

## **Survey Methods and Reliability Statement for MB3 Research Estimates of the Occupational Employment and Wage Statistics Survey**

### **Introduction**

The Occupational Employment and Wage Statistics (OEWS) survey measures occupational employment and wage rates for wage and salary workers in nonfarm establishments nationally, and in the 50 states and the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

About 7.5 million<sup>1</sup> in-scope establishments are stratified within their respective states by substate area, industry, size, and ownership. Substate areas include all officially defined metropolitan areas, metropolitan divisions<sup>2</sup>, and one or more nonmetropolitan areas. The North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) is used to stratify establishments by industry.

Probability sample panels of about 180,000 to 200,000 establishments are selected semiannually. Responses are obtained by mail, Internet or other electronic means, email, telephone, or personal visit. Respondents report their employees' job titles or occupations across 12 wage ranges. The job titles and descriptions are used to classify workers into occupations in the Standard Occupational Classification (SOC) system.

Estimates of occupational employment and wage rates are based on six panels of survey data collected over a 3-year cycle. The final in-scope sample size when six panels are combined is approximately 1.2 million establishments. Total 6-panel unweighted employment covers approximately 80 million<sup>3</sup> out of the total employment of over 140 million<sup>4</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> Total frame establishments, in millions: 7.9 in 2019, 7.7 in 2018; 7.6 in 2017; 7.5 in 2016; 7.4 in 2015

<sup>2</sup> Data for metropolitan divisions were eliminated in the May 2018 estimates; data are available for prior years.

<sup>3</sup> Total sample employment, millions: 83 in 2019, 83 in 2018; 82 in 2017; 81 in 2016; 79 in 2015

<sup>4</sup> Total frame employment, millions: 145 in 2019; 143 in 2018; 141 in 2017; 139 in 2016; 136 in 2015

The estimates described here are produced using a new system for model-based estimation using 3 years of OEWS data (MB3) to estimate current year occupational employment and wages. The sampling methods described here are the same as for the regular published OES estimates. MB3 estimation has advantages over the current OES methodology as described in [Model-Based Estimates for the Occupational Employment Statistics program](#). Estimates produced with MB3 are directly comparable to official estimates.

## **Occupational and industrial classification systems**

### ***The occupational classification system***

The U.S. Office of Management and Budget's Standard Occupational Classification (SOC) system is used to define occupations. The November 2012 to May 2018 panels were collected using the 2010 SOC system. November 2018 and later panels were collected using the 2018 SOC system. More information about the 2010 and 2018 SOC systems can be found at <https://www.bls.gov/soc/>.

The May 2019 OEWS estimates are based on a hybrid of the 2010 and 2018 SOCs so that data collected under the two different systems can be combined. Almost all occupations in the May 2019 OES hybrid system are the same as 2018 SOC occupations. However, in some cases, survey data for more than one 2018 and/or 2010 SOC occupation were combined to form a hybrid occupation. Some of these combinations are equivalent to a standard 2018 SOC broad occupation and are published under the 2018 SOC broad occupation code and title. Other combinations are equivalent to an occupation in the 2010 SOC and are published under their 2010 SOC code and title. Finally, some combinations are not found in either the 2010 or 2018 SOC structure. These are published under an OEWS-specific hybrid code and a composite title that indicates the content of the hybrid. Further information on hybrid SOC codes is available at [https://www.bls.gov/oes/soc\\_2018.htm](https://www.bls.gov/oes/soc_2018.htm).

### ***The industrial classification system***

The May 2015, 2016, and 2017 OEWS estimates use the 2012 North American Industry Classification System (NAICS). More information about NAICS can be found in the *2012 North American Industry Classification System* manual. The May 2018 and May 2019 OEWS estimates use the 2017 North

American Industry Classification System (NAICS). More information about NAICS can be found at the BLS web site [www.bls.gov/bls/naics.htm](http://www.bls.gov/bls/naics.htm) or in the 2017 North American Industry Classification System manual available at [www.census.gov/naics/](http://www.census.gov/naics/). Each establishment in the survey is assigned a 6-digit NAICS code based on its primary economic activity. The four panels from November 2015 to May 2017 were collected using the 2012 NAICS codes; these data were mapped to 2017 NAICS codes. The November 2017 and May 2018 panels were collected using the 2017 NAICS. Beginning with the May 2017 estimates, selected 4-digit and 5-digit NAICS industries previously published by OEWS are no longer published separately. More information on these NAICS aggregations is available at [www.bls.gov/oes/changes\\_2017.htm](http://www.bls.gov/oes/changes_2017.htm) in Tables 2 through 4.

### ***Industrial scope and stratification***

The survey covers the following NAICS industry sectors:

- 11 Logging (1133), support activities for crop production (1151),  
and support activities for animal production (1152) *only*
- 21 Mining
- 22 Utilities
- 23 Construction
- 31-33 Manufacturing
- 42 Wholesale trade
- 44-45 Retail trade
- 48-49 Transportation and warehousing
- 51 Information
- 52 Finance and insurance
- 53 Real estate and rental and leasing
- 54 Professional, scientific, and technical services
- 55 Management of companies and enterprises
- 56 Administrative and support and waste management and  
remediation services

- 61 Educational services
- 62 Healthcare and social assistance
- 71 Arts, entertainment, and recreation
- 72 Accommodation and food services
- 81 Other services, except public administration [private households (814) are excluded]

Federal government executive branch (assigned industry code 999100)\*

State government (assigned industry code 999200)\*

Local government (assigned industry code 999300)\*

\* These are OEWS-defined industry codes and not a part of the NAICS industry classification.

These sectors are stratified into about 302<sup>5</sup> industry groups at the 3-, 4-, 5-, or 6-digit NAICS level of detail.

## Concepts

An **establishment** is generally a single physical location at which economic activity occurs (e.g., store, factory, restaurant, etc.). Each establishment is assigned a 6-digit NAICS code. When a single physical location encompasses two or more distinct economic activities, it is treated as two or more separate establishments if separate payroll records are available and certain other criteria are met.

**Employment** refers to the number of workers who can be classified as full- or part-time employees, including workers on paid vacations or other types of paid leave; salaried officers, executives, and staff members of incorporated firms; employees temporarily assigned to other units; and noncontract employees for whom the reporting unit is their permanent duty station regardless of whether that unit prepares their paychecks.

---

<sup>5</sup> Industry group strata: 302 in 2019; 302 in 2018; 301 in 2017; 344 in 2016; 344 in 2015

The OEWS survey includes all full- and part-time wage and salary workers in nonfarm industries. Self-employed workers, owners and partners in unincorporated firms, household workers, and unpaid family workers are excluded.

**Occupations** are classified based on work performed and on required skills. Employees are assigned to an occupation based on the work they perform and not on their education or training. For example, an employee trained as an engineer but working as a drafter is reported as a drafter. Employees who perform the duties of two or more occupations are reported in the occupation that requires the highest level of skill or in the occupation where the most time is spent if there is no measurable difference in skill requirements. **Working supervisors** (those spending 20 percent or more of their time doing work similar to the workers they supervise) are classified with the workers they supervise. **Workers receiving on-the-job training, apprentices, and trainees** are classified with the occupations for which they are being trained.

A wage is money that is paid or received for work or services performed in a specified period. Base rate pay, cost-of-living allowances, guaranteed pay, hazardous-duty pay, incentive pay such as commissions and production bonuses, and tips are included in a wage. Back pay, jury duty pay, overtime pay, severance pay, shift differentials, nonproduction bonuses, employer costs for supplementary benefits, and tuition reimbursements are excluded. Federal government, the U.S. Postal Service (USPS), and most state governments report individual wage rates for workers. Wage rates for other employers are placed into one of the 12 wage intervals shown in table 1 below:

Starting in November 2013, OEWS began collecting data using the following updated wage intervals:

Interval	Wages	
	Hourly	Annual
Range A	Under \$9.25	Under \$19,240

Range B	\$9.25 to \$11.74	\$19,240 to \$24,439
Range C	\$11.75 to \$14.74	\$24,440 to \$30,679
Range D	\$14.75 to \$18.74	\$30,680 to \$38,999
Range E	\$18.75 to \$23.99	\$39,000 to \$49,919
Range F	\$24.00 to \$30.24	\$49,920 to \$62,919
Range G	\$30.25 to \$38.49	\$62,920 to \$80,079
Range H	\$38.50 to \$48.99	\$80,080 to \$101,919
Range I	\$49.00 to \$61.99	\$101,920 to \$128,959
Range J	\$62.00 to \$78.74	\$128,960 to \$163,799
Range K	\$78.75 to \$99.99	\$163,800 to \$207,999
Range L	\$100.00 and over	\$208,000 and over

---

Data for the May 2013 and November 2012 panels were collected with the following wage intervals:

---

Interval	Wages	
	Hourly	Annual
	-----	-----
Range A	Under \$9.25	Under \$19,240
Range B	\$9.25 to \$11.49	\$19,240 to \$23,919
Range C	\$11.50 to \$14.49	\$23,920 to \$30,159
Range D	\$14.50 to \$18.24	\$30,160 to \$37,959
Range E	\$18.25 to \$22.74	\$37,960 to \$47,319
Range F	\$22.75 to \$28.74	\$47,320 to \$59,799

Range G	\$28.75 to \$35.99	\$59,800 to \$74,879
Range H	\$36.00 to \$45.24	\$74,880 to \$94,119
Range I	\$45.25 to \$56.99	\$94,120 to \$118,559
Range J	\$57.00 to \$71.49	\$118,560 to \$148,719
Range K	\$71.50 to \$89.99	\$148,720 to \$187,199
Range L	\$90.00 and over	\$187,200 and over

---

### **3-year survey cycle of data collection**

The survey is based on a probability sample drawn from the universe of in-scope establishments stratified by geography, industry, size and ownership. The sample is designed to represent all nonfarm establishments in the United States.

The OEWS survey allocates and selects a sample of approximately 180,000 to 200,000 establishments semiannually. Semiannual samples are referred to as *panels*. To the extent possible, private sector units selected in any one panel are not sampled again in the next five panels.

The survey is conducted over a rolling 6-panel (or 3-year) cycle. This is done in order to provide adequate geographic, industrial, and occupational coverage. Over the course of a 6-panel (or 3-year) cycle, approximately 1.2 million establishments are sampled. In the May 2016 cycle, for example, data collected in May 2016 are combined with data collected in November 2015, May 2015, November 2014, May 2014, and November 2013.

For a given panel, most sampled establishments initially receive either a survey questionnaire or instructions for reporting their data electronically. Nonrespondents receive up to three additional mailings at approximately 4-week intervals and may be contacted by phone or email.

Censuses of federal and state government are collected annually.

- A census of the executive branch of the federal government and the U.S. Postal Service (USPS) is collected annually in June from the U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM), the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the U.S. Postal Service. Data from only the most recent year are retained for use in OEWS estimates.
- In each area, a census of state government establishments, except for schools and hospitals, is collected annually every November. Data from only the most recent year are retained for use in OEWS estimates.

A probability sample is taken of local government establishments, private sector establishments, and state schools.

## **Sampling procedures**

### ***Frame construction***

The sampling frame, or universe, is a list of all in-scope nonfarm establishments that file unemployment insurance (UI) reports to the state workforce agencies. Employers are required by law to file these reports to the state where each establishment is located. Every quarter, BLS creates a national sampling frame by combining the administrative lists of unemployment insurance reports from all of the states into a single database called the Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages (QCEW). Every six months, OEWS extracts the administrative data for establishments that are in scope for the OEWS survey from the most current QCEW. QCEW files were supplemented with frame files covering rail transportation (NAICS 4821) and Guam for establishments not covered by the UI program.

Construction of the sampling frame includes a process in which establishments that are linked together into multiunit companies are assigned to either the May or November sample. This prevents BLS from contacting multiunit companies more than once per year for this survey. Furthermore, the frame is matched to the 5 prior sample panels, and units that have been previously selected in the 5 prior panels are marked as ineligible for sampling for the current panel.

### ***Stratification***

Establishments on the frame are stratified by geographic area and industry group.

- Geography—For the May 2015, 2016, and 2017 estimates, about 645 Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs), metropolitan divisions<sup>6</sup>, and nonmetropolitan or balance-of-state (BOS) areas are specified. MSAs and metropolitan divisions are defined and mandated by the Office of Management and Budget. Each officially defined metropolitan area within a state is specified as a substate area. Cross-state metropolitan areas have a separate portion for each state contributing to that MSA. In addition, states may have up to six residual nonmetropolitan areas that together cover the remaining non-MSA portion of their state.

As of the May 2018 estimates, OEWS no longer publishes data for metropolitan divisions, so the total number of areas is about 600. Data for the 11 large metropolitan areas that were further broken down into divisions are now published at the metropolitan area level only. In addition, some nonmetropolitan areas were combined to form larger nonmetropolitan areas in the May 2018 and May 2019 estimates. Details can be found at [www.bls.gov/oes/areas\\_2018.htm](http://www.bls.gov/oes/areas_2018.htm). The May 2018 estimates use the July 2015 MSA definitions.

- Industry—The May 2015 and 2016 estimates have 344 industry groups defined at the NAICS 4-, 5-, or 6-digit level. The May 2017, 2018, and 2019 estimates have about 300 industry groups defined at the NAICS 3-, 4-, 5-, or 6-digit level.
- Ownership—Schools are also stratified by state government, local government, or private ownership. Also, local government casinos and gambling establishments are sampled separately from the rest of local government.
- Size—Establishments are divided into certainty and noncertainty size classes.

Sample is taken from nonempty frame cells<sup>7</sup>. Frame cells in the May 2015 and May 2016 samples were defined by State/MSA-BOS/NAICS 4-, 5-, 6-digit/ownership strata. Frame cells in the May 2017 and

---

<sup>6</sup> Estimates are made at the metropolitan division level through May 2017.

<sup>7</sup> About 151,000 nonempty cells in May 2018 frame; 158,000 in May 2017; 179,000 in May 2016 and May 2015

May 2018 samples were defined by State/MSA-BOS/NAICS 3-, 4-, 5-, 6-digit/ownership strata. When comparing nonempty strata between frames, there may be substantial frame-to-frame differences. The differences are due primarily to normal establishment birth and death processes and normal establishment growth and shrinkage. Other differences are due to establishment NAICS reclassification and changes in geographic location.

A small number of establishments indicate the state in which their employees are located, but do not indicate the specific county in which they are located. These establishments are also sampled and used in the calculation of the statewide and national estimates. They are not included in the estimates of any substate area. Therefore, the sum of the employment in the MSAs and nonmetropolitan areas within a state may be less than the statewide employment.

#### ***Allocation of the sample to strata***

Each time a sample is selected, a 6-panel allocation of the 1.1 million sample units among these strata is performed. The largest establishments are removed from the allocation because they will be selected with certainty once during the 6-panel cycle. For the remaining noncertainty strata, a set of minimum sample size requirements based on the number of establishments in each cell is used to ensure coverage for industries and MSAs. For each nonempty frame cell, a sample allocation is calculated using a power Neyman allocation. The actual 6-panel sample allocation is the larger of the minimum sample allocation and the power allocation. To determine the current single panel allocation, the 6-panel allocation is divided by 6 and the resulting quotient is randomly rounded.

Two factors influence the power Neyman allocation. The first factor is the square root of the employment size of each stratum. With a Neyman allocation, strata with higher levels of employment generally are allocated more sample than strata with lower levels of employment. Using the square root within the Neyman allocation softens this effect. The second factor is a measure of the occupational variability of the industry based on prior OEWS survey data. The occupational variability of an industry is measured by computing the coefficient of variation (CV) for each occupation within the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile of occupational employment in a given industry, averaging those CVs, and then calculating the standard error from that average CV. Using this measure, industries that tend to have greater occupational variability will get more sample than industries that are more occupationally homogeneous.

#### ***Sample selection***

Sample selection within strata is approximately proportional to size. In order to provide the most occupational coverage, establishments with higher employment are more likely to be selected than those with lower employment; some of the largest establishments are selected with certainty. The unweighted employment of sampled establishments makes up approximately 57 to 59 percent of total employment.

Permanent random numbers (PRNs) are used in the sample selection process. To minimize sample overlap between the OEWS survey and other large surveys conducted by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, each establishment is assigned a PRN. For each stratum, a specific PRN value is designated as the “starting” point to select a sample. From this “starting” point, we sequentially select the first ‘ $n$ ’ eligible establishments in the frame into the sample, where ‘ $n$ ’ denotes the number of establishments to be sampled.

### ***Single panel weights (sampling weights)***

Sampling weights are computed so that each panel will roughly represent the entire universe of establishments. In MB3, sample weights are used to fit wage interval models but do not otherwise play a role in estimation because data is predicted for every establishment in the universe.

Federal government, USPS, and state government units are assigned a panel weight of 1. Other sampled establishments are assigned a design-based panel weight, which reflects the inverse of the probability of selection.

### ***National sample counts***

The combined sample for each set of estimates is the equivalent of six panels. The sample allocations, excluding federal government and U.S. Postal Service (USPS), for the panels in the 2015 through 2018 estimates cycles are:

182,809 establishments for May 2019

186,679 establishments for November 2018

186,125 establishments for May 2018

185,450 establishments for November 2017

195,117 establishments for May 2017  
 201,952 establishments for November 2016  
 201,447 establishments for May 2016  
 202,772 establishments for November 2015  
 202,696 establishments for May 2015  
 201,615 establishments for November 2014  
 201,486 establishments for May 2014  
 201,936 establishments for November 2013  
 201,020 establishments for May 2013  
 201,666 establishments for November 2012

Each set of estimates includes a census of about 8,000 federal and USPS units. The combined sample size for each set of estimates is approximately 1.1 to 1.2 million establishments, which includes only the most recent data for federal and state government. Federal and state government units from older panels are deleted to avoid double counting.

### ***Sample Response Rates***

Table 1, below, contains information on unit and employment response rates and viable units for each of the estimate years from 2015 to 2019. All sets of estimates have approximately 1.1 to 1.2 million establishments in the combined initial sample.

Table 1: Response Rates for 6 Panel Data Used to Estimate a Given Year

Year	Viable Units	Responding Units	Unit Response Rate	Employment Response Rate
2019	1,067,454	756,400	70.9%	67.7%
2018	1,097,549	781,455	71.2%	67.9%
2017	1,125,690	810,835	72.0%	68.4%
2016	1,128,214	821,724	72.8%	69.0%
2015	1,126,286	827,599	73.5%	69.6%

### **MB3 Estimation methodology**

Modeled occupational employment and wage estimates are made directly from a predicted population. The OEWS population is defined as the set of in-scope establishments present in the universe during the survey reference period. Each population establishment is defined by information including industry, size, ownership, and location; these are known to be strong predictors of occupational employment and wages. OEWS survey response data provides occupational employment distributions, known as staffing patterns, and wage information for a portion of the population. Models based on OEWS response data from the current panel and five previous panels predict staffing patterns and wages for the majority of the population.

### **Matching Population Units to Respondent Data**

The prediction framework splits the population into the categories of “observed units” and “unobserved units”. Observed units are defined as stable establishments with response data from the previous three years. Unit stability is defined through comparison between QCEW and reported values for a number of variables, as detailed in the following section. The balance of responding units, those that do not satisfy stability criteria, are usable for prediction purposes. Unobserved units may be non-sampled units, non-responding units, or responding units that do not meet stability criteria. For any given observed unit, occupational employment and wage data come from that unit’s survey data. For any given unobserved unit, occupational employment and wages are predicted using data from similar responding establishments.

#### ***Exact Matching – Observed Units***

Response data from observed units are used directly provided a given unit is stable. The stability criteria for observed units requires that reported values exactly match QCEW for the May reference panel values for 6-digit NAICS, ownership, MSA, and be similar to population employment. Population employment for a given unit is taken as the average of the most recent May and November QCEW employment for a given reference period. The criteria for stable employment, for population employment  $E_P$  and respondent employment  $E_R$ , are either of  $|E_R - E_P|/E_P < 0.5$  or  $|E_R - E_P| < 5$ .

Observed unit wage data from previous years are adjusted using the wage adjustment model to reflect current wage levels and employment data are scaled to population employment levels. Partial respondent data contains information on occupational employment but not wages. Missing wage data for partial respondents is imputed through hot deck imputation, and the units are then used as respondents.

### ***Prediction – Unobserved Units***

The staffing patterns and wages of unobserved units in the population are predicted using data from nearest neighbor respondents. Responding units that do not pass stability criteria are no longer representative of the population cell for which they were sampled, but are useable to predict units in the cell to which it currently belongs. A combination of unit matching and model-based adjustments produces these predictions for each unobserved unit. A pool of 10 nearest neighbor responding units is used to predict each unobserved unit. Matching is deterministic, so the predicted staffing pattern and wages of any unit of a given size, location, ownership group, and industry will be identical.

Prediction of unobserved unit staffing patterns and wages derives from a weighted sum of similar unit response data. Data from responding units that closely match the unobserved units are given more match weight relative to dissimilar units. For a given unobserved unit, the ten responding units with the highest relative weights are used for the prediction. Industry and establishment size as measured by total employment are the strongest predictors of staffing patterns; matches that are close in those dimensions are preferred, and a difference in either of these dimensions results in a large penalty to matching weight. Time, location, and ownership are also important predictors that play a part in finding matches; differences in any of these dimensions result in relatively smaller weight penalties than are given for industry and size differences. Matching unit weights are determined as the product of scoring functions based on each of these factors.

The match scores can be thought of as a set of penalties for deviation from a perfect match, which would have a score of 1. Matches are penalized (given lower weight) using these scores, each with value less than or equal to 1. The scoring function for each predictive factor aims to assign a score value based on the relative importance of each factor. The specific score values used in the MB3 system were evaluated using simulation studies. Various proposed scoring functions were used to generate estimates and the best performing of these were used.

Where establishment  $a$  is an unobserved unit and establishment  $b$  is a potential match, each component of the score function accounts for differences between  $a$  and  $b$ . The score of the match is:

$$S(a, b) = S_I(a, b) \cdot S_A(a, b) \cdot S_E(a, b) \cdot S_O(a, b) \cdot S_T(a, b) \text{ where:}$$

$$S(a, b) \leq 1$$

$S_I(a, b)$  – Score for difference in six-digit industry between  $a$  and  $b$

$S_A(a, b)$  – Score for difference in detailed area between  $a$  and  $b$

$S_E(a, b)$  – Score for difference in total employment between  $a$  and  $b$

$S_O(a, b)$  – Score for difference in ownership between  $a$  and  $b$

$S_T(a, b)$  – Score for difference in time between  $b$  and present

A potential donor which differs in size from the predicted unit will be penalized for this difference. The employment component is  $S_E(a, b) = \left(1 - \frac{|E_a - E_b|}{E_a + E_b}\right)$ , where  $E_a$  and  $E_b$  are the employment totals for the respective units. For a potential donor with 20 employees and a predicted unit with 15 employees, this works out to  $S_E(a, b) = \left(1 - \frac{|15 - 20|}{15 + 20}\right) = 0.857$ .

Recently collected data are favored over data collected in previous panels. The time score component which reflects this is  $S_T(a, b) = 1 - \frac{p_b}{6}$ , where  $p_b$  is the number of panels between the collection of data for  $b$  and the reference period. A unit  $b$  observed in the current panel would have  $S_T(a, b) = 1$  and a unit sampled 5 panels previously would have  $S_T(a, b) = 1 - \frac{5}{6} = \frac{1}{6}$ .

Donors would ideally be in the same industry or ownership group as the predicted unit, but may be in a similar industry or ownership.

The score component reflecting differences in industry is  $S_I(a, b) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if industry matches} \\ 0.25 & \text{if industry mismatches} \end{cases}$

The score component reflecting differences in ownership is  $S_O(a, b) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if ownership matches} \\ 0.5 & \text{if ownership mismatches} \end{cases}$

Donors in the same geographical area are preferred, and are treated at 4 different matching levels. Units in the same state and MSA have an area match score of 1, whereas units in the same state and same urban/rural status but differing MSAs receive an area match score of 0.75. Units from the same state but

with differing MSAs and urban/rural status receive a score of 0.5. Units from different states receive a score of 0.25. The score component reflecting differences in area is

$$S_A(a, b) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if same MSA, state} \\ 0.75 & \text{same state, area status} \\ 0.5 & \text{if same state} \\ 0.25 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

For a potential donor with 20 employees that would predict a unit of 15 employees ( $S_E(a, b) = 0.857$ ) from 2 panels previous to the reference period ( $(S_T(a, b) = 0.667)$ , with a mismatching msa and differing urban/rural status ( $S_A(a, b) = 0.5$ ), where both are privately owned ( $S_O(a, b) = 1$ ), and mismatching industry ( $S_I(a, b) = 0.25$ ), the match score is:

$$S(a, b) = 0.25 \cdot 0.5 \cdot 0.857 \cdot 1 \cdot 0.667 = 0.0714$$

Depending on the match scores of other potential donors, the unit may or may not be used in prediction.

The relative matching weight  $W_{b_i}$  of any match  $b_i$  among 10 matches,  $b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{10}$ , is:

$$W_{b_i} = \frac{S(a, b_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^{10} S(a, b_i)}$$

Current panel data from the same MSA, detailed industry, ownership, and employment level as an unobserved unit will receive a weight of 1, the maximum possible weight. Potential matches are found by a hierarchical nearest neighbor search detailed in Table 2 below. All establishments with a given employment, NAICS, Ownership category, state, and MSA are predicted within the same estimation cell and will be predicted using the same set of donors. An employment criteria is defined for each level such that the donor must be sufficiently close to the estimation cell's employment level. For example, in the first hierarchical level the donor must be in the same state, NAICS, Ownership category, and MSA of the estimation cell while having employment within  $\pm 10$  percent of the estimation cell's employment. Broader industry cells use E\_NAICS, the industry groups of published OES estimates, which are defined at the 3-, 4-, 5-, or 6-digit NAICS level. The search for matches proceeds through hierarchical levels and stops when the 10 highest scoring matching donors are found. If fewer than 10 donor units are available at hierarchy level 10, prediction will still proceed if at least 5 donor units are found when the search reaches the highest level. The matches with the highest scores are used for prediction.

Table 2: Hierarchical Levels of Donor Matches

Hierarchy Level	Characteristics that must match between the Estimation Cell and Responder (Donor)	Empl Criteria
1	State – NAICS – Ownership – MSA	10%
2	State – NAICS – Ownership – MSA	20%
3	State – NAICS – Ownership	10%
4	State – E_NAICS – Ownership	20%
5	State – NAICS – Ownership	None
6	State – E_NAICS	None
7	E_NAICS – Ownership	10%
8	E_NAICS – Ownership	20%
9	NAICS	None
10	E_NAICS	None

Table note: NAICS is 6 digit NAICS. E\_NAICS is the most detailed NAICS level for which OES publishes estimates.

Employment, staffing pattern, and wage data for the 10 closest matches are used to predict the staffing pattern and wages of each unobserved unit. If a match differs from the unobserved unit's employment, occupational employment numbers will be scaled to the appropriate level. Occupational wage values are scaled using a wage adjustment factor if a match differs from the unobserved unit in industry, ownership, area, employment, or data collection panel. Methods for wage adjustment are discussed in the following section. For a given unobserved unit  $U$  and set of matches  $b_i$  in  $(b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{10})$ , the predicted employment  $E$  for occupation  $O$  in wage interval  $M$  will be:

$$E_{UOM} = \sum_{i=1}^{10} W_{b_i} \cdot \frac{E_U}{E_{b_i}} \cdot E_{b_iOM}$$

where  $E_{b_iOM}$  is the employment in wage interval  $M$  for the occupation  $O$  in establishment  $b_i$ ,  $E_{b_i}$  is the employment for establishment  $b_i$ ,  $E_U$  is the employment of the estimation cell, and  $W_{b_i}$  is the relative matching weight of match  $b_i$ . The occupational wage  $w$  predicted for unit  $U$  is a weighted composite of the occupational employment of the 10 donor units, as given by:

$$w_{UOM} = \sum_{i=1}^{10} W_{b_i} \cdot A_O(U, b_i) \cdot w_{b_iOM} \cdot I(E_{b_iOM} \neq 0) / \sum_{i=1}^{10} W_{b_i} \cdot I(E_{b_iOM} \neq 0)$$

Here,  $A_O(U, b_i)$  is the wage adjustment factor discussed below under *Model Based Adjustments*,  $w_{b_iOM}$  is the wage interval  $M$  mean for the occupation  $O$  in the location associated with establishment  $b_i$ . The function  $I(E_{b_iOM} \neq 0)$  equals 1 when the establishment's occupational employment is nonzero for a wage interval, and equals 0 otherwise.

To illustrate the prediction of an unobserved unit, suppose the unobserved unit  $U$  is a jeweler in a medium sized town. The staffing pattern is predicted for each wage interval of each occupation in the nearest donors. Detailed below is the prediction for sales associates in wage interval C. Suppose the nearest respondents available as donors consist of 5 other jewelers of similar size in the same MSA, 2 of which responded in previous panels. 3 other jewelers in the MSA responded but differed in size class. Some of these units employ sales associates in wage interval C. To predict the employment and wage for sales associates in  $U$ , we use the example data and calculations in table 3.

Table 3: Example Data for Predicting Employment

Matching Unit:	$i$	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Unit $i$ relative match weight: $W_{b_i}$		0.116	0.116	0.116	0.113	0.113	0.097	0.088	0.107	0.110	0.022
Unit $i$ employment in interval $C$ , occupation $O$ : $E_{b_iOC}$		4	3	0	2	3	0	3	8	7	11
Total employment ratio: $E_U/E_{b_i}$		1	1	1	1.05	0.95	1	1.19	0.86	0.90	1
Wage adjustment factor: $A_O(U, b_i)$		1	1	1	1	1	1.03	1.03	1	0.9	1.1
Unit $i$ wage in interval $C$ , occupation $O$ : $w_{b_iOC}$		13.25	13.25	13.25	13.25	13.25	13.05	13.05	13.25	13.25	13.25
Computed unit $i$ Employment Share: $W_{b_i} \cdot E_U/E_{b_i} \cdot E_{b_iOC}$		0.464	0.348	0	0.237	0.323	0	0.314	0.734	1.195	0.33

Computed unit $i$ Wage Share:	1.958	1.958	0	1.907	1.907	0	1.507	1.806	1.671	0.408
$\frac{W_{b_i} \cdot A_0(U, b_i) \cdot w_{b_i} \cdot I(E_{b_i} \neq 0)}{\sum_{i=1}^{10} W_{b_i} \cdot I(E_{b_i} \neq 0)}$										

Note: data does not correspond to existing establishments or weights.

Summing the second-to-last line of Table 3 yields predicted employment of sales associates  $O$  in wage interval  $C$  for establishment  $U$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
E_{UOC} &= \sum_{i=1}^{10} W_{b_i} \cdot \frac{E_U}{E_{b_i}} \cdot E_{b_i} \\
&= 0.464 + 0.348 + 0 + 0.237 + 0.323 + 0 + 0.314 + 0.734 + 1.195 + 0.33 \\
&= 3.95
\end{aligned}$$

Although this does not add up to a whole number, for estimation purposes it is reasonable. Summing the last line of table 2 yields the predicted wage of sales associates  $O$  in wage interval  $C$  for establishment  $U$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
w_{UOC} &= \sum_{i=1}^{10} \frac{W_i \cdot A_0(U, b_i) \cdot w_{b_i} \cdot I(E_{b_i} \neq 0)}{\sum_{i=1}^{10} W_i \cdot I(E_{b_i} \neq 0)} \\
&= 1.958 + 1.958 + 0 + 1.907 + 1.907 + 0 + 1.507 + 1.806 + 1.671 + 0.408 \\
&= \$13.12
\end{aligned}$$

When this process is completed for all occupation groups and wage interval levels observed in the match units, the predicted wage and employment profile of establishment  $U$  can be used for estimation.

## Wage Parameters

Wage data collection uses wage interval groups as shown in table 1 above. Using interval data to compute mean wage estimates requires that a wage value be assigned to each employee. MB3 wage estimates use wage interval means, which are computed using log-normal models fit to each panel of OEWS wage data aggregated by occupation group and area group. Unobserved unit prediction further requires the adjustment of wages for nearest neighbor unit matches to current local dollars for the unobserved unit. For example, let's suppose an interior design firm (NAICS 541410) in a large city contributes to the wage predication for an industrial design firm (NAICS 541420) in a small city. Occupational wages will differ between these firms due to both geography and industry effects. Thus, wages from the first unit must be adjusted with these factors in mind to give a reasonable prediction of the second unit. A fixed effect logistic regression model, fit to observed unit data, is the basis for these adjustments.

The wage interval mean model and wage adjustment model both use weighted least squares regression to estimate model parameters. Benchmarked sample weights are used in this process, such that weighted employment totals for the current panel will equal QCEW frame values for each industry, state, MSA, and size subgroup. The benchmarking process is performed using the same methods applied in OEWS design based estimates, and is detailed in the OEWS Handbook of Methods <https://www.bls.gov/opub/hom/oews/calculation.htm#preparing-data-for-estimation>.

### ***Wage Interval Mean Modeling***

Wage interval means are modeled for each panel using only weighted data from that panel to represent the population. Occupation and locality are the strongest predictors of wages and may affect substantial differences in wage levels between establishments. To provide greater homogeneity within the data, occupations and areas with similar wages are aggregated into groups.

Using single panel sample weights and reported employment levels within wage intervals we compute the wage distribution for every detailed occupation (nationally across all areas) and then determine in which interval the median wage falls. This then determines the wage occupation group for every six-digit occupation. To be specific, we calculate occupation-specific employment in each of the twelve wage intervals in panel  $p$

$$\hat{E}_{ob_p p} = \sum_{e \in R_p} w_{ep} \times E_{ob_p ep}$$

where  $R_p$  represents the set of panel  $p$  OEWS responders,  $w_{ep}$  is the sample weight, and  $E_{ob_{ep}}$  is the reported level of employment in occupation  $o$  at establishment  $e$  in wage interval  $b_p$ .<sup>8</sup> We then calculate total occupation-specific employment

$$\hat{E}_{op} = \sum_{b_p} \hat{E}_{ob_{pp}}$$

and compute the relative employment shares by wage interval

$$\hat{s}_{b_p|o,p} = \frac{\hat{E}_{ob_{pp}}}{\hat{E}_{op}}$$

We then compute cumulative employment shares

$$\pi_{b_p|o,p} = \sum_{b \leq b_p} \hat{s}_{b_p|o,p}$$

The detailed occupation  $o$  is mapped into aggregate occupation  $O$  where

$$\pi_{O-1|o,p} < 0.5 \leq \pi_{o|o,p}$$

so that an aggregate occupation is actually a wage interval.

Typically, there are either 11 or 12 aggregate occupations corresponding to the various wage intervals. For example, the aggregate occupation group that registered nurses typically belong to is G while the aggregate occupation group that chief executives typically belong to is L.

Similarly, we compute the wage distribution for every detailed area (across all occupations) and then determine in which interval the median wage would fall. This then determines the aggregate area for every detailed MSA or BOS area. To be specific, we calculate area-specific employment in each of the twelve wage intervals  $b_p$  in the current year

$$\hat{E}_{ab_{ap}} = \sum_o \sum_{e \in R_{ap}} w_{ep} \times E_{ob_{ep}}$$

where  $R_{ap}$  represents the set of panel  $p$  OEWS responders in area  $a$  and  $w_{ep}$  represents the sampling weight. We then calculate total area-specific employment

<sup>8</sup> The wage interval is indexed by  $p$ ; wage interval definitions may change across panels.

$$\hat{E}_{ap} = \sum_{b_p} \hat{E}_{ab_pp}$$

and compute the relative employment shares by wage interval

$$\hat{s}_{b_p|a,p} = \frac{\hat{E}_{ab_pp}}{\hat{E}_{ap}}$$

We then compute cumulative employment shares

$$\pi_{b_p|a,p} = \sum_{b \leq b_p} \hat{s}_{b_p|a,p}$$

The detailed area  $a$  is mapped into aggregate area  $A$  where

$$\pi_{A-1|a,p} < 0.5 \leq \pi_{A|a,p}$$

so that an aggregate area is actually a wage interval.

Typically, there are only three or four aggregate areas corresponding to interval C, D, E, or F. For example, Boston, Massachusetts typically belongs to area group E while Mobile, Alabama typically belongs to area group C.

For every possible aggregate occupation-area, denoted as  $OA$ , we compute the single panel sample weighted employment levels for each wage interval.

$$\hat{E}_{OAb_pp} = \sum_{o \in O} \sum_{e \in R_{Ap}} w_{ep} \times E_{oeb_pp}$$

where  $R_{Ap}$  is the panel  $p$  sample in aggregate area  $A$ . In general, there will be a limited number of aggregate occupation-area groups, generally between 33 and 48.

A log-normal model is fit to these aggregated-occupation-by-aggregated-area cells. A maximum likelihood estimator and the sample weighted employment sums from the current sample are used to estimate the two parameters of the lognormal model for wage  $w$ , occupation  $O$ , and area  $A$ :

$$\ln(w_{AO}) \sim N(\mu_{AO}, \sigma_{AO}^2)$$

Local wage interval means are predicted using these wage parameter estimates. These wage interval means directly define wages for all respondents and are adjusted, if needed to define wages for unobserved units. For each interval containing a state or federal minimum wage, the wage interval mean is a weighted linear combination of the minimum wage and the portion of the interval above the minimum.

### ***Wage Regression Modeling***

Using observed units to predict unobserved units relies on similarity between the units. Wage adjustment is necessary if the unobserved unit differs from donor units in industry, size, location, or time of data collection. Sample response data from the current and previous two years are used to fit a fixed effect logistic regression models for wage corrections. Coefficients are determined using maximum likelihood estimation over data from the six panels. For a given occupation  $O$ , the model is of the form:

$$\ln(w_{OT}) \sim \beta_0 + \beta_{IH} + \beta_A + \beta_S \cdot E + \beta_{TM} + \epsilon$$

$w$  – wage

$\beta_0$  – occupation effect across about 850 detailed occupations

$\beta_{IH}$  – industry-ownership combined effects across about 1100 detailed NAICS

$\beta_A$  – area effect across about 480 detailed areas

$\beta_S$  – size effect linear coefficient

$E$  – Total establishment employment

$\beta_{TM}$  – time effect computed independently for each of 22 major occupations

### ***Model Based Adjustments: Wage aging and Cell-Level Adjustments***

Aging factors, which provide adjustments for changes to occupational wages over time, and locality adjustments are both computed directly using wage regression model parameters. Suppose unit  $b$  data are adjusted to match local current dollars for unit  $a$ . Then, the predicted wage for occupation  $O$  in unit  $a$  based on adjusted unit  $b$  data is:

$$\tilde{w}_{ao} = w_{bo} \cdot A_o(a, b)$$

Where:

$$A_o(a, b) = \exp\left(\frac{\beta_0(a) + \beta_{IT}(a) + \beta_A(a) + \beta_S \cdot E_a + \beta_{MP}(a)}{\beta_0(b) + \beta_{IT}(b) + \beta_A(b) + \beta_S \cdot E_b + \beta_{MP}(b)}\right)$$

## Estimates

Occupational employment and wage estimates are computed using observed data and predicted data for the population of about 8 million<sup>9</sup> units. Predicted data are available for each unit of the population, so estimates are computed using full-population expressions.

### *Occupational Employment Estimates*

Estimates of occupational employment totals are computed by summing all employment counts of a given occupation over the modeled population data. Estimates are made over area, industry, and ownership. For occupation  $o$ , where unit  $i$  is any establishment in cell  $c$ , the occupational employment estimate is:

$$\hat{X}_{o,c} = \sum_{i \in o,c} x_{i,o}$$

### *Hourly wage rate estimates*

Mean hourly wage is calculated as the total hourly wages for an occupation divided by its total modeled population employment. Wage rate information is available for every individual federal employee and some state employees. All other wage data are in wage interval ranges and are converted to local hourly wages for each employee. These local hourly wages are predicted using adjusted estimates of local interval means, and thus are treated as point data. Mean wage is calculated as a sum of the hourly wage for each employees in a cell divided by the total number of employees in a cell. Employees  $E$  in a given occupation and wage interval at a single establishment will all have the same predicted wage  $w$ . For establishments  $i$ , wage ranges  $r$ , and occupation  $o$  in cell  $c$ , the computation is as follows:

---

<sup>9</sup> Millions of units per year: 8.95 in 201902, 8.74 in 201802, 8.54 in 201702, 7.94 in 201602, 7.80 in 201502

$$\hat{w}_{c,o} = \frac{\sum_{i \in c,o} \sum_r x_{iro} \cdot w_{iro}}{\sum_{i \in c,o} x_{iro}}$$

Percentile wage rate estimates are computed directly from the predicted population using the empirical distribution function with averaging, which is implemented in many statistical packages.

### ***Annual wage rate estimates***

These estimates are calculated by multiplying mean or percentile hourly wage rate estimates by a “year-round, full time” figure of 2,080 hours (52 weeks x 40 hours) per year for most occupations. These estimates, however, may not represent mean annual pay should the workers work more or less than 2,080 hours per year.

Alternatively, some workers are paid based on an annual basis but do not work the usual 2,080 hours per year. For these workers, survey respondents report annual wages. Since the survey does not collect the actual number of hours worked, hourly wage rates cannot be derived from annual wage rates with any reasonable degree of confidence. Only annual wages are reported for some occupations.

### ***Variance estimation***

Variances for both mean wage estimates and occupational employment estimates are computed using the “bootstrap” replication technique. Many weights may be associated with a given respondent in MB3 estimates because that respondent may be used in multiple different ways for unobserved unit prediction. This presents problems for many approaches to computing sampling variances. However, bootstrap sample replication is amenable to this design because the full MB3 estimation system may be applied to each replicate sample. Studies that were performed using simulated data inform decisions on the specifics of the bootstrapping approach used here and the number of replicates needed for estimates to converge.

The MB3 variances are computed over 300 bootstrap sample replicates. Each set of replicate estimates is based on a subsample of the full sample, and includes model fitting as well as population prediction based on this subsample. The subsample is drawn from the full sample using a stratified simple random sample

with replacement design, where the size of the subsample is equal to the size of the full sample. By sampling with replacement, we are essentially up-weighting some sampled units by including them more than once in the subsample while down-weighting others by not including them at all. MB3 selects six independent subsamples, one from each of the six bi-annual OEWS panel samples. The stratification plan is the same used for drawing the full sample, where strata are defined by state, MSAs, aggregate NAICS industry, and ownership for schools and hospitals.

Subsampling only occurs for the non-certainty sample units. All certainty units from the full sample are used in every replicate's bootstrap sample. Some strata may only contain a single non-certainty unit, for which a variance cannot be computed. These are referred to as 1-PSU strata. A collapsing algorithm combines these 1-PSU strata with other like strata to ensure that two or more non-certainty sample units are present in a particular stratum. The collapsing is by the hierarchy detailed in Table 4.

Table 4: Hierarchical Definitions for Collapsing 1-PSU Strata

Hierarchy Level	Collapse
1	Panels*: (0,1), (2,3), and (4,5)
2	Panels*: (0, 1, 2), and (3,4,5)
3	Panels*: (0,1,2,3,4,5)
4	MSAs
5	Allocation NAICS (A_NAICS)
6	Nationally

\* Panels are labeled 0 to 5, where 0 corresponds to the most recent panel

The probability of selection for resampling a given unit is proportional to that unit's share of stratum employment. This ensures that bootstrap sample replicates yield unbiased estimates of the full sample's estimates. Sampling variance estimates obtained through these methods do not use the same probabilities used in selection of the full sample, which presents a possible source of error. Studies indicate that these estimates are approximately unbiased and perform well in estimating sampling variance.

The six replicate subsamples are combined for calculating MB3 replicate estimates. Single panel sample weights for the most recent panel are retained for computation of wage interval means and the wage adjustment factors in each replicate. All matching, wage parameter, and estimation methods described previously are used with each 6-panel bootstrap subsample to create occupational employment and wage replicate estimates for every estimation domain. This process is repeated to create 300 sets of replicate estimates. For every estimation domain in which OEWS calculates an estimate, there are occupational employment and mean wage estimates based on the full OEWS sample as well as 300 occupational employment and mean wage replicate estimates each based on a different bootstrap subsample. The variance estimates for the occupational estimates based on the full sample is calculated by finding the variability across the occupational replicate estimates. The below formula calculates the bootstrap variance estimates:

$$v_{BS}(\hat{\theta}_{j,D}) = \frac{1}{(300-1)} \sum_{b=1}^{300} \left( \hat{\theta}_{j,D}^{(b)} - \hat{\theta}_{j,D}^{(*)} \right)^2$$

where,

$\hat{\theta}_{j,D}$  = occupational estimate (employment or mean wage) for occupation  $j$ , within estimation domain  $D$ , based on **full** sample

$\hat{\theta}_{j,D}^{(b)}$  = occupational replicate estimates (employment or mean wage) for occupation  $j$ , within estimation domain  $D$ , based on the bootstrap subsample for replicate  $b$

$\hat{\theta}_{j,D}^{(*)}$  = average occupational replicate estimates (employment or mean wage) for occupation  $j$ , within estimation domain  $D$  averaged across all 300 replicates

### *Special procedures*

In certain circumstances, the OEWS has critical nonrespondents who could not be imputed using current OEWS methods. OEWS employed special imputation procedures which used nonrespondents' prior staffing patterns and wages. The occupational employment was benchmarked to the current year and the wage distribution was imputed using procedures very similar to the current partial imputation method.

In 2013, the Office of Management and Budget updated the Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) definitions. The nonmetropolitan or balance-of-state areas were also updated. This resulted in the OEWS selecting the 2016Q2 through 2014Q4 samples using the new MSA definitions, and the 2014Q2 and 2013Q4 samples using the old definitions. In order to reduce the bias introduced from using two different MSA definitions, the sampling weights from 2014Q2 and 2013Q4 were adjusted. May 2015 was the first time OEWS published estimates using the new MSA definitions.

## **Reliability of the estimates**

Estimates developed from a sample will differ from the results of a census. An estimate based on a sample survey is subject to two types of error: sampling and nonsampling error. An estimate based on a census is subject only to nonsampling error.

### ***Nonsampling error***

This type of error is attributable to several causes, such as errors in the sampling frame; an inability to obtain information for all establishments in the sample; differences in respondents' interpretation of a survey question; an inability or unwillingness of the respondents to provide correct information; and errors made in recording, coding, or processing the data. Explicit measures of the effects of nonsampling error are not available.

### ***Sampling error***

When a sample, rather than an entire population, is surveyed, estimates differ from the true population values that they represent. This difference, the sampling error, occurs by chance and depends on the particular random sample used in a survey. Sampling error is characterized by the variance of the estimate or the standard error of the estimate (square root of the variance). The relative standard error is the ratio of the standard error to the estimate itself.

Estimates of sampling variability for occupational employment and mean wage rates are provided for all employment and mean wage estimates to allow data users to determine if those statistics are reliable enough for their needs. Sample estimates from a given design are said to be unbiased when an average of the estimates from all possible samples yields the true population value. Empirical studies support that MB3 methods provide accurate estimates of sampling variability.

Estimated standard errors should be taken to indicate the magnitude of sampling error only. They are not intended to measure nonsampling error, including any biases in the data. Particular care should be exercised in the interpretation of small estimates or of small differences between estimates when the sampling error is relatively large or the magnitude of the bias is unknown.

### ***Quality control measures***

Several edit and quality control procedures are used to reduce nonsampling error. For example, completed survey questionnaires are checked for data consistency. Follow-up mailings, emails, and phone calls are sent out to nonresponding establishments to improve the survey response rate.

The OEWS survey is a federal-state cooperative effort that enables states to conduct their own surveys. A major concern with a cooperative program such as OEWS is to accommodate the needs of BLS and other federal agencies, as well as state-specific publication needs, with limited resources while simultaneously standardizing survey procedures across all 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the U.S. territories. Controlling sources of nonsampling error in this decentralized environment can be difficult. One important computerized quality control tool used by the OEWS survey is the Survey Processing and Management system. It was developed to provide a consistent and automated framework for survey processing and to reduce the workload for analysts at the state, regional, and national levels.

To ensure standardized sampling methods in all areas, the sample is drawn in the national office. Standardizing data processing activities, such as validating the sampling frame, allocating and selecting the sample, refining mailing addresses, addressing envelopes and mailers, editing and updating questionnaires, conducting electronic review, producing management reports, and calculating employment estimates, have resulted in the overall standardization of the OEWS survey methodology. This has reduced the number of errors on the data files as well as the time needed to review them.

Other quality control measures used in the OEWS survey include:

- Follow-up mail and telephone solicitations of nonrespondents, especially critical or large nonrespondents
- Review of data during collection to verify its accuracy and reasonableness

- Adjustments for atypical reporting units on the data file
- Validation of unit matching and donor profiles
- Validation by comparison between MB3 research estimates and official OEWS estimates

## **Confidentiality**

BLS has a strict confidentiality policy that ensures that the survey sample composition, lists of reporters, and names of respondents will be kept confidential. Additionally, the policy assures respondents that published figures will not reveal the identity of any specific respondent and will not allow the data of any specific respondent to be inferred. The most relevant statute which governs BLS confidentiality is the Confidential Information Protection and Statistical Efficiency Act (CIPSEA). Each published estimate is screened to ensure that it meets these confidentiality requirements. To further protect the confidentiality of the data, the specific screening criteria are not listed in this publication. For additional information regarding confidentiality, please visit the BLS website at [www.bls.gov/bls/confidentiality.htm](http://www.bls.gov/bls/confidentiality.htm).

## **Data presentation**

Included are cross-industry data for the United States as a whole, for individual U.S. states, and for metropolitan and nonmetropolitan areas, along with U.S. industry-specific estimates by 2-, 3-, 4-, and some 5- and 6-digit NAICS levels. Available data include estimates of employment, annual mean wages and relative standard errors (RSEs) for the employment and mean wage estimates.

## **Uses**

For many years, the OEWS survey has been a major source of detailed occupational employment data for the nation, states, and areas, and by industry at the national level. This survey provides information for many data users, including individuals and organizations engaged in planning vocational education programs, higher education programs, and employment and training programs. OEWS data also are used to prepare information for career counseling, for job placement activities performed at state workforce agencies, and for personnel planning and market research conducted by private enterprises. OEWS data also are used by the Department of Labor's Foreign Labor Certification (FLC) program, which sets the rate at which workers on work visas in the United States must be paid.