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The purpose of this publication is to report findings from a statewide survey of women of Kentucky regarding their demographic and economic characteristics. Research findings are based on data gathered from respondents selected using a standard practice random digit dialing telephone survey procedure that resulted in a statewide sample of 1,000 women, 18 to 62 years of age, where 50% are from households below two times the federal poverty guideline and 50% are from households at or above two times the Federal poverty guideline for a family of their size. These sample eligibility criteria result in the use of the terms poor and non-poor, respectively, which have been derived to reflect a broader range of income inadequacy experienced by individuals and families than the usual reference to poverty.

- General patterns were detected for indicators of family of origin substance use, conflict, or violence when growing up, verbal abuse, family of origin physical abuse, adult relationship physical abuse, sexual abuse experiences, mental health status, and alcohol and drug use.

- For non-poor women living in metro areas of Kentucky, no statistically significant differences were found for the indicators of family of origin substance use, conflict, or violence when growing up, verbal abuse, family of origin physical abuse, adult relationship physical abuse, sexual abuse experiences, mental health status, and alcohol and drug use. However, sexual abuse experiences were statistically different for non-poor metro married and not married women.

- For poor and non-poor women living in metro and non-metro areas of Kentucky, a majority of indicators of abuse, mental health status, and substance use were found to have higher percentages of not married women than married women reporting at least one incident.

- For both poor and non-poor women residing in metro or non-metro areas of the Commonwealth, income was statistically significantly different between married and not married women.

- For non-poor metro women, not married women were younger than married women.

- For poor metro and non-metro women of Kentucky, a greater percentage of white women were married than for other races, especially African American women.

- While the data indicate that a greater percentage of poor women reported low educational levels and a greater percentage of non-poor women reported the higher educational levels, there were no statistically significant differences within poor and non-poor women in metro and non-metro areas when comparing the educational levels of married and not married women.

- For poor non-metro women, married women had higher part-time employment than not married women. For non-poor metro women, married women had a higher percentage not employed and not married had a higher percentage of full-time employment.

- For poor and non-poor, metro and non-metro women, income was statistically different for married and not married women with a greater percentage of high incomes among married women.

The Women of Kentucky series publication titled *Abuse, Mental Health, and Substance Use* focuses on these maladies from a statewide perspective. Background information provided there regarding the incidence and the interrelatedness of abuse, mental health issues, and substance use are applicable here. Also, many of the issues related to geographic remoteness and isolation discussed in the *Women in Kentucky* publication subtitled *Appalachian and Non-Appalachian Differences* can also be extrapolated to rural and urban geographic areas.
Introduction

The purpose of the Women of Kentucky publication series is to provide information about women in Kentucky that is not otherwise available. The purpose of this publication is to illustrate and discuss the differences in reported demographic and economic characteristics and the incidence of family of origin abuse, adult abuse, mental health problems, and substance abuse for poor and non-poor for women residing in metro and non-metro counties in Kentucky. Women of Kentucky Economic Differences: Introduction and Overview (Heath, 2008) provides details.

Economic Differences

Economic differences are defined as poor and non-poor economic status. Women who are poor live in a household where the total dollar income of the household is less than two times the federally determined poverty guideline amount for the size and composition of their family. Alternatively, women who are non-poor live in a household where the total dollar income of the household is equal to or greater than two times the federally determined poverty guideline amount for the size and composition of their family (http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/poverty/povdef.html). For the purpose of these publications, the use of the terms poor and, alternatively, non-poor have been derived to reflect a broader range of income inadequacy experienced by individuals and families than the usual reference to poverty. There is common use regarding these terms, poor and non-poor, and justifications for the definitions and use.

Marital Differences

The relevance of marital status derives from the language and aims of the same welfare legislation that determines benefits for eligible families. States can use TANF funding for programs that strengthen and encourage two-parent families (http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ofa/goals.htm). Additionally, the Deficit Reduction Act provides funding of $150 million per year for healthy marriage and responsible fatherhood initiatives (http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ofa/mission.htm). Given the emphasis on supporting and promoting healthy marriages funded by welfare reform legislated funding, the importance of the combined status of whether a woman is currently married, or alternatively, currently not married, is especially important relevant to a woman’s economic status.

Sample and Data Collection

Data were gathered in spring of 2004 from female respondents using a standard random digit dialing procedure that resulted in a statewide sample of 1,000 women in Kentucky between the ages of 18 and 62 with the additional eligibility criteria being that 50 percent (n=500) would be from households below two times the Federal Poverty Guideline for a household of their size and the other 50 percent (n=500) would be from households at or above two times the Federal Poverty Guideline for a household of their size (Heath, 2008). These eligibility criteria assigned the respondent’s household into either the poor or non-poor sub-sample (income less than 200% of the Federal Poverty Guideline or equal to or greater than 200% of the Federal Poverty Guideline, respectively).

Geographic Differences

In this publication, differences for women who reside in the metro compared to the non-metro counties of Kentucky are reported. Geographic location reflects differential 1] access to products and services; 2] levels of economic development, employment, and income sources; and 3] levels of remoteness and isolation. These factors have differential influences on women's experiences and perceptions.

Metro and non-metro counties were determined using the 2003 rural-urban continuum codes that classify metropolitan counties (codes 1 - 3) by size of the Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA), and nonmetropolitan counties (codes 4 – 9) by degree of urbanization and proximity to metro areas. For this report, these definitions are the basis for metro and non-metro, respectively.

For further information see rural-urban continuum codes at http://www.ers.usda.gov/Data/RuralUrbanContinuumCodes/. For Kentucky, 35 of the 120 counties are considered metro. Six of Kentucky’s counties are not included in the dataset. See the map and listing of counties on page 5.
Metro and Non-Metro Areas of Kentucky


Metro Counties of Kentucky Not Represented in Dataset (1): Henry

• Metro areas of Kentucky consist of 35 counties of Kentucky’s 120—29% of the counties are metro.

• Counties not in the dataset used for this study represent 2.9% (1 of 35) of the metro counties and 5.9% (5 of 85) of the non-metro counties.


Non-Metro Counties of Kentucky Not Represented in Dataset (5): Casey, Clinton, Lyon, Owsley, Wolfe
Metro and Non-Metro Kentucky

There are social and economic factors unique to metro and unique to non-metro settings in Kentucky. These factors and geographic location—remoteness and isolation in rural areas—have an impact on the incidence of domestic violence, mental health, and substance use for poor and non-poor women. There are also metro and non-metro differences in availability of services. This publication is designed to provide resources about metro and non-metro Kentucky and information about metro and non-metro differences of poor and non-poor women who are married and not married to be able to highlight these demographic and economic differences along with abuse, mental health, and substance use experiences of these women of Kentucky.

As illustrated in the table on the right, the Economic Research Service has adopted the Office of Management and Budget’s 2003 classification of urban (metro) and rural (non-metro) definitions. Likewise, the map on page 5 illustrates metro and non-metro counties in Kentucky—lighter counties are urban/metro¹.

The Women of Kentucky series publication titled Abuse, Mental Health, and Substance Use focuses on these maladies from a statewide perspective. Background information provided there regarding the incidence and the interrelatedness of abuse, mental health issues, and substance use are applicable here. Also, many of the issues related to geographic remoteness and isolation discussed in the Women in Kentucky publication subtitled Appalachian and Non-Appalachian Differences can be extrapolated to rural and urban geographic areas, respectively. The Appalachian culture dominates the rural areas in the eastern half of Kentucky; while, the western half of the state contains all except three of the metro areas: Boyd, Clark, and Greenup. Therefore, Kentucky’s rural geography extends beyond Appalachian rural and beyond the Appalachian culture.

¹The rural-urban continuum codes classify metropolitan counties by size of the Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) and nonmetropolitan counties by degree of urbanization and proximity to metro areas. In this publication the only distinction is between metro and non-metro without regard for varying degrees of rurality among non-metro counties. An alternative use of degrees of urbanization and proximity relative to metro areas is found in Reeser, C. and Heath, C. J. (2007).

Abuse, Mental Health, and Substance Use Measures

The sexual abuse item was adapted from Kilpatrick, D. J., Edmunds, C. N., & Seymour, A. (1992). Verbal abuse and physical abuse items were adapted from Straus, M. (1979) and Straus, M; Hamby, S. L.; Boney-McCoy, S.; and Sugarman, D. B. (1996). Both sexual abuse and physical abuse items were similar to those of Tjaden and Thoennes (2000) and were derived from the same sources as above. Mental health measures were adapted from the American Psychiatric Association’s (APA) DSM-IV-TR (APA, 2000). Substance abuse measures were adapted from Hoffmann, N. G., Hunt, D. E., Rhodes, W. M., Riley, K. J. (2003).
**Background Characteristics & References**

**Companion Publications**

Two companion publications—Appalachian and Non-Appalachian Influences and Abuse, Mental Health, and Substance Use provide background literature regarding abuse, mental health and substance abuse that supports this publication. Additionally, these same publications provide prevention, intervention, and treatment suggestions as well as education and policy implications.

**Background Characteristics**

Within each sample of poor and non-poor women of Kentucky, whether the women reside in metro or non-metro areas of the state contributes to differences in reported characteristics between married and not married women. The table on the following page illustrates some of those differences (see Table 1). Only statistically significant differences are discussed.

- For both poor and non-poor women residing in metro or non-metro areas of the Commonwealth income was statistically significantly different between married and not married women.
- For non-poor metro women, not married women were younger than married women.
- For poor metro and non-metro women of Kentucky, a greater percentage of white women were married than for other races, especially African American women.
- While the data indicate that a greater percentage of poor women reported low educational levels and a greater percentage of non-poor women reported the higher educational levels, there were no statistically significant differences within poor and non-poor women in metro and non-metro areas when comparing the educational levels of married and not married women.
- For poor non-metro women, married women had higher part-time employment than not married women. For non-poor metro women, married women had a higher percentage not employed and not married had a higher percentage of full-time employment.
- For poor and non-poor, metro and non-metro women, income was statistically different for married and not married women with a greater percentage of high incomes among married women.

**References**


### Table 1: Means of Background Characteristics by Economic, Geographic, and Marital Status Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Poor Women</th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Poor Women</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>Non-Metro</td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>Non-Metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-62</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race or Ethnic Background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>87.4%</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
<td>96.4%</td>
<td>85.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than HS</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Diploma or Vo-tech</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.S.</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate or Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Employed, Retired or Unemployed</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed Part-Time</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed Full-Time</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $5,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000-$9,999</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000-$14,999</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000-$19,999</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000-$24,999</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000-$29,999</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000-$34,999</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000-$39,999</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000-$44,999</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$45,000-$49,999</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000-$59,999</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,000-$69,999</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$70,000-$79,999</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,000-$89,999</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$90,000 or more</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For poor women of Kentucky, family of origin substance abuse, violence, and/or conflict was only statistically different regarding violence among members of the family of origin household for non-metro women.

For non-poor women, family of origin substance abuse, violence, and/or conflict was not statistically different between married and not married metro or non-metro women.

**Chart 1: Substance Abuse, Violence, and Conflict in Family of Origin for Poor Women**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Metro Married Women</th>
<th>Metro Not Married Women</th>
<th>Non-Metro Married Women</th>
<th>Non-Metro Not Married Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When growing up:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone in the household had a drug or substance abuse problem.</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There was conflict or arguing among adults in the household.</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There was violence among members of the household.</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chart 2: Substance Abuse, Violence, and Conflict in Family of Origin for Non-Poor Women**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Metro Married Women</th>
<th>Metro Not Married Women</th>
<th>Non-Metro Married Women</th>
<th>Non-Metro Not Married Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When growing up:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone in the household had a drug or substance abuse problem.</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There was conflict or arguing among adults in the household.</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There was violence among members of the household.</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicators of Verbal Abuse

Statistical differences exist between married and not married poor women in Kentucky regarding being called fat or ugly, being insulted or sworn at, and being threatened to be hit or have something thrown at her for women residing in metro and non-metro areas of Kentucky.

Chart 3: Indicators of Verbal Abuse for Poor Women

Chart 4: Indicators of Verbal Abuse for Non-Poor Women

For non-poor non-metro women, married and not married women are statistically different regarding having been called fat or ugly by a partner.
Family of Origin Physical Abuse

For poor women, family of origin physical abuse is statistically different between married an not married women residing in a metro area regarding a parent, stepparent, or guardian having choked or attempted to drown her. Among non-poor women residing in non-metro areas of Kentucky, they report statistically different percentages of having been hit with some object and having been beaten up by a parent, stepparent, or guardian while a child.

For non-poor women, no indicators of family of origin physical abuse are statistically different between married and not married women residing in a metro area. Among women residing in non-metro areas of Kentucky, they report statistically different percentages of women reporting having had their hair pulled, having been kicked or bitten, threatened with a weapon, or having had a weapon used on them by a parent, stepparent, or guardian while a child.
For poor married and not married women residing in metro areas of Kentucky, statistical differences were reported regarding as an adult having their hair pulled, being slapped or hit, or being hit with an object by another adult. For poor married and not married women in non-metro areas, differences were reported for all indicators of adult physical abuse, except having had a weapon used on them.

Non-poor women living in metro areas of the Commonwealth report no statistical differences between married and not married women regarding any of the indicators of abuse physical abuse. Non-poor women living in non-metro areas report statistical differences between married and not married women regarding most of the adult abuse indicators: having something thrown at them that could hurt; being pushed, grabbed, or shoved; being slapped or hit; being kicked or bitten; being chocked or an attempt to drown her; being hit with an object; or being beaten up by an adult.
Sexual Abuse Experiences

Poor married and not married women living in non-metro areas report statistically significantly different percentages for having experienced sexual abuse at some time in their lives. Non-poor metro residing women report statistically significantly different percentages for having experienced sexual abuse at some time in their lives. In each of these comparisons not married women report higher percentages of sexual abuse than for married women.

Chart 9: Sexual Abuse Experiences for Poor Women

Chart 10: Sexual Abuse Experiences for Non-Poor Women
Both poor and non-poor women of Kentucky report higher levels of depression; anxiety or tension; and trouble understanding, concentrating, and remembering than their percentages for trouble controlling behavior, serious thoughts of suicide, or having been prescribed medication for psychological or emotional problems. For poor women the percent of not married women exceeds the percent of married women reporting each mental health indicator. For poor metro women, statistical differences were reported between married and not married women regarding serious depression, trouble controlling violent behavior, serious thoughts of suicide, and having been prescribed medication of psychological or emotional problems. For poor non-metro women, statistical differences exist for serious depression, serious anxiety or tension, trouble concentrating or remembering things, serious thoughts of suicide, and recent prescriptions for psychological or emotional problems.

Non-poor women report no statistical differences regarding mental health indicators between married and not married women whether residing in metro or non-metro areas of the state.
Alcohol and Drug Abuse Indicators

Not married women report a greater percentage of each alcohol and drug use indicator for all indicators across poor and non-poor, metro and non-metro women. Among poor women all indicators are statistically different between married and not married women living in both metro and non-metro areas of the state.

For non-poor women, the only statistically different indicator of alcohol and drug use between married and not married women is for metro women regarding use of alcohol or drugs to relieve emotional discomfort.

Chart 13: Alcohol and Drug Indicators—Poor Women

Chart 14: Alcohol and Drug Indicators—Non-Poor Women
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