

FLORIDA

Released:

8/26/2005

Access our reports
Via the internet at
www.nass.usda.gov/fl

The number of workers paid by farmers and agricultural services totaled 43,000 for the week of July 10 through 16. Farmers hired 41,000 workers compared with 39,000 in July 2004 and 49,000 in April 2005. Agricultural services provided 2,000 paid workers, down 8,000 from last quarter and 1,000 less than those supplied a year ago.

Daily, scattered thunderstorms persisted throughout the survey week. Producers in the Panhandle and northern Peninsula reported minimal damage from Hurricane Dennis, mainly saturated fields in low lying areas and some wind damage. Dennis and Tropical Storm Cindy hit the Panhandle and northern Peninsula the weekend before the reference week. Hay quality is declining in some northern Peninsula localities due to excessive wet fields. Tobacco fields suffered immensely from the wet conditions with many producers still reporting disease problems. Growers marketed light supplies of okra, tomatoes and watermelons. Grove work included fertilizing, dead tree removal and young tree care. Many citrus growers tried to minimize the spread of canker during the wet weather.

The July all hired worker wage rate averaged \$9.71 per hour, 7 cents more than last year and 44 cents more than last quarter. Farmers paid an average of \$9.70 per hour, 39 cents higher than in April and 7 cents above the \$9.63 paid a year ago. Agricultural services paid workers an average of \$9.90 per hour, 80 cents higher than last quarter and 20 cents above last year.

UNITED STATES

There were 1,332,000 hired workers on the Nation's farms and ranches during the week of July 10-16, 2005, up 2 percent from a year ago. Of these hired workers, 930,000 workers were hired directly by farm operators. Agricultural service employees on farms and ranches made up the remaining 402,000 workers.

Farm operators paid their hired workers an average wage of \$9.39 per hour during the July 2005 reference week, up 35 cents from a year earlier. Field workers received an average of \$8.62 per hour, up 28 cents from last July, while livestock workers earned \$9.25 per hour compared with \$8.74 a year earlier. The field and livestock worker combined wage rate, at \$8.78 per hour, was up 35 cents from last year.

The number of hours worked averaged 40.6 hours for hired workers during the survey week, up 4 percent from a year ago.

The largest decreases in the number of hired farm workers from last year occurred in California, and in the Appalachian I (North Carolina and Virginia), Appalachian II (Kentucky, Tennessee, and West Virginia), Delta (Arkansas, Louisiana, and Mississippi), Southern Plains (Oklahoma and Texas), and Mountain I (Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming) regions. In California, the cool, wet spring caused considerable delays in planting and slowed development of most field and vegetable crops. The slow start to the growing season continued to keep crop progress behind normal through early July, reducing the need for hired workers. Moderate to heavy rainfall from Hurricane Dennis hampered fieldwork in both Appalachian regions, greatly decreasing the demand for hired workers. In the Delta region, the hot, dry weather in Arkansas was more than offset by the rain and wet conditions in Louisiana and Mississippi, causing the overall demand for workers in the region to decline. In the Southern Plains region, season-long dry conditions over much of Texas severely curtailed hay growth and production. With less hay acreage for harvest, fewer workers were needed. The cool, wet spring in the Mountain I region delayed crop development. Field activities that normally would have been ongoing during the reference week were pushed back due to the slow growth. Therefore, hired worker demand was lower.

(Continued on Page 4)

United States
Department
Of Agriculture



National
Agricultural
Statistics Service

Florida
Field Office

Benjamin F. Klugh, Jr.
Director
407/648-6013

TABLE 1 -- Florida agricultural workers, number of workers, wage rates, and hours worked, July 10 - 16, 2005, with comparisons

Employer, Year, and survey week	Hired Workers							
	Number of workers			Hours Worked Per Week	Wages Paid by Type of Work			
	All	Expected to work			All	Field	Livestock	
		150 days or more	149 days or less					
HIRED BY FARMERS								
2005		<i>Thousands</i>		<i>Hours</i>	<i>Dollars Per Hour^{1/}</i>			
July 10 -16	41.0	39.0	2.0	41.3	9.70	8.75	9.15	
April 10 - 16	49.0	41.0	8.0	38.7	9.31	8.20	9.90	
January 9 - 15	48.0	37.0	11.0	38.7	9.52	8.50	8.60	
2004								
October 10 - 16	52.0	44.0	8.0	39.4	9.14	7.95	9.10	
July 11 - 17	39.0	33.0	6.0	39.2	9.63	8.70	9.10	
April 11 - 17	57.0	53.0	4.0	38.3	8.79	7.85	8.60	
January 11-17	61.0	54.0	7.0	41.7	8.85	7.70	8.60	
2003								
October 12 -18	49.0	43.0	6.0	39.1	9.53	8.55	7.95	
July 6 - 12	45.0	39.0	6.0	39.0	9.55	8.55	8.30	
HIRED BY AGRICULTURAL SERVICES								
2005								
July 10 -16	2.0			45.0	9.90			
April 10 - 16	10.0			39.0	9.10			
January 9 - 15	8.0			40.0	9.50			
2004								
October 10 - 16	3.0			40.0	10.20			
July 11 - 17	3.0			45.0	9.70			
April 11 - 17	9.0			38.0	9.25			
January 11-17	14.0			38.5	9.25			
2003								
October 12 -18	4.0			38.0	9.65			
July 6 - 12	3.0			41.0	9.25			
HIRED BY BOTH FARMERS & AGRICULTURAL SERVICES								
2005								
July 10 -16	43.0				9.71			
April 10 - 16	59.0				9.27			
January 9 - 15	56.0				9.52			
2004								
October 10 - 16	55.0				9.20			
July 11 - 17	42.0				9.64			
April 11 - 17	66.0				8.85			
January 11-17	75.0				8.92			
2003								
October 12 -18	53.0				9.54			
July 6 - 12	48.0				9.53			

^{1/} Benefits, such as housing and meals, are provided some workers but the values are not included in the wage rates.

TABLE 2 -- Number of workers hired by farmers, wage rates, and hours worked, selected States, July 10 - 16, 2005, with comparisons ^{1/}

Item	Florida	California	Texas & Oklahoma	Arizona & New Mexico	Hawaii	United States ^{2/}
<i>Thousands</i>						
ALL HIRED WORKERS						
July 10 -16, 2005	41	200	63	24	7	930
April 10 - 16, 2005	49	*182	55	18	7	*753
July 11 -17, 2004	39	218	68	24	7	961
EXPECTED TO WORK						
150 days or more						
July 10 -16, 2005	39	156	47	21	6	656
April 10 - 16, 2005	41	*147	47	17	6	*600
July 11 -17, 2004	33	167	48	21	6	637
149 days or less						
July 10 -16, 2005	2	44	16	3	1	274
April 10 - 16, 2005	8	*35	8	1	1	*153
July 11 -17, 2004	6	51	20	3	1	324
<i>Dollars per hour ^{3/}</i>						
ALL HIRED WORKER WAGE RATE						
July 10 -16, 2005	9.70	9.69	9.27	8.53	11.76	9.39
April 10 - 16, 2005	9.31	9.48	9.28	9.18	11.33	*9.35
July 11 -17, 2004	9.63	9.26	8.58	8.34	11.46	9.04
WAGES BY TYPE OF WORKER						
Field & Livestock						
July 10 -16, 2005	8.81	9.01	8.50	7.98	10.05	8.78
April 10 - 16, 2005	8.37	*8.76	8.53	8.51	9.79	*8.72
July 11 -17, 2004	8.78	8.60	7.81	7.73	9.90	8.43
Field						
July 10 -16, 2005	8.75	8.78	8.07	7.90	10.00	8.62
April 10 - 16, 2005	8.20	*8.62	8.13	7.95	9.67	*8.56
July 11 -17, 2004	8.70	8.41	7.59	7.45	9.77	8.34
Livestock						
July 10 -16, 2005	9.15	10.60	9.06	8.11	^{4/}	9.25
April 10 - 16, 2005	9.90	*9.60	9.15	9.40	^{4/}	*9.14
July 11 -17, 2004	9.10	9.91	8.18	8.24	^{4/}	8.74
<i>Average hours per week</i>						
HOURS WORKED BY ALL HIRED WORKERS						
July 10 -16, 2005	41.3	45.5	36.5	45.6	40.0	40.6
April 10 -16, 2005	38.7	*45.0	42.3	44.8	39.6	*39.9
July 11 -7, 2004	39.2	44.6	37.8	45.0	39.4	39.2

^{1/} Excludes Agricultural Service workers.

^{2/} United States excludes Alaska.

^{3/} Value of any perquisites provided are not included in wage rates.

^{4/} Insufficient data for this category; included in all hired wages.

* Revised.

(Continued from page 1)

The largest increases in the number of hired farm workers from a year ago were in the Corn Belt II (Iowa and Missouri), Lake (Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin), Northern Plains (Kansas, Nebraska, North Dakota, and South Dakota), and Corn Belt I (Illinois, Indiana, and Ohio) regions. Persistent dryness in the Corn Belt II region caused pasture condition to deteriorate, necessitating more supplemental feeding and increasing the need for livestock workers. The dry conditions led to greater insect pressure on developing crops, resulting in more pesticide applications, which also raised the demand for hired workers. Warm, dry weather in the Lake and Northern Plains regions allowed field activities to progress rapidly, causing more hired workers to be needed. Despite hurricane moisture in the eastern half of the Corn Belt I region, dry conditions quickly returned, causing increased insect pressure in corn and soybeans. Therefore, more workers were needed for pesticide spraying.

Hired farm worker wage rates were generally above a year ago in most regions. The largest increases occurred in the Northeast II (Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania), Corn Belt II, Southern Plains, Mountain I, and Appalachian II regions. The higher wages in the Northeast II region were due to a smaller percentage of part time workers in the work force. In the Corn Belt II region, wages were up due to a higher percentage of skilled workers needed for crop spraying. Wages in the Southern Plains, Mountain I, and Appalachian II regions were higher because of more salaried workers putting in fewer hours, which pushed their hourly wage higher. Also, the Southern Plains and Appalachian II regions had fewer part time workers as a percent of the total.

RELIABILITY OF FARM LABOR ESTIMATES

SURVEY PROCEDURES: These data were collected by the National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS) during the last two weeks of July using sampling procedures to ensure every employer of agricultural workers had a chance of being selected.

Two samples of farm operators are selected. First, NASS maintains a list of farms that hire farm workers. Farms on this list are classified by size and type. Those expected to employ large numbers of workers are selected with greater frequency than those hiring few or no workers. A second sample consists of segments of land scientifically selected from an area sampling frame. Each June, highly trained interviewers locate each selected land segment and identify every farm operating land within the sample segment's boundaries. The names of farms found in these area segments are matched against the NASS list of farms; those not found on the list are included in the labor survey sample to represent all farms. This methodology is known as multiple frame sampling, with an area sample used to measure the incompleteness of the list. Additionally, a list of agricultural service firms was sampled in California and Florida. The survey reference week was July 10-16, 2005.

RELIABILITY: Two types of errors, sampling and non-sampling, are always present in an estimate based on a sample survey. Both types affect the "accuracy" of the estimates.

Sampling error occurs because a complete census is not taken. The sampling error measures the variation in estimates from the average of all possible samples. An estimate of 100 with a sampling error of 1 would mean that chances are 19 out of 20 that the estimates from all possible samples averaged together would be between 98 and 102; which is the survey estimate, plus or minus two times the sampling error. The sampling error expressed as a percent of the estimate is called the relative sampling error. The relative sampling error for number of hired workers at the U.S. level is normally less than 5 percent. The relative sampling error for the number of hired workers generally ranged between 4 and 36 percent at the regional level. The U.S. all hired farm worker wage rate had a relative sampling error of 0.9 percent. The relative sampling error was 1.0 percent for the combined field and livestock worker wage rate. Relative sampling errors for the all hired farm worker wage rate generally ranged between 2 and 8 percent at the regional levels. Relative sampling errors for wage rates published by type of farm and economic class of farm generally ranged between 2 and 18 percent at the regional level.

Non-sampling errors can occur in a complete census as well as in sample surveys. They are caused by the inability to obtain correct information from each operation sampled, differences in interpreting questions or definitions, and mistakes in editing, coding or processing the data. Special efforts are taken at each step of the survey to minimize non-sampling errors.

Revision Policy: Farm labor information is subject to revision the next time the information is published or the year after the original publication date. The basis for revision must be supported by additional data that directly affect the level of the estimate. Worker numbers and wage rates for July 2004 and April 2005 were subject to revision with this report. If any revisions were made to previous data, they are reprinted in this report for your information, and they are identified as such.