

Mass Layoff Statistics Data in the United States and Domestic and Overseas Relocation^{*}

Sharon P. Brown
Chief, Division of Local Area Unemployment Statistics
Bureau of Labor Statistics
U.S. Department of Labor

Introduction

In the United States, the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) is the principal fact-finding agency for the Federal Government in the broad field of labor economics and statistics. The BLS collects, processes, analyzes, and disseminates essential statistical data to the American public, the U.S. Congress, other Federal agencies, State and local governments, business, and labor. BLS data must satisfy a number of criteria: relevance to current social and economic issues, timeliness in reflecting today's rapidly changing economic conditions, accuracy and consistently high statistical quality, and impartiality.

Among the key economic data developed by the BLS, mass layoff statistics provide important and detailed information on a subset of establishments and job losers experiencing dislocation. In BLS' Mass Layoff Statistics (MLS) program, closings and layoffs of 50 or more from establishments with 50 or more workers are identified using administrative data. Employer interviews are then conducted to identify events that last more than 30 days and to augment the administrative data with information on the nature of the layoff itself, including the reason for separation.

The MLS program provides data for the nation as a whole, for States, and for selected areas. The statistics are among the most timely economic measures issued by BLS. Monthly data on mass layoff events and workers (without regard to duration of the layoff) by State and industry of the establishment are issued about three weeks after the end of the reference month. Data on extended mass layoffs (those lasting more than 30 days) are issued about seven weeks after the end of the reference quarter. In addition to providing timely labor market information, the MLS data are used to identify the need for employment and training services to workers, while economic developers use the data as an indicator of available labor supply.

The BLS has operated the MLS program since 1995. During this period, the program has been able to respond to current economic events on a timely basis through the employer interview. For example, after the terrorist events of 9/11, the MLS program added "nonnatural disaster" as a reason for separation, allowing for the identification and tracking of directly and indirectly related job loss associated with 9/11. With increasing interest in the impact on the U.S. economy of offshoring and outsourcing of work, the MLS program, and the employer interview component in particular, was determined to be

^{*} Presented at the EU-US Seminar on "Offshoring of Services in ICT and Related Services," Brussels, Belgium, December 13-14, 2004.

an appropriate vehicle for collecting information on this economic phenomenon. After an intensive period of development, questions were added to the MLS employer interview in January 2004 that identify job loss associated with movement of work within the company and to another company, domestically and out of the country. Beginning in June 2004, the results of these questions have been published.

MLS Program Description

The MLS program is one of the Bureau's federal-State cooperative programs. In the program, BLS is responsible for program specifications, quality assurance, data review and acceptance, and BLS publication. State analysts are responsible for administrative data collection, the employer interview, data development, and State publication. The MLS program identifies, describes, and tracks the effects of major job cutbacks. The program uses administrative statistics—data taken from records created as part of the administration of a program—on establishments covered by unemployment insurance laws and on unemployment insurance claimants who previously worked in these establishments to define the MLS population. These statistics are augmented by information obtained through the employer interview.

Administrative Data

Administrative data are available in every State, and provide important socioeconomic information. For an establishment identified as having conducted a mass layoff event, this includes the State in which the establishment is located and its detailed industry code. For the workers who file for unemployment compensation, their age, race, gender, location of residence, and status in the unemployment insurance system come from administrative data. The program yields information on the individual's entire spell of insured unemployment, up to the point at which regular unemployment insurance benefits are exhausted.

The MLS establishment data are the universe of establishments meeting program specifications, and the claimant data are all claims filed against these establishments. MLS specifications concerning the size of establishment, number of claims, and timing of filing refine the administrative data to represent an economic event. However, they also limit the scope of the program.

Size specification. Relatively large and concentrated layoffs are identified through the MLS size limitation on establishments and the requirement that at least 50 initial claims for unemployment insurance were filed against the establishment in a consecutive five-week period.

Focusing on the subset of establishments employing 50 or more workers means that, according to 2003 data, 4.6 percent of all covered employers and 56.7 percent of covered employment are in program scope. The size criterion was determined more than two decades ago, when 5 percent of establishments and 61 percent of employment were reported in establishments of 50 or more workers. Since then, smaller establishments

have accounted for a greater share of covered employment. Layoff activity in these establishments may be significant but such actions are not in the scope of the MLS program.

Reference period for filing. The MLS program specifies that at least 50 initial claims must be filed in a five-week period. The five-week period is used to approximate a “mass” layoff. Once 50 claims are reached, the event is triggered and claims are allowed to aggregate against the establishment. However, if a large layoff occurs gradually, the requirement of 50 claims in a five-week period may not be reached and the event not identified in the MLS program.

Minimum duration of layoff. The requirement that the layoff last more than 30 days allows the program to focus on more permanent job dislocation, and significantly reduces program coverage of job loss.

Table A. Mass layoff events and initial claims for unemployment insurance from the private nonfarm sector

Year	Mass Layoff Events			Mass Layoff Initial Claimants		
	Total	Extended	% total	Total	Extended	% total
2001	19,449	7,375	37.9	2,346,584	1,457,512	62.1
2002	18,212	6,337	34.8	2,069,713	1,218,143	58.9
2003	16,821	6,181	36.7	1,721,985	1,200,811	69.7
First three quarters of 2004	10,418	3,478	33.4	1,079,148	591,482	54.8

In the table above, private nonfarm mass layoff events are those where 50 or more initial claims for unemployment insurance benefits were filed against an establishment during a five-week period, regardless of duration. Extended mass layoff events reflect the constraint that the layoff had to last more than 30 days. As seen in the table, most layoff events involving 50 or more workers last for 30 days or less. By eliminating such layoffs, over 500,000 workers in 2003 were out of program scope. On the other hand, over 1,200,000 initial claimants were identified in extended mass layoffs in 2003. Thus far in 2004, and based on provisional data that will be revised, about 600,000 initial claimants were identified in extended mass layoffs while about 500,000 were excluded because the layoff lasted 30 days or less.

MLS Employer Interview.

The MLS employer interview collects important information on the layoff event. All establishments meeting the MLS layoff event trigger of 50 initial claims in a consecutive five-week period are interviewed. The employer is first asked whether the separations are of at least 31 days duration, and, if so, information is obtained on the total number of affected workers, the economic reason for the layoff, the open/closed status of the

worksite, and recall expectations. (Attachment 1 provides the structure of the MLS employer interview, including questions on movement of work.)

The employer interview is conducted by telephone by trained State employment security agency analysts. Employer participation is voluntary, and the survey is conducted in an unstructured manner by the analyst. The employer is not given a copy of the questionnaire or response options in advance of the interview. From responses provided by the employer to the MLS questions, the analyst enters the information into standard categories. Twenty-five reasons for separation were identified by the MLS program and used through 2003. Among the reasons were “domestic relocation” and “overseas relocation.”

The response rate for the employer interview in the MLS program is quite high. Thus far this year, only 5.5 percent of employers refused to participate in the employer interview.

MLS and Movement of Work

Because of the employer interview component in the MLS program, where specific information on the nature of the layoff event, including reason for separation, is collected, the BLS decided to use the MLS program as the vehicle for collecting additional information on what is usually referred to as “outsourcing” and “offshoring.” In doing so, the following definitions were used.

- “Outsourcing” is the movement of work that was formerly conducted in-house by employees paid directly by a company to a different company. The different company can be located inside or outside of the U.S. The work can occur at a different geographic location or remain on-site.
- “Offshoring” is the movement of work from within the U.S. to locations outside of the U.S. “Offshoring” can occur within the same company and involve movement of work to a different location of that company outside of the U.S., or to a different company altogether (offshoring/outsourcing).

Recognizing that there was not uniformity in understanding the terms “offshoring” and “outsourcing,” BLS chose to approach the data collection by defining these economic actions in terms of “movement of work.” A BLS group that included members from the BLS Behavioral Sciences Research Laboratory crafted the following two basic questions on movement of work associated with the layoff event, one pertaining to movement within the company and the other pertaining to movement of work to another company under contractual arrangements.

- (1) “Did this layoff include your company moving work from this location(s) to a different geographic locations(s) within your company?”
- (2) “Did this layoff include your company moving work that was performed in-house by your employees to a different company, through contractual arrangements?”

If an employer responded “yes” to either basic question, then information was requested on the geographic area to which work was moved and the number of separated workers associated with that action. If the move was domestic, the specific State or States was sought. If the move was out-of-country, the specific country or countries was sought. These questions were to be asked when the employer-provided reason for layoff was other than seasonal or vacation, since such reasons would not have a movement of work component. (See Attachment 1 for the employer interview.)

Relating these questions to the terms offshoring and outsourcing, “offshoring” is measured by an affirmative response to either question 1 or question 2, with the work moved out of the U.S., while “outsourcing” is measured by an affirmative response to question 2, with the work moved domestically, out of the U.S., or remaining on-site.

As part of the development and implementation of the movement-of-work questions, BLS conducted a review of the reasons for separation used by the program at that time. In this evaluation, it was recognized that, although “domestic relocation” and “overseas relocation” were accepted as reasons for separation, this fell short of the requirement that the reason for separation be an economic one. “Domestic relocation” and “overseas relocation” actually provide information on the effect of the economic reason on the establishment, rather than the reason itself. Economic reasons for these actions can include reorganizing staff to be more efficient, saving costs, or to be closer to customers. Additionally, in the prior use of these terms, they were volunteered reasons and could not be viewed as representative of the experiences of all MLS-identified layoff events with movement of work. Therefore, effective with the implementation of the movement-of-work questions, “domestic relocation” and “overseas relocation” were no longer accepted as economic reasons for separation. Analysts were directed to probe employers who cite these actions and obtain the underlying economic reasons for moving work.

Through the expanded employer interview, direct job loss from offshoring {the movement of work outside of the U.S., both within the company and to another company (outsourced)}, as well as outsourcing (the movement of work from the establishment to another establishment), both domestically and outside of the U.S., can be measured when these job losses fall within the scope of the MLS program.

It is important to recognize, however, those components of offshoring that are beyond the scope of the MLS program. The MLS program does not collect statistics from small establishments—those employing fewer than 50 workers. In establishments employing 50 or more, MLS does not collect statistics on small layoffs—those of less than 50 workers in a five-week period. Lastly, MLS does not collect information when there is no direct job loss—where employers initiate or transfer work elsewhere without laying off workers.

MLS Findings on Movement of Work

Overview of MLS Statistics

MLS data have been collected since the second quarter of 1995. Annual statistics from the program identified an average of more than 17,000 layoff events of 50 or more workers affecting nearly 1,900,000 initial claimants were identified each year. Private nonfarm layoff events averaged nearly 15,000 over the period, with nearly 1,700,000 initial claims. Considering those events that lasted more than 30 days, an average of 5,400 extended mass layoff events and almost 1,100,000 workers from private nonfarm industries were identified annually. Mass layoff and plant closing activity peaked in 2001, when 7,375 extended mass layoff events affecting almost 1,500,000 workers were identified.

In 2003, the program identified 6,181 layoff events from private nonfarm industries, affecting about 1,200,000 workers. Manufacturing establishments accounted for around one-third of MLS activity during the year. Fifteen percent of extended layoff events in 2003 were permanent closures, accounting for 210,903 workers, and were due mainly to internal company restructuring. Permanent closures were most numerous in manufacturing, primarily in computer and electronic products, machinery manufacturing, textile mills, and apparel. Import competition was most often cited as the reason for closures in manufacturing.

Employers expected to recall workers in 43 percent of the mass layoff actions, about the same as a year earlier but below the typical 50 percent recall rate since the data collection began.

Seasonal work continued to be most often cited as reason for layoff. Internal company restructuring (bankruptcy, business ownership change, financial difficulty, and reorganization) accounted for 21 percent of layoff events and resulted in the separation of nearly 300,000 workers. Overseas relocation was cited as the reason for separation for 13,000 workers (9 percent of all separations), nearly all from manufacturing industries. In more than 40 percent of such events, Mexico was cited as the destination.

2004 MLS Data and Movement of Work Statistics

The questions on movement of work were implemented in the employer interview beginning with layoff events identified in January 2004. Thus far, three quarters of information on job loss associated with movement of work have been issued.

Between January and September 2004, employers took 3,478 mass layoff actions that resulted in the separation of 685,929 workers from their jobs for at least 31 days. Extended mass layoffs that involve the movement of work within the same company or to a different company, domestically or out of the U.S., occurred in 276 of all private nonfarm events excluding those for seasonal or vacation reasons. The events involving movement of work were associated with the separation of 52,309 workers, about 11 percent of all separations resulting from nonseasonal and non-vacation mass layoff events. (See Table B.)

As part of the 276 layoff events, 334 movement-of-work actions were taken by employers. (The number of movement-of-work actions exceeds the number of layoff events because individual mass layoff events may involve more than one movement of work action. For example, an employer may shut down a worksite and move the work previously performed there to two or more other sites.) Employers were able to provide information on the specific separations associated with the movement of work component of the layoff in 279 actions, 84 percent of the total for the first three quarters of 2004.

Nearly 41,000 separations were associated with these 279 actions. (In the remaining 55 movement-of-work actions, the employer could not provide the number of separations associated with these actions.) Thus, a range of 52,309 (total separations in all layoff events that included movement of work) to 40,727 (separations in movement of work actions where the employer was able to provide specific detail) is established for separations due to movement of work in the January-September period.

Table B. Extended mass layoff events and separations, selected measures, January-September 2004

Action	Layoff events	Separations
Total, private nonfarm sector	3,478	685,929
Total, excluding seasonal and vacation events	2,379	469,991
Total with movement work	276	52,309
Movement of work actions	334	---
With separations reported	279	40,727
With separations unknown	55	---

Focusing on the broadest measure—the 276 layoff events that involve some movement of work—59 percent were permanent closures of worksites that affected 34,609 workers. This compares with a 16 percent closure rate for all 3,478 layoff events in the first three quarters of the year.

Internal company restructuring (bankruptcy, business ownership change, financial difficulty, and reorganization) accounted for 68 percent of layoff events involving relocation of work and resulted in 35,778 separations. (See Table 1.) Most of these were due to reorganization within the company. In contrast, about 21 percent of all layoff events from January to September were because of internal company restructuring.

Of the layoffs involving movement of work, two-thirds of the events and separations were from manufacturing industries in the first three quarters of 2004 (See Table 2). Among all private nonfarm extended layoffs, manufacturing accounted for 28 percent of events and 23 percent of separations.

The information technology-producing industries (communication equipment, communication services, computer hardware, and software and computer services)

accounted for 174 layoff events affecting 29,812 workers in January-September. Movement of work was reported in 33 events in these industries, affecting 7,923 workers. Although these industries accounted for a relatively greater proportion of movement of work events and separations than for the total, layoff activity in these industries is markedly lower than in the recent past. Closings and layoffs from computer hardware peaked in 2001 (503 layoff events and 102,587 separations). Annual highs in 2001 were also recorded for software and computer services (242 events and 36,016 separations) and for communications equipment in 2001 (140 events and 34,874 workers). Layoff activity for communications services reached a high in 2002 (176 events and 32,134 separations). (See Table 3)

Turning to the 279 movement of work actions reported in the first three quarters of 2004 for which complete information is available, more than 7 in 10 of the relocations were domestic—200 out of 279—and more than 8 in 10 of those involved moving work within the company. (See Table C.) One out of four of the relocations were out of the U.S., and again, most (66 percent) involved the movement of work within the company. When work was moved out of the U.S., Mexico and China were cited 56 percent of the time. When work was moved to another company under contractual arrangements, in slightly more than 4 out of 10 instances, the work was moved outside of the U.S.

The separation of 10,722 workers were associated with out-of-country relocations, slightly more than one-fourth of all separations related to movement of work and about 2.3 percent of all extended layoff separations excluding seasonal and vacation. Domestic relocation of work—both within the company and to other companies—affected 27,326 workers.

Table C. Relocations of work actions by employers, January-September 2004

Action	Layoff actions	Separations
Total, private nonfarm sector, excluding seasonal and vacation events, with movement of work	279	40,727
By location		
Out-of-country	70	10,722
Within company	46	7,863
Different company	24	2,859
Domestic relocations	200	27,326
Within company	167	22,697
Different company	33	4,629
Unable to assign	9	2,679
By company		
Within company	221	32,586
Domestic	167	22,697
Out of country	46	7,863
Unable to assign	8	2,026
Different company	58	8,141

Domestic	33	4,629
Out of country	24	2,859
Unable to assign	1	653

Continuing Activities on Movement of Work

MLS data collection, including the movement of work questions, continues. As we receive more quarters of information on extended mass layoffs with domestic and out-of-country relocations, we will be able to learn more about this activity and provide more information to the public.

BLS has initiated a cognitive reinterview of a sample of MLS establishments, not only with the events identified with movement of work but from the general MLS population as well. These will allow us to be more confident that employers understand what we are asking on layoff events and related information.

In the first three quarters of movement of work data collection, employers could not provide specific information on job loss associated with the movement of work in 55 instances—about 16 percent of all actions. BLS is continuing to explore ways to reduce the nonreponse to this question.

BLS will be undertaking an in-depth review of the reasons for separation used in the MLS program. Are they appropriate as descriptors of economic activity today? Are we anticipating the reasons why employers take certain actions? The major thrust will be to ensure that we are focusing on economic reasons for layoffs.

Attachment 1. MLS Employer Interview Including Offshoring and Outsourcing Questions

The analyst has the following information on a potential layoff event:

- Establishment name
- Establishment address
- Industry of the company
- Number of initial claims filed against the company, weeks in which the claims were filed, and week in which the event triggered
- Prior layoff history of the establishment

Using the telephone number and contact person, the analyst calls and asks the following:

- Did a layoff in fact occur?
 - Did the layoff last more than 30 days?
 - How many people were involved in the layoff?
 - When did the layoff begin?
 - What was the (economic) reason for the layoff?
 - For all reasons other than seasonal and vacation:
 - 1.a. Did this layoff include your company moving work from this location(s) to a different geographic location(s) within your company?
 - Yes: enter Yes, go to 1b.
 - No: skip to question 2a.
 - DK and RF: enter DK or RF, go to question 2a
 - b. Is the other location inside or outside of the US?
 - Inside US: Which State(s)?
 - Outside US: Which Country(s)?
 - c. How many of the layoffs were a result of this reduction?
 - Number inside US
 - Number outside US
 - 2.a. Did this layoff include your company moving work that was conducted in-house by your employees to a different company, through contractual arrangements?
 - Yes: enter Yes, go to 2b.
 - No: proceed with employer interview.
 - DK and RF: enter DK or RF, proceed with employer interview.
 - b. Is that company located inside or outside of the US?
 - Inside US: Which State(s)?
 - Outside US: Which Country(s)?
 - c. How many of the layoffs were a result of moving the work to the different company?
 - Number inside US
 - Number outside US
- Is a recall expected?
- Will the recall be total or partial (percentage)?
- What is the timeframe for possible recall?
- Open/closed status of the worksite?

Table 1. Reason for layoff: Extended mass layoff events and separations associated with the movement of work, first-third quarters 2004^P

Reason for layoff	Layoff events		Separations	
	Total	MOW	Total	MOW
Total, private nonfarm	3,478	276	685,929	52,309
Automation	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)
Bankruptcy	61	–	15,725	–
Business ownership change	96	21	22,545	3,352
Contract cancellation	82	(¹)	12,946	(¹)
Contract completed	569	(¹)	126,651	(¹)
Energy-related	–	–	–	–
Environment-related	(¹)	–	(¹)	–
Financial difficulty	167	20	30,425	4,492
Import competition	38	12	6,355	2,563
Labor dispute	16	–	23,482	–
Material shortage	4	–	317	–
Model changeover	9	(¹)	2,417	(¹)
Natural disaster	(¹)	–	(¹)	–
Non-natural disaster	(¹)	–	(¹)	–
Plant or machine repair	14	–	2,211	–
Product line discontinued	26	7	4,940	733
Reorganization within company	421	147	78,149	27,934
Seasonal work	990	(²)	198,404	(²)
Slack work	403	13	52,884	2,882
Vacation period	109	(²)	17,534	(²)
Weather-related	29	–	3,037	–
Other	130	44	27,100	7,983
Not reported	308	–	59,590	–

¹ Data do not meet BLS or state agency disclosure standards.

² The questions on movement of work were not asked of employers when the reason for layoff was either seasonal work or vacation period.

^P = preliminary.

NOTE: Dash represents zero.

Table 2. Industry distribution: Extended mass layoff events and separations associated with the movement of work, first-third quarters 2004^P

Industry	Layoff events		Separations	
	Total	MOW	Total	MOW
Total, private nonfarm	3,478	276	685,929	52,309
Mining.....	16	–	2,208	–
Utilities.....	7	(¹)	811	(¹)
Construction.....	445	(¹)	56,197	(¹)
Manufacturing.....	991	185	159,578	34,630
Food.....	188	14	32,694	2,832
Beverage and tobacco products.....	13	(¹)	2,050	(¹)
Textile mills.....	34	7	5,361	1,347
Textile product mills.....	23	7	4,196	1,129
Apparel.....	49	12	6,462	2,470
Leather and allied products.....	8	(¹)	1,289	(¹)
Wood products.....	28	(¹)	3,229	(¹)
Paper.....	30	10	4,227	1,409
Printing and related support activities.....	36	7	5,037	1,303
Petroleum and coal products.....	5	–	392	–
Chemicals.....	37	8	5,131	1,124
Plastics and rubber products.....	56	16	7,870	2,791
Nonmetallic mineral products.....	35	(¹)	5,725	(¹)
Primary metal.....	33	(¹)	5,744	(¹)
Fabricated metal products.....	67	10	9,363	1,835
Machinery.....	45	10	6,056	1,431
Computer and electronic products.....	64	19	9,618	3,957
Electrical equipment and appliance.....	32	12	6,247	3,264
Transportation equipment.....	132	19	27,944	4,783
Furniture and related products.....	49	13	6,871	1,610
Miscellaneous manufacturing.....	27	9	4,072	1,789
Wholesale trade.....	72	11	11,368	1,701
Retail trade.....	286	21	119,504	3,869
Transportation and warehousing.....	233	7	50,467	1,471
Information.....	117	14	25,977	3,980
Finance and insurance.....	124	13	26,682	1,731
Real estate and rental and leasing.....	9	–	2,414	–
Professional and technical services.....	122	6	26,432	1,112
Management of companies and enterprises.....	16	(¹)	2,017	(¹)
Administrative and waste services.....	382	9	78,442	2,019
Educational services.....	15	–	1,487	–
Health care and social assistance.....	247	3	33,449	621
Arts, entertainment, and recreation.....	90	–	28,453	–
Accommodation and food services.....	225	–	47,856	–
Other services, except public administration.....	76	3	12,169	311
Unknown	5	–	418	–

¹ Data do not meet BLS or state agency disclosure standards.

^P = preliminary.

NOTE: Dash represents zero.

Table 3. Information technology-producing industries: Extended mass layoff events and separations, private nonfarm sector, 1996-2004

Year	Total extended mass layoffs		Information technology-producing industries ¹							
			Computer hardware ²		Software and computer services ³		Communications equipment ⁴		Communications services ⁵	
	Layoff events	Separations	Layoff events	Separations	Layoff events	Separations	Layoff events	Separations	Layoff events	Separations
Total										
1996	4,760	948,122	100	17,884	20	10,724	32	5,323	33	6,612
1997	4,671	947,843	64	11,934	25	3,206	23	2,515	18	3,237
1998	4,859	991,245	166	36,069	23	4,056	33	6,971	25	4,150
1999	4,556	901,451	103	22,557	29	5,194	27	4,344	18	3,930
2000	4,591	915,962	66	18,805	70	16,774	25	4,618	24	4,048
2001	7,375	1,524,832	503	102,587	242	36,016	140	34,874	136	30,084
2002	6,337	1,272,331	303	59,653	162	22,382	112	23,236	176	32,134
2003	6,181	1,216,886	196	32,689	100	16,230	62	10,408	113	21,721
First-third quarters, 2004 ^p	3,478	685,929	55	8,014	51	8,003	12	1,324	56	12,471
Movement of work										
First-third quarters, 2004 ^p	276	52,309	13	3,004	9	2,626	4	423	7	1,870

¹ Information technology-producing industries are defined in *Digital Economy 2003*, Economics and Statistics Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce.

² The industries included in this grouping, based on the 2002 North American Industry Classification System (NAICS), are: semiconductor machinery manufacturing; office machinery manufacturing; electronic computer manufacturing; computer storage device manufacturing; computer terminal manufacturing; other computer peripheral equipment mfg.; electron tube manufacturing; bare printed circuit board manufacturing; semiconductors and related device mfg.; electronic capacitor manufacturing; electronic resistor manufacturing; electronic coils, transformers, and inductors; electronic connector manufacturing; printed circuit assembly manufacturing; other electronic component manufacturing; industrial process variable instruments; electricity and signal testing instruments; analytical laboratory instrument mfg.; computer and software merchant wholesalers; and computer and software stores.

³ The industries included in this grouping, based on the 2002 North American Industry Classification System (NAICS), are: software publishers; internet service providers; web search portals; data processing and related services; computer and software merchant wholesalers; computer and software stores; custom computer programming

services; computer systems design services; computer facilities management services; other computer related services; office equipment rental and leasing; and computer and office machine repair.

⁴ The industries included in this grouping, based on the 2002 North American Industry Classification System (NAICS), are: telephone apparatus manufacturing; audio and video equipment manufacturing; broadcast and wireless communications equip.; fiber optic cable manufacturing; software reproducing; and magnetic and optical recording media mfg.

⁵ The industries included in this grouping, based on the 2002 North American Industry Classification System (NAICS), are: wired telecommunications carriers; cellular and other wireless carriers; telecommunications resellers; cable and other program distribution; satellite telecommunications; other telecommunications; and communication equipment repair.

⁶ Data do not meet BLS or state agency disclosure standards.

NOTE: Dash represents zero.

^p = preliminary.

^r = revised.