





For Release: Friday, January 15, 2016

16-104-ATL

SOUTHEAST INFORMATION OFFICE: Atlanta, Ga.

Technical information: (404) 893-4222 BLSInfoAtlanta@bls.gov www.bls.gov/regions/southeast

Media contact: (404) 893-4220

# County Employment and Wages in Mississippi – Second Quarter 2015

Employment increased in one of Mississippi's two large counties from June 2014 to June 2015, the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics reported today. (Large counties are those with 2014 annual average employment levels of 75,000 or more.) Regional Commissioner Janet S. Rankin noted that Hinds County employment rose 2.0 percent during the 12-month period. Harrison County registered a 0.2-percent decline. (See table 1.)

Nationally, employment advanced 2.0 percent from June 2014 to June 2015 as 319 of the 342 largest U.S. counties registered increases. Utah, Utah, had the largest increase, with a gain of 7.5 percent over the year. Ector, Texas, had the largest over-the-year decrease in employment among the largest counties in the U.S. with a loss of 4.2 percent.

Among Mississippi's two largest counties, employment was higher in Hinds (120,600) in June 2015, followed by Harrison (83,900). Together, Hinds and Harrison Counties accounted for 18.3 percent of total employment within the state. Nationwide, the 342 largest counties made up 72.1 percent of total U.S. employment, which stood at 140.6 million in June 2015.

From the second quarter of 2014 to the second quarter of 2015, Harrison County recorded a gain of 0.9 percent in average weekly wages, the largest rate of increase among the two large counties in Mississippi. (See table 1.) Hinds County had the highest average weekly wage of these two large counties at \$831. Nationally, the average weekly wage was \$968, a 3.0 percent increase from a year ago.

Employment and wages levels (but not over-the-year changes) are also available for the 80 counties in Mississippi with employment below 75,000. In all but one of these smaller counties (Kemper), wage levels were below the national average. (See table 2.)

### Large county wage changes

Harrison and Hinds County's average weekly wages rose 0.9 and 0.8 percent, respectively, from the second quarter of 2014 to the second quarter of 2015. These advances ranked both Harrison (305<sup>th</sup>) and Hinds (307<sup>th</sup>) in the bottom quarter of the national rankings for large county wage growth. (See table 1.)

Nationally, 323 of the 342 largest counties had over-the-year increases in average weekly wages. Ventura, Calif. had the largest wage increase among the largest U.S. counties (15.2 percent). Santa Clara, Calif., was second with a wage increase of 11.3 percent, followed by the counties of Forsyth, N.C. (10.9 percent), Riverside, Calif. (8.7 percent), and San Francisco, Calif. (8.6 percent).

Of the 342 largest counties, 16 experienced over-the-year decreases in average weekly wages. Olmsted, Minn., had the largest percentage decrease in average weekly wages, with a loss of 5.2 percent. Ector, Texas, had the second largest wage decline of 5.1 percent, followed by Midland, Texas (-3.2 percent), Hillsborough, N.H. (-2.6 percent), and Lorain, Ohio (-2.1 percent).

## Large county average weekly wages

Average weekly wages in both Hinds County (\$831) and Harrison County (\$688) were below the U.S. average of \$968 and placed in the bottom third of the national ranking in the second quarter of 2015. The average weekly wage in Hinds County ranked 230<sup>th</sup> and Harrison County's average weekly wage ranked 331<sup>st</sup>. (See table 1.)

Nationwide, average weekly wages were higher than the U.S. average (\$968) in 102 of the 342 largest counties. Santa Clara, Calif., held the top position among the highest-paid large counties with an average weekly wage of \$2,109. San Mateo, Calif., was second with an average weekly wage of \$1,863, followed by New York, N.Y. (\$1,842).

Seventy percent of the largest U.S. counties (240) reported average weekly wages below the national average in the second quarter of 2015. The lowest wage was reported in Horry, S.C. (\$568), followed by the Texas counties of Cameron (\$586) and Hidalgo (\$614). 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. (\$2,109).

## Average weekly wages in Mississippi's smaller counties

Among the 80 smaller counties in Mississippi – those with employment below 75,000 – Kemper (\$1,007) was the only county to report average weekly wages above the \$968 national average. Issaquena County reported the lowest weekly wage among all the counties in the state, averaging \$426 in the second quarter of 2015. (See table 2.)

When all 82 counties in Mississippi were considered, 30 reported average weekly wages below \$600, 24 had wages from \$600 to \$649, 11 had wages from \$650 to \$699, 9 had wages from \$700 to 749, and 8 had wages above \$750. (See chart 1.)

#### 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.

Employment and Wages Annual Averages Online features comprehensive information by detailed industry on establishments, employment, and wages for the nation and all states. The 2014 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 2015 version of the national news release. Tables and additional content from Employment and Wages Annual Averages 2014 are now available online at https://www.bls.gov/cew/publications/employment-and-wages-annual-averages/2014/home.htm.

The County Employment and Wages release for third quarter 2015 is scheduled to be released on Wednesday, March 9, 2016, at 10:00 a.m. (ET).

## **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 9.6 million employer reports cover 140.6 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 Bureau's 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.

Information in this release will be made available to sensory impaired individuals upon request. Voice phone: (202) 691-5200; Federal Relay Service: (800) 877-8339.

Table 1. Covered employment and wages in the United States and the 2 largest counties in Mississippi, second quarter 2015

Area	Employment			Average weekly wage (1)				
	June 2015 (thousands)	Percent change, June 2014-15 <sup>(2)</sup>	National ranking by percent change <sup>(3)</sup>	Average weekly wage	National ranking by level (3)	Percent change, second quarter 2014-15 <sup>(2)</sup>	National ranking by percent change (3)	
United States (4)	140,594.9	2.0		\$968		3.0		
Mississippi	1,114.7	1.1		709	51	0.6	48	
Harrison, Miss.	83.9	-0.2	323	688	331	0.9	305	
Hinds, Miss	120.6	2.0	160	831	230	0.8	307	

#### Footnotes:

- (1) Average weekly wages were calculated using unrounded data.
- (2) Percent changes were computed from quarterly employment and pay data adjusted for noneconomic county reclassifications.
- (3) Ranking does not include data for Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands.
- (4) Totals for the United States do not include data for Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands.

Note: Data are preliminary. Covered employment and wages includes workers covered by Unemployment Insurance (UI) and Unemployment Compensation for Federal Employees (UCFE) programs.

Table 2. Covered employment and wages in the United States and all counties in Mississippi, 2nd quarter 2015

	Employment June 2015	Average Weekly Wage (1)
ted States (2)	140,594,927	\$9
Mississippi		7
Adams	10,826	6
Alcorn	13,950	6
Amite	1,695	6
Attala	4,540	5
Benton	1	6
Bolivar		6
Calhoun		5
Carroll	·	5
Chickasaw	1	5
	·	7
Choctaw	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Claiborne		8
Clarke	·	6
Clay	5,177	6
Coahoma		6
Copiah		6
Covington	5,168	6
De Soto	51,903	6
Forrest		7
Franklin		6
George	4,957	6
Greene	·	5
Grenada	·	6
Hancock	·	3
Harrison		6
	·	3
Hinds	·	
Holmes	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	5
Humphreys		5
Issaquena		4
Itawamba		6
Jackson	·	8
Jasper		6
Jefferson		Ę
Jefferson Davis		6
Jones		6
Kemper		1,0
Lafayette		7
Lamar		ţ
Lauderdale		
Lawrence		3
Leake	·	Ę
Lee		7
	·	
Leflore	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	Ę
Lincoln	·	6
Lowndes	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	7
Madison	·	8
Marion		6
Marshall		6
Monroe		6
Montgomery		Ę
Neshoba		6
Newton		Ę
Noxubee		Ę
Oktibbeha	·	(
Panola		(
1 aliola		C

Table 2. Covered employment and wages in the United States and all counties in Mississippi, 2nd quarter 2015 - Continued

Area	Employment June 2015	Average Weekly Wage (1)	
Perry	2,069	736	
Pike	14,876	582	
Pontotoc	12,469	615	
Prentiss	7,109	570	
Quitman	1,087	600	
Rankin	60,284	705	
Scott	13,620	592	
Sharkey	1,189	539	
Simpson	6,977	539	
Smith	2,716	728	
Stone	3,959	618	
Sunflower	8,626	560	
Tallahatchie	3,035	547	
Tate	5,430	592	
Tippah	6,621	595	
Tishomingo	5,975	591	
Tunica	8,954	566	
Union	10,107	810	
Walthall	2,534	553	
Warren	20,417	764	
Washington	17,550	619	
Wayne	4,892	639	
Webster	1,977	583	
Wilkinson	1,802	544	
Winston	4,596	624	
Yalobusha	3,046	595	
Yazoo	6,482	692	

#### Footnotes

NOTE: Includes workers covered by Unemployment Insurance (UI) and Unemployment Compensation for Federal Employees (UCFE) programs. Data are preliminary.

<sup>(1)</sup> Average weekly wages were calculated using unrounded data.

<sup>(2)</sup> Totals for the United States do not include data for Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands.

Table 3. Covered employment and wages by state, second quarter 2015

United States (2)	Employment		Average weekly wage (1)				
Alabama Alaska Arizona Arkansas California Colorado Connecticut Delaware District of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana	June 2015 (thousands)	Percent change, June 2014-15	Average weekly wage	National ranking by level	Percent change, second quarter 2014-15	National ranking by percent change	
Alaska	140,594.9	2.0	\$968		3.0		
Arizona Arkansas California Colorado Connecticut Delaware District of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana	1,899.3	1.3	819	37	1.6	41	
Arkansas California Colorado Connecticut Delaware District of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana	346.6	0.4	1,028	8	2.4	30	
California	2,549.9	2.5	904	21	1.8	39	
Colorado Connecticut Delaware District of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana	1,184.6	1.7	762	47	2.1	35	
Connecticut Delaware District of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana	16,338.9	2.8	1,131	5	5.5	1	
Delaware District of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana	2,517.1	3.2	989	13	3.0	13	
District of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois	1,693.1	0.9	1,177	4	2.0	38	
Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana	439.1	2.2	991	12	1.5	42	
Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana	745.1	1.8	1,599	1	1.8	39	
HawaiiIdahoIllinoisIndiana	7,907.7	3.6	861	28	2.6	23	
IdahoIllinoisIndiana	4,167.8	3.4	903	22	2.4	30	
IllinoisIndiana	635.9	1.6	876	24	3.8	6	
Indiana	678.5	2.9	713	50	2.3	33	
	5,925.5	1.5	1,015	10	2.6	23	
lowa	2,966.0	1.7	811	40	3.4	7	
	1,561.2	0.9	802	43	2.8	18	
Kansas	1,382.1	0.7	819	37	2.8	18	
Kentucky	1,850.5	1.7	822	35	3.0	13	
Louisiana	1,930.6	0.5	850	30	0.8	47	
Maine	615.8	0.8	768	46	2.9	16	
Maryland	2,631.3	1.4	1,046	7	2.6	23	
Massachusetts	3,488.3	2.1	1,211	2	4.7	2	
Michigan	4,225.0	1.5	916	20	2.1	35	
Minnesota	2,826.3	1.5	977	15	3.2	8	
Mississippi	1,114.7	1.1	709	51	0.6	48	
Missouri	2,746.6	1.7	842	32	2.8	18	
Montana	461.5	1.8	754	48	2.7	21	
Nebraska	968.7	1.2	787	44	4.1	3	
Nevada	1,248.1	3.2	855	29	2.6	23	
New Hampshire	647.7	1.5	967	16	1.3	46	
New Jersey	4,000.2	1.5	1,126	6	2.6	23	
New Mexico	808.4	0.8	805	41	1.4	44	
New York	9,136.9	1.9	1,180	3	3.1	9	
North Carolina	4,185.6	2.6	850	30	3.9	4	
North Dakota	445.0	-1.8	939	18	0.3	50	
Ohio	5,308.1	1.4	865	26	2.4	30	
Oklahoma	1,591.5	0.6	818	39	0.5	49	
Oregon	1,810.4	3.4	899	23	3.0	13	
Pennsylvania	5,763.9	0.8	958	17	2.7	21	
Rhode Island	480.0	1.5	925	19	2.9	16	
South Carolina	1,963.5	2.5	782	45	2.1	35	
South Dakota	428.6	1.3	740	49	3.9	Δ	
Tennessee	2,832.1	2.8	863	27	3.1	9	
Texas	11,689.4	2.4	988	14	1.5	42	
Utah	1,345.9	3.9	821	36	3.1	9	
Vermont	309.3	0.6	831	34	2.2	34	
	3,767.2	1.7	1,000	11	2.2	29	
Virginia	3,197.6	3.3	1,000	9	3.1	28	
Washington	706.5	-0.8	803	42	1.4	44	
West Virginia	2,839.8	-0.8 1.0	836	33	2.6	23	
Wisconsin	2,839.8		869	25	-0.1	23 51	
Puerto Rico	291.5 884.6	-1.5 -1.4	513	(3)	-0.1 2.0	(3)	

Note: See footnotes at end of table.

Table 3. Covered employment and wages by state, second quarter 2015 - Continued

	Employment		Average weekly wage (1)				
State	June 2015 (thousands)	Percent change, June 2014-15	Average weekly wage	National ranking by level	Percent change, second quarter 2014-15	National ranking by percent change	
Virgin Islands	37.9	0.1	748	(3)	2.2	(3)	

#### Footnotes

- (1) Average weekly wages were calculated using unrounded data.
- (2) Totals for the United States do not include data for Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands.
- (3) Data not included in the national ranking.

Note: Data are preliminary. Covered employment and wages includes workers covered by Unemployment Insurance (UI) and Unemployment Compensation for Federal Employees (UCFE) programs.

Chart 1. Average weekly wages by county in Mississippi, second quarter 2015

