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## County Employment and Wages in Oklahoma - Second Quarter 2011

Employment rose in Oklahoma's two large counties from June 2010 to June 2011, the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics reported today. (Large counties are defined as those with employment of 75,000 or more as measured by 2010 annual average employment.) Regional Commissioner Stanley W. Suchman noted that employment in Oklahoma County increased 2.1 percent, while Tulsa County rose at a slower 0.3percent rate. (See table 1.)

Employment nationwide advanced 0.9 percent during the 12 -month period as 215 of the 322 largest U.S. counties registered increases. Ottawa, Mich., recorded the fastest employment gain in the country, up 4.7 percent, with the manufacturing sector making the largest contribution to the increase. San Joaquin, Calif., experienced the largest over-the-year decrease, down 4.0 percent.

Oklahoma's two large counties accounted for half of the state's total employment, with 420,135 in Oklahoma County and 328,550 in Tulsa County in June 2011. Nationwide, the 322 largest counties made up 70.5 percent of U.S. total employment.

From the second quarter of 2010 to the second quarter of 2011, average weekly wages rose 5.3 percent in Oklahoma County and 4.2 percent in Tulsa County. (See table 1.) Oklahoma County had the higher of the two average weekly wages at $\$ 832$ per week, closely followed by Tulsa at $\$ 816$. Nationally, average weekly wages increased 3.0 percent over the year to $\$ 891$.

Employment and wage levels (but not over-the-year changes) are also available for the 75 counties in Oklahoma with employment below 75,000 . Wage levels in all of these counties were below the national average. (See table 2.)

## Large county wage changes

Oklahoma County's 5.3-percent rise in average weekly wages from the second quarter of 2010 to the second quarter of 2011 ranked $19^{\text {th }}$ among the nation's largest counties. Tulsa's 4.2 -percent wage gain ranked $52^{\text {nd }}$. Over-the-year wage growth rates in both of these counties were notably higher than the national average of 3.0 percent. (See table 1.)

Nationally, 307 of the 322 largest counties registered over-the-year wages increases. Williamson, Texas, experienced the largest wage gain in the nation, up 18.0 percent. Within Williamson, the trade, transportation, and utilities industry had the largest impact on the county's over-the-year increase in average weekly wages. Middlesex, Mass. had the second largest overall increase ( 10.2 percent), followed by Harford, Md. and Santa Clara, Calif. (8.8 and 8.5 percent, respectively).

Nationwide, 11 of the largest counties registered wage declines during the period. Champaign, Ill., experienced the largest decrease in average weekly wages with a loss of 3.6 percent over the year; large declines within education and health services wages contributed significantly to this county's overall average weekly wage loss. Benton, Ark., had the second largest overall decline, followed by Rutherford, Tenn., New York, N.Y., and Elkhart, Ind.

## Large county average weekly wages

Although below the national average of $\$ 891$ per week, average weekly wages in the state's two large counties placed in the middle third of the national ranking. In the second quarter of 2011, Oklahoma County's average wage (\$832) ranked $157^{\text {th }}$ and Tulsa County (\$816) ranked $171^{\text {st }}$. (See table 1.)

Average weekly wages were higher than the national average (\$891) in 107 of the 322 largest U.S. counties. Santa Clara, Calif., held the top position among the highest-paid large counties with an average weekly wage of $\$ 1,743$. New York, N.Y., was second with an average weekly wage of $\$ 1,645$, followed by Arlington, Va. $(\$ 1,553)$, and Washington, D.C. $(\$ 1,541)$.

Two-thirds of the largest U.S. counties (215) reported average weekly wages below the national average in the second quarter of 2011. The lowest wage was reported in Horry, S.C. (\$526), followed by the Texas counties of Hidalgo (\$571) and Cameron (\$572). Wages in these lowest-ranked counties were less than one-third of the average weekly wage reported for the highest-ranked county, Santa Clara, Calif. $(\$ 1,743)$.

## Average weekly wages in Oklahoma's smaller counties

All 75 of Oklahoma's smaller counties - those with employment of less than 75,000 - reported weekly wages below the national average of $\$ 891$ in the second quarter of 2011. Among these counties, Washington (\$791) and Stephens (\$765) posted the highest wages, while Cimarron reported the lowest average weekly wage in the state (\$457). (See table 2.)

When all 77 counties in Oklahoma were considered, 8 reported average wages under $\$ 550$ per week, 18 registered wages from $\$ 550$ to $\$ 599,22$ had wages from $\$ 600$ to $\$ 649$, 14 had wages from $\$ 650$ to $\$ 699$, and 15 had wages of $\$ 700$ or more. (See chart 1.) The higher-paying counties were concentrated around the larger metropolitan areas of Oklahoma City and Tulsa, as well as smaller cities including Duncan, Elk City, McAlester, and Wilburton. The lower-paying counties, those with weekly wages under $\$ 550$, were generally located in the eastern third of the state.

## Additional statistics and other information

QCEW data for states have been included in this release in table 3. For additional information about quarterly employment and wages data, please read the Technical Note or visit www.bls.gov/cew. QCEW data in this release are based on the 2012 North American Industry Classification System. Data for 2011 are preliminary and subject to revision.

Employment and Wages Annual Averages Online features comprehensive information by detailed industry on establishments, employment, and wages for the nation and all states. The 2010 edition of this publication contains selected data produced by Business Employment Dynamics (BED) on job gains and losses, as well as selected data from the first quarter 2011 version of the news release. Tables and additional content from Employment and Wages Annual Averages 2010 are now available online at www.bls.gov/cew/cewbultn10.htm. Information in this release will be made available to sensory impaired individuals upon request. Voice phone: 202-691-5200; TDD message referral phone number: 1-800-877-8339.

For personal assistance or further information on the Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages Program, as well as other Bureau programs, contact the Southwest Information Office at 972-850-4800.

## Technical Note

Average weekly wage data by county are compiled under the Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages (QCEW) program, also known as the ES-202 program. The data are derived from summaries of employment and total pay of workers covered by state and federal unemployment insurance (UI) legislation and provided by State Workforce Agencies (SWAs). The 9.1 million employer reports covered 130.5 million full- and part-time workers. The average weekly wage values are calculated by dividing quarterly total wages by the average of the three monthly employment levels of those covered by UI programs. The result is then divided by 13, the number of weeks in a quarter. It is to be noted, therefore, that over-the-year wage changes for geographic areas may reflect shifts in the composition of employment by industry, occupation, and such other factors as hours of work. Thus, wages may vary among counties, metropolitan areas, or states for reasons other than changes in the average wage level. Data for all states, Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs), counties, and the nation are available on the BLS Web site at www.bls.gov/cew; however, data in QCEW press releases have been revised and may not match the data contained on the BLS Web site.

QCEW data are not designed as a time series. QCEW data are simply the sums of individual establishment records reflecting the number of establishments that exist in a county or industry at a point in time. Establishments can move in or out of a county or industry for a number of reasons-some reflecting economic events, others reflecting administrative changes.

The preliminary QCEW data presented in this release may differ from data released by the individual states as well as from the data presented on the BLS Web site. These potential differences result from the states' continuing receipt, review and editing of UI data over time. On the other hand, differences between data in this release and the data found on the BLS Web site are the result of adjustments made to improve over-the-year comparisons. Specifically, these adjustments account for administrative (noneconomic) changes such as a correction to a previously reported location or industry classification. Adjusting for these administrative changes allows users to more accurately assess changes of an economic nature (such as a firm moving from one county to another or changing its primary economic activity) over a 12 -month period. Currently, adjusted data are available only from BLS press releases.

Table 1. Covered (1) employment and wages in the United States and the 2 largest counties in Oklahoma, second quarter 2011 (2)

| Area | Employment |  |  | Average Weekly Wage (3) |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | June <br> 2011 <br> (thousands) | Percent <br> change, June <br> $2010-11(4)$ | National ranking <br> by percent <br> change (5) | Average <br> weekly <br> wage | National <br> ranking by <br> level (5) | Percent change, <br> second quarter <br> 2010-11 (4) | National ranking <br> by percent <br> change (5) |
| United States (6) | $130,469.9$ | 0.9 | -- | $\$ 891$ | -- | 3.0 | -- |
| Oklahoma | $1,510.3$ | 0.7 | -- | 749 | 41 | 4.5 | 5 |
| Oklahoma, Okla. | 420.1 | 2.1 | 43 | 832 | 157 | 5.3 | 19 |
| Tulsa, Okla. | 328.6 | 0.3 | 188 | 816 | 171 | 4.2 | 52 |

(1) Includes w orkers covered by Unemployment Insurance (UI) and Unemployment Compensation for Federal Employees (UCFE) programs.
(2) Data are preliminary.
(3) Average w eekly w ages w ere calculated using unrounded data.
(4) Percent changes were computed from quarterly employment and pay data adjusted for noneconomic county reclassifications.
(5) Ranking does not include the county of San Juan, Puerto Rico.
(6) Totals for the United States do not include data for Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands.

Table 2. Covered (1) employment and wages in the United States and all counties in Oklahoma, second quarter 2011 (2)

| Area | Employment June 2011 | Average Weekly Wage (3) | Area | Employment June 2011 | Average Weekly Wage (3) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| United States (4) | 130,469,924 | \$891 | Latimer | 3,496 | \$755 |
| Oklahoma | 1,510,340 | 749 | LeFlore | 12,750 | 600 |
| Adair | 5,319 | 558 | Lincoln | 6,784 | 605 |
| Alfalfa | 1,303 | 603 | Logan | 7,101 | 594 |
| Atoka | 3,270 | 555 | Love | 4,151 | 535 |
| Beaver | 1,521 | 687 | Major | 2,469 | 695 |
| Beckham | 10,211 | 763 | Marshall | 4,246 | 584 |
| Blaine | 2,979 | 594 | Mayes | 11,190 | 654 |
| Bryan | 14,100 | 612 | McClain | 7,665 | 621 |
| Caddo | 7,062 | 643 | McCurtain | 10,961 | 584 |
| Canadian | 27,017 | 731 | McIntosh | 4,177 | 497 |
| Carter | 22,643 | 718 | Murray | 5,776 | 604 |
| Cherokee | 15,571 | 592 | Muskogee | 29,561 | 679 |
| Choctaw | 4,266 | 548 | Noble | 4,250 | 731 |
| Cimarron | 704 | 457 | Nowata | 1,725 | 576 |
| Cleveland | 73,124 | 648 | Okfuskee | 2,231 | 544 |
| Coal | 1,064 | 611 | Oklahoma | 420,135 | 832 |
| Comanche | 42,304 | 675 | Okmulgee | 9,877 | 597 |
| Cotton | 1,387 | 584 | Osage | 6,228 | 621 |
| Craig | 5,545 | 601 | Ottawa | 11,904 | 569 |
| Creek | 17,234 | 699 | Pawnee | 3,522 | 640 |
| Custer | 12,452 | 708 | Payne | 30,915 | 680 |
| Delaware | 8,974 | 559 | Pittsburg | 17,412 | 742 |
| Dewey | 1,455 | 645 | Pontotoc | 17,134 | 620 |
| Ellis | 1,090 | 674 | Pottawatomie | 21,225 | 600 |
| Garfield | 25,556 | 683 | Pushmataha | 2,802 | 539 |
| Garvin | 9,212 | 678 | Roger Mills | 926 | 719 |
| Grady | 11,992 | 649 | Rogers | 24,572 | 742 |
| Grant | 1,169 | 699 | Seminole | 7,354 | 636 |
| Greer | 1,270 | 583 | Sequoyah | 8,812 | 511 |
| Harmon | 683 | 594 | Stephens | 15,515 | 765 |
| Harper | 1,146 | 608 | Texas | 9,412 | 675 |
| Haskell | 3,528 | 508 | Tillman | 1,927 | 578 |
| Hughes | 2,831 | 575 | Tulsa | 328,550 | 816 |
| Jackson | 9,958 | 646 | Wagoner | 7,259 | 607 |
| Jefferson | 1,137 | 563 | Washington | 20,556 | 791 |
| Johnston | 2,590 | 610 | Washita | 2,139 | 660 |
| Kay | 18,882 | 666 | Woods | 3,161 | 612 |
| Kingfisher | 5,730 | 715 | Woodward | 9,565 | 751 |
| Kiowa | 2,315 | 588 |  |  |  |

(1) Includes workers covered by Unemployment Insurance (UI) \& Unemployment Compensation for Federal Employees (UCFE).
(2) Data are preliminary.
(3)Average weekly wages were calculated using unrounded data.
(4) Totals for the United States do not include data for Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands.

Table 3. Covered (1) employment and wages by state, second quarter 2011 (2)

| State | Employment |  | Average weekly wage (3) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | June 2011 (thousands) | Percent change, <br> June 2010-11 | Average weekly wage | National ranking by level | Percent change, second quarter 2010-11 | National ranking by <br> percent change |
| United States (4) | 130,469.9 | 0.9 | \$891 | -- | 3.0 | -- |
| Alabama | 1,824.8 | -0.4 | 767 | 34 | 2.3 | 41 |
| Alaska | 335.9 | 1.6 | 941 | 9 | 2.6 | 27 |
| Arizona | 2,336.3 | 1.1 | 842 | 20 | 2.7 | 26 |
| Arkansas | 1,140.4 | -1.3 | 703 | 47 | 2.6 | 27 |
| California | 14,664.6 | 0.3 | 1,019 | 6 | 4.0 | 7 |
| Colorado | 2,234.7 | 1.4 | 900 | 13 | 3.4 | 16 |
| Connecticut | 1,630.2 | 0.8 | 1,116 | 3 | 3.8 | 9 |
| Delaware | 408.4 | 0.5 | 926 | 12 | 5.9 | 2 |
| District of Columbia | 711.3 | 1.4 | 1,541 | 1 | 2.4 | 36 |
| Florida | 7,092.3 | 0.8 | 802 | 25 | 2.6 | 27 |
| Georgia | 3,803.1 | 1.0 | 832 | 21 | 2.5 | 32 |
| Hawaii | 590.5 | 0.7 | 799 | 26 | 2.4 | 36 |
| Idaho | 616.6 | 0.0 | 667 | 49 | 2.3 | 41 |
| Illinois | 5,633.0 | 1.0 | 939 | 10 | 3.2 | 17 |
| Indiana | 2,769.2 | 1.3 | 749 | 41 | 2.2 | 46 |
| lowa | 1,476.9 | 0.7 | 726 | 43 | 2.5 | 32 |
| Kansas | 1,313.2 | -0.1 | 754 | 40 | 2.9 | 23 |
| Kentucky | 1,751.8 | 0.9 | 760 | 38 | 2.3 | 41 |
| Louisiana | 1,844.3 | -0.1 | 794 | 28 | 3.1 | 18 |
| Maine | 593.8 | 0.3 | 712 | 46 | 1.9 | 48 |
| Maryland | 2,513.5 | 0.5 | 987 | 7 | 3.1 | 18 |
| Massachusetts | 3,230.4 | 0.9 | 1,120 | 2 | 5.6 | 3 |
| Michigan | 3,896.9 | 1.8 | 845 | 19 | 2.4 | 36 |
| Minnesota | 2,645.4 | 1.4 | 898 | 15 | 3.5 | 12 |
| Mississippi | 1,079.4 | -0.6 | 664 | 50 | 1.8 | 49 |
| Missouri | 2,617.7 | 0.3 | 774 | 31 | 1.6 | 50 |
| Montana | 434.1 | 0.5 | 681 | 48 | 3.5 | 12 |
| Nebraska | 911.6 | 0.1 | 714 | 45 | 2.4 | 36 |
| Nevada | 1,123.0 | 0.5 | 816 | 24 | 2.5 | 32 |
| New Hampshire | 615.2 | 0.4 | 888 | 16 | 2.4 | 36 |
| New Jersey | 3,836.2 | -0.3 | 1,056 | 5 | 2.6 | 27 |
| New Mexico | 788.7 | -0.5 | 763 | 37 | 2.8 | 24 |
| New York | 8,575.3 | 1.0 | 1,092 | 4 | 1.0 | 51 |
| North Carolina | 3,865.9 | 1.5 | 783 | 30 | 2.5 | 32 |
| North Dakota | 382.4 | 5.1 | 769 | 33 | 8.2 | 1 |
| Ohio | 5,009.1 | 0.9 | 795 | 27 | 2.6 | 27 |
| Oklahoma | 1,510.3 | 0.7 | 749 | 41 | 4.5 | 5 |
| Oregon | 1,637.5 | 0.7 | 819 | 22 | 4.2 | 6 |
| Pennsylvania | 5,606.5 | 1.0 | 875 | 17 | 3.1 | 18 |
| Rhode Island | 458.1 | 0.3 | 862 | 18 | 3.5 | 12 |
| South Carolina | 1,801.6 | 1.1 | 726 | 43 | 2.3 | 41 |
| South Dakota | 404.8 | 0.8 | 656 | 51 | 3.8 | 9 |
| Tennessee | 2,616.9 | 1.3 | 794 | 28 | 2.3 | 41 |
| Texas | 10,462.4 | 2.1 | 900 | 13 | 4.0 | 7 |
| Utah | 1,183.9 | 2.0 | 756 | 39 | 3.1 | 18 |
| Vermont | 297.0 | 1.0 | 773 | 32 | 2.8 | 24 |
| Virginia | 3,619.7 | 0.9 | 949 | 8 | 2.2 | 46 |
| Washington | 2,875.8 | 0.6 | 928 | 11 | 3.5 | 12 |
| West Virginia | 702.9 | 0.3 | 765 | 36 | 5.4 | 4 |
| Wisconsin | 2,712.0 | 0.9 | 767 | 34 | 3.0 | 22 |
| Wyoming | 284.7 | 1.2 | 819 | 22 | 3.7 | 11 |
| Puerto Rico | 915.1 | -1.4 | 496 | (5) | 0.6 | (5) |
| Virgin Islands | 44.1 | 0.6 | 747 | (5) | 5.5 | (5) |

(1) Includes w orkers covered by Unemployment Insurance (UI) and Unemployment Compensation for Federal Employees (UCFE) programs.
(2) Data are preliminary.
(3) Average w eekly wages were calculated using unrounded data.
(4) Totals for the United States do not include data for Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands.
(5) Data not included in the national ranking.

## Chart 1. Average weekly wages by county in Oklahoma, second quarter 2011



Source: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics

