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## 1. Executive Summary

The primary objective of the content evaluation was to measure the accuracy of census data tabulated from respondents to the 1982 Census of Wholesale Trade. Wholesale petroleum distributors, Standard Industrial Classifications (SIC's) 5171 and 5172, were chosen for the study because they were known to have serious reporting problems.

Intensive personal visit interviews were conducted for a sample of establishments, during which highly accurate data (reinterview) were collected for three census items: total dollar volume of business (sales), operating expenses, and sales by commodity line. The reinterview data were compared to data tabulated in the census for sample establishments using ratio estimators. The table below shows the ratios for total sales and operating expenses.

> Ratios of $\frac{\text { Reinterview Data }}{\text { Tabulated Data }}$
> (standard errors)

Census item SIC 5171 SIC 5172

Total Sales
0.868
(0.037)

Operating Expenses

| 1.111 | 0.793 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $(0.029)$ | $(.056)$ |

In the process of constructing the reinterview data, the kinds of errors made by respondents were examined. Errors made on individual components of sales and operating expenses did not contribute much to total response errors. However, respondents' use of estimates on census forms, or failure to report sales or operating expenses at all, accounted for the largest subtotals of reporting errors.
2. Results

The content evaluation studied the accuracy of several items on 1982 Economic Censuses forms completed by wholesale petroleum distributors, Standard Industrial Classifications (SIC) 5171 and 5172 . These items were dollar volume of business (total sales) including commission business, operating expenses, and sales by commodity line. These items are reproduced from the census form CB-5109 in Appendix A. The main objective of the study was to estimate the accuracy of the respondent (to the census) portion of the published U.S. totals for each of these items. Highly accurate values, referred to as reinterview data, for these items were obtained from a sample of establishments during intensive personal visit interviews. Estimates of totals for an item were then computed from the sample using each of three versions of data: values as originally reported on census forms, called reported data, values as used in census tabulations after census processing, called tabulated data, and reinterview data. Ratios of pairs of these totals were then computed as shown in Table 1 for total sales and operating expenses.

Table 1. Ratios of Estimated Totals for Dollar Volume of Business (Sales) and Operating Expenses

|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \hat{R}_{1}=\frac{\text { reinterview }}{\text { tabulated }} \\ \left(\text { se of } \hat{R}_{1}\right. \text { ) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hat{R}_{2}=\frac{\text { tabulated }}{\text { reported }} \\ \left(\text { se of } \hat{R}_{2}\right. \text { ) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hat{R}_{3}=\frac{\text { reinterview }}{\text { reported }} \\ \left(\text { se of } \hat{R}_{3}\right) \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SIC 5171 |  |  |  |  |
| Sales |  | $\begin{aligned} & 1.129 \\ & (.085) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.987 \\ & (.026) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.095 \\ & (.098) \end{aligned}$ |
| Operating Expenses |  | 1.111* | 0.825* | 0.948 |
|  |  | (.029) | (.050) | (.044) |
| SIC 5172 |  |  |  |  |
| Sales |  | .868* | 1.557 非 | 0.908 |
|  |  | (.037) | (.461) | (.132) |
|  | Operating Expenses | 0.793* | 0.425 e* $^{*}$ |  |
|  |  | (.056) | (.229) | $(.061)$ |
| * Significantly different from 1.0 at $\alpha=0.05$. |  |  |  |  |
| ** Significantly different from 1.0 at $\alpha=0.10$. |  |  |  |  |
| \# When one outlier is removed, this ratio becomes 1.107 (.029) |  |  |  |  |
| © | When one outlier is | ved, this ratio | mes 1.160 (.09 |  |

In looking at the first column of Table 1 , the ratios of reinterview data to tabulated data, the respondent portion of the published totals for both sales and operating expenses are lower than they should be for SIC 5171 and higher than they should be for SIC 5172. Three of these ratios are significantly different from 1.0 , indicating that the published data for respondents is significantly in error for these items.

The ratios $\hat{R}_{1}, \hat{R}_{2}$, and $\hat{R}_{3}$ can be looked at together as an indication of what may be happening in census processing. The combinations of ratios indicate the following:

For SIC 5171 sales: tabulated data < reported data < reinterview data For SIC 5171 operating expenses: tabulated data < reinterview data < reported data, For SIC 5172 sales: reinterview data < reported data < tabulated data, For SIC 5172 operating expenses: reinterview data < reported data < tabulated data,

For SIC 5171 sales and SIC 5172 sales and operating expenses, census editing is changing the originally reported data in the wrong direction. For SIC 5171 operating expenses, census editing is changing the reported data in the right direction but too far.

The reinterview values for each census item were reconstructed from originally reported data by making corrections for errors made by respondents on individual components of the census item. For example, business insurance costs should be included in reported operating expenses according to the census definition of the item. When a respondent indicated that insurance costs had been left out, the amount of the error was obtained and later added in to reconstruct the reinterview operating expenses for the respondent's establishment. Tables 2 through 5 summarize the corrections made to originally reported values for sales and operating expenses.

The first two rows of Tables 2-5 represent the overall quality of the originally reported numbers. The first row represents cases which left the sales or operating expenses item on their census forms blank, but based on the content evaluation interviews, should have reported figures (item nonresponse on the census form). The second row represents cases which reported estimated figures on the census forms but gave the interviewer better total figures. The rest of the rows represent particular components of the census items. The census definitions for the sales and operating expenses items determined Whether each component should have been included in or excluded from the reported total sales or operating expenses figures. The columns of the tables are defined as follows:

| Number |  | weighted count of establishments for which a component |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Eligible |  | was applicable, and therefore the respondents had an |
|  |  | opportunity to make a mistake. |
|  |  |  |
| Number | - | weighted count of establishments which included or excluded |
| of |  | a component erroneously when providing the total figure |
| Errors |  | for sales or operating expenses. |
| Number | - | Weighted count of establishments which provided book |
| of |  | figures or reliable estimates for corrections to the |
| Reliable |  | component. The difference between this column and Number |
| Corrections |  | of Errors represents the establishments which could not |
|  |  | provide a correction or provided corrections that were |
|  |  | judged by the interviewer to be unreliable. |
| Total | - | Weighted total, in thousands of dollars, of the book or |
| Correction |  | reliable corrections for the component. |

Table 2. Components for Total Sales - SIC - 5171
( 549 unweighted, 8,886 weighted establishments included in table)

| Component | Number of Eligible Establishments | Number of Errors | Number of Reliable Corrections | ```Total Correction ($1,000's)``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Item Nonresponse on Census Form | 324 | 324 | $324^{\circ}$ | \$ 13,297,824 |
| 2. Correction for Estimation on Census Form | 8524 | 1279 | 1279 | 9,024,642 |
| 3. Receipts for services (should be included) | 2899 | 225 | 174 | 8,036 |
| 4. Receipts for goods delivered in 1982 but not paid in 1982 (should be included) | 6495 | 76 | 22 | 2,129 |
| 5. "Goods delivered before 1982, paid for in 1982 (should be excluded) | 5623 | 459 | 333 | -158,207 |
| 6. Carrying or other credit charges (should be excluded) | 4142 | 1438 | 1267 | -46,960 |
| 7. Nonoperating income (should be excluded) | 3563 | 938 | 926 | -47,913 |
| 8. Sales abroad of goods that never entered U.S. territory (should be excluded) | 316 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 9. Export sales (should be included) | 111 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10. Sales or excise taxes collected from customers by establishment (should be excluded) | 6326 | 2591 | 2012 | -997,562 |
| 11. Excise taxes paid before or at time that establishment purchased goods (should be included) | 2474 | 144 | 86 | 81,282 |
| 12. Refunds, discounts, allowances (should be deducted) | 4648 | 1137 | 632 | $-104,724$ |
| 13. Value of trade-ins accepted as partial payment for goods (should be included) | 369 | 67 | 33 | 270 |
| 14. Gross selling value of commission business including commisions, brokerage, or age fees (should be included) | . 340 | 195 | 195 | 18,981 |
| TOTAL |  |  |  | \$ 21,077,258 |

Table 3. Components for Total Sales - SIC - 5172
( 144 unweighted 1,129 weighted establishments included in table)
$\left.\left.\begin{array}{lcccc} \\ \text { Component }\end{array} \begin{array}{c}\text { Number of } \\ \text { Eligible }\end{array}\right) \begin{array}{c}\text { Number } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Errors }\end{array}\right)$

Table 4. Components of Operating Expenses - SIC - 5171 (537 unweighted, 8,550 weighted establishments included in table)

| Component | Number of Eligible Establishments | Number of Errors | - Number of Reliable Corrections | Total Correction (\$1,000's) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Item nonresponse on census form | 791 | 791 | 791 | \$ 218,272 |
| 2. Correction for estimation on census form | 7759 | 1009 | 1009 | $-2,070,548$ |
| 3. Withdrawals by or payments to proprietors or partners (should be excluded) | 582 | 63 | 63 | $-1,631$ |
| 4. Gross payroll (should be included) | 8005 | 266 | 233 | 41,833 |
| 5. Employer's contributions to <br> - legally required governmental programs - FICA etc. (should be included) | 8148 | 192 | 80 | 2,219 |
| 6. Employer's contributions to voluntary programs or negotiated benefits (should be included) | 5363 | 245 | 211 | 4,401 |
| 7. Business insurance costs (snould be included) | 7415 | 179 | 95 | : 941 |
| 8. Sales or excise taxes collected from customers (should be excluded) | 5954 | 594 | 408 | -16,568 |
| 9. Fines, license fees, taxes (should be included) | 7738 | 325 | 257 | 3,246 |
| 10. Cost of goods bought for resale (should be excluded) | 8376 | 154 | 86 | -252,098 |
| 11. Costs of office supplies (should be included) | 8468 | 43 | 23 | 487 |
| 12. Costs for storing or shipping inventory (should be included) | . 5149 | 427 | 353 | 60,085 |
| 13. Costs of utilities (should be included) | 8470 | 87 | 46 | 413 |
| 14. Losses from theft, damage, bad debts (should be included) | 5094 | 631 | 578 | 15,668 |
| 15. Costs for fuel purchased and consumed by establishment (other than highway vehicles) (should be included) | 4255 | 1 | 0 | 0 |

Table 4. Components of Operating Expenses - SIC - 5171 (Continued)

| Component E | Number of Eligible Establishments | Number of Errors | Number of Reliable Corrections | Total Correction ( $\$ 1,000$ 's) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 16. Costs for purchased advertising (should be included) | 6214 | 216 | 169 | 566 |
| 17. Commissions paid to employees not included in payroll (should be included) | 642 | 32 | 32 | 64 |
| 18. Commissions or subcontract fees paid to persons or firms outside the company (should be included) | 1675 | 211 | 140 | 15,783 |
| 19. Repair service payments to persons or firms outside the - company (should be included) | 7183 | 104 | 103 | 1,462 |
| 20. Capital leasing payments (shouzd be excluded) | 982 | 585 | 470 | -12,416 |
| 21. Depreciation charges against capital leases (should be included) | 1676 | 241 | 182 | 5,141 |
| 22. Depreciation or amortization charges (should be included) | 5528 | 465 | 386 | 9,413 |
| 23. Value of or payments for depreciable assets (should be excluded) | 5331 | 253 | 201 | -15,685 |
| 24. Lease or rental payments by multi-unit establishments to parent company (should be excluded) | 596 | 219 | 208 | -7,235 |
| 25. Rent for buildings or equipment owned by another company (should be included) | 2565 | 130 | 109 | 2,419 |
| 26. Payment for leasing of land (snould be excluded) | 1334 | 1094 | 1023 | -9,252 |
| 27. Costs of repairs covered by lease payments (should be excluded) | 444 | 76 | 76 | -203 |
| 28. Costs for utilities covered by lease payments (should be excluded) | 213 | 63 | 42 | 0 |
| total |  |  |  | 2,013,505 |

Table 5. Components of Operating Expenses - SIC - 5172
(146 unweighted, 1,163 weighted establishments included in table)

| Component | Number of Eligible Establishments | Number of Errors | Number of Reliable Corrections | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ \text { Correction } \\ (\$ 1,000 ' s) \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Item nonresponse on census form | 54 | 54 | 54 | \$ 20,635 |
| 2. Correction for estimation on census form | 1109 | 157 | 157 | -2,729 |
| 3. Withdrawals by or payments to proprietors or partners (should be excluded) | 37 | 5 | 5 | $-1,857$ |
| 4. Gross payroll <br> (should be included) | 1037 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5. Employer's contributions to legally required governmental programs - FICA etc. (should be excluded) | 978 | 6 | 6 | 13 |
| 6. Employer's contributions to voluntary programs or negotiated benefits (should be included) | 590 | 11 | 7 | 167 |
| 7. Business insurance costs (should be included) | 890 | 8 | 5 | 535 |
| 8. Sales or excise taxes collected from customers (should be excluded) | 501 | 37 | 27 | -1,569 |
| 9. Fines, license fees, taxes (should be included) | 955 | 5 | 1 | 30 |
| 10. Cost of goods bought for for resale (should be excluded) | 1140 | 18 | 16 | -33,660 |
| 11. Costs of office supplies (should be included) | 1163 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12. Costs for storing or shipping inventory (snould be included) | 432 | 34 | 24 | 13,120 |
| 13. Costs of utilities (should be included) | 1163 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14. Losses from thert, damage, bad debts (should be included) | 640 | 60 | 33 | 9,046 |
| 15. Costs for fuel purchased and consumed by establishment (other than hignway vehicles) (should be included) | 410 | 1 | 0 | 0 |

Table 5. Components of Operating Expenses - SIC - 5172
(Continued)

| Component E | Number of Eligible Establishments | Number of Errors | Number of Reliable Corrections | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ \text { Correction } \\ (\$ 1,000 ' s) \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 16. Costs for purchased advertising (should be included) | 639 | 23 | 1 | 14 |
| 17. Commissions paid to employees not included in payroll (should be included) | 79 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 18. Commissions or subcontract fees paid to persons or firms outside the company (should be included) | e 404 | 21 | 15 | 4,845 |
| 19. Repair service payments to -persons or firms outside the company (should be included) | 832 | 2 | 1 | 320 |
| 20. Capital leasing payments (should be excluded) | 106 | 46 | 46 | -9,457 |
| 21. Depreciation charges against capital leases (should be included) | 319 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 22. Depreciation or amortization charges (should be included) | 583 | 41 | 41 | 14,331 |
| 23. Value of or payments for depreciable assets (should be excluded) | 542 | 14 | 11 | -184 |
| 24. Lease or rental payments by multi-unit establishments to parent company (should be excluded) | 75 | 38 | 25 | $-1,414$ |
| 25. Rent for buildings or equipment owned by another company (should be included) | 484 | 1 | 1 | 325 |
| 26. Payment for leasing of land (should be excluded) | - 62 | 60 | 25 | -870 |
| 27. Costs of repairs covered by lease payments (should be excluded) | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 28. Costs for utilities covered by lease payments (should be excluded) | 182 | 12 | 12 | -268 |
| TOTAL |  |  |  | \$ 11.373 |

In order to interpret Tables 2 through 5, it should be noted that the total correction for each component is understated due to Component 2, correction for estimation on census form. When respondents provided a new total figure for a reported census item the difference between the new and old total figures was not broken down into smaller components. Therefore Component 2 represents a composite of corrections for other components. The reason for compiling Tables 2 through 5 was to determine whether any individual components were responsible for a large part of reporting error on each census item. In looking at Tables 2 and 3 , however, components of total sales for SIC's 5171 and 5172 , most of the individual components are of ilttle imporfance and cancel out with each other. Component 10 , sales or excise taxes, needed the largest correction for SIC 5171 sales, and Component 8, sales abroad of goods that never entered U.S. territory, needed the largest correction for SIC 5172 sales. Component 2 for these tables is interesting in that, for SIC 5171, the correction for estimation on the census form added nine billion dollars to total sales, almost half of the grand total addition to sales, while for SIC 5172, this correction subtracted one billion dollars from sales, part of which was cancelled out by additions to sales.

In looking at Tables 4 and 5 , only one definitional component stands out, which is Component 10 , cost of goods bought for resale, in Table 4, SIC 5171 operating expenses. Also in Table 4, the correction for estimation on the census form subtracted two billion dollars from total operating expenses, which is about the same amount as the grand total correction to reported operating expenses.

After looking at the ratios and components of sales and operating expenses, it appears that the best way to improve the accuracy of the reported published sales and operating expenses is to first encourage respondents to
report book figures rather than estimates. After that, census processing must be designed to avoid compounding respondents' errors.

The sales by commodity line (Item 13 , see Appendix A) item on the census form requests a breakdown of each establishments total sales into separate figures for each commodity commonly handled by petroleum wholesalers, such as aviation gasoline, motor gasoline, jet fuel, and related products like marketing equipment or tires and tubes. Tables 6 and 7 show ratios of weighted reported, tabulated and reinterview sales in dollars and sales in gallons where appropriate, for each commodity line. To arrive at the published census total for a commodity line, say aviation gasoline, data were tabulated for dealers in aviation gasoline which reported figures that appeared to be reliable. This tabulated figure was then inflated to reflect all aviation gasoline dealers, including nonrespondents to the census. The ratios in Tables 6 and 7 are computed from establishments which were used in census tabulations for a commodity line and provided reinterview data to the content evaluation survey. For some commodity lines, this set of establishments was very small and for the commodity lines where less than 10 establishments fell into this category, the ratios were dropped from the tables.

The most interesting thing to be seen in Tables 6 and 7 is the wide variability in the ratios from one commodity line to another. For some lines, such as aviation gasoline for SIC 5171, reported, tabulated and reinterview data were very close together, while for others, such as lubricating oll and grease for SIC 5171 the three versions of the data were much farther apart. Also, the accuracy of sales in gallons varied differently from sales in dollars. And last, the gallons and dollars ratios were neither consistently above nor below 1.0 but part of these is explained by the fact that different
establishments were in each ratio. So Tables 6 and 7 provided a warning that ensuring the accuracy of published totals for individual commodity lines would be a very difficult task.

## Table 6. Ratios of Reinterview, Tabulated and Reported Data for Sales by Commodity Line SIC 5171

## Sales in Dollars

Sales in Gallons

$$
\hat{R}_{1}=\frac{\text { rein }}{\text { tab }} \quad \hat{R}_{2}=\frac{\text { tab }}{\text { rep }} \quad \hat{R}_{3}=\frac{\text { rein }}{\text { rep }}
$$

$$
\hat{R}_{1}=\frac{r e i n}{t a b}
$$

$$
\hat{R}_{2}=\frac{\mathrm{tab}}{\mathrm{rep}}
$$ $\hat{R}_{3}=\frac{r e i n}{r e p}$

|  | 1.0005 | 1.0018 | .9989 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Ratio | 389 | 810 | 298 |
| No. of Cases (weighted) | 35 | 47 | 26 |
| No. of Cases (unweighted) | 35 |  |  |

$$
\text { . } 9999
$$

            26
    $$
417
$$

$$
351
$$

## Motor Gasoline

$$
31
$$

$$
29
$$

Ratio 1.0032
No. of Cases (weighted) 5166
No. of Cases (unweighted) 291
Special Naphtha
Ratio .8534
$\begin{array}{rr}1.0251 & .9994 \\ 5167 & 4892 \\ 263 & 246\end{array}$

$$
1.0000
$$

$$
4588
$$

$$
236
$$

    \(\begin{array}{rr}.9958 & .6947 \\ 671 & 421\end{array}\)
    $$
.7964 \quad .8905
$$

    421
    25

$$
708
$$

$$
498
$$

                    1.1466
    $$
1.2
$$

$$
712
$$

        712
    $$
52
$$

$$
224
$$

$$
20
$$

                .9826
    .9624
    $$
.0543
$$

            2991
            2698
    $$
2698
$$

        140
    $$
144
$$

            .9971
                756
    274

$$
.9969
$$

$$
262
$$

$$
244
$$

                    1.1
                        36
    $$
.9992
$$

        26
            1.2076
        37
    $$
490
$$

$$
\begin{array}{r}
1.0000 \\
495
\end{array}
$$

$$
27
$$

                1.0000
    287
34
1.0000
287
34
1.0000
287
34

$$
\begin{array}{rrr}
1.1697 & .8724 & 1.0000 \\
350 & 355 & 320 \\
41 & 36 &
\end{array}
$$

            \(\begin{array}{rr}1.1061 & 1.0183 \\ 4779 & 4370 \\ 247 & 225\end{array}\)
            \(\begin{array}{rrr}1.0037 & .9951 & .9513 \\ 3253 & 2661 & 2698 \\ 183 & 144 & 144 \\ 1.0104 & .9822 & .9969 \\ 268 & 262 & 244 \\ 34 & 30 & 31\end{array}\)
            \(\begin{array}{rr}.9863 & .9837 \\ 4249 & 3963 \\ 192 & 179\end{array}\)
    Lubricating oil and grease
$\begin{array}{lr}\text { Ratio } & 1.0320 \\ \text { No. of Cases (weighted) } \\ 4506\end{array}$
No. of Cases (unweighted) 244
Liquefied petroleum gases
Ratio .9620
No. of Cases (weighted) 460
No. of Cases (unweighted) 34
715.. 459
$\begin{array}{lr}\text { No. of Cases (weighted) } & 378 \\ \text { No. of Cases (unweighted) } & 41\end{array}$
No. of Cases (unweighted)
No. 2 Distillate fuel

$$
\begin{array}{r}
1.0220 \\
4869 \\
277
\end{array}
$$

    .9758
    3855
207
Jet Fuel

$$
2076
$$

            1.0103
    691
287

$$
375
$$

Crude oil
.9992
357
17
. 9992
39
.9155
426
36
52
No. of Cases (weighted) 655
No. of Cases (unweighted) 38
Ratio
41

| Ratio | 1.0640 |
| :--- | ---: |
| No. of Cases (weighted) | 4717 |
| No. of Cases (unweighted) | 273 |

No. of Cases (unweighted) 273
All other Distillate fuel
Ratio 1.0657
.9885
4241

| .9885 | .9980 |
| ---: | ---: |
| 4241 | 497 |
| 224 | 280 |


| 1.0034 | .9926 | 1.0000 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 5266 | 4535 | 4588 |
| 296 | 237 | 236 |31

            .9035
    
    3531
    
                                    .9692
    
                                    32.5
    .9035
3531 ..... 9692
325
207$\begin{array}{rr}.9577 & 1.2109 \\ 476 & 375\end{array}$

$$
\begin{array}{r}
370 \\
\hline
\end{array}
$$

Ratio 1.0294
No. of Cases (weighted) 71No. of Cases (unweighted) 13

Table 6. Ratios of Reinterview, Tabulated and Reported Data for Sales by Commodity Line SIC 5171 Continued

## Sales in Dollars

$$
\hat{R}_{1}=\frac{\text { rein }}{\operatorname{tab}} \quad \hat{R}_{2}=\frac{\operatorname{tab}}{r e p} \quad \cdot \quad \hat{R}_{3}=\frac{\text { rein }}{r e p}
$$

| Other petroleum products |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ratio | 1.5373 | . 7668 | . 9915 |
| Number of Cases (weighted) | 116 | 522 | 198 |
| Number of Cases (unweighted) | 16 | 31 | 19 |
| Automotive parts and supplies |  |  |  |
| Ratio | 1.1128 | . 9970 | . 9752 |
| Number pf Cases (weighted) | 1491 | 1222 | 832 |
| Number of Cases (unweighted) | 88 | 62 | 47 |
| Petroleum products marketing equipment |  |  |  |
| Ratio | 1.6000 | . 9327 | --- |
| Number of Cases (weighted) | 332 | 483 | --- |
| Number of Cases (unweighted) | 21 | 25 | --- |
| Tires and Tubes |  |  |  |
| Ratio | 1.0265 | 1.0001 | . 9358 |
| Number of Cases (weighted) | 1439 | 1532 | 1238 |
| Number of Cases (unweighted) | 82 | 71 | 55 |
| Chemicals and Allied products |  |  |  |
| Ratio | 2.2456 | 1.0170 | --- |
| Number of Cases (weighted) | 228 | 516 | --- |
| Number of Cases (unweighted) | 13 | 26 | --- |
| Farm Supplies |  |  |  |
| Ratio | . 9521 | 1.2438 | . 9932 |
| Number of Cases (weighted) | 313 | 527 | 215 |
| Number of Cases (unweighted) | 15 | 26 | 12 |
| Rental receipts |  |  |  |
| Ratio | 1.6272 | . 9877 | 1.0090 |
| Number of Cases (weighted) | 1627 | 730 | 542 |
| Number of Cases (unweighted) | 108 | 44 | 36 |
| Service receipts and labor charges |  |  |  |
| Ratio | 1.0412 | . 9829 | . 9738 |
| Number of Cases (weighted) | 1150 | 1060 | 739 |
| Number of Cases (unweighted) | 78 | 54 | 42 |

Table 7. Ratios of Reinterview, Tabulated and Reported Data for Sales by Commodity Line SIC 5172

## Sales in Dollars

$$
\hat{R}_{1}=\frac{\text { rein }}{\operatorname{tab}} \quad \hat{R}_{2}=\frac{\operatorname{tab}}{r e p} \quad \hat{R}_{3}=\frac{r e i n}{r e p}
$$

## Sales in Gallons

$$
\hat{R}_{1}=\frac{\text { rein }}{\operatorname{tab}} \quad \hat{R}_{2}=\frac{\text { tab }}{\text { rep }} \quad \hat{R}_{3}=\frac{\text { rein }}{\text { rep }}
$$

## Motor Gasoline

Ratio
No. of Cases (weighted)
No. of Cases (unweight
No. 2 Distillate fuel

|  | 1.0390 | .9586 | 1.0060 | 1.0118 | .9904 | .9988 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Ratio | 463 | 282 | 172 | 434 | 213 | 147 |
| No. of Cases (weighted) | 53 | 38 | 44 | 39 | 33 |  |
| No. of Cases (unweighted) | .47 |  |  |  |  |  |

All other distillate fuel
Ratio
No. of Cases (wei
No. of Cases (unw
Residual fuel oil
Ratio
No. of Cases (weighted)
No. of Cases (unweighted)

Lubricating oil and grease

| .0075 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Ratio | .9883 | 1.0084 | .9882 | 1.0339 | .9988 | 202 |
| No. of Cases (weighted) | 423 | 306 | 161 | 253 | 105 |  |
| No. of Cases (unweighted) | 45 | 54 | 35 | 32 | 34 | 25 |

Liquefied petroleum gases

| Ratio | . 9764 | 1.0006 | . 9815 | 1.0412 | . 9619 | . 9965 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. of Cases (weighted) | 65 | 63 | 56 | 65 | 53 | 56 |
| No. of Cases (unweighted) | 11 | 16 | 12 | 11 | 12 | 12 |
| Crude oil |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ratio | . 9704 | 1.3505 | 1.0000 | --- | . 6553 |  |
| No. of Cases (weighted) | 80 | 121 | 80 | --- | 44 | -- |
| No. of Cases (unweighted) | 17 | 26 | 17 | --- | 12 | --- |

## Table 7. Ratios of Reinterview, Tabulated and Reported Data for Sales by Commodity Line SIC 5172 Continued

Sales in Dollars

$$
\hat{R}_{1}=\frac{\text { rein }}{t a b} \quad \hat{R}_{2}=\frac{t a b}{r e p} \quad . \quad \hat{R}_{3}=\frac{\text { rein }}{\text { rep }}
$$

| Other petroleum products |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ratio | . 9377 | 1.5427 | -- |
| Number of Cases (weighted) | 50 | 54 |  |
| Number of Cases (unweighted) | 12 | 15 | --- |
| Automotive parts and supplies |  |  |  |
| Ratio | 1.5453 | . 9910 | 1.3831 |
| Number of Cases (weighted) | 80 | 50 | 43 |
| Number of Cases (unweighted) | 17 | 17 | 14 |
| Tires and Tubes* |  |  |  |
| Ratio | 1.0182 | .9943 | . 9981 |
| Number of Cases (weighted) | 45 | 71 | 37 |
| Number of Cases (unweighted) | 12 | 15 | 10 |
| Rental Receipts |  |  |  |
| Ratio | 1.0969 | --- | --- |
| Number of Cases (weighted) | 77 | --- | --- |
| Number of Cases (unweighted) | 12 | --- | --- |
| Service Receipts and labor charges |  |  |  |
| Ratio | 1.0657 | . 9854 | 1.0000 |
| Number of Cases (weighted) | 47 | 120 | 56 |
| Number of Cases (unweighted) | 13 | 22 | 15 |

During editing, the SIC and single unit/multiunit status of each sample case was checked. It is interesting to note how often these classifications were wrong, since the processing of the census and the accuracy of the final tabulations depend on them. The two tables below show how the sample cases were classified for mailout of $C B-5109$ forms, in final census tabulations, and by the reinterview. Table. 8 shows the SIC breakdown for 885 establishments for which a reinterview classification could be made (refusals, for example, are left out). Table 9 shows the single unit/multiunit status for the 759 cases for which interviews were completed.

## Table 8. Mailout, Tabulations, and Reinterview Classifications (number of establishments)

REINTERVIEW SIC 5171

|  | Tabulation | Tabulation | Tabulation | Tabulation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | SIC 5171 | SIC 5172 | SIC Out-of-Scope | SIC Unknown |
| Mailout SIC 5171 | 364 | 44 | 10 | 3 |
| Mailout SIC 5172 | 130 | 42 | 6 | 7 |

## REINTERVIEW SIC 5172

Mailout SIC 5171 Mailout SIC 5172
$10 \quad 26$
$10 \quad 98$
26

Tabulation Tabulation SIC Out-of-Scope SIC Unknown

| Tabulation | Tabulation | Tabulation | Tabulation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SIC 5171 | SIC 5172 | SIC Out-of-Scope | SIC Unknown |

1
1
2

## REINTERVIEW SIC OUT-OF-SCOPE

| Tabulation Tabulation | Tabulation | Tabulation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SIC 5171 | SIC 5172 | SIC Out-of-Scope SIC Unknown |


| Mailout SIC 5171 | 25 | 6 | 20 | 6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Mailout SIC | 5172 | 13 | 24 | 26 |

Notice that only 462 of the 885 establishments ( $364+98$, underlined) were mailed out and tabulated in the correct SIC, as determined by reinterview. This means that 423 cases, almost half, either were reclassified during processing or should have been reclassified.

Table 9. Single Unit/Multiunit Classifications (number of sample cases)

REINTERVIEW SINGLE UNITS

|  | Tabulation <br> Single Units | Tabulation <br> Multiunits |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Mailout Single Units | $\frac{274}{0}$ | 11 |
| Mailout Multiunits |  | 8 |

## REINTERVIEW MULTIUNITS

> Tabulation Single Units

Tabulation Multiunits

Meilout Single Units Mailout Multiunits

71
0

30
365

In Table 9, 120 of the sample cases were or should have been reclassified during census processing. Reclassification of a single unit to a multiunit is often difficult to do correctly during census processing, because data for a whole company must be split into subtotals for each establishment. Both Tables 8 and 9 demonstrate the extra problems associated with producing accurate tabulations for individual SIC's and counties beyond respondent errors as shown in Tables 2 through 5.

## 3. The Sample Design

The universe for this study was the set of establishments which were classified in SIC's 5171 or 5172 before the census, and after responding to the census, were still in SIC's 5171 and 5172. The first level of
stratification of establishments was by single-unit and multi-unit status. Establishments in the single-unit stratum were arranged in 128 primary sampling units (PSU's) which were formed from groups of contiguous counties. A small number of single units were separated from the PSU's and included in the sample with certainty due to their large size. The PSU's were stratified, based on employment and first quarter payroll, into 14 strata. One stratum, containing two PSU's, was designated the certainty stratum and both PSU's were later subject to within-PSU sampling. One PSU was sampled from each of the 13 non-certainty strata using probability proportional to first quarter payroll. Within the sample PSU's and the PSU's from the certainty stratum, establishments were further stratified into two to five substrata for each of SIC 5171 and 5172 based on annual payroll. The substrata of establishments with the largest payroll were designated certainty substrata within the PSU's and all establishments were included in the sample. Establishments were sampled systematically within the noncertainty substrata.

For multiunits, large establishments were first identified by payroll cutoffs and assigned to certainty strata. The rest of the multiunits, designated the noncertainty strata for SIC's 5171 and 5172 , were further stratified by payroll size. Systematic sampling was used within these substrata.

In order to conduct interviews within a reasonable time frame, it was necessary to draw the samples from the file of names and addresses used for mailing out census forms. Because of this, the sample included establishments which never responded to the census or which were transferred to other SIC's during census processing, both types being out-of-scope of the content evaluation. In order to ensure that a sufficient number of in-scope establishments would be sampled, the sample sizes needed for estimation were
inflated to cover the anticipated percentage of out-of-scope cases. Table 10 below summarizes the sample sizes and the weights associated with noncertainty establishments.

| Stratum |  | Number of Establishments in Inflated Sample | Number of In-scope <br> Establishments in Sample | Range of Weights Over Noncertainty Substrata |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SIC 5171 | Single units | 434 | 267 | 2.25-41.93 |
|  | Multiunits | 294 | 227 | 2.50-67.08 |
|  | Total | 728 | 494 | 2.25-67.08 |
| SIC 5172 | Single units | 285 | 166 | $2.80-18.5$ |
|  | Multiunits | 293 | 166 | $2.50-22.03$ |
|  | Total | 578 | 332 | 2.50-22.03 |

Details of the universe and sample design can be obtained from a sampling and estimation memorandum from Glenn Wolfgang to Carol Corby, July 16, 1985.

## 4. Methodology

Early in 1982, planning for the content evaluation began with the choice of wholesale petroleum distributors, a kind of business (KB) known to have serious reporting problems, as the target of the study. Questionnaires were developed and interviewers were trained. Interviews were conducted between July, 1983 and July, 1984, followed by processing and analysis of the data. The following subsections describe these activities.

### 4.1 The Questionnaires

The census items studied in the content evaluation were from the $C B-5109$ census form: Item 6, Dollar Volume of Business (sales), Item 9, Operating Expenses, and Item 13, Sales by Commodity Lines (see Appendix A). The general style of the questionnaire was as follows: first, the originally reported figure for an item was verified and determined to be a book figure or an estimate. When an estimate had been reported, the interviewer requested a book figure or a better estimate. Then it was determined whether the figure
included each component that it should according to the census definition of the item, and similarly, that it excluded components that should have been left out of the census item. Each time an error was found, the amount of the error was requested. For example, if costs for purchased advertising were not included in Item 9, Operating Expenses, a value for advertising costs was requested. The amounts for each error were later used to correct the reported figure. It was typical to find that any one establishment made errors on at most one or two components of an item.

Each time an amount was requested and obtained, a subjective judgment was made of the quality of the amount, using probing questions and visual cues, such as whether the respondent actually took the figure from accounting records or guessed at the amount. Codes of $B, R$, or $U$ for book figure, reliable estimate, or unreliable estimate were assigned to the amount based on the subjective judgment. In the event that the figure was unreliable or unavailable, or the interviewer was unsure of the quality of the figure, a request was made for a range of values that would indicate the lowest and highest values the true figure could take. During editing by SRD staff figures were compared to their ranges, and final judgements of the quality of each were made. If, after editing, the reinterview figure was still unreliable, it was not used in the anaiysis.

### 4.2 The Interviews

Voluntary personal visit interviews were conducted with the establishment or company employees who actualiy filled out the census forms or who were most familiar with the numbers reported on the forms. Personal visits were required mainly because of the need for judging the quality of numbers provided by respondents. These judgments could not be made using telephone interviews or a mailout-mailback questionnaire. After a two and one-nalf day
training session, Field Division interviewers conducted interviews at most single-unit establishments. Members of the professional staff from Census Bureau headquarters, primarily from Statistical Research Division and Business Division, conducted interviews for multi-unit establishments and large single units. The response rates for the content evaluation interviews are summarized below.

## TABLE 11. Response Rates



SIC 5171

| single units | unweighted | 267 | $\begin{array}{r} 240 \\ (89.9 \%) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 11 \\ (4.1 \%) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 16 \\ (6.0 \%) \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | weighted | 4712 | $\begin{array}{r} 4232 \\ (89.8 \%) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 160 \\ (3.4 \%) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 320 \\ (6.8 \%) \end{array}$ |
| multiunits | unweighted | 227 | $\begin{array}{r} 219 \\ (96.5 \%) \end{array}$ | $(2.2 \%)$ | $(1.3 \%)^{3}$ |
|  | weighted | 4989 | $\begin{array}{r} 4773 \\ (95.7 \%) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 87 \\ (1.7 \%) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 129 \\ (2.68) \end{array}$ |
| total | unweignted | 494 | $\begin{array}{r} 459 \\ (92.9 \%) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 16 \\ (3.2 \%) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 19 \\ (3.8 \%) \end{array}$ |
|  | weighted | 9701 | $\begin{array}{r} 9005 \\ (92.8 \%) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 247 \\ (2.5 \%) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 449 \\ (4.6 \%) \end{array}$ |

SIC 5172

| sirgle units | unweighted | 166 | $\begin{array}{r} 146 \\ (88.0 \%) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 9 \\ (5.4 \%) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 11 \\ (6.6 \%) \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | weighted | 1110 | $\begin{array}{r} 1004 \\ (90.5 \%) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 48 \\ (4.3 \%) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 58 \\ (5.2 \%) \end{array}$ |
| multiunits | unweighted | 166 | $\begin{array}{r} 154 \\ (92.8 \%) \end{array}$ | $(4.2 \%)$ | $\begin{array}{r} 5 \\ (3.0 \%) \end{array}$ |
|  | weighted | 1007 | $\begin{array}{r} 926 \\ (92.0 \%) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 20 \\ (2.0 \%) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 61 \\ (6.1 \%) \end{array}$ |
| total | unweighted | 332 | $\begin{array}{r} 300 \\ (90.4 \%) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 16 \\ (4.8 \%) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 16 \\ (4.8 \%) \end{array}$ |
|  | weighted | 2117 | $\begin{array}{r} 1930 \\ (91.2 \%) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 68 \\ (3.2 \%) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 119 \\ (5.6 \%) \end{array}$ |

\# from Table 10

* out-of-business, other cases that couldn't be reached

Given that the content evaluation interviews were voluntary, and that interviews lasted from 20 minutes to 90 minutes, the response rates shown in Table 9 were quite good. The effect of item nonresponse can be seen in Tables 2-5 in Section 2.

Several stages of processing were completed to get from raw questionnaire data to the final analysis. The first activity was a screening of the questionnaires for data from several establishments combined on one census form, cases which were actually in a different SIC, and major problems with the quality of the reinterview data. The more important problems that were uncovered by screening are documented in a memorandum from Glenn Wolfgang to Carol.Corby, March 28, 1985.

The keying stage involved further editing of the questionnaires. Data were keyed on a microcomputer using a program that edited the data as they were keyed, prompting the keyer to type in answers to each appropriate question (the system resembles Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing without the telephone). Invalid verbal responses were refused and skip patterns were checked. Then the data were keyed a second time, independently of the first keying. The two versions for each record were matched and any differences, usually due to keying errors, were reconciled.

The next stage completed two more reviews of the reinterview data: inspection of the high and low ranges on unreliable figures and verification of values for cases showing large differences between the reinterveiw figures and reported and tabulated figures. These edits ensured that only reliable reinterview data would be compared to tabulated data in the analysis. The last stage of data processing consisted of computer programming to prepare the file of establishment records for analysis (sorting, adding on weights, etc.) and to complete the ratio estimates.

### 4.3 The Estimators

This section presents a brief summary of the estimators used for the content evaluation excerpted from a full description included in a sampling and estimation memorandum from Glenn Wolfgang to Carol Corby, July 16, 1985. As was described in Section 2, the main results were a series of ratio estimates obtained from estimates of totals for reported data, reinterview data, and tabulated census data, for a given census item and SIC code. Let X and $Y$ represent the numerator and denominator values appropriate for one of these ratios. Then
$\rightarrow$

$$
\begin{equation*}
=\hat{R}=\frac{\hat{X}}{\hat{Y}} \tag{4.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

The general form for $\hat{X}$ (and similarly for $\hat{Y}$ ) is

$$
\begin{equation*}
\hat{X}=\sum_{K=1}^{2} \sum_{n=1}^{\sum_{i}^{8}} \frac{{ }^{1}}{P_{K h}} \quad \sum_{j=1}^{J_{K n}} \quad W_{K h i} \quad{ }_{i=1}^{n_{K h j}} a_{K h j i} \quad X_{K h j i} \tag{4.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\quad X_{K h j i} \quad$ is the census ite $m$ vaule for establishment $i$ in substratum $j$ within stratum h of frame K. K marks the mail-out list (SIC 5171 or SIC 5172) from which the establishment was originally sampled. This allows use of data from establish ments that belong in the kind of business being analyzed even when originally classified in the other frame.

| ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Khji | is an indicator variable ( 1 if case is valid for SIC being analyzed; $\emptyset$ otherwise) |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{Khji}}$ | $=a_{K h j i} X_{K h j i}$, a simplification useful in later formulas |
| ${ }^{n_{K h j}}$ | number of establish ments selected within substratum $j$ of stratum $h$ and frame $K$ |


where $\hat{X}_{S} \quad$ is the single-unit total derived from the first 13 strata, - which exclude first-cut certainty cases and certainty PSU's
$\hat{X}_{\text {SOP }} \quad$ single-unit total from two certainty PSU's, strata 14 and 15
$\mathrm{X}_{\text {SC }} \quad$ single-unit total for first-cut certainty cases, collected into stratum 16
$\hat{X}_{M} \quad$ multi-unit total derived from stratum 17 which excludes certainty cases
$X_{M C} \quad$ multi-unit certainty case total, collected in stratum 18

To derive a variance estimation formula in a form easy to compute, the overall estimator is first broken into components:
$\hat{\operatorname{Var}}(\hat{R})=\hat{R}^{2} \quad \frac{\hat{\operatorname{Var}}(\hat{X})}{\hat{X}^{2}}+\frac{\hat{\operatorname{Var}}(\hat{Y})}{\hat{Y}^{2}}-2 \frac{\hat{\operatorname{Cov}}(\hat{X}, \hat{Y})}{\hat{X} \hat{Y}}$
The numerators above may also be broken into components, ie.

$$
\begin{equation*}
\hat{\operatorname{Var}}(\hat{X})=\hat{\operatorname{Var}}\left(\hat{X}_{S}\right)+\hat{\operatorname{Var}}\left(\hat{\mathrm{X}}_{\mathrm{SCP}}\right)+\hat{\operatorname{Var}}\left(\hat{\mathrm{X}}_{\mathrm{SC}}\right)+\hat{\operatorname{Var}}\left(\hat{X}_{M}\right)+\hat{\operatorname{Var}}\left(\hat{X}_{M C}\right) \tag{4.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

and similarily for $\hat{\operatorname{Var}}(\hat{Y})$ and
$\hat{\operatorname{Cov}}(\hat{X}, \hat{Y})=\hat{\operatorname{Cov}}\left(\hat{X}_{S}, \hat{Y}_{S}\right)+\hat{\operatorname{Cov}}\left(\hat{X}_{S C P}, \hat{Y}_{S C P}\right)+\hat{\operatorname{Cov}}\left(\hat{X}_{S C}, \hat{Y}_{S C}\right)+\hat{\operatorname{Cov}}\left(\hat{X}_{M}, \hat{Y}_{M}\right)+\hat{\operatorname{Cov}}\left(\hat{X}_{M C}, \hat{Y}_{M C}\right)$
Since establishments providing $\hat{X}_{S C}, \hat{X}_{M C}, \hat{Y}_{S C}$, and $\hat{Y}_{M C}$ are sampled with certainty, the variances of those sums have zero sampling error and their terms may be dropped from the formulae as in

$$
\begin{equation*}
\hat{\operatorname{Var}}(\hat{X})=\hat{\operatorname{Var}}\left(\hat{X}_{S}\right)+\hat{\operatorname{Var}}\left(X_{S C P}\right)+\hat{\operatorname{Var}}\left(\hat{X}_{M}\right) \tag{4.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

When the variance and covariance expansions are substituted in (4.4)

$$
\begin{align*}
\hat{\operatorname{Var}}(\hat{R})=\hat{R}^{2} & \frac{\hat{\operatorname{Var}}\left(\hat{X}_{S}\right)}{\hat{X}^{2}}+\frac{\hat{\operatorname{Var}}\left(\hat{X}_{S C P}\right)}{\hat{X}^{2}}+\frac{\hat{\operatorname{Var}\left(\hat{X}_{M}\right)}}{\hat{X}^{2}} \\
& +\frac{\hat{\operatorname{Var}\left(\hat{Y}_{S}\right)}}{\hat{Y}^{2}}+\frac{\hat{\operatorname{Var}}\left(\hat{Y}_{S C P}\right)}{\hat{Y}^{2}}+\frac{\hat{\operatorname{Var}\left(\hat{Y}_{M}\right)}}{\hat{Y}^{2}} \\
& -2 \frac{\hat{\operatorname{Cov}\left(\hat{X}_{S}, \hat{Y}_{S}\right)}}{\hat{X} \hat{Y}}-2 \frac{\hat{\operatorname{Cov}}\left(\hat{X}_{S C P}, \hat{Y}_{S C P}\right)}{\hat{X} \hat{Y}}-2 \frac{\hat{\operatorname{Cov}}\left(\hat{X}_{M}, \hat{Y}_{M}\right)}{\hat{X} \hat{Y}}
\end{align*}
$$

Because of differences in sampling techniques used for $S, S C P$, and $M$ strata, variance and covariance formulae appropriate for these parts of the sample differ but, as shown, may be added to produce $\hat{\operatorname{Var}}(\hat{R}$ ). The following shows how the numerators of (4.7) may be computed.

A collapsed stratum variance estimator was used for $\operatorname{Var}\left(X_{S}\right)$ as follows:
$\operatorname{Var}\left(X_{S}\right)=\sum_{K=1}^{\sum} g_{g}^{\sum_{=1}} \frac{L_{K g}}{L_{K g}-1} \sum_{l=1}^{L_{K g}}\left(\hat{X}_{K g l}-\frac{\hat{X}_{K g}}{L_{K g}}\right)^{2}$
is the model for $\hat{\operatorname{Var}}\left(\hat{Y}_{S}\right)$ and also for
$\operatorname{Cov}\left(\hat{X}_{S}, \hat{Y}_{S}\right)=\sum_{K=1}^{2} \sum_{g=1}^{s} \frac{L_{K g}}{L_{K g-1}} \sum_{1=1}^{\sum_{K g}}\left(\hat{X}_{K g l}-\frac{\hat{X}_{K g}}{L_{K g}}\right)\left(\hat{Y}_{K g l}-\frac{\hat{Y}_{K g}}{L_{K g}}\right)$

i.e. the stratum total, $\hat{X}_{K h}$, for the 1 th PSU in group $g$.

$$
\hat{X}_{\mathrm{Kg}} \quad=\sum_{\mathrm{Kg}}^{\sum_{\mathrm{Kg}}} \hat{\mathrm{X}}_{\mathrm{KgI}} \text {, the group total. }
$$

* First difference estimators were used for $\operatorname{Var}\left(X_{S C P}\right)$ and $\operatorname{Var}\left(X_{M}\right)$ as follows:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\hat{\operatorname{Var}}\left(\hat{X}_{S C P}\right)=\sum_{K=1}^{2} \sum_{n=14}^{15} \sum_{j=1}^{\sum_{K h}} b_{K h j} N_{K h j}^{2}\left(\frac{1}{n_{K h j}}-\frac{1}{N_{K h j}}\right)_{i=2}^{n_{K h j}} \frac{\left(X_{K h j i}^{\prime}-X_{K h j}^{\prime}(i-1)\right)^{2}}{2\left(n_{K h j}^{-1}\right)} \tag{4.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $b_{K h j}$ is an indicator variable equal to 1 if some cases from that substrata were not selected and equal to 0 if all cases were selected as in certainty substrata.

$$
\operatorname{Var}\left(\hat{X}_{M}\right)=\sum_{K=1}^{2} \sum_{j=1}^{J} b_{K 17 j} N_{K 17 j}^{2}\left(\frac{1}{n_{K 17 j}}-\frac{1}{N_{K 17 j}}\right) \sum_{i=2}^{n_{K 17 j}} \frac{\left(x_{K 17 j i}-X_{K 17 j(i-1))}\right.}{2\left(n_{K 17 j}-1\right)}
$$

$$
\left.\hat{\operatorname{Var}}\left(\hat{Y}_{S C P}\right), \operatorname{Cov} \hat{( }_{X_{S C P}}, Y_{S C P}\right), \hat{V}\left(\hat{Y}_{M}\right) \text { and } \hat{\operatorname{Cov}}\left(\hat{X}_{M}, \hat{Y}_{M}\right) \text { are similar. }
$$

U.s. DEPARTMENT OF COMMEACE CUAEAL CF TME CEMEUS
FORM
СВ-5109

## 1982 CENSUS OF DISTRIBUTIVE TRADES

PETROLEUM AND PETROLEUM PRODUCTS

Item 6 - DOLLAR VOLUME OF BUSIMESS IN 1982
a. Sales of merchandise and other operating receipts

Did this establishment sell merchandise on a commission or brokerage basis?
c. Gross selling value of business conducted for the account of others (Include in item 6a)
d. Dollar volume of commissions or brokerage received on transactions reported in item 6c
e. What percentage of the products sold by this establishment did your company (including firms under common ownership or control) manufacture or mine in the United States or its possessions?
f. Did this establishment have transfers (billings) to other establishments within your company?
$104, \square$ YES-Go to oNO-SKIP to h
8. Dollar volume of transfers (billings) to other establishments within your company (DO NOT include in item 6a.)
L. Were $50 \%$ or more of the products sold by this establishnent imported from a foreign country?

TOTAL 1982 operating expenses, including payroll

| Mil. | Thou. | Dol. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 040 | 1 | 1 |
|  | 1 | 1 |



