0 percent of the business population yet earned only 3.8 percent of sales and receipts. Native Americans comprised 0.9 percent of all businesses but earned only 0.3 percent of sales and receipts.

These disparities between the size of the minority and female business populations and their share of sales and receipts are very large. They are also statistically significant, meaning they are unlikely to result from chance alone.

While the exact proportions vary, large and statistically significant disparities are observed in all 50 states and the District of Columbia, for all minority groups—African-Americans, Hispanics and Latinos, Asians and Pacific Islanders, and Native Americans—as well as for women. This is documented below in Tables 1A through 1F.

When the results for the construction sector are isolated, again, the specific proportions vary but the overall trend is one of large and statistically significant disparities. This is documented in Tables 2A through 2F.

Similar outcomes have been observed in the previous versions of this survey as well.

Decennial Census Public Use Microdata Samples (DCPUMS), American Community Survey Public Use Microdata Samples (ACPUMS), and Current Population Survey (CPS)

It is a fair question to ask whether these disparities result primarily from discrimination, either past, present or both, or whether they result primarily from other, potentially non-discriminatory, factors.⁵ The evidence strongly suggests they primarily result from discrimination.

I have tested this hypothesis empirically using the DCPUMS from the 2000 census and 1990 decennial censuses. I am currently preparing to conduct similar tests using the ACPUMS microdata for 2000-2007. Like the SBO, these data sources can be used to document large and statistically significant disparities between the proportion of business owners who are minorities or women and their share of business owner earnings, in the nation as a whole, and throughout the states, and in the economy as a whole as well as across different industry sectors.

⁵ This was the subject of my book, *Racial Discrimination and Minority Business Enterprise: Evidence from the 1990 Census*, New York and London: Garland Publishing, 2000. Similar findings are observed using the 2000 decennial census data. See, e.g. “NERA Economic Consulting, “Race, Sex, and Business Enterprise: Evidence from the State of Maryland (Final Report),” 8 March 2006, 107-145.

The advantage of the DCPUMS and the ACPUMS is that they allow us to compare these percentages while holding a wide variety of other, potentially non-discriminatory, factors constant, such as industry, geography, education, age, and labor market status, among other factors.⁶ Even when all these factors are held constant, using regression analysis, the disparities between minority business owners (African-Americans, Hispanics and Latinos, Asians and Pacific Islanders, and Native Americans) and women business owners on the one hand and their non-minority male counterparts on the other tend to remain large and statistically significant.

The ACPUMS has only recently achieved nationwide coverage. Prior to this, in the interim between issues of the DCPUMS, we have used data from the CPS, which is published on an annual basis. The CPS is the official source of government statistics on employment and unemployment and has been conducted monthly for over 40 years. The data structure of the CPS is similar to the decennial census, so it is possible to conduct similar types of disparity analyses to those just described. The CPS results also tend to show large and statistically significant disparities facing minority and women business owners, even when a large variety of potentially non-discriminatory factors is held constant.⁷

Survey of Small Business Finances (SSBF)

One significant factor leading to the disadvantaged status of minority and women businesses is lack of access to capital and credit. This is among the most frequently cited obstacles to success among M/WBEs, particularly African-Americans and Hispanics and Latinos.⁸ It is also reported more frequently by women business owners than by men. Discrimination in the credit market against such businesses can obviously have an important effect on the likelihood that they will succeed. Indeed, discrimination in the credit market could even prevent such businesses from opening in the first place.

We are fortunate to have data that allows us to test for evidence of discrimination in the small business credit market in recent years. The SSBF is conducted jointly by the U.S. Small Business Administration and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. It has been conducted every 5 years since 1988 and is drawn from a representative sample of firms with fewer than 500 employees. The 1993 and 1998 surveys deliberately oversampled minority-owned and women-owned firms but the 2003 survey, unfortunately, did not.⁹

⁶ We have also tested the hypothesis, with similar results, including additional factors such marital and family status, immigration status, ability to speak English, military service, disability status, and asset levels.

⁷ See, *e.g.*, NERA Economic Consulting, *op. cit.*, 107-145.

⁸ See, *e.g.*, U.S. Chamber of Commerce (2005), "Access to capital, what funding sources work for you?," U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Washington, DC, 55.

⁹ The 2003 survey took other steps, however, to increase the likelihood that minority-owned and women-owned firms were captured in the sampling frame. For more details, see NORC (2005), p. 11.

The beauty of the SSBF data is that, in addition to the race and sex of the business owners, it contains complete balance sheet and credit history information for each business that was interviewed. This is the same information that would be available to a loan officer when making a determination of whether or not to grant credit. With this data, we can use regression analysis to test for race and sex disparities in access to commercial credit while holding constant all of the relevant balance sheet and credit history information.

The SSBF data provide qualitative and quantitative evidence consistent with the presence of discrimination against minorities in the credit market for small businesses. For example, I find that African-American-owned firms are much more likely to report being seriously concerned with credit market problems and to report being less likely to apply for credit because they fear their loan application will be denied. Moreover, after controlling for a large number of financial and other characteristics of the firms, I find that African-American-owned firms, Hispanic-owned firms, and to a lesser extent other minority-owned firms are substantially and statistically significantly more likely to be denied credit than are White-owned firms. I find some evidence that women are discriminated against in this market as well. The principal results are as follows:

- Minority-owned firms were more likely to report that they did not apply for a loan over the preceding three years because they feared the loan would be denied.
- When minority-owned firms did apply for a loan their loan requests were substantially more likely to be denied than non-minorities, even when differences like firm size and credit history are accounted for.
- When minority-owned firms *did* receive a loan they were obligated to pay higher interest rates on the loans than was true of comparable White-owned firms.
- A larger proportion of minority-owned firms than White-owned firms report that credit market conditions are a serious concern.
- A larger share of minority-owned firms than White-owned firms believes that the availability of credit is the most important issue likely to confront them in the upcoming year.
- There is no evidence that discrimination in the market for credit is significantly different in different regions of the country, or in the construction industries than it is in the nation or the economy as a whole.
- There is no evidence that the level of discrimination in the market for credit has diminished between 1993 and 2003.

The analysis of credit market discrimination against minority and women business owners using SSBF data was the subject of a 60 page report about which I testified to the

Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship earlier this month. A copy of that report is included in the package of supplementary materials I have provided.

Anecdotal/Qualitative Evidence of Discrimination

In addition to the statistical evidence of discrimination, the numerous studies we have conducted in recent years found extensive anecdotal evidence of discrimination against minorities and women in the key sectors of construction and construction-related professional services. In conjunction with my long time colleague, attorney Colette Holt of Colette Holt & Associates in Chicago, we have conducted surveys and in person interviews with hundreds of M/WBEs and majority-male owned firms, and the results are strikingly similar across the country.

In general, minorities and women reported that they still encounter significant barriers to doing business in the public and private sector market places, as both prime contractors and subcontractors. They often suffer from stereotypes about their suspected lack of competence and are subject to higher performance standards than similar White men. They also encounter discrimination in obtaining loans and surety bonds; receiving price quotes from suppliers; working with trade unions; obtaining public and private sector prime contracts and subcontracts; and being paid promptly. Finally, there was general agreement that without the use of affirmative remedies such as subcontracting goals, minorities and women would receive few if any opportunities on government contracts, as is the case on non-goals projects. Prime contractors who use M/WBEs on goals projects rarely use them—or even solicit them—in the absence of goals. Thus, the continued operation of federal, state, and local efforts to ensure equal access to the public contracting process is essential to the competitive viability of minority-owned and women-owned business enterprises.

Suggested Refinements to Federal Data Collection Programs Related to M/WBEs

Useful as they are, the key federal databases used to study M/WBE issues that I have just discussed are limited in several important respects. Below is a list of suggested refinements to the federal databases that would enhance the ability of researchers such as myself and policy makers such as yourselves to draw defensible inferences about MWBEs.

Public Use Microdata Samples of the Decennial Census, American Community Survey, and the Current Population Survey

- provide more industry detail for construction (NAICS 23) (*i.e.* differentiate general building contractors, general heavy construction contractors, and special trades contractors, which are all currently lumped together).

- more industry detail for professional, scientific, and technical services (NAICS 541) (differentiate lawyers, architects & engineers, accountants, advertisers, and others, which are all currently lumped together).
- show legal form of organization for self-employed persons in the class of worker field (sole proprietorship, partnership, C corporation, S-corporation or LLC).

Survey of Business Owners

- substantially increase sample size so that more detailed combinations of geographic location and industry attachment can be analyzed; this would be of enormous benefit to state and local governments operating or considering M/WBE programs.
- substantially increase the sample size so that 3- and 4- digit NAICS results can be had for all or most metropolitan areas.
- reduce the time lag between when the survey is conducted and when the results are released to the public; currently it is in excess of 4 years.

Survey of Small Business Finances

- restore the over-sampling of minorities and women that was present in the 1993 and 1998 surveys but dropped for the 2003 survey. Increase resources to account for the alleged negative impact of this over-sampling on response rates.
- substantially increase overall sample size so that more results for different race groups can be analyzed, in particular Native Americans and Asians.
- substantially increase overall sample size so that, *e.g.*, the influence of venture capital/Small Business Investment Companies on minority and women businesses can be studied.
- conduct research designed to identify, and then include, one or more variables that are correlated with a firm's decision to apply for a loan, but is independent of the financial institution's decision to approve or deny the request. This would allow for "Heckman corrected" analyses that could account for self-selection issues in the loan application process.
- add a longitudinal component so that commercial loans to small businesses could be tracked from origination through repayment or default.

Business Establishment List of the Bureau of Labor Statistics
Standard Statistical Establishment List of the Bureau of the Census

- implement identification of establishment ownership by race and sex in these basic Census and BLS lists of business establishments.

Small Business Size Standards

- more transparency needed in how size standards are actually determined.
- why are manufacturing and mining industries mostly sized in terms of employees while other industries are mostly sized in terms of annual revenues?
- geographic differentiation needed - we often hear complaints that a set of standards that works in Chicago or Los Angeles doesn't work so well in Tampa or Dayton.
- more frequent updates needed for firms sized by annual revenues, in times of significant price inflation.

Conclusion

It is fairly easy to specify in a general way the economic consequences of public sector M/WBE contracting programs. They have improved economic opportunities for minorities and women in business and therefore improved the competitiveness and efficiency of the American economy. They have also focused public attention on discrimination against minority and female businesses for reasons unrelated to their qualifications or performance.

These public sector programs, standing alone, will not solve the problem of business discrimination. The private sector, which is far larger in terms of economic activity and scope, must take on more responsibility for eliminating business discrimination as well. Some major corporations have begun to take important steps down this road by developing genuine supplier diversity initiatives, but these companies are still the exception rather than the rule.

I am optimistic that the statistical and anecdotal evidence will one day show that such M/WBE contracting programs are no longer needed, because minority-owned and women-owned businesses will have achieved competitive parity with their majority-owned counterparts. However, my own research and that of my colleagues demonstrates that this day has not yet arrived.

Thank you. I will be pleased to answer any questions.

Table 1A. Percentage of Firms and Sales and Corresponding Disparity Ratios, All Firms and Employer Firms, African Americans, All Industries, 2002

| State | Percentage of All Firms | Percentage of All Sales | Percentage of All Employers | Percentage of All Employer Sales | Disparity Ratio-All Firms | Disparity Ratio Employers |
|------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Alabama | 9.26% | 0.62% | 2.96% | 0.46% | 0.07 | 0.16 |
| Alaska | 1.49% | 0.18% | 0.66% | 0.14% | 0.12 | 0.22 |
| Arizona | 1.66% | 0.16% | 0.66% | 0.13% | 0.10 | 0.19 |
| Arkansas | 4.28% | 0.27% | 1.38% | 0.18% | 0.06 | 0.13 |
| California | 3.88% | 0.35% | 1.48% | 0.26% | 0.09 | 0.18 |
| Colorado | 1.52% | 0.20% | 0.68% | 0.16% | 0.13 | 0.24 |
| Connecticut | 3.42% | 0.19% | 0.97% | 0.14% | 0.05 | 0.14 |
| Delaware | 6.70% | 0.18% | 1.97% | 0.11% | 0.03 | 0.06 |
| Dist of Columbia | 25.86% | 1.47% | 9.23% | 1.28% | 0.06 | 0.14 |
| Florida | 6.63% | 0.53% | 1.95% | 0.36% | 0.08 | 0.19 |
| Georgia | 13.41% | 0.77% | 3.88% | 0.55% | 0.06 | 0.14 |
| Hawaii | 0.82% | 0.12% | 0.31% | 0.10% | 0.15 | 0.33 |
| Idaho | 0.31% | 0.08% | 0.34% | 0.07% | 0.26 | 0.21 |
| Illinois | 7.17% | 0.43% | 1.73% | 0.35% | 0.06 | 0.20 |
| Indiana | 3.24% | 0.35% | 1.28% | 0.31% | 0.11 | 0.24 |
| Iowa | 0.68% | 0.11% | 0.35% | 0.10% | 0.16 | 0.29 |
| Kansas | 2.04% | 0.16% | 0.96% | 0.13% | 0.08 | 0.13 |
| Kentucky | 2.52% | 0.39% | 0.92% | 0.35% | 0.15 | 0.38 |
| Louisiana | 12.24% | 0.59% | 3.55% | 0.40% | 0.05 | 0.11 |
| Maine | 0.24% | 0.04% | 0.10% | 0.03% | 0.18 | 0.33 |
| Maryland | 15.65% | 1.25% | 4.23% | 0.92% | 0.08 | 0.22 |
| Massachusetts | 2.27% | 0.19% | 0.87% | 0.15% | 0.08 | 0.18 |
| Michigan | 6.03% | 0.54% | 1.68% | 0.47% | 0.09 | 0.28 |
| Minnesota | 1.77% | 0.15% | 0.46% | 0.12% | 0.08 | 0.27 |
| Mississippi | 13.33% | 0.94% | 4.39% | 0.59% | 0.07 | 0.13 |
| Missouri | 3.81% | 0.30% | 1.73% | 0.24% | 0.08 | 0.14 |
| Montana | 0.22% | 0.03% | n/a | n/a | 0.13 | |
| Nebraska | 1.44% | 0.10% | 0.62% | 0.09% | 0.07 | 0.14 |
| Nevada | 2.56% | 0.29% | 1.08% | 0.23% | 0.11 | 0.22 |
| New Hampshire | 0.37% | 0.07% | 0.23% | 0.06% | 0.19 | 0.26 |
| New Jersey | 5.12% | 0.38% | 1.86% | 0.31% | 0.07 | 0.16 |
| New Mexico | 1.13% | 0.29% | 0.50% | 0.27% | 0.26 | 0.53 |
| New York | 7.58% | 0.43% | 1.81% | 0.31% | 0.06 | 0.17 |
| North Carolina | 8.11% | 0.59% | 3.07% | 0.45% | 0.07 | 0.15 |
| North Dakota | 0.14% | 0.03% | n/a | n/a | 0.24 | |
| Ohio | 4.36% | 0.40% | 1.56% | 0.34% | 0.09 | 0.22 |
| Oklahoma | 2.55% | 0.23% | 0.96% | 0.18% | 0.09 | 0.19 |
| Oregon | 0.74% | 0.15% | 0.39% | 0.13% | 0.20 | 0.34 |
| Pennsylvania | 2.83% | 0.22% | 1.17% | 0.18% | 0.08 | 0.16 |
| Rhode Island | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |
| South Carolina | 9.77% | 0.63% | 3.31% | 0.42% | 0.06 | 0.13 |
| South Dakota | 0.18% | 0.10% | 0.11% | 0.10% | 0.58 | 0.90 |
| Tennessee | 5.90% | 0.40% | 2.16% | 0.29% | 0.07 | 0.14 |
| Texas | 5.12% | 0.35% | 1.79% | 0.26% | 0.07 | 0.14 |
| Utah | 0.34% | 0.13% | 0.15% | 0.13% | 0.38 | 0.86 |
| Vermont | 0.29% | 0.05% | 0.15% | 0.05% | 0.18 | 0.33 |

| State | Percentage of All Firms | Percentage of All Sales | Percentage of All Employers | Percentage of All Employer Sales | Disparity Ratio-All Firms | Disparity Ratio Employers |
|---------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Virginia | 7.77% | 0.67% | 3.39% | 0.55% | <i>0.09</i> | <i>0.16</i> |
| Washington | 1.49% | 0.23% | 0.84% | 0.21% | <i>0.16</i> | <i>0.25</i> |
| West Virginia | 1.30% | 0.11% | 0.39% | 0.08% | <i>0.08</i> | <i>0.22</i> |
| Wisconsin | 1.70% | 0.15% | 0.76% | 0.12% | <i>0.09</i> | <i>0.16</i> |
| Wyoming | 0.28% | 0.03% | 0.24% | 0.02% | <i>0.10</i> | <i>0.10</i> |

Notes: The disparity ratio is derived by dividing the percentage of sales by the corresponding percentage of firms. A disparity ratio of zero indicates complete disparity while a value of 1 indicates parity. Disparity ratios in italics are statistically significant at a 1-in-100 probability level.

Table 1B. Percentage of Firms and Sales and Corresponding Disparity Ratios, All Firms and Employer Firms, Hispanics and Latinos, All Industries, 2002

| State | Percentage of All Firms | Percentage of All Sales | Percentage of All Employers | Percentage of All Employer Sales | Disparity Ratio-All Firms | Disparity Ratio Employers |
|------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Alabama | 0.82% | 0.28% | 0.90% | 0.26% | 0.34 | 0.29 |
| Alaska | 2.00% | 0.37% | 1.85% | 0.34% | 0.19 | 0.18 |
| Arizona | 9.21% | 1.32% | 5.30% | 1.10% | 0.14 | 0.21 |
| Arkansas | 1.00% | 0.23% | 0.84% | 0.20% | 0.23 | 0.24 |
| California | 14.70% | 2.04% | 7.06% | 1.68% | 0.14 | 0.24 |
| Colorado | 5.17% | 1.33% | 3.48% | 1.21% | 0.26 | 0.35 |
| Connecticut | 3.12% | 0.33% | 1.70% | 0.28% | 0.11 | 0.16 |
| Delaware | 1.38% | 0.12% | 0.72% | 0.09% | 0.09 | 0.12 |
| Dist of Columbia | 4.60% | 0.51% | 3.18% | 0.48% | 0.11 | 0.15 |
| Florida | 17.33% | 3.80% | 11.09% | 3.27% | 0.22 | 0.29 |
| Georgia | 2.71% | 0.57% | 1.66% | 0.48% | 0.21 | 0.29 |
| Hawaii | 3.12% | 0.73% | 2.05% | 0.66% | 0.23 | 0.32 |
| Idaho | 2.28% | 0.48% | 1.82% | 0.41% | 0.21 | 0.23 |
| Illinois | 4.13% | 0.64% | 2.69% | 0.57% | 0.16 | 0.21 |
| Indiana | 1.26% | 0.16% | 0.81% | 0.14% | 0.13 | 0.17 |
| Iowa | 0.65% | 0.12% | 0.58% | 0.11% | 0.19 | 0.19 |
| Kansas | 1.90% | 0.29% | 1.47% | 0.25% | 0.15 | 0.17 |
| Kentucky | 0.70% | 0.27% | n/a | n/a | 0.39 | |
| Louisiana | 2.33% | 0.60% | 1.63% | 0.56% | 0.26 | 0.34 |
| Maine | 0.54% | 0.15% | 0.32% | 0.13% | 0.28 | 0.41 |
| Maryland | 3.46% | 0.64% | 2.00% | 0.54% | 0.19 | 0.27 |
| Massachusetts | 2.83% | 0.32% | 1.41% | 0.26% | 0.11 | 0.19 |
| Michigan | 1.34% | 0.40% | 0.90% | 0.39% | 0.30 | 0.43 |
| Minnesota | 0.90% | 0.10% | 0.57% | 0.08% | 0.11 | 0.14 |
| Mississippi | 0.71% | 0.15% | 0.56% | 0.13% | 0.21 | 0.22 |
| Missouri | 0.83% | 0.15% | 0.63% | 0.14% | 0.18 | 0.22 |
| Montana | 0.96% | 0.22% | n/a | n/a | 0.23 | |
| Nebraska | 1.35% | 0.31% | 0.94% | 0.29% | 0.23 | 0.31 |
| Nevada | 5.75% | 1.11% | 3.18% | 0.96% | 0.19 | 0.30 |
| New Hampshire | 0.73% | 0.21% | 0.65% | 0.18% | 0.28 | 0.28 |
| New Jersey | 7.03% | 0.85% | 3.78% | 0.73% | 0.12 | 0.19 |
| New Mexico | 21.73% | 5.40% | 15.08% | 4.83% | 0.25 | 0.32 |
| New York | 9.58% | 0.71% | 3.26% | 0.56% | 0.07 | 0.17 |
| North Carolina | 1.41% | 0.30% | 1.09% | 0.25% | 0.21 | 0.23 |
| North Dakota | 0.41% | 0.04% | 0.25% | 0.03% | 0.09 | 0.13 |
| Ohio | 0.87% | 0.14% | 0.67% | 0.13% | 0.16 | 0.19 |
| Oklahoma | 1.87% | 0.58% | 1.40% | 0.53% | 0.31 | 0.38 |
| Oregon | 2.12% | 0.56% | 1.56% | 0.52% | 0.26 | 0.34 |
| Pennsylvania | 1.26% | 0.18% | 0.72% | 0.15% | 0.14 | 0.21 |
| Rhode Island | 3.91% | 0.32% | 1.20% | 0.20% | 0.08 | 0.17 |
| South Carolina | 1.03% | 0.27% | 0.90% | 0.25% | 0.26 | 0.28 |
| South Dakota | 0.51% | 0.20% | 0.49% | 0.19% | 0.40 | 0.39 |
| Tennessee | 0.95% | 0.23% | 0.92% | 0.21% | 0.24 | 0.23 |
| Texas | 18.41% | 2.33% | 9.47% | 1.88% | 0.13 | 0.20 |
| Utah | 2.68% | 0.38% | 1.82% | 0.32% | 0.14 | 0.17 |
| Vermont | 0.62% | 0.10% | 0.35% | 0.08% | 0.15 | 0.22 |

| State | Percentage of All Firms | Percentage of All Sales | Percentage of All Employers | Percentage of All Employer Sales | Disparity Ratio-All Firms | Disparity Ratio Employers |
|---------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Virginia | 3.59% | 0.62% | 1.79% | 0.53% | 0.17 | 0.30 |
| Washington | 2.20% | 0.34% | 1.74% | 0.30% | 0.16 | 0.18 |
| West Virginia | 0.57% | 0.22% | 0.81% | 0.20% | 0.38 | 0.25 |
| Wisconsin | 0.95% | 0.22% | 0.77% | 0.21% | 0.23 | 0.27 |
| Wyoming | 2.49% | 0.66% | 1.95% | 0.63% | 0.26 | 0.32 |

Notes: See Table 1A.

Table 1C. Percentage of Firms and Sales and Corresponding Disparity Ratios, All Firms and Employer Firms, Asians, All Industries, 2002

| State | Percentage of All Firms | Percentage of All Sales | Percentage of All Employers | Percentage of All Employer Sales | Disparity Ratio-All Firms | Disparity Ratio Employers |
|------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Alabama | 1.38% | 0.56% | 2.17% | 0.53% | 0.41 | 0.24 |
| Alaska | 3.07% | 0.91% | 4.05% | 0.82% | 0.30 | 0.20 |
| Arizona | 2.68% | 0.73% | 3.36% | 0.67% | 0.27 | 0.20 |
| Arkansas | 0.96% | 0.37% | 1.84% | 0.36% | 0.39 | 0.19 |
| California | 12.77% | 4.50% | 15.24% | 4.17% | 0.35 | 0.27 |
| Colorado | 2.35% | 0.64% | 2.94% | 0.58% | 0.27 | 0.20 |
| Connecticut | 2.38% | 0.48% | 3.24% | 0.41% | 0.20 | 0.13 |
| Delaware | 2.98% | 0.53% | 3.96% | 0.49% | 0.18 | 0.12 |
| Dist of Columbia | 5.11% | 0.94% | 10.11% | n/a | 0.18 | |
| Florida | 2.68% | 1.04% | 3.78% | 0.99% | 0.39 | 0.26 |
| Georgia | 3.99% | 1.08% | 5.97% | 1.00% | 0.27 | 0.17 |
| Hawaii | 45.28% | 18.88% | 43.92% | 17.73% | 0.42 | 0.40 |
| Idaho | 0.91% | 0.39% | 1.29% | 0.38% | 0.43 | 0.29 |
| Illinois | 4.64% | 1.27% | 5.43% | 1.19% | 0.27 | 0.22 |
| Indiana | 1.40% | 0.54% | 2.11% | 0.52% | 0.38 | 0.24 |
| Iowa | 0.76% | 0.20% | 1.12% | 0.18% | 0.26 | 0.16 |
| Kansas | 1.62% | 0.39% | 2.36% | 0.36% | 0.24 | 0.15 |
| Kentucky | 1.08% | 0.48% | 1.89% | 0.47% | 0.45 | 0.25 |
| Louisiana | 2.50% | 0.55% | 3.07% | 0.47% | 0.22 | 0.15 |
| Maine | 0.62% | 0.27% | 1.28% | 0.26% | 0.45 | 0.21 |
| Maryland | 5.90% | 1.89% | 7.44% | 1.76% | 0.32 | 0.24 |
| Massachusetts | 3.21% | 0.77% | 3.76% | 0.72% | 0.24 | 0.19 |
| Michigan | 2.09% | 0.64% | 2.80% | 0.60% | 0.31 | 0.21 |
| Minnesota | 1.73% | 0.38% | 1.61% | 0.35% | 0.22 | 0.22 |
| Mississippi | 1.56% | 0.87% | 2.34% | 0.79% | 0.56 | 0.34 |
| Missouri | 1.45% | 0.42% | 2.19% | 0.40% | 0.29 | 0.18 |
| Montana | 0.51% | 0.22% | 0.90% | 0.22% | 0.44 | 0.24 |
| Nebraska | 1.00% | 0.49% | 1.53% | 0.49% | 0.49 | 0.32 |
| Nevada | 5.23% | 1.35% | 5.37% | 1.17% | 0.26 | 0.22 |
| New Hampshire | 1.22% | 0.43% | 2.07% | 0.39% | 0.35 | 0.19 |
| New Jersey | 7.33% | 2.18% | 8.46% | 2.06% | 0.30 | 0.24 |
| New Mexico | 1.73% | 0.73% | 2.52% | 0.69% | 0.42 | 0.27 |
| New York | 8.50% | 1.76% | 8.40% | 1.58% | 0.21 | 0.19 |
| North Carolina | 2.13% | 0.58% | 2.84% | 0.54% | 0.27 | 0.19 |
| North Dakota | 0.49% | 0.25% | 0.97% | 0.25% | 0.52 | 0.26 |
| Ohio | 1.68% | 0.57% | 2.71% | 0.54% | 0.34 | 0.20 |
| Oklahoma | 1.57% | 0.47% | 2.28% | 0.42% | 0.30 | 0.18 |
| Oregon | 3.02% | 0.87% | 3.42% | 0.76% | 0.29 | 0.22 |
| Pennsylvania | 2.59% | 0.69% | 3.17% | 0.63% | 0.27 | 0.20 |
| Rhode Island | 1.75% | 0.49% | 1.78% | 0.44% | 0.28 | 0.25 |
| South Carolina | 1.51% | 0.81% | 2.47% | 0.79% | 0.54 | 0.32 |
| South Dakota | 0.43% | 0.15% | 0.46% | 0.14% | 0.34 | 0.31 |
| Tennessee | 1.59% | 0.50% | 2.86% | 0.47% | 0.31 | 0.16 |
| Texas | 4.49% | 1.14% | 5.99% | 1.04% | 0.25 | 0.17 |
| Utah | 1.46% | 0.48% | 1.81% | 0.45% | 0.33 | 0.25 |
| Vermont | 0.60% | 0.17% | 1.00% | n/a | 0.28 | |

| State | Percentage of All Firms | Percentage of All Sales | Percentage of All Employers | Percentage of All Employer Sales | Disparity Ratio-All Firms | Disparity Ratio Employers |
|---------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Virginia | 5.75% | 1.38% | 6.05% | 1.27% | 0.24 | 0.21 |
| Washington | 5.75% | 1.59% | 6.01% | 1.46% | 0.28 | 0.24 |
| West Virginia | 1.09% | 0.51% | 2.12% | 0.50% | 0.47 | 0.23 |
| Wisconsin | 1.26% | 0.34% | 1.61% | 0.32% | 0.27 | 0.20 |
| Wyoming | 0.76% | 0.25% | 1.34% | 0.24% | 0.33 | 0.18 |

Notes: See Table 1A.

Table 1D. Percentage of Firms and Sales and Corresponding Disparity Ratios, All Firms and Employer Firms, American Indians and Alaska Natives, All Industries, 2002

| State | Percentage of All Firms | Percentage of All Sales | Percentage of All Employers | Percentage of All Employer Sales | Disparity Ratio-All Firms | Disparity Ratio Employers |
|------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Alabama | 0.94% | 0.18% | 0.69% | 0.16% | 0.19 | 0.23 |
| Alaska | 8.29% | 6.02% | 4.76% | 6.07% | 0.73 | 1.28 |
| Arizona | 1.72% | 0.17% | 0.49% | 0.14% | 0.10 | 0.29 |
| Arkansas | 1.09% | 0.19% | 0.50% | 0.16% | 0.18 | 0.31 |
| California | 1.31% | 0.14% | 0.54% | 0.11% | 0.11 | 0.20 |
| Colorado | 0.85% | 0.14% | 0.50% | 0.11% | 0.16 | 0.23 |
| Connecticut | 0.40% | 0.04% | n/a | n/a | 0.09 | |
| Delaware | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |
| Dist of Columbia | 0.47% | 0.05% | 0.33% | 0.05% | 0.10 | 0.14 |
| Florida | 0.64% | 0.06% | 0.23% | 0.04% | 0.09 | 0.16 |
| Georgia | 0.66% | 0.08% | 0.42% | 0.06% | 0.12 | 0.15 |
| Hawaii | 0.90% | 0.15% | n/a | n/a | 0.17 | |
| Idaho | 0.94% | 0.28% | 0.54% | 0.26% | 0.30 | 0.48 |
| Illinois | 0.35% | 0.04% | 0.20% | 0.03% | 0.11 | 0.16 |
| Indiana | 0.45% | 0.05% | 0.27% | 0.05% | 0.12 | 0.17 |
| Iowa | 0.27% | 0.04% | n/a | n/a | 0.13 | |
| Kansas | 0.79% | 0.15% | 0.60% | 0.14% | 0.20 | 0.24 |
| Kentucky | 0.44% | 0.03% | 0.15% | 0.02% | 0.06 | 0.11 |
| Louisiana | 0.82% | 0.10% | 0.30% | 0.08% | 0.12 | 0.27 |
| Maine | 0.50% | 0.06% | 0.32% | 0.05% | 0.13 | 0.15 |
| Maryland | 0.81% | 0.11% | 0.35% | 0.09% | 0.13 | 0.24 |
| Massachusetts | 0.40% | 0.06% | 0.24% | 0.05% | 0.14 | 0.20 |
| Michigan | 0.73% | 0.09% | 0.40% | 0.08% | 0.12 | 0.19 |
| Minnesota | 0.62% | 0.07% | 0.43% | 0.06% | 0.11 | 0.15 |
| Mississippi | 0.36% | 0.05% | n/a | n/a | 0.12 | |
| Missouri | 0.75% | 0.08% | 0.39% | 0.06% | 0.10 | 0.14 |
| Montana | 1.98% | 0.48% | 1.26% | 0.43% | 0.24 | 0.34 |
| Nebraska | 0.29% | 0.03% | 0.11% | 0.03% | 0.11 | 0.25 |
| Nevada | 1.12% | 0.14% | 0.59% | 0.10% | 0.13 | 0.17 |
| New Hampshire | 0.42% | 0.06% | 0.29% | 0.05% | 0.15 | 0.17 |
| New Jersey | 0.37% | 0.03% | 0.18% | 0.02% | 0.09 | 0.14 |
| New Mexico | 4.99% | 0.52% | 1.14% | 0.45% | 0.11 | 0.39 |
| New York | 0.65% | 0.04% | 0.23% | 0.03% | 0.06 | 0.13 |
| North Carolina | 0.93% | 0.10% | 0.55% | 0.07% | 0.11 | 0.14 |
| North Dakota | 1.50% | 0.29% | 0.55% | 0.26% | 0.19 | 0.48 |
| Ohio | 0.38% | 0.05% | 0.20% | 0.05% | 0.14 | 0.23 |
| Oklahoma | 5.86% | 1.28% | 3.53% | 1.10% | 0.22 | 0.31 |
| Oregon | 1.02% | 0.14% | 0.53% | 0.10% | 0.13 | 0.20 |
| Pennsylvania | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |
| Rhode Island | 0.51% | 0.04% | 0.13% | 0.02% | 0.08 | 0.19 |
| South Carolina | 0.49% | 0.06% | 0.32% | 0.05% | 0.12 | 0.16 |
| South Dakota | 1.87% | 0.22% | 0.73% | 0.21% | 0.12 | 0.28 |
| Tennessee | 0.78% | 0.15% | 0.38% | 0.12% | 0.19 | 0.32 |
| Texas | 0.93% | 0.17% | 0.61% | 0.15% | 0.19 | 0.25 |
| Utah | 0.59% | 0.06% | 0.36% | 0.05% | 0.09 | 0.13 |
| Vermont | 0.41% | 0.11% | 0.18% | 0.10% | 0.27 | 0.54 |

| State | Percentage of All Firms | Percentage of All Sales | Percentage of All Employers | Percentage of All Employer Sales | Disparity Ratio-All Firms | Disparity Ratio Employers |
|---------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Virginia | 0.50% | 0.08% | 0.36% | 0.07% | <i>0.17</i> | <i>0.19</i> |
| Washington | 1.23% | 0.22% | 0.72% | 0.19% | <i>0.18</i> | <i>0.27</i> |
| West Virginia | 0.36% | 0.04% | 0.30% | 0.03% | <i>0.11</i> | <i>0.09</i> |
| Wisconsin | 0.64% | 0.10% | 0.35% | 0.09% | <i>0.15</i> | <i>0.25</i> |
| Wyoming | 1.12% | 0.18% | 0.87% | 0.15% | <i>0.16</i> | <i>0.18</i> |

Notes: See Table 1A.

Table 1E. Percentage of Firms and Sales and Corresponding Disparity Ratios, All Firms and Employer Firms, Native Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders, All Industries, 2002

| State | Percentage of All Firms | Percentage of All Sales | Percentage of All Employers | Percentage of All Employer Sales | Disparity Ratio-All Firms | Disparity Ratio Employers |
|------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Alabama | 0.03% | 0.00% | 0.01% | 0.00% | 0.06 | 0.24 |
| Alaska | 0.24% | 0.02% | 0.22% | n/a | 0.09 | |
| Arizona | 0.09% | 0.01% | 0.07% | 0.01% | 0.13 | 0.14 |
| Arkansas | 0.03% | 0.00% | n/a | n/a | 0.09 | |
| California | 0.24% | 0.04% | 0.15% | 0.03% | 0.18 | 0.22 |
| Colorado | 0.08% | 0.01% | 0.05% | 0.01% | 0.11 | 0.16 |
| Connecticut | 0.06% | 0.02% | n/a | n/a | 0.36 | |
| Delaware | 0.03% | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |
| Dist of Columbia | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |
| Florida | 0.10% | 0.01% | 0.04% | 0.00% | 0.07 | 0.13 |
| Georgia | 0.03% | 0.00% | 0.03% | 0.00% | 0.13 | 0.08 |
| Hawaii | 8.42% | 2.16% | 4.26% | 1.98% | 0.26 | 0.46 |
| Idaho | 0.08% | 0.01% | n/a | n/a | 0.15 | |
| Illinois | 0.07% | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |
| Indiana | 0.03% | 0.02% | n/a | n/a | 0.61 | |
| Iowa | 0.01% | 0.00% | 0.00% | n/a | 0.39 | |
| Kansas | 0.02% | 0.01% | n/a | n/a | 0.42 | |
| Kentucky | 0.02% | n/a | 0.00% | n/a | | |
| Louisiana | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |
| Maine | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |
| Maryland | 0.02% | n/a | 0.04% | 0.01% | | 0.24 |
| Massachusetts | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |
| Michigan | 0.03% | 0.00% | n/a | n/a | 0.17 | |
| Minnesota | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |
| Mississippi | 0.07% | 0.00% | n/a | n/a | 0.07 | |
| Missouri | 0.02% | 0.01% | n/a | n/a | 0.35 | |
| Montana | 0.04% | 0.00% | n/a | n/a | 0.12 | |
| Nebraska | 0.01% | n/a | 0.00% | 0.00% | | |
| Nevada | 0.18% | 0.04% | n/a | n/a | 0.20 | |
| New Hampshire | 0.01% | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |
| New Jersey | 0.06% | 0.00% | n/a | n/a | 0.07 | |
| New Mexico | 0.10% | 0.02% | n/a | n/a | 0.19 | |
| New York | 0.18% | 0.01% | 0.04% | n/a | 0.04 | |
| North Carolina | 0.03% | 0.00% | n/a | n/a | 0.07 | |
| North Dakota | 0.00% | n/a | 0.00% | 0.00% | | |
| Ohio | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |
| Oklahoma | 0.10% | 0.00% | 0.03% | 0.00% | 0.05 | 0.10 |
| Oregon | 0.12% | 0.02% | 0.08% | 0.02% | 0.18 | 0.21 |
| Pennsylvania | 0.03% | 0.00% | n/a | n/a | 0.13 | |
| Rhode Island | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |
| South Carolina | 0.01% | 0.00% | n/a | n/a | 0.29 | |
| South Dakota | 0.02% | n/a | 0.01% | n/a | | |
| Tennessee | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |
| Texas | 0.08% | 0.00% | n/a | n/a | 0.05 | |
| Utah | 0.22% | 0.10% | 0.18% | 0.10% | 0.47 | 0.58 |
| Vermont | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |

| State | Percentage of All Firms | Percentage of All Sales | Percentage of All Employers | Percentage of All Employer Sales | Disparity Ratio-All Firms | Disparity Ratio Employers |
|---------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Virginia | 0.08% | 0.03% | 0.07% | n/a | 0.32 | |
| Washington | 0.16% | 0.05% | 0.09% | 0.05% | 0.33 | 0.55 |
| West Virginia | 0.01% | n/a | 0.00% | 0.00% | | |
| Wisconsin | 0.03% | 0.00% | 0.01% | 0.00% | 0.03 | 0.12 |
| Wyoming | 0.04% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.04 | |

Notes: See Table 1A. The Employer disparity ratio for Utah is statistically significant at a 1-in-10 probability level.

Table 1F. Percentage of Firms and Sales and Corresponding Disparity Ratios, All Firms and Employer Firms, Women, All Industries, 2002

| State | Percentage of All Firms | Percentage of All Sales | Percentage of All Employers | Percentage of All Employer Sales | Disparity Ratio-All Firms | Disparity Ratio Employers |
|------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Alabama | 26.43% | 4.29% | 15.77% | 3.87% | 0.16 | 0.25 |
| Alaska | 26.24% | 5.08% | 18.87% | 4.53% | 0.19 | 0.24 |
| Arizona | 28.79% | 4.83% | 16.60% | 4.26% | 0.17 | 0.26 |
| Arkansas | 23.74% | 3.85% | 14.92% | 3.50% | 0.16 | 0.23 |
| California | 29.93% | 4.92% | 17.18% | 4.25% | 0.16 | 0.25 |
| Colorado | 29.08% | 4.25% | 18.36% | 3.69% | 0.15 | 0.20 |
| Connecticut | 27.23% | 3.14% | 14.66% | 2.68% | 0.12 | 0.18 |
| Delaware | 24.14% | 1.74% | 14.86% | 1.45% | 0.07 | 0.10 |
| Dist of Columbia | 33.23% | 2.25% | 17.92% | n/a | 0.07 | |
| Florida | 28.41% | 5.70% | 18.09% | 5.01% | 0.20 | 0.28 |
| Georgia | 29.09% | 4.06% | 17.02% | 3.60% | 0.14 | 0.21 |
| Hawaii | 30.18% | 6.91% | 19.32% | 6.17% | 0.23 | 0.32 |
| Idaho | 23.71% | 4.42% | 13.72% | 3.96% | 0.19 | 0.29 |
| Illinois | 29.74% | 4.08% | 16.53% | 3.69% | 0.14 | 0.22 |
| Indiana | 27.39% | 3.41% | 14.77% | 3.07% | 0.12 | 0.21 |
| Iowa | 26.98% | 3.17% | 14.04% | 2.86% | 0.12 | 0.20 |
| Kansas | 27.18% | 3.02% | 15.78% | 2.68% | 0.11 | 0.17 |
| Kentucky | 25.66% | 3.33% | 15.01% | 2.95% | 0.13 | 0.20 |
| Louisiana | 26.43% | 3.76% | 15.54% | 3.36% | 0.14 | 0.22 |
| Maine | 24.01% | 4.40% | 14.88% | 3.83% | 0.18 | 0.26 |
| Maryland | 30.98% | 4.63% | 17.24% | 3.99% | 0.15 | 0.23 |
| Massachusetts | 28.73% | 3.57% | 15.88% | 3.07% | 0.12 | 0.19 |
| Michigan | 29.59% | 3.68% | 15.61% | 3.29% | 0.12 | 0.21 |
| Minnesota | 27.92% | 3.52% | 14.71% | 3.15% | 0.13 | 0.21 |
| Mississippi | 25.11% | 4.79% | 15.67% | 4.27% | 0.19 | 0.27 |
| Missouri | 27.41% | 4.14% | 16.69% | 3.80% | 0.15 | 0.23 |
| Montana | 24.42% | 4.79% | 16.41% | 4.16% | 0.20 | 0.25 |
| Nebraska | 26.61% | 4.16% | 14.95% | 3.91% | 0.16 | 0.26 |
| Nevada | 28.13% | 5.86% | 15.36% | 5.17% | 0.21 | 0.34 |
| New Hampshire | 24.74% | 4.99% | 15.80% | 4.56% | 0.20 | 0.29 |
| New Jersey | 26.13% | 4.19% | 15.46% | 3.79% | 0.16 | 0.24 |
| New Mexico | 30.91% | 5.44% | 18.54% | 4.81% | 0.18 | 0.26 |
| New York | 29.59% | 4.10% | 15.74% | 3.55% | 0.14 | 0.23 |
| North Carolina | 27.06% | 4.43% | 16.14% | 4.02% | 0.16 | 0.25 |
| North Dakota | 23.25% | 3.12% | 11.87% | 2.74% | 0.13 | 0.23 |
| Ohio | 28.12% | 3.61% | 15.11% | 3.23% | 0.13 | 0.21 |
| Oklahoma | 25.73% | 4.69% | 15.97% | 4.25% | 0.18 | 0.27 |
| Oregon | 29.49% | 4.21% | 16.30% | 3.66% | 0.14 | 0.22 |
| Pennsylvania | 25.98% | 4.09% | 15.28% | 3.76% | 0.16 | 0.25 |
| Rhode Island | 26.52% | 5.48% | 14.40% | 4.92% | 0.21 | 0.34 |
| South Carolina | 26.22% | 4.29% | 15.55% | 3.86% | 0.16 | 0.25 |
| South Dakota | 22.40% | 2.58% | 13.61% | 2.31% | 0.12 | 0.17 |
| Tennessee | 25.96% | 4.04% | 14.78% | 3.61% | 0.16 | 0.24 |
| Texas | 27.02% | 3.63% | 17.43% | 3.18% | 0.13 | 0.18 |
| Utah | 25.12% | 4.06% | 12.69% | 3.66% | 0.16 | 0.29 |
| Vermont | 26.26% | 3.64% | 13.41% | 3.00% | 0.14 | 0.22 |

| State | Percentage of All Firms | Percentage of All Sales | Percentage of All Employers | Percentage of All Employer Sales | Disparity Ratio-All Firms | Disparity Ratio Employers |
|---------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Virginia | 29.66% | 3.96% | 17.35% | 3.52% | 0.13 | 0.20 |
| Washington | 29.40% | 3.88% | 16.21% | 3.41% | 0.13 | 0.21 |
| West Virginia | 27.68% | 3.82% | 14.76% | 3.38% | 0.14 | 0.23 |
| Wisconsin | 26.49% | 4.03% | 14.99% | 3.75% | 0.15 | 0.25 |
| Wyoming | 24.38% | 3.37% | 15.63% | n/a | 0.14 | |

Notes: See Table 1A..

Table 2A. Percentage of Firms and Sales and Corresponding Disparity Ratios, All Firms and Employer Firms, African Americans, Construction Industries, 2002

| State | Percentage of All Firms | Percentage of All Sales | Percentage of All Employers | Percentage of All Employer Sales | Disparity Ratio-All Firms | Disparity Ratio Employers |
|------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Alabama | 5.71% | 1.09% | 3.12% | 0.74% | 0.19 | 0.24 |
| Alaska | 0.44% | 0.13% | 0.23% | 0.11% | 0.30 | 0.46 |
| Arizona | 0.57% | 0.10% | 0.20% | 0.09% | 0.18 | 0.45 |
| Arkansas | 2.60% | 1.38% | n/a | n/a | 0.53 | |
| California | 2.10% | 0.47% | 1.05% | 0.40% | 0.22 | 0.38 |
| Colorado | 0.65% | 0.24% | n/a | n/a | 0.36 | |
| Connecticut | 2.13% | 0.39% | 0.97% | 0.28% | 0.18 | 0.28 |
| Delaware | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |
| Dist of Columbia | 34.90% | n/a | 17.16% | 7.05% | | 0.41 |
| Florida | 4.15% | 0.59% | 1.67% | 0.45% | 0.14 | 0.27 |
| Georgia | 6.19% | 1.68% | 2.96% | 1.42% | 0.27 | 0.48 |
| Hawaii | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |
| Idaho | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |
| Illinois | 2.79% | 0.80% | 0.94% | 0.74% | 0.29 | 0.79 |
| Indiana | 0.89% | 0.97% | 0.65% | 1.02% | 1.09 | 1.57 |
| Iowa | 0.22% | 0.15% | 0.13% | 0.14% | 0.68 | 1.04 |
| Kansas | 1.09% | 0.52% | 1.17% | 0.48% | 0.48 | 0.41 |
| Kentucky | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |
| Louisiana | 9.90% | 1.34% | 2.92% | 0.77% | 0.14 | 0.26 |
| Maine | 0.04% | n/a | 0.04% | n/a | | |
| Maryland | 7.12% | 2.05% | 2.69% | 1.82% | 0.29 | 0.68 |
| Massachusetts | 1.18% | 0.55% | 0.59% | 0.51% | 0.47 | 0.87 |
| Michigan | 1.64% | 1.33% | 0.85% | 1.32% | 0.81 | 1.55 |
| Minnesota | 0.73% | 0.18% | 0.11% | 0.15% | 0.25 | 1.40 |
| Mississippi | 10.47% | 2.14% | 5.65% | 0.98% | 0.20 | 0.17 |
| Missouri | 1.50% | 0.62% | 0.77% | 0.60% | 0.41 | 0.78 |
| Montana | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |
| Nebraska | 0.51% | n/a | 0.54% | n/a | | |
| Nevada | 1.18% | 0.37% | n/a | n/a | 0.31 | |
| New Hampshire | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |
| New Jersey | 2.42% | 0.58% | 1.31% | 0.47% | 0.24 | 0.36 |
| New Mexico | 0.60% | 0.16% | n/a | n/a | 0.27 | |
| New York | 4.86% | 0.77% | 1.52% | 0.67% | 0.16 | 0.44 |
| North Carolina | 4.22% | 0.87% | n/a | n/a | 0.21 | |
| North Dakota | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | | |
| Ohio | 2.04% | 1.45% | 1.37% | 1.50% | 0.71 | 1.10 |
| Oklahoma | 1.41% | 0.32% | 0.26% | 0.16% | 0.23 | 0.61 |
| Oregon | 0.41% | 0.30% | 0.38% | 0.31% | 0.74 | 0.80 |
| Pennsylvania | 1.41% | 0.38% | 0.54% | 0.35% | 0.27 | 0.64 |
| Rhode Island | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |
| South Carolina | 6.65% | 1.44% | 3.95% | 0.99% | 0.22 | 0.25 |
| South Dakota | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |
| Tennessee | 2.72% | 0.70% | 1.39% | 0.57% | 0.26 | 0.41 |
| Texas | 2.16% | 0.57% | 0.92% | 0.41% | 0.26 | 0.45 |
| Utah | 0.25% | 0.03% | 0.02% | n/a | 0.12 | |
| Vermont | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |

| State | Percentage of All Firms | Percentage of All Sales | Percentage of All Employers | Percentage of All Employer Sales | Disparity Ratio-All Firms | Disparity Ratio Employers |
|---------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Virginia | 4.10% | 1.05% | 2.71% | 0.88% | <i>0.26</i> | <i>0.33</i> |
| Washington | 0.55% | 0.28% | n/a | n/a | <i>0.52</i> | |
| West Virginia | 0.54% | 0.94% | 0.29% | 0.97% | <i>1.73</i> | <i>3.32</i> |
| Wisconsin | 0.54% | 0.40% | n/a | n/a | <i>0.75</i> | |
| Wyoming | 0.13% | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |

Notes: The disparity ratio is derived by dividing the percentage of sales by the corresponding percentage of firms. A disparity ratio of zero indicates complete disparity while a value of 1 indicates parity. Disparity ratios in italics are statistically significant at a 1-in-20 probability level or better. The Employer disparity ratio for Arizona and the All Firms disparity ratio for Arkansas are statistically significant at a 1-in-10 probability level.

Table 2B. Percentage of Firms and Sales and Corresponding Disparity Ratios, All Firms and Employer Firms, Hispanics and Latinos, Construction Industries, 2002

| State | Percentage of All Firms | Percentage of All Sales | Percentage of All Employers | Percentage of All Employer Sales | Disparity Ratio-All Firms | Disparity Ratio Employers |
|------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Alabama | 1.23% | 0.44% | 1.32% | 0.28% | 0.36 | 0.21 |
| Alaska | 2.20% | 0.86% | 2.50% | 0.81% | 0.39 | 0.32 |
| Arizona | 11.66% | 2.73% | 6.97% | 2.47% | 0.23 | 0.35 |
| Arkansas | 1.50% | 0.76% | 0.44% | 0.66% | 0.51 | 1.48 |
| California | 15.38% | 4.30% | 8.25% | 3.71% | 0.28 | 0.45 |
| Colorado | 7.35% | 2.61% | 5.50% | 2.22% | 0.36 | 0.40 |
| Connecticut | 3.50% | 0.64% | 1.67% | 0.44% | 0.18 | 0.26 |
| Delaware | 1.16% | 0.58% | 0.25% | 0.36% | 0.50 | 1.45 |
| Dist of Columbia | 19.76% | n/a | 10.65% | n/a | n/a | |
| Florida | 17.44% | 5.15% | 8.25% | 3.90% | 0.30 | 0.47 |
| Georgia | 5.77% | 1.39% | 1.95% | 0.62% | 0.24 | 0.32 |
| Hawaii | 3.40% | 1.31% | 3.05% | n/a | 0.38 | |
| Idaho | 2.01% | 1.63% | 1.93% | 1.67% | 0.81 | 0.87 |
| Illinois | 4.52% | 1.52% | 2.24% | 1.38% | 0.34 | 0.61 |
| Indiana | 1.67% | 0.73% | 0.97% | 0.62% | 0.44 | 0.64 |
| Iowa | 0.73% | 0.29% | 0.46% | 0.18% | 0.39 | 0.40 |
| Kansas | 2.49% | 1.53% | n/a | n/a | 0.61 | |
| Kentucky | 0.79% | 0.43% | 0.41% | 0.32% | 0.55 | 0.77 |
| Louisiana | 3.23% | 1.84% | 0.82% | 1.70% | 0.57 | 2.07 |
| Maine | 0.31% | 0.33% | 0.28% | 0.37% | 1.04 | 1.34 |
| Maryland | 8.43% | 1.89% | 3.13% | 1.44% | 0.22 | 0.46 |
| Massachusetts | 2.05% | 0.75% | 1.15% | 0.67% | 0.37 | 0.58 |
| Michigan | 1.33% | 0.75% | 0.95% | 0.70% | 0.57 | 0.73 |
| Minnesota | 0.88% | 0.42% | 0.67% | 0.35% | 0.47 | 0.52 |
| Mississippi | 0.75% | 0.57% | 0.31% | 0.49% | 0.76 | 1.59 |
| Missouri | 0.72% | 0.43% | 0.68% | 0.41% | 0.59 | 0.60 |
| Montana | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |
| Nebraska | 1.35% | 0.33% | n/a | n/a | 0.24 | |
| Nevada | 7.05% | 2.70% | 3.93% | 2.64% | 0.38 | 0.67 |
| New Hampshire | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |
| New Jersey | 6.97% | 2.13% | 3.33% | 1.83% | 0.31 | 0.55 |
| New Mexico | 29.50% | 17.20% | 25.44% | 15.39% | 0.58 | 0.60 |
| New York | 7.59% | 1.72% | 2.74% | 1.48% | 0.23 | 0.54 |
| North Carolina | 2.26% | 1.11% | 1.32% | 0.72% | 0.49 | 0.55 |
| North Dakota | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |
| Ohio | 0.76% | 0.32% | 0.58% | 0.27% | 0.42 | 0.47 |
| Oklahoma | 2.27% | 1.03% | 1.49% | 0.82% | 0.46 | 0.55 |
| Oregon | 1.69% | 1.10% | 1.92% | 1.10% | 0.65 | 0.57 |
| Pennsylvania | 1.22% | 0.36% | 0.65% | 0.28% | 0.29 | 0.44 |
| Rhode Island | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |
| South Carolina | 1.41% | 0.67% | 1.13% | 0.58% | 0.48 | 0.51 |
| South Dakota | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |
| Tennessee | 1.47% | 0.34% | 0.71% | 0.22% | 0.23 | 0.31 |
| Texas | 30.86% | 7.30% | 11.30% | 4.71% | 0.24 | 0.42 |
| Utah | 2.78% | 0.77% | 1.60% | 0.68% | 0.28 | 0.43 |
| Vermont | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |

| State | Percentage of All Firms | Percentage of All Sales | Percentage of All Employers | Percentage of All Employer Sales | Disparity Ratio-All Firms | Disparity Ratio Employers |
|---------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Virginia | 7.24% | 1.99% | 2.10% | 1.41% | 0.28 | 0.67 |
| Washington | 1.67% | 0.76% | 1.78% | 0.76% | 0.45 | 0.43 |
| West Virginia | 0.35% | 0.96% | 0.41% | 1.02% | 2.75 | 2.50 |
| Wisconsin | 0.70% | 0.37% | 0.58% | 0.35% | 0.53 | 0.61 |
| Wyoming | 1.23% | 0.44% | 1.32% | 0.28% | 0.36 | 0.21 |

Notes: See Table 2A. The Employer disparity ratio for Michigan is statistically significant at a 1-in-10 probability level.

Table 2C. Percentage of Firms and Sales and Corresponding Disparity Ratios, All Firms and Employer Firms, Asians, Construction Industries, 2002

| State | Percentage of All Firms | Percentage of All Sales | Percentage of All Employers | Percentage of All Employer Sales | Disparity Ratio-All Firms | Disparity Ratio Employers |
|------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Alabama | | | | | | |
| Alaska | 1.73% | 0.43% | 0.67% | 0.32% | 0.25 | 0.48 |
| Arizona | 0.55% | 0.14% | n/a | n/a | 0.25 | |
| Arkansas | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |
| California | 4.77% | 1.55% | 3.57% | 1.30% | 0.32 | 0.36 |
| Colorado | 0.88% | 0.21% | 0.54% | 0.17% | 0.24 | 0.31 |
| Connecticut | 0.30% | 0.26% | 0.27% | 0.27% | 0.86 | 1.01 |
| Delaware | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |
| Dist of Columbia | 2.69% | n/a | 6.80% | n/a | | |
| Florida | 0.75% | 0.36% | 0.45% | 0.35% | 0.48 | 0.78 |
| Georgia | 0.69% | 0.40% | n/a | n/a | 0.58 | |
| Hawaii | 37.27% | 27.68% | 35.62% | 27.67% | 0.74 | 0.78 |
| Idaho | 0.31% | 0.16% | 0.24% | 0.14% | 0.51 | 0.58 |
| Illinois | 0.80% | 0.60% | 0.65% | 0.59% | 0.74 | 0.90 |
| Indiana | 0.35% | 0.08% | n/a | n/a | 0.23 | |
| Iowa | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |
| Kansas | 0.32% | 0.06% | n/a | n/a | 0.19 | |
| Kentucky | 0.17% | 0.27% | 0.20% | 0.29% | 1.62 | 1.50 |
| Louisiana | 0.63% | 0.21% | n/a | n/a | 0.34 | |
| Maine | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |
| Maryland | 4.14% | 1.28% | 1.49% | | 0.31 | |
| Massachusetts | 1.21% | 1.03% | 0.54% | 1.03% | 0.85 | 1.90 |
| Michigan | 0.34% | 0.25% | 0.26% | 0.24% | 0.72 | 0.95 |
| Minnesota | 0.47% | 0.44% | n/a | n/a | 0.92 | |
| Mississippi | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |
| Missouri | 0.23% | 0.29% | 0.23% | n/a | 1.22 | |
| Montana | 0.18% | 0.15% | n/a | n/a | 0.87 | |
| Nebraska | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |
| Nevada | 1.11% | 0.48% | 0.70% | 0.47% | 0.44 | 0.66 |
| New Hampshire | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |
| New Jersey | 1.33% | 0.77% | 0.89% | n/a | 0.58 | |
| New Mexico | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |
| New York | 4.12% | 1.15% | 1.93% | 1.03% | 0.28 | 0.53 |
| North Carolina | 0.53% | 0.34% | 0.40% | 0.31% | 0.65 | 0.76 |
| North Dakota | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |
| Ohio | 0.43% | 0.39% | n/a | n/a | 0.91 | |
| Oklahoma | 0.57% | 0.10% | n/a | n/a | 0.18 | |
| Oregon | 0.86% | 0.30% | 0.67% | 0.25% | 0.35 | 0.38 |
| Pennsylvania | 0.72% | 0.23% | 0.23% | 0.20% | 0.32 | 0.88 |
| Rhode Island | 0.38% | 0.25% | 0.06% | n/a | 0.67 | |
| South Carolina | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |
| South Dakota | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |
| Tennessee | 0.47% | 0.16% | 0.32% | 0.13% | 0.35 | 0.39 |
| Texas | 1.02% | 0.40% | 0.69% | 0.36% | 0.39 | 0.52 |
| Utah | 0.42% | 0.66% | n/a | n/a | 1.57 | |
| Vermont | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |

| State | Percentage of All Firms | Percentage of All Sales | Percentage of All Employers | Percentage of All Employer Sales | Disparity Ratio-All Firms | Disparity Ratio Employers |
|---------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Virginia | 3.14% | 0.86% | 1.28% | 0.58% | 0.27 | 0.45 |
| Washington | 2.10% | 1.09% | 1.72% | 1.06% | 0.52 | 0.62 |
| West Virginia | 0.15% | 0.15% | n/a | n/a | 0.96 | |
| Wisconsin | 0.21% | 0.06% | n/a | n/a | 0.26 | |
| Wyoming | 0.13% | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |

Notes: See Table 2A. The Employer disparity ratio for Alaska and the All Firms disparity ratio for Michigan are statistically significant at a 1-in-10 probability level.

Table 2D. Percentage of Firms and Sales and Corresponding Disparity Ratios, All Firms and Employer Firms, Amer. Indians and Alaska Natives, Construction Industries, 2002

| State | Percentage of All Firms | Percentage of All Sales | Percentage of All Employers | Percentage of All Employer Sales | Disparity Ratio-All Firms | Disparity Ratio Employers |
|------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Alabama | 1.30% | 0.56% | 1.31% | 0.53% | 0.43 | 0.40 |
| Alaska | 5.08% | 15.03% | 5.24% | 15.67% | 2.96 | 2.99 |
| Arizona | 2.05% | 0.56% | 0.80% | 0.51% | 0.27 | 0.64 |
| Arkansas | 1.81% | 1.53% | 1.19% | 1.51% | 0.84 | 1.26 |
| California | 2.15% | 0.70% | 1.27% | 0.62% | 0.33 | 0.49 |
| Colorado | 1.18% | 0.31% | 0.87% | 0.24% | 0.26 | 0.28 |
| Connecticut | 0.53% | 0.09% | n/a | n/a | 0.16 | |
| Delaware | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |
| Dist of Columbia | 0.75% | n/a | 0.00% | 0.00% | | |
| Florida | 1.00% | 0.17% | n/a | n/a | 0.17 | |
| Georgia | 1.03% | 0.17% | 0.26% | 0.03% | 0.16 | 0.12 |
| Hawaii | 0.54% | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |
| Idaho | 1.47% | 0.84% | n/a | n/a | 0.57 | |
| Illinois | 0.33% | 0.13% | 0.22% | 0.12% | 0.39 | 0.55 |
| Indiana | 0.20% | 0.23% | n/a | n/a | 1.16 | |
| Iowa | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |
| Kansas | 1.21% | 0.71% | 0.90% | 0.69% | 0.59 | 0.77 |
| Kentucky | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |
| Louisiana | 1.05% | 0.29% | n/a | n/a | 0.28 | |
| Maine | 0.81% | 0.18% | n/a | n/a | 0.22 | |
| Maryland | 2.07% | 0.32% | n/a | n/a | 0.15 | |
| Massachusetts | 0.67% | 0.07% | 0.29% | 0.05% | 0.11 | 0.18 |
| Michigan | 0.95% | 0.34% | 0.48% | 0.31% | 0.36 | 0.65 |
| Minnesota | 0.66% | 0.21% | 0.42% | 0.20% | 0.32 | 0.48 |
| Mississippi | 0.38% | 0.03% | n/a | n/a | 0.08 | |
| Missouri | 1.36% | 0.39% | n/a | n/a | 0.28 | |
| Montana | 2.30% | 1.91% | 1.81% | 1.99% | 0.83 | 1.10 |
| Nebraska | 0.33% | 0.29% | 0.20% | 0.28% | 0.86 | 1.36 |
| Nevada | 2.07% | 0.29% | 1.10% | 0.26% | 0.14 | 0.23 |
| New Hampshire | 0.79% | 0.38% | n/a | n/a | 0.47 | |
| New Jersey | 0.38% | n/a | 0.16% | n/a | | |
| New Mexico | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |
| New York | 0.96% | 0.19% | 0.38% | 0.14% | 0.20 | 0.37 |
| North Carolina | 1.34% | 0.48% | 0.95% | 0.38% | 0.36 | 0.40 |
| North Dakota | 1.93% | 1.02% | 1.68% | 1.00% | 0.53 | 0.60 |
| Ohio | 0.48% | 0.15% | n/a | n/a | 0.32 | |
| Oklahoma | 8.30% | 5.39% | 5.00% | 4.75% | 0.65 | 0.95 |
| Oregon | 1.36% | 0.64% | 1.03% | 0.60% | 0.47 | 0.58 |
| Pennsylvania | 0.37% | 0.08% | 0.23% | 0.07% | 0.21 | 0.28 |
| Rhode Island | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |
| South Carolina | 0.58% | 0.17% | n/a | n/a | 0.29 | |
| South Dakota | 2.65% | 1.74% | 1.85% | 1.79% | 0.66 | 0.97 |
| Tennessee | 1.03% | 0.35% | n/a | n/a | 0.34 | |
| Texas | 1.09% | 0.57% | 0.91% | 0.54% | 0.53 | 0.60 |
| Utah | 0.92% | 0.22% | 0.48% | 0.18% | 0.23 | 0.37 |
| Vermont | 0.91% | 0.38% | 0.31% | 0.27% | 0.42 | 0.85 |

| State | Percentage of All Firms | Percentage of All Sales | Percentage of All Employers | Percentage of All Employer Sales | Disparity Ratio-All Firms | Disparity Ratio Employers |
|---------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Virginia | 0.75% | 0.30% | 0.40% | 0.20% | 0.40 | 0.50 |
| Washington | 1.06% | 0.66% | 0.92% | 0.63% | 0.62 | 0.68 |
| West Virginia | 0.55% | 0.13% | 0.09% | 0.12% | 0.24 | 1.33 |
| Wisconsin | 0.57% | 0.32% | 0.31% | 0.31% | 0.55 | 1.00 |
| Wyoming | 1.82% | 0.84% | n/a | n/a | 0.46 | |

Notes: See Table 2A. The Employer disparity ratio for Arizona and the All Firms disparity ratio for New Hampshire and Washington are statistically significant at a 1-in-10 probability level.

Table 2E. Percentage of Firms and Sales and Corresponding Disparity Ratios, All Firms and Employer Firms, Native Hawaiians and Pac. Islanders, Construction Industries, 2002

| State | Percentage of All Firms | Percentage of All Sales | Percentage of All Employers | Percentage of All Employer Sales | Disparity Ratio-All Firms | Disparity Ratio Employers |
|------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Alabama | 0.00% | n/a | 0.01% | n/a | | |
| Alaska | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |
| Arizona | 0.14% | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |
| Arkansas | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |
| California | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |
| Colorado | 0.14% | 0.03% | 0.09% | n/a | 0.24 | |
| Connecticut | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |
| Delaware | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | | |
| Dist of Columbia | 0.06% | n/a | 0.00% | 0.00% | | |
| Florida | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |
| Georgia | 0.03% | 0.03% | 0.07% | 0.03% | 0.89 | 0.44 |
| Hawaii | 12.87% | 4.66% | n/a | n/a | 0.36 | |
| Idaho | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |
| Illinois | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |
| Indiana | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |
| Iowa | 0.01% | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |
| Kansas | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | | |
| Kentucky | 0.01% | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |
| Louisiana | 0.00% | n/a | 0.01% | n/a | | |
| Maine | 0.01% | n/a | 0.04% | n/a | | |
| Maryland | 0.01% | n/a | 0.01% | n/a | | |
| Massachusetts | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |
| Michigan | 0.00% | n/a | 0.01% | n/a | | |
| Minnesota | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |
| Mississippi | 0.02% | 0.02% | 0.02% | n/a | 0.74 | |
| Missouri | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |
| Montana | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | | |
| Nebraska | 0.01% | n/a | 0.00% | 0.00% | | |
| Nevada | 0.06% | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |
| New Hampshire | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |
| New Jersey | 0.03% | n/a | 0.07% | n/a | | |
| New Mexico | 0.01% | n/a | 0.02% | n/a | | |
| New York | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |
| North Carolina | 0.01% | 0.00% | n/a | n/a | 0.47 | |
| North Dakota | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | | |
| Ohio | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |
| Oklahoma | 0.50% | 0.06% | n/a | n/a | 0.11 | |
| Oregon | 0.08% | 0.09% | n/a | n/a | 1.05 | |
| Pennsylvania | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |
| Rhode Island | 0.02% | n/a | 0.00% | 0.00% | | |
| South Carolina | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |
| South Dakota | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | | |
| Tennessee | 0.00% | n/a | 0.01% | n/a | | |
| Texas | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |
| Utah | 0.17% | 0.82% | n/a | n/a | 4.85 | |
| Vermont | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | | |

| State | Percentage of All Firms | Percentage of All Sales | Percentage of All Employers | Percentage of All Employer Sales | Disparity Ratio-All Firms | Disparity Ratio Employers |
|---------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Virginia | 0.02% | n/a | 0.05% | n/a | | |
| Washington | 0.13% | n/a | 0.18% | n/a | | |
| West Virginia | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | | |
| Wisconsin | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | |
| Wyoming | 0.03% | n/a | 0.00% | 0.00% | | |

Notes: See Table 2A. The Employer disparity ratio for Georgia is statistically significant at a 1-in-10 probability level.

Table 2F. Percentage of Firms and Sales and Corresponding Disparity Ratios, All Firms and Employers Firms, Women, Construction Industries, 2002

| State | Percentage of All Firms | Percentage of All Sales | Percentage of All Employers | Percentage of All Employer Sales | Disparity Ratio-All Firms | Disparity Ratio Employers |
|------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Alabama | 7.45% | 3.97% | 6.96% | 3.75% | 0.53 | 0.54 |
| Alaska | 10.30% | 8.39% | n/a | n/a | 0.81 | |
| Arizona | 7.47% | 4.69% | 7.23% | 4.34% | 0.63 | 0.60 |
| Arkansas | 7.37% | 4.05% | 5.55% | 4.11% | 0.55 | 0.74 |
| California | 5.98% | 4.97% | 5.65% | 4.95% | 0.83 | 0.88 |
| Colorado | 7.85% | 3.99% | 7.32% | 3.89% | 0.51 | 0.53 |
| Connecticut | 6.85% | 5.69% | 7.03% | 5.68% | 0.83 | 0.81 |
| Delaware | 5.19% | 4.30% | 7.36% | n/a | 0.83 | |
| Dist of Columbia | 5.25% | n/a | 10.36% | n/a | | |
| Florida | 8.33% | 5.31% | 7.38% | 5.05% | 0.64 | 0.68 |
| Georgia | 6.96% | 3.76% | 6.49% | 3.53% | 0.54 | 0.54 |
| Hawaii | 8.03% | 3.62% | 5.93% | 3.56% | 0.45 | 0.60 |
| Idaho | 6.89% | 4.92% | 5.88% | 4.97% | 0.71 | 0.84 |
| Illinois | 8.92% | 7.87% | 10.83% | 8.12% | 0.88 | 0.75 |
| Indiana | 7.45% | 4.32% | 5.85% | 4.36% | 0.58 | 0.75 |
| Iowa | 6.74% | 4.59% | 4.60% | 4.60% | 0.68 | 1.00 |
| Kansas | 6.57% | 4.57% | n/a | n/a | 0.70 | |
| Kentucky | 7.62% | 5.30% | 6.75% | 5.29% | 0.70 | 0.78 |
| Louisiana | 7.06% | 5.64% | 7.89% | 5.66% | 0.80 | 0.72 |
| Maine | 6.12% | 5.45% | 5.47% | 5.32% | 0.89 | 0.97 |
| Maryland | 8.14% | 5.46% | 7.75% | 5.40% | 0.67 | 0.70 |
| Massachusetts | 6.44% | 4.00% | 6.31% | 3.98% | 0.62 | 0.63 |
| Michigan | 8.01% | 4.98% | 6.49% | 4.94% | 0.62 | 0.76 |
| Minnesota | 6.61% | 3.98% | 6.49% | 3.93% | 0.60 | 0.61 |
| Mississippi | 5.14% | 5.70% | 6.12% | 5.07% | 1.11 | 0.83 |
| Missouri | 8.21% | 5.50% | 8.05% | 5.57% | 0.67 | 0.69 |
| Montana | 7.09% | 5.34% | 7.35% | 5.49% | 0.75 | 0.75 |
| Nebraska | 4.55% | 3.13% | 4.22% | 3.21% | 0.69 | 0.76 |
| Nevada | 9.79% | 5.22% | 9.21% | 5.09% | 0.53 | 0.55 |
| New Hampshire | 3.38% | 4.64% | 3.35% | 5.22% | 1.37 | 1.56 |
| New Jersey | 7.37% | 7.55% | 7.76% | 7.78% | 1.02 | 1.00 |
| New Mexico | 10.34% | 6.92% | n/a | n/a | 0.67 | |
| New York | 8.11% | 6.65% | 8.51% | 6.71% | 0.82 | 0.79 |
| North Carolina | 8.05% | 5.30% | 7.64% | 5.24% | 0.66 | 0.69 |
| North Dakota | 4.80% | n/a | 5.56% | n/a | | |
| Ohio | 7.55% | 5.05% | 8.00% | 5.16% | 0.67 | 0.65 |
| Oklahoma | 7.37% | 5.40% | 6.61% | 5.69% | 0.73 | 0.86 |
| Oregon | 6.29% | 3.72% | 5.84% | 3.60% | 0.59 | 0.62 |
| Pennsylvania | 6.18% | 4.79% | 7.01% | 4.98% | 0.77 | 0.71 |
| Rhode Island | 6.96% | 10.55% | 7.80% | 11.20% | 1.52 | 1.44 |
| South Carolina | 6.66% | 5.45% | 5.55% | 5.50% | 0.82 | 0.99 |
| South Dakota | 6.48% | 4.21% | 3.90% | 4.26% | 0.65 | 1.09 |
| Tennessee | 8.30% | 3.99% | 6.40% | 3.69% | 0.48 | 0.58 |
| Texas | 7.22% | 5.15% | 9.19% | 5.18% | 0.71 | 0.56 |
| Utah | 6.66% | 3.61% | 5.06% | 3.59% | 0.54 | 0.71 |
| Vermont | 6.20% | n/a | 2.67% | n/a | | |

| State | Percentage of All Firms | Percentage of All Sales | Percentage of All Employers | Percentage of All Employer Sales | Disparity Ratio-All Firms | Disparity Ratio Employers |
|---------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Virginia | 6.81% | 4.59% | 6.97% | 4.58% | 0.67 | 0.66 |
| Washington | 6.87% | 3.37% | 5.42% | 3.26% | 0.49 | 0.60 |
| West Virginia | 6.03% | 7.84% | 7.75% | 7.96% | 1.30 | 1.03 |
| Wisconsin | 6.52% | 5.63% | 5.49% | 5.87% | 0.86 | 1.07 |
| Wyoming | 7.77% | 6.60% | 9.07% | 6.69% | 0.85 | 0.74 |

Notes: See Table 2A.. The Employer disparity ratio for Arkansas, Hawaii, and Nebraska and the All Firms disparity ratio for Idaho, Illinois, and Montana are statistically significant at a 1-in-10 probability level.