



For Release: Wednesday, December 19, 2018

18-1759-DAL

SOUTHWEST INFORMATION OFFICE: Dallas, Texas

Technical information: (972) 850-4800 BLSInfoDallas@bls.gov www.bls.gov/regions/southwest

Media contact: (972) 850-4800

County Employment and Wages in Oklahoma – Second Quarter 2018

Employment rose in Oklahoma's three large counties from June 2017 to June 2018, the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics reported today. (Large counties are defined as those with employment of 75,000 or greater as measured by 2017 annual average employment.) Assistant Commissioner for Regional Operations Stanley W. Suchman noted that employment increased 1.4 percent over the year in Oklahoma County, 1.3 percent in Tulsa County, and 0.9 percent in Cleveland County. (See [table 1.](#))

Employment nationwide advanced 1.5 percent during the 12-month period as 309 of the 349 largest U.S. counties registered increases. Midland, TX, had the largest percentage increase in the country, up 11.6 percent over the year. McLean, IL, experienced the largest over-the-year percentage decrease in employment with a loss of 2.0 percent.

Among the three largest counties in Oklahoma, employment was highest in Oklahoma County (457,200) in June 2018. The counties of Tulsa and Cleveland had employment levels of 358,300 and 80,300, respectively. Together, the three largest Oklahoma counties accounted for 55.8 percent of total employment within the state. Nationwide, the 349 largest counties made up 72.9 percent of total U.S. employment.

All three large Oklahoma counties experienced average weekly wage gains from the second quarter of 2017 to the second quarter of 2018, with the fastest rate of increase in Cleveland County, up 3.9 percent. In Oklahoma and Tulsa Counties, average weekly wages increased 3.1 percent and 3.0 percent, respectively. (See [table 1.](#)) Oklahoma County had the highest average weekly wage among the state's largest counties at \$979. Nationally, the average weekly wage increased 3.4 percent from a year ago to \$1,055 in the second quarter of 2018.

Employment and wage levels (but not over-the-year changes) are also available for the 74 counties in Oklahoma with employment below 75,000. Wage levels in all of these smaller counties were below the national average in June 2018. (See [table 2.](#))

Large county wage changes

The 3.9-percent annual average weekly wage gain in Cleveland County ranked 77th among the nation's 349 largest counties in the second quarter of 2018. The 3.1-percent wage gain in Oklahoma County ranked 160th and Tulsa's 3.0-percent increase ranked 172nd. (See [table 1.](#))

Nationally, 340 of the 349 largest counties had over-the-year wage increases. Marin, CA, had the largest percentage wage increase in the nation, up 11.7 percent. King, WA, and Lake, IL, tied for the second largest increase, each at 9.3 percent.

Nationwide, eight large counties registered wage declines during the period. New Hanover, NC, had the largest percentage decrease in average weekly wages with a loss of 6.4 percent.

Large county average weekly wages

Weekly wages in the state's three large counties were below the national average of \$1,055 in the second quarter of 2018. Average weekly wages in Oklahoma County (\$979) and Tulsa County (\$942) ranked 166th and 188th, respectively, near the middle of the national ranking. The average weekly wage in Cleveland County (\$777) ranked 332nd. (See [table 1.](#))

More than 70 percent of the largest U.S. counties (255) reported average weekly wages below the national average in the second quarter of 2018. At \$625 a week, Horry County, SC, had the lowest average weekly wage among the 349 large counties. The next three lowest-paying large counties were in Texas: Cameron (\$642), Hidalgo (\$645), and Webb (\$687).

Nationwide, average weekly wages were higher than the U.S. average in 94 of the 349 largest counties. Santa Clara, CA, held the top position with an average weekly wage of \$2,573. San Mateo, CA, was second with an average weekly wage of \$2,357, followed by San Francisco, CA (\$2,083) and New York, NY (\$2,025). Average wages in the highest-ranked county, Santa Clara, Calif., were more than four times the average wage in the lowest-ranked county, Horry, SC (\$625).

Average weekly wages in Oklahoma's smaller counties

All 74 smaller counties in Oklahoma – those with employment below 75,000 – reported average weekly wages below the national average of \$1,055. Among these counties, Grant posted the highest weekly wage, \$962, followed by Woodward (\$954), Dewey (\$948), and Beckham (\$942). Sequoyah County reported the lowest average wage in the state at \$536 per week, closely followed by Johnston County at \$538 per week. (See [table 2.](#))

When all 77 counties in Oklahoma were considered, 27 reported average weekly wages of less than \$700, 26 registered wages from \$700 to \$799, 15 had wages from \$800 to \$899, and 9 had average weekly wages of \$900 or more. (See [chart 1.](#)) The higher-paying counties were located in and around the Oklahoma City and Tulsa metropolitan areas, as well as the smaller areas of Elk City and Woodward. The lower-paying counties, those with weekly wages under \$700, were concentrated in the eastern portion 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.

Employment and Wages Annual Averages Online features comprehensive information by detailed industry on establishments, employment, and wages for the nation and all states. The 2017 edition of this publication, which was published in September 2018, contains selected data produced by Business Employment Dynamics (BED) on job gains and losses, as well as selected data from the first quarter 2018 version of the national news release. Tables and additional content from *Employment and Wages Annual Averages Online* are now available at www.bls.gov/cew/publications/employment-and-wages-annual-averages/2017/home.htm.

The County Employment and Wages release for third quarter 2018 is scheduled to be released on Wednesday, February 20, 2019.

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 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 (see Technical Note below) 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 3 largest counties in Oklahoma, second quarter 2018

| Area | Employment | | | Average weekly wage ⁽¹⁾ | | | |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--|------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| | June 2018 (thousands) | Percent change, June 2017-18 ⁽²⁾ | National ranking by percent change ⁽³⁾ | Average weekly wage | National ranking by level ⁽³⁾ | Percent change, second quarter 2017-18 ⁽²⁾ | National ranking by percent change ⁽³⁾ |
| United States ⁽⁴⁾ | 147,431.2 | 1.5 | -- | \$1,055 | -- | 3.4 | -- |
| Oklahoma | 1,606.4 | 1.2 | -- | 875 | 41 | 3.2 | 27 |
| Cleveland, OK | 80.3 | 0.9 | 206 | 777 | 332 | 3.9 | 77 |
| Oklahoma, OK..... | 457.2 | 1.4 | 144 | 979 | 166 | 3.1 | 160 |
| Tulsa, OK..... | 358.3 | 1.3 | 159 | 942 | 188 | 3.0 | 172 |

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 Oklahoma, 2nd quarter 2018

| Area | Employment June 2018 | Average weekly wage(1) |
|------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| United States(2) | 147,431,154 | \$1,055 |
| Oklahoma | 1,606,435 | 875 |
| Adair | 4,446 | 659 |
| Alfalfa | 1,532 | 880 |
| Atoka | 3,378 | 639 |
| Beaver | 1,632 | 853 |
| Beckham | 10,265 | 942 |
| Blaine | 3,093 | 807 |
| Bryan | 18,924 | 725 |
| Caddo | 7,489 | 792 |
| Canadian | 37,247 | 910 |
| Carter | 23,896 | 806 |
| Cherokee | 15,247 | 670 |
| Choctaw | 4,227 | 629 |
| Cimarron..... | 740 | 642 |
| Cleveland | 80,345 | 777 |
| Coal | 1,095 | 644 |
| Comanche..... | 42,496 | 736 |
| Cotton | 1,543 | 636 |
| Craig..... | 5,560 | 672 |
| Creek..... | 18,825 | 835 |
| Custer..... | 12,808 | 796 |
| Delaware | 9,119 | 639 |
| Dewey | 1,720 | 948 |
| Ellis..... | 1,245 | 736 |
| Garfield..... | 24,726 | 825 |
| Garvin..... | 9,798 | 863 |
| Grady..... | 13,132 | 746 |
| Grant | 1,369 | 962 |
| Greer | 1,120 | 606 |
| Harmon..... | 636 | 620 |
| Harper | 1,038 | 712 |
| Haskell..... | 3,125 | 589 |
| Hughes..... | 2,969 | 635 |
| Jackson | 9,497 | 757 |
| Jefferson..... | 1,085 | 578 |
| Johnston..... | 4,562 | 538 |
| Kay | 18,122 | 795 |
| Kingfisher | 6,879 | 917 |
| Kiowa..... | 1,735 | 600 |
| Latimer | 2,421 | 754 |
| LeFlore | 12,428 | 722 |
| Lincoln | 6,645 | 724 |
| Logan | 7,673 | 678 |
| Love..... | 6,126 | 610 |
| Major | 2,515 | 820 |
| Marshall..... | 4,312 | 718 |
| Mayes..... | 13,001 | 812 |
| McClain | 9,463 | 724 |
| McCurtain | 10,700 | 686 |
| McIntosh..... | 3,881 | 581 |
| Murray | 5,949 | 647 |
| Muskogee..... | 29,348 | 781 |
| Noble | 4,859 | 837 |
| Nowata | 1,764 | 675 |
| Okfuskee | 2,290 | 614 |

Note: See footnotes at end of table.

Table 2. Covered employment and wages in the United States and all counties in Oklahoma, 2nd quarter 2018 - Continued

| Area | Employment June 2018 | Average weekly wage(1) |
|-------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Oklahoma | 457,166 | 979 |
| Okmulgee | 9,364 | 727 |
| Osage | 6,668 | 709 |
| Ottawa | 12,301 | 642 |
| Pawnee | 3,540 | 705 |
| Payne | 32,273 | 792 |
| Pittsburg | 16,327 | 864 |
| Pontotoc | 18,353 | 810 |
| Pottawatomie..... | 22,251 | 679 |
| Pushmataha | 2,449 | 594 |
| Roger Mills | 852 | 792 |
| Rogers | 27,073 | 843 |
| Seminole | 7,252 | 726 |
| Sequoyah | 9,423 | 536 |
| Stephens | 14,467 | 812 |
| Texas | 9,894 | 782 |
| Tillman | 1,687 | 704 |
| Tulsa | 358,270 | 942 |
| Wagoner | 9,242 | 772 |
| Washington..... | 19,374 | 914 |
| Washita..... | 1,883 | 728 |
| Woods | 3,264 | 882 |
| Woodward | 8,780 | 954 |

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.

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

Table 3. Covered employment and wages by state, second quarter 2018

| State | Employment | | Average weekly wage ⁽¹⁾ | | | |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|---|
| | June 2018 (thousands) | Percent change, June 2017-18 | Average weekly wage | National ranking by level | Percent change, second quarter 2017-18 | National ranking by percent change |
| United States ⁽²⁾ | 147,431.2 | 1.5 | \$1,055 | -- | 3.4 | -- |
| Alabama | 1,969.9 | 1.2 | 882 | 37 | 2.8 | 35 |
| Alaska..... | 335.8 | -0.9 | 1,043 | 15 | 3.7 | 9 |
| Arizona | 2,770.8 | 2.6 | 973 | 23 | 3.3 | 19 |
| Arkansas | 1,214.6 | 0.7 | 824 | 47 | 1.7 | 47 |
| California | 17,473.1 | 1.9 | 1,265 | 4 | 4.6 | 3 |
| Colorado..... | 2,704.4 | 2.4 | 1,075 | 10 | 3.2 | 27 |
| Connecticut | 1,704.5 | 0.3 | 1,218 | 5 | 0.1 | 50 |
| Delaware | 454.3 | 1.3 | 1,023 | 17 | 1.4 | 49 |
| District of Columbia | 777.3 | 1.3 | 1,713 | 1 | 2.6 | 39 |
| Florida | 8,568.9 | 2.1 | 931 | 28 | 2.9 | 32 |
| Georgia..... | 4,440.5 | 2.0 | 979 | 22 | 2.3 | 43 |
| Hawaii..... | 658.3 | 0.5 | 956 | 24 | 2.5 | 41 |
| Idaho | 745.3 | 3.1 | 794 | 50 | 3.8 | 8 |
| Illinois | 6,061.1 | 0.8 | 1,097 | 9 | 3.4 | 14 |
| Indiana..... | 3,075.8 | 1.1 | 883 | 36 | 2.8 | 35 |
| Iowa..... | 1,583.7 | 0.8 | 880 | 39 | 3.3 | 19 |
| Kansas | 1,393.3 | 1.0 | 879 | 40 | 3.4 | 14 |
| Kentucky..... | 1,905.9 | 0.9 | 882 | 37 | 2.3 | 43 |
| Louisiana | 1,918.6 | 0.4 | 901 | 33 | 3.7 | 9 |
| Maine..... | 636.8 | 1.0 | 843 | 45 | 3.6 | 11 |
| Maryland..... | 2,712.0 | 0.7 | 1,141 | 8 | 3.4 | 14 |
| Massachusetts | 3,650.1 | 1.0 | 1,322 | 2 | 3.5 | 12 |
| Michigan | 4,424.7 | 1.3 | 997 | 20 | 2.9 | 32 |
| Minnesota..... | 2,925.6 | 0.8 | 1,072 | 12 | 3.3 | 19 |
| Mississippi | 1,130.7 | 0.2 | 752 | 51 | 2.7 | 38 |
| Missouri | 2,829.0 | 0.5 | 924 | 30 | 3.9 | 7 |
| Montana | 478.7 | 1.1 | 817 | 48 | 2.5 | 41 |
| Nebraska | 990.8 | 0.6 | 859 | 43 | 3.1 | 29 |
| Nevada | 1,372.4 | 3.1 | 931 | 28 | 3.3 | 19 |
| New Hampshire..... | 670.8 | 0.8 | 1,049 | 14 | 3.3 | 19 |
| New Jersey..... | 4,157.0 | 0.9 | 1,201 | 7 | 2.3 | 43 |
| New Mexico..... | 823.6 | 1.0 | 852 | 44 | 3.5 | 12 |
| New York | 9,579.2 | 1.7 | 1,297 | 3 | 4.5 | 4 |
| North Carolina | 4,450.2 | 2.2 | 933 | 25 | 3.3 | 19 |
| North Dakota | 426.1 | 0.8 | 986 | 21 | 3.4 | 14 |
| Ohio..... | 5,461.3 | 0.7 | 933 | 25 | 2.3 | 43 |
| Oklahoma | 1,606.4 | 1.2 | 875 | 41 | 3.2 | 27 |
| Oregon | 1,947.3 | 1.5 | 999 | 18 | 3.3 | 19 |
| Pennsylvania..... | 5,924.9 | 1.1 | 1,031 | 16 | 3.1 | 29 |
| Rhode Island | 491.0 | 0.7 | 998 | 19 | 1.7 | 47 |
| South Carolina..... | 2,126.5 | 3.4 | 833 | 46 | 0.0 | 51 |
| South Dakota..... | 439.7 | 0.9 | 807 | 49 | 2.8 | 35 |
| Tennessee | 2,994.1 | 1.6 | 932 | 27 | 2.9 | 32 |
| Texas | 12,326.3 | 2.2 | 1,062 | 13 | 3.4 | 14 |
| Utah..... | 1,483.9 | 3.4 | 899 | 35 | 4.3 | 5 |
| Vermont..... | 312.4 | -0.8 | 907 | 31 | 4.3 | 5 |
| Virginia..... | 3,941.0 | 1.3 | 1,073 | 11 | 2.6 | 39 |
| Washington..... | 3,444.1 | 2.7 | 1,218 | 5 | 6.9 | 1 |
| West Virginia | 702.9 | 1.6 | 868 | 42 | 4.8 | 2 |
| Wisconsin | 2,933.5 | 0.9 | 904 | 32 | 3.3 | 19 |
| Wyoming | 282.2 | 0.5 | 901 | 33 | 3.0 | 31 |
| Puerto Rico..... | 853.5 | -2.3 | 543 | (3) | 5.2 | (3) |

Note: See footnotes at end of table.

Table 3. Covered employment and wages by state, second quarter 2018 - Continued

| State | Employment | | Average weekly wage ⁽¹⁾ | | | |
|---------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------|--|------------------------------------|
| | June 2018 (thousands) | Percent change, June 2017-18 | Average weekly wage | National ranking by level | Percent change, second quarter 2017-18 | National ranking by percent change |
| Virgin Islands..... | 33.4 | -14.4 | 838 | (3) | 12.8 | (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 Oklahoma, second quarter 2018

