

America's Best Employers 2022

Methodology

Methodology – America's Best Employers 2022


Summary

- America's Best Employers have been chosen based on an independent survey from a vast sample of **~60,000 U.S.-employees** working for companies employing **at least 1,000 people** in their U.S.-operations.
- The employees have not been consulted via their employers but **anonymously** through several online panels. By doing so, the employee could openly state his/her opinion, avoiding any influence from their employer.
- Each employee has been asked which firm or institution he or she works for, in an open-ended question with an autofill-option. Where appropriate, subsidiaries of larger entities have been combined for evaluation. The survey has been conducted on companies from all industry sectors employing **at least 1,000 employees in the U.S.** The recommended employers have been grouped into one of the **25 industry sectors**.
- The evaluation was based on two distinct criteria:
 - 1. Direct recommendations:** Employees were asked to rate their willingness to recommend their own employers to friends and family. The responses were analysed on a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 means "I wouldn't recommend my employer under any circumstances" and 10 means "I would definitely recommend my employer".
 - 2. Indirect recommendations:** Participants were also prompted to evaluate other employers in their respective industries that stood out either positively or negatively.
- Furthermore, the employees were asked questions about **work related topics:** Employees were asked to give their opinions on a series of statements surrounding work-related topics, like working conditions, salary, potential for development and company image regarding their current employer. The rate of agreement/disagreement regarding the statements was measured on a 5-point Likert scale.
- In total the survey took an average of 8-15 minutes to complete and the field period ran from CW 37 to CW 41.

The calculation of the direct and indirect score is based on the recommendations of 60,000 employees

Survey

The survey has been conducted using an **online access panel**, providing a representative sample of **~60,000 employees** working part- or full-time for companies and institutions employing **at least 1,000 employees in the U.S.**




Online access panel

An online access panel is a sample group set up by a survey company and available for custom-built surveys. People register and agree to take part in online surveys.



~60,000 participants:

- Full-time** (> 35 hours per week)
- Part-time** (< 35 hours per week)
- Unemployed**
- Self-employed**
- Company size < 1,000 employees**




Survey

Calculation of the scores: for each employer a combination of the direct and indirect score

The score is based on the two main elements below:


1. Direct score: willingness to recommend one's own employer

- > In order to measure the willingness to recommend one's own employer, the following question has been asked: „**On a scale of 0 to 10, how likely is it that you would recommend your employer to a friend or family member?**” (0: wouldn't recommend my employer under any circumstances, 10: would definitely recommend my employer).



2. Indirect score: willingness to recommend other employers

- > The participants have also been asked if there are **employers they would recommend to their acquaintances**, or, on the contrary, if there are **employers, they would not recommend their acquaintances to work for**.



The results of these two elements have been combined to calculate a final score for around 3,500 employers in the U.S., with a **greater weight given to the direct score**, i.e. willingness of the participants to recommend their own employer.⁽¹⁾

(1) If available, last year's score was also included with a smaller weight

America's Best Midsize, America's Best Large Employers: two rankings, one approach

data based process

Data Gathering

The Survey is programmed and responses are gathered. Incoming **data is cleaned and prepared** for analysis



1



2

Analysis

The prepared data is analyzed with a proven scoring model to create a ranking of the **highest rated employer brands**. Further evaluation is made on demographic and industry levels to gather insights into the US labor market



3



4

Additional Research

Headcount data is researched to sort organizations into midsize or large category. Where available US headcount data is gathered via **publicly available company information**. If this is not directly available, size is estimated on available indicators like number and distribution of locations.

Publication





The final ranking is published by Forbes. America's Best **Midsize** Employers ranging from **1,000 to 5,000** US-employees and Best **Large** Employers, consisting of organizations with **more than 5,000 employees**

Demographic profile

Sample characteristics

Profile comparable to estimates from the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

29% of respondents claimed that their skill level required for their job could be acquired through on the job training, 25.3% claimed they required specialized education or skills, and 45.7% claimed their work requires at least a college degree.



Industries

Each employer grouped by industry

1. Construction, Oil & Gas Operations, Mining and Chemicals
2. Utilities
3. Engineering, Manufacturing
4. Automotive (Automotive and Suppliers)
5. Aerospace & Defense
6. Drugs & Biotechnology
7. Semiconductors, Electronics, Electrical Engineering, Technology Hardware & Equipment
8. Health Care Equipment & Services
9. Packaged Goods
10. Food, Soft Beverages, Alcohol & Tobacco
11. Transportation & Logistics
12. Banking & Financial Services
13. Insurance
14. Telecommunications Services, Cable Supplier
15. IT, Internet, Software & Services
16. Professional Services
17. Media & Advertising
18. Business Services & Supplies
19. Government Services
20. Education
21. Healthcare & Social
22. Retail & Wholesale
23. Clothing, Shoes, Sports Equipment (Manufacturing and Retail)
24. Restaurants
25. Travel & Leisure

sample:
internal use only



Report: Best Employers 2022

Insights Package Preview

included in
Gold and
Platinum
licensing
packages

Forbes

statista 

Best Employers Insights Report 2022

Insights Package Overview

2022 marks our second full-year of ranking projects in this new, corona-effected global work environment. Throughout the course of this year's projects, we will continue to survey thousands of professionals from the United States, Canada, and large collection of other countries from around the world. As always, our Best Employers surveys collect information regarding a broad range of workplace-related topics and give respondents the opportunity to comprehensively review their employer's performance both as a whole and in terms of individual drivers. Furthermore, respondents are asked to provide public perception scores for additional companies within their industry, before finally expressing their thoughts about the importance of selected factors in general workplace satisfaction.

What can you expect from this year's Insights Report?


This year's report contains four main types of insight: Respondent-Level Insights, Industry-Level Insights, Company-Level Insights, and finally, this year's special topic: Pandemic - The importance of Adaptability, Digitalization, and Work-From-Home in times of crisis.

Explanation of Insight Types:

- A Respondent-Level:** Broad scope information and statistics related to the survey sample as a whole, their demographics, and how these characteristics correlate with their perceptions of employer performance.
- B Industry-Level:** Statistics comparing results between industries and giving further detail regarding the changing demands of employers from industry to industry.
- C Company-Level:** Benchmarking of employer scores versus an array of competitors. Additional detail regarding a specific company's scores for willingness-to-recommend as well as individual factors.
- D Special Topic:** Analysis of drivers related to adaptability, digitalization, and work from home options specifically in terms of how each factor relates to overall willingness-to-recommend.

Table of Contents

- 01 **Introduction**
 - Executive Summary
 - Project Overview
- 02 **Ranking-Level Insights**
 - Sample Statistics / Demographics
 - Hidden Champions / Public Image Leaders
- 03 **Industry-Level Insights**
 - Between-Industry Comparisons
 - Within-Industry Factor Importance
 - Ranking and Scoring Comparison
- 04 **Company-Level Insights**
 - Benchmarking
 - Company Specifics
 - Competitor and Industry Comparison
- 05 **Special Topic Pandemic: Adaptability, Digitalization and WFH in Times of Crisis**
- 06 **Methodology**



Methodology (1/2)

The survey was conducted using an online access panel, providing a representative sample of employees working part- or full-time for large companies and institutions



Online access panel



~survey participants:

- ✓ Full-time (> 30 hours per week)
- ✓ Part-time (< 30 hours per week)
- ✗ Unemployed
- ✗ Self-employed
- ✗ Company size



Survey

1. Direct score: willingness to recommend one's own employer

> In order to measure the willingness to recommend one's own employer, the following question was asked: "On a scale of 0 to 10, how likely is it that you would recommend your employer to a friend or family member?" (0: wouldn't recommend my employer under any circumstances, 10: would definitely recommend my employer).



Participant



Participant's employer

2. Indirect score: willingness to recommend other employers

> The participants were asked if there are employers they would recommend to their acquaintances, or, on the contrary, if there are employers they would not recommend to their acquaintances.



Participant



Employer 1



Employer 2

...



Employer 5

The results of these two elements have been combined to calculate a final score., with a **greater weight given to the direct score**, i.e. willingness of the participants to recommend their own employer.⁽¹⁾

(1) Last year's score, continuing to be a small factor, has been included where possible

Methodology (2/2)

In addition to the willingness to recommend one's own employer, each participant has evaluated their employer on the basis of 24 criteria (items).

Each driver provides a different perspective of the employer, and enables us to evaluate them based on more generalized criteria, for example Atmosphere & Development and Salary / Wage

Specific aspects evaluated (items)

Item examples

- > "There is a climate of fairness and trust"
- > "My direct supervisor makes his/her decisions clear"
- > "There are career advancement opportunities with my employer"
- > "The work is distributed fairly"
- > ...

...

- > "Wages/salaries paid are in line with responsibilities"
- > "The company pays a good wage/salary"
- > ...

6 main drivers of the employer's attractiveness

Atmosphere at work and potential for development



Image



Working Conditions



Salary / Wage



Workplace



Diversity



A

sample:
internal use only

Respondent-Level: Drivers by Position

Coefficient weight⁽¹⁾ of drivers on promotion score among different employment levels



The report contains a detailed analysis of the relationship between individual drivers and respondents' overall willingness-to-recommend their employer, divided by subgroups, demographics, and work-related characteristics.

(1) Standardized regression coefficient in percent of the total sum

A

Respondent-Level: Hidden Champions

sample:
internal use only

Top 10 employers by internal perception (with the best direct scores and a below average public perception¹)

Order	Rank	Name	Industry
1	15	Company A	IT, Internet, Software & Services
2	198	Company B	Transportation and Logistics
3	29	Company C	Utilities
4	124
5	47
6	229
7	250
8	73
9	130
10	17	Company X	IT, Internet, Software and Services

> **Hidden Champions** are companies with an above average internal evaluation who are below average when it comes to public opinion.

i

Additional Respondent-Level insights offer a deeper look into the ranking itself and give an overview of companies whose results differ between respondent groups.

Industry-Level: Score Comparison

sample:
internal use only

Average score and ranking share by industry





Company-Level: Benchmarking

Company A, Industry

Performance in individual driver dimensions



sample:
internal use only

Special Topic

sample:
internal use only


Relationship between Willingness-to-recommend and Adaptability

One question posed in this year's survey asked respondents to rate their company in terms of its ability to adapt to sudden changes in its business environment.

Considering the timing of our survey during an unprecedented global event such as the Covid-19 pandemic, this was surely a pressing concern for many of our respondents.

Results show a significant, positive correlation between this measure of a company's ability to adapt to changes in their environment and the overall willingness-to-recommend of their employees.

Positive Correlation Between Recommendation and Adaptability



This year's special topic highlights some of the employment characteristics that have become increasingly important given the unprecedented times of the past year. The focus is on adaptability and remote working.

Survey respondents who strongly agreed that their company was able to adapt to sudden changes in its business environment were more than three times as likely to recommend their company to a friend or family member than respondents who did not at all agree with that statement.

Imprint

sample:
internal use only

Imprint:

Statista

support@statista.com
www.statista.com
statista-research.com

Authors:

Dr. Friedrich Schwandt, Silke Giesler, Klaas Seestaedt, Sabela Rodriguez Valín, Bradley Presentati, Mitchel Graves

Sources:

own survey, company websites

Image rights:

iStock

Disclaimer:

Statista does not take any responsibility for the correctness and completeness of the information. All rights are reserved regarding copying, distribution and translation of this document. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without a prior written permission.