

2004

UI Work Search Rules and Their Effects on Employment

Christopher J. O'Leary

W.E. Upjohn Institute, oleary@upjohn.org

Citation

O'Leary, Christopher J. 2004. "UI Work Search Rules and Their Effects on Employment." Report prepared for Center for Employment Security Education and Research, National Association of State Workforce Agencies.

<https://research.upjohn.org/reports/83>

This title is brought to you by the Upjohn Institute. For more information, please contact ir@upjohn.org.

UI Work Search Rules and Their Effects on Employment

February 2004

prepared by:

Christopher J. O'Leary
W. E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research
300 South Westnedge Avenue
Kalamazoo, MI 49007
Tel: 269-343-5541
Fax: 269-343-3308
E-mail: oleary@upjohn.org
www.upjohn.org

prepared for:

Center for Employment Security Education and Research (CESER)
National Association of State Workforce Agencies (NASWA)
North Capitol Street, NW
Suite 142
Washington, DC 20001
Tel: (202) 434-8020
Fax: (202) 434-8033
E-mail: ceser@naswa.org; naswa@naswa.org;
www.naswa.org

I thank Claire Black for her expert assistance. The opinions expressed are my own, and do not necessarily reflect the views of either the W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research or the National Association of State Workforce Associations. Any errors are my own.

UI Work Search Rules and Their Effects on Employment

Executive Summary

This paper summarizes state unemployment insurance (UI) job search policies based on a survey of state rules conducted in 2003 by the National Association of State Workforce Agencies (NASWA). Commonalities in policies are identified and a summary of research evidence on the effects of job search assistance (JSA) is then presented. The conclusion considers promising directions for future research and policy.

Commonalities in State UI Work Search Requirements

The NASWA questionnaire asked for the following information:

- a. Provisions dealing with job search requirements in state law;
- b. Descriptions of policies and procedures for enforcing job search requirements; and
- c. Descriptions of job search assistance provided to UI claimants.

Claims for new and continuing UI benefits among the 50 states plus the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico (henceforth counted for our purposes as states) responding to the NASWA survey are administered through remote call centers and the Internet in the majority of states. Until recently, most initial claims for UI were taken in person at employment security offices, and certification of job search contacts with employers was usually required in writing. In the very near future, nearly all claims will be done without face-to-face visits between claimants and employment security professionals. The impact of this change on insured unemployment durations and average time until return to work is not known but should be investigated.

Registration for job search with the Employment Service (ES) is required by most states. Forty states require a continuous active job search, whereas—either by statute or judicial interpretation—12 states do not. Currently, only Pennsylvania does not require UI claimants either to register for job search with the ES or to conduct an independent job search. Ten other states have no statute requiring job search by UI beneficiaries but in practice do require job search. They are: Alaska, Arizona, Mississippi, Nebraska, Nevada, New York, Puerto Rico, South Dakota, Tennessee, and Texas.

Exemption from the work search requirement is granted under certain conditions by states that require an active job search for continued claim eligibility. The three most common instances under which the requirement is waived are when the claimant is either: 1) employer-attached and awaiting recall to the prior job; 2) a union hiring hall member; or 3) participating in commissioner-approved training.

Regular employer contacts are required in many states, and the actual number of required contacts per week varies between one and five. The most common requirement is called “customary for the occupation.” Many states require a minimum of one contact per week.

Validation of required employer contacts differs. Some states require job seekers to keep a written log of employer contacts which must be submitted upon request of the UI agency. Other states require a written statement on a signed continued-claim form to be submitted to the agency. Some survey responses mentioned that the state eligibility review program (ERP) assured a continuous job search, and a

few mentioned the U.S. Department of Labor (USDOL) Benefits Accuracy Measurement (BAM) random audit system (or one of the preceding audit programs) as a means of validating compliance with rules for a required work search.

Other means of job search assistance (JSA) are provided by states to UI beneficiaries. The most common survey responses listed here were simply JSA and workshops provided to WPRS referrals. Most states also listed things that are considered core services in one-stop centers, such as labor market information (LMI), job referrals (interviews), resume preparation, and interviewing skills. However, outside of WPRS and ERP, no systematic methods for linking UI beneficiaries with reemployment services were mentioned. A concise summary of responses to the 2003 NASWA survey of states is presented in Table E.1.

Research Evidence on the Effects of Job Search Assistance

Job interview referrals. A national evaluation found that job referrals are most effective for women, for men over 45 years of age, and for men in urban areas.

An evaluation in Washington and Oregon found job placements to be most effective for those with a strong record of job attachment.

A Pennsylvania study found that UI claimants treat job referrals as a last resort in their job search process and that JSA was most effective early in a spell of joblessness.

Job search assistance. Evaluations in South Carolina and Maryland found that the stronger UI job search requirements achieved by requiring reporting of job search

contacts and validation of contacts led to significantly shorter periods of compensated joblessness.

A field experiment in Tacoma, Washington, found that eliminating both continued-claim filing and required job search led to dramatically longer spells of compensated joblessness and that JSA shortens compensated durations.

Evidence from the United Kingdom suggests that over the short term, required JSA may function as a stick used to prod UC beneficiaries back to work but that over the long term, JSA supports continued higher success in the labor market. Evaluations in Maryland, Washington, DC, and Florida have demonstrated that standardized ERP and JSA are inexpensive to administer and have a sizable effect on reducing periods of compensated joblessness.

Targeted job search assistance. Evidence from New Jersey shows that JSA targeted at dislocated workers at risk of long-term unemployment can be a cost-effective intervention, as the treatment can be simple and structured.

Evaluations in the District of Columbia and Florida found that statistical targeting of JSA at those at risk of long-term joblessness is cost-effective. Evaluations of WPRS have found impacts in the range of -0.5 to -2.2 weeks per claimant receiving services.

Low-cost interventions. All studies evaluating the effectiveness of job referrals and JSA consistently report very low costs per customer served. This typically contributes to high benefit-cost ratios for such interventions.

Future Directions for Research and Policy

Research has found that required and validated job searches shorten insured durations of unemployment. In recent years, however, states have weakened UI job search requirements. Automation of UI claim practices has further insulated beneficiaries from JSA. Many states cite their WPRS systems as mechanisms for linking beneficiaries to reemployment services. A dozen states actively use ERP programs. Because WPRS and ERP have been shown to shorten unemployment spells, ERP programs should be more widely adopted, and systems for ensuring that all beneficiaries are linked to reemployment services should be in place in all states.

Previous research studies have found that a variety of in-person employment services are cost effective. Nevertheless, employment services are becoming increasingly automated. Although automated services have received a steadily rising share of public labor exchange funding, the effectiveness of these services is not known and should be evaluated. Administrative data systems should be modified to record data on self- service use which would help assess their value to job seekers and employers. Such information could inform the design of new systems that may facilitate a faster return to work by UI beneficiaries.

Research into new ways of linking UI beneficiaries to reemployment services should be conducted for the new environment of remote initial and continued claims through telephone and the Internet. Such research could evaluate alternative methods for establishing links for UI beneficiaries to reemployment services and one-stop centers, such as: 1) required Internet job searches with automated validation of search activity; 2) required telephone calls to an automated job-search information and referral

system; 3) required telephone calls to an ES staff person at a one-stop center for job search assistance; or 4) required response to an ES call-in for referral to a job order.

Table E.1 A Summary of State Work Search Rules and Practices

State	Initial Claim	Continued Claim	ES Register Register	Active Search	Exceptions
AL	Phone (P)	Phone	Yes	Yes	Recall, union, training
AK	Phone	Phone			Work test for extended benefits
AZ	Phone		Yes		
AR	Phone	Phone	Yes	Yes	Recall within 10 weeks, union
CA	Phone	Mail	Yes	Yes	Job attached
CO	Phone	Phone		Yes	Definite recall soon, union
CT	Phone	Phone	Yes	Yes	Definite recall date, training, age 62+
DE				Yes	Definite recall date, training, illness
DC	In person (p)	In person		Yes	
FL	m, p, Internet (I)		Yes	Yes	Recall, union, training, season, mass, rural
GA	In person, I	Mail	Yes	Yes	Recall, union, training, partial, strike
HI	In person, p		Yes		Recall, union, strike
ID	P, p, I		Yes	Yes	
IL				Yes	Recall, union, partial, strike
IN	P, p, I		Yes	Yes	Definite recall date, union hall members
IA	P, p	Phone	Yes	Yes	Recall soon, union, training, shared work
KS	P, p, I, Mail (m)		Yes	Yes	
KY	In Person		Yes	Yes	Recall probable, union, partial, strike
LA	In Person	Phone	Yes	Yes	Recall in 30-45 days, union, training
ME	In Person	Phone	Yes	Yes	Recall in 6 wks, mass layoff, strike
MD	In Person		Yes	Yes	Job attached w/ definite recall date
MA	In Person	Phone	Yes	Yes	
MI	In Person	Mail	Yes	Yes	Recall in 45 days, training full time
MN				Yes	Recall, union, training, jury, high unrate
MS			Yes		
MO	P, p, I	P, p, I	Yes	Yes	Union hiring hall member
MT	P, p, I		Yes	Yes	Definite recall date, union hiring hall
NE			Yes		
NV	P, p, I		Yes		
NH			Yes	Yes	Recall, union, training, partial mass layoff
NJ	In Person	Phone		Yes	
NM	In Person			Yes	
NY	In Person	Phone			Recall date, union hiring hall member
NC				Yes	Recall, union, training, seasonal, strike
ND	In Person	Phone	Yes	Yes	Job attached
OH	In Person		Yes	Yes	Recall within 45 days, training
OK	In Person	Phone	Yes	Yes	Recall, mass layoff, rural
OR			Yes	Yes	
PA					
PR	In Person				Recall, union, partial, interstate
RI	P, p, m		Yes	Yes	Recall in 12 wks, union, strike
SC			Yes	Yes	Commissioner-approved training
SD	In Person		Yes		
TN	P, p, m				Job attached
TX	In Person	Phone	Yes		
UT	In person			Yes	Recall, union, training, seasonal
VT			Yes	Yes	Job attached w/ recall date
VA				Yes	Recall date reasonably soon
WA	p, I, m		Yes	Yes	Recall, union, training, partial, shared
WV			Yes	Yes	Recall, union, training, jury duty
WI	In person	Mail	Yes	Yes	Recall, union, training, jury, disaster
WY			Yes	Yes	Recall in 12 weeks, union, training

Source: NASWA survey of states. For current information see:

www.itsc.state.md.us/info_tech/infotech.asp#twc <Accessed February 3, 2004.>

Table E.1 A Summary of State Work Search Rules and Practices—continued

State	Contacts	Validation of Search	Job Search Assistance
AL	Custom	Random, BQC, employer's report, fraud calls	Job Placement (JP), assessment, plan, LMI
AK			JP, Labor Market Information (LMI), workshops
AZ	Custom	Certify JS responsibilities, must accept referral	JP, resume prep, interview prep, WPRS, training
AR	2 to 5	By 13 wks certify contacts in person, Internet	JP, LMI, guidance, grant
CA		Continued claim by mail	CalJOBS, LMI, resume, job clubs, English
CO	Custom	Contact record on request	JSA required if WPRS referred
CT	3	Phone-certify, ERP, contact record on request	JSA required if WPRS referred
DE	1 person	ERP (prior 2), BQC, employer signing dropped	JSA required if WPRS referred
DC	2	ERP contacts in prior 2 weeks reported	JP, workshops: resume, Internet search
FL	Custom	ERP (UC20A), ES 2 weeks, WPRS	JP, LMI, WPRS, resource rooms
GA	Directed	ERP at 5, 9, 14 weeks (workshops)	WPRS and ERP orientation plus services
HI	Directed	ERP, keep contact record, may verify	WPRS interviews, one-stop services, JP
ID	Directed	BQC, contact record on request	Assistance customized to market and claimant
IL		Contact record on request	LMI, job clubs, Internet, resume, workshops
IN		Weekly written report, random verification	Resume workshops, counseling, JP
IA	2	Written record, presented upon request	WPRS, resume, interviewing, work search
KS	1		Services available online, or visit one-stop
KY	1	Required to maintain log of contacts	JP, resume, testing, interviewing, workshops
LA	1 person	Maintain record in unemployment booklet	JP, Internet resume posting, workshops
ME	Weekly	List on continued claim, call center checks	JP, resume, interview, counseling, job training
MD	2	Verified through BAM/QC program	Internet job search, workshops, interviewing
MA	1	A work search log required, may request	LMI, resume, interview, planning, job training
MI		MWA staff verify resume is entered in MTB	LMI, resume, Internet, resource room, workshops
MN	Custom		
MS		ERP, record of contacts required	JP, LMI, resume, counseling, resource room
MO	Directed	ERP, report contacts weekly, BAM	JP provided at one-stop-centers and Internet
MT		Written record, presented upon request	JP, resume, testing, Internet, WPRS, training
NE	Reason	Certified weekly	Core or intensive, depending on job readiness
NV	Custom	Record in handbook, may be verified	Call-in JP, workshops, LMI, counseling, testing
NH		Registration in Job Matching System required	Automated JP, services to random customers
NJ	3 person	ERP, BQC	Workshops: LMI, search, resume, interview
NM	2	Required to attest weekly to active work search	
NY	Directed	ERP, Periodic elig.-employ. review (PEER)	Resume, Internet, resource, interview, counsel
NC	2 days	Work search record submitted weekly	
ND	2		Internet JP, one-stops, workshops
OH		Written record, random validation	LMI, resume, counseling, workshops, WPRS
OK			LMI, resume, workshops, interview, Internet
OR	Custom	Keep record, present upon request	JP, LMI, Internet, SEA via WPRS
PA		Active work search not required	Resume, clubs, workshops, testing, interviewing
PR			Workshops: self-esteem, motivation, resume
RI	Directed		Workshops, job fairs, job matching
SC	Directed	ERP, weekly record (UCB-303) submit at ERP	JP, training, guidance
SD	2	Written record, random validation	JP, workshops
TN	Directed		LMI, resume, Internet JP, workshops, training
TX	Directed	Written record, random validation	JP, resume, resource rm, workshops, counseling
UT	2	Keep record, present upon request	
VT	3	Keep record, present upon request	
VA	1	Keep record, random validation	Resume, interviewing, coaching, mentoring
WA	3 center	Keep record, random validation	LMI, resume, workshops, interviewing, job search
WV	Custom	Attest weekly to job contacts	Counseling, job search & placement assistance
WI	Directed	Ready to validate work search efforts	Employment workshops
WY	Custom		LMI, assessment, Internet access, counseling

"Custom" means the number of contacts required is determined by the usual practice within the occupation.

UI Work Search Rules and Their Effects on Employment

Table of Contents

Section	Page
Executive Summary	i
1. Background	1
2. Commonalities in State UI Work Search Requirements	3
3. Research Evidence on the Effects of Work Search Requirements	8
4. Future Directions for Research and Policy	12
References	14

List of Tables

Table E1. A Summary of State Work Search Rules and Practices	vii
Table 1. A Comparison of State Job Search Policies	17
Table 2. Studies on the Effectiveness of Job Interview Referrals	27
Table 3. Studies on the Effectiveness of Job Search Assistance	28
Table 4. Studies on the Effectiveness of Targeted Job Search Assistance	29

UI Work Search Rules and Their Effects on Employment

1. Background

For unemployment to be an insurable risk, it must be unavoidable. That is, it must be a misfortune befalling a worker through no fault of his or her own. State unemployment insurance (UI) programs in the United States establish specific rules identifying both conditions of job separation for initial UI entitlement and continuing actions that must be taken to maintain benefit eligibility. Among the continuing eligibility conditions are rules requiring an active search for work by the beneficiary. These rules are commonly known in UI as the “work test.”

There is a significant variation in job search requirements among states. Through their Worker Profiling and Reemployment Services (WPRS) systems, all states identify the UI claimants most likely to exhaust their UI entitlement and require them to participate in special job-search assistance programs. Additionally, about a dozen states have eligibility review programs (ERP) that involve scheduled counseling and services for UI beneficiaries for those who continue to receive weekly UI benefits for long periods without interruption. For example, in Georgia UI claimants must report to a Georgia Career Center for ERP services after 5, 9, 11 and 14 weeks of continuous benefit receipt following their waiting week. There are differences among states in their ERP and in other outreach efforts designed to help UI beneficiaries return to work.

Since the inception of the federal-state UI program in the 1930s, there has been a focus on reemployment for beneficiaries. The work test is a central feature of reemployment efforts. Customarily, the work test has required both registration for job

search with a state office of the Employment Service (ES) and job search contacts with potential employers during each week claimed for UI compensation. Some states require a specific number of employer contacts per week, while others require a search effort consistent with occupational norms.

Over the past 12 years, many states have changed their UI work search policies. During the late 1980s, studies of UI benefit payment accuracy identified failure to properly enforce statutory work-search requirements as a prime source of payment errors (Burgess and Kingston 1987). Soon thereafter, the U.S. Department of Labor instituted the Random Audit program (which subsequently became the Benefits Accuracy Measurement (BAM) program) of randomly auditing UI payments. Federally funded BAM auditors annually investigate between 400 and 500 randomly selected, active UI claims, in each state. Recently, many states have relaxed their work test and consequently have lowered their BAM work-test error rates. In the most recent BAM report, a dozen states had zero errors related to work test compliance (U.S. Department of Labor 2002).

The practical aspects of UI job search requirements have changed dramatically in the past few years. Until recently, most new initial claims for UI were taken in person at employment security offices, with some mass applications made by employers on behalf of workers when large numbers of workers were involved. Continued claims for weekly benefits were usually required by mail, but were required in person in some states. Certification of proscribed job search activity was required in writing. Today, many states take most of their new UI claims over the telephone or Internet. Similarly, it is common for continued claim certification to take place automated telephone touch-

key response systems. In such a system, a claimant may simply be instructed to “press one if you contacted a potential employer about a job during the claim week, or press two if you did not.”

This paper summarizes state UI job search policies based on a survey of state rules conducted in 2003 by the National Association of State Workforce Agencies (NASWA). Commonalities in policies are identified, and a summary of research evidence on the effects of job search assistance is then presented, and those effects contrasted to current state policies. Finally, promising directions for future research and policy are identified.

2. Commonalities in State UI Work Search Requirements

The NASWA questionnaire asked for the following information:

- 1) Provisions dealing with job search requirements in state law;
- 2) Descriptions of policies and procedures for enforcing job search requirements; and
- 3) Descriptions of job search assistance provided to UI claimants.

Responses to the survey are summarized in Table 1. Column (1) lists the state name and the legal statute number addressing UI job search requirements. The table summarizes information from all 50 states, plus the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. These 52 entities administering UI programs are simply called “states” in this paper.

Column (2) in Table 1 summarizes the administrative method of taking initial claims and continued UI claims in the state. This information is important in understanding how claimants interact with the institution of UI in a state. Claims-taking

practices may affect claimants' exposure to information and methods of job search. Twenty years ago, with the exception of mass applications associated with layoffs by large employers, almost all initial claims were made in person. Weekly or biweekly continued claims were conducted either in person or by mail, but continued claims and work search attestation were always made in writing and signed. As summarized on the Information Technology Support Center (ITSC) web site, among the 52 states responding to the survey summarized here, 35 take initial claims over the telephone, whereas 16 are making plans to do so.¹ (Currently, only the state of Delaware is not planning to take initial UI claims by phone.) Furthermore, 44 states take continued claims by phone while eight are planning to implement the system. As of August 2003, there were 32 states accepting initial UI claims over the Internet, with 16 more in the planning stage and five with no plans to do so. Additionally, 24 states were taking Internet continued claims, 21 states planned to do so, and eight states had no plans for Internet continued claims.

Columns (3) and (4) in Table 1 contain data on job search requirements that involve the employment service (ES) and independent search. A long-running semiannual publication of the U.S. Department of Labor (USDOL), titled "Comparison of State Unemployment Insurance Laws," was changed this year to delete the table summarizing state UI job search rules. The table was replaced with the following brief paragraph (USDOL 2003):

¹<http://www.itsc.state.md.us/State_Maps_&_Charts/tic_twc.htm> Accessed September 4, 2003.

ACTIVELY SEEKING WORK—In addition to registration for work at a local employment office, all states, whether by law or practice, except Pennsylvania, require that a worker be actively seeking work or making a reasonable effort to obtain work. Pennsylvania requires that the claimant be able and available for suitable work. Those states which apply actively seeking work through practice are Alaska, Arizona, Mississippi, Nebraska, Nevada, New York, Puerto Rico, South Dakota, Tennessee, and Texas.

The UI legislation unit in USDOL made the judgment that there was no longer sufficient variation in job search requirements among states to justify a separate table. Currently only Pennsylvania requires neither registration of UI claimants with the ES nor active job search on the part of beneficiaries.

The 10 other states listed above have no statute requiring job search by UI beneficiaries but in practice do require job search. An examination of UI job search rules and practices by Anderson (2000), based on 1999 statutes, found that among the 10 states besides Pennsylvania without a *legal* requirement for job search by beneficiaries only five required job search *in practice*. States identified as having neither a law requiring UI beneficiaries to search for work nor practices promoting job search were Alaska, Mississippi, Nebraska, Puerto Rico, and Tennessee.

Most states require initial registration for job search with the ES and regular use of ES services, including the attendance of interviews for suitable jobs when referred by the ES. Forty states require a continuous, active job search, while—either by statute or judicial interpretation—12 states do not.

Among the states that require an active job search for continued claim eligibility, most specify conditions under which the requirement is waived. Column (5) in Table 1 lists these conditions. The three most common instances occur when a claimant is either: 1) employer-attached and awaiting recall, with a definite date of return to the prior job; 2) a union hiring hall member; or 3) participating in commissioner-approved training.

Almost all states waive the work search requirement for workers on temporary layoff with a definite recall date in the near future. Some states specify exactly how soon the expected recall date must be for a work search requirement to be waived. When UI was established in the 1930s, employers accepted a payroll tax to finance the system largely because it was viewed as a means of keeping their skilled but idle workers close by until such a time as product demand recovered and hiring resumed. UI is not intended to break employer-worker relationships, but instead to preserve the existing ones and foster new ones.

Also commonly excluded from required work searches are union members who belong to hiring halls. These workers are not expected to conduct an independent job search, but instead to use the job placement service of the hiring hall. Most state UI laws respect union affiliations in this way.

For beneficiaries who are offered a retraining opportunity approved by the commissioner of a state workforce agency, work search requirements are waived and the weekly benefit amount is viewed as a type of training stipend.

Though not mentioned by states responding to the survey, another small group of UI beneficiaries is similarly exempted from the job search requirement and permitted

to receive weekly benefits those in approved self-employment assistance (SEA). Legislation permits UI use for self-employment in 11 states, but by 1998, when the federal SEA legislation became permanent as part of the Workforce Investment Act (WIA), there was appreciable SEA activity in only five states: New York, Maine, Delaware, New Jersey, and Maryland (Messenger, Peterson-Vaccaro, and Vroman 2002).

The formal requirements for continuing UI beneficiaries to make contacts with potential employers are listed in column (6) of Table 1. The most common requirement is called “customary for the occupation.” This is a compromise standard that emerged from attempts to set strict numbers of contacts per week, which led to employer backlash due to alleged insincere, repetitive, and burdensome employment applications submitted merely to satisfy the UI job search requirement. However, a nebulous standard like “customary for the occupation” is difficult to enforce. Other vague rules refer to “reasonable and diligent” job search. Several states allow the number of contacts required within the statute or regulation to be customized by stating “as directed.” Many states, however, still require a fixed number of employer contacts per week. For example, Arkansas requires between two and five, and Iowa requires two per week as long as the applicant is claiming benefits. Many states require a minimum of one a week.

State practices for validation of required employer contacts are summarized in column (7) of Table 1. Some states require job seekers to keep a written log of employer contacts which must be submitted upon request of the UI agency. Other states require a written statement on a signed continued-claim form which is submitted

to the agency. A few survey responses mentioned that the state eligibility review program (ERP) assured a continuous job search. Another few survey responses mentioned the USDOL BAM random audit system as a means of validating compliance with rules for required work search.

Column (8) in Table 1 lists other means of job search assistance (JSA) provided by states to UI beneficiaries. The most common responses listed here were simply JSA and workshops for WPRS referrals. Several states also listed means of assistance that are considered core services in one-stop centers, such as labor market information (LMI), job referrals (interviews), résumé preparation, and interviewing skills. Outside of WPRS and ERP, no systematic methods for linking UI beneficiaries with reemployment services were mentioned. So for a large fraction of beneficiaries, there is no existing mechanism beyond ES registration to connect them to reemployment services.

3. Research Evidence on the Effects of Work Search Requirements

Evaluations of job search services for UI claimants have focused on three main topics: job interview referrals, job search assistance (JSA), and targeted JSA.² The major studies on each of these three topics are summarized separately in tables 2, 3, and 4. Each of the evaluations used a distinct research design, and some satisfied higher methodological standards than others. Impact estimates differ across the studies because of methodology and the variety of samples and time frames used for analysis.

² Two early studies evaluated the effectiveness of counseling provided by the ES (Benus et al. 1977; Johnson et al. 1981). Both studies found “no significant impact of counseling on duration of unemployment, earnings or job satisfaction” (Balducchi, Johnson, and Gritz 1997, p. 485).

Nonetheless, each of the studies adds to our understanding of labor exchange services in the United States.

Taken together, evidence from these studies has helped shape the direction of public labor exchange policy in the United States. Research has guided the development of programs for dislocated workers, of targeted job search assistance, and of institutions for coordination of services. These include the establishment of the Worker Profiling and Reemployment Services (WPRS) system, one-stop career centers, and state eligibility review programs (ERP) as part of the ES-administered UI work test.

The first national evaluation of the ES in the United States found that job referrals are most effective for women, but are also effective for men over 45 years of age and men in urban areas—which makes an argument for providing job placement services to middle-aged, dislocated workers (Johnson et al. 1983; Johnson, Dickinson, and West 1985).

A study of ES effectiveness for dislocated workers in Pennsylvania found JSA to be most effective early in a spell of joblessness. The study also found that ES job referrals act as a backstop once job seekers exhaust other avenues of search—evidence that would favor early JSA intervention in support of the WPRS system (Katz 1991).

An evaluation in Washington and Oregon found ES job placements most effective for those with a strong record of job attachment—providing evidence for JSA as an intervention for dislocated workers (Jacobson and Petta 2000).

Evaluation studies in South Carolina and Maryland found that a stronger UI work test, achieved by requiring reporting of job search contacts and validation of contacts

through cooperation between UI and ES, leads to significantly shorter periods of compensated joblessness. This offers evidence of the importance of an objective and verified job search requirement (Corson, Long, and Nicholson 1985; Klepinger et al. 1998).

A field experiment in Washington found that eliminating both continued-claim filing and the work test leads to dramatically longer spells of compensated joblessness—providing further examples of the importance of UI and ES cooperation in requiring and monitoring job search activity (Johnson and Klepinger 1991, 1994). This study also evaluated JSA and found shorter unemployment durations for those referred to JSA. However, because of the timing of leaving benefits, the authors suspected that these responses aimed to avoid JSA rather than to support the case that JSA boosted success in the labor market.

In the United Kingdom (UK), unemployment compensation (UC) is administered by the Employment Service (ES) and has a uniform initial entitlement duration of 12 months. In 1987, a new program called Restart was introduced nationally. Under Restart, UC beneficiaries nearing six continuous months of benefit receipt were called in for an appointment at their local ES office and were provided with an intensive package of JSA.

An evaluation by Dolton and O'Neill (1996) of the UK's Restart program estimated short-term effects similar to those observed by Johnson and Klepinger (1994) in the Tacoma alternative work-search experiment. Both evaluations suggested that there was a modest shortening in the duration of compensated unemployment and that

the invitation for intensive JSA acted more as a prod than as a support for reemployment.

Dolton and O'Neill (2002) conducted a subsequent random assignment field experiment, wherein the treatment group received the standard Restart services when nearing six continuous months on claim while the randomly selected control group was given the Restart services when approaching 12 continuous months of receiving UC benefits. They found evidence that over the short term required JSA appears to prod UC beneficiaries to go back to work, but that over the long term JSA supports continued higher success in the labor market—an indication that JSA can have valuable content for job seekers.

Evidence from evaluations in Maryland, Washington, DC, and Florida demonstrates that standardized ERP and JSA are relatively inexpensive to administer and have a significant effect on reducing periods of compensated joblessness. They therefore become cost-effective interventions, a consideration that favors WPRS and state-adopted ERP programs (Klepinger et al. 1998; Johnson and Klepinger 1991; Decker et al. 2000).³

Evidence from the New Jersey UI Reemployment Experiment shows that JSA targeted at dislocated workers at risk of long-term unemployment can be a cost-effective intervention and that the treatment can be very simple and structured; these

³ In an interstate study of UI reciprocity, Vroman (2002, p. ii) finds that states with established ERP programs have shorter durations of compensated unemployment. On the technical support Web site linked to U.S. Department of Labor's Employment and Training Administration Web site (www.doleta.gov), under the heading of "best practices," links are provided to descriptions of ERP programs in four states—Florida, Michigan, Tennessee, and West Virginia. Several other states also operate ERP programs. <http://www.itsc.state.md.us/best_practices/eligibility_review_program.htm> Accessed September 4, 2003.

results led directly to WPRS implementation (Corson et al. 1989). Statistical targeting of JSA to those at risk of long-term joblessness was tested in the District of Columbia and Florida through field experiments and offered further support for the cost-effectiveness of targeted JSA (Decker et al. 2000).

Recent evaluations of WPRS indicate shorter jobless durations for program participants. An evaluation of WPRS in Kentucky, applying an experimental design, found that WPRS shortens UI duration by more than two weeks (Dickinson et al. 1999; Black et al. 2003).

All studies evaluating the effectiveness of ES interventions consistently report low costs per customer served by the public labor exchange. This fact is key to the cost-effectiveness of ES interventions. Even services resulting in a modest reduction in jobless durations show a significant return on public investment when costs are low. Interventions that improve linkages of UI beneficiaries to job search assistance have great potential to increase the efficiency of state workforce investment systems.

4. Future Directions for Research and Policy

What is the UI work test today? What does registration with the ES mean? What mechanisms are used to check job search contacts with potential employers? Does automation present a barrier or an opportunity? Work search requirements reduce the duration of claims if they are objective and adequately enforced, but what type of reasonable work search requirements can be reliably implemented and monitored at a modest cost in an automated environment?

Previous studies have found a variety of in-person services provided by the ES to be cost-effective; however, public labor exchange services are becoming increasingly automated. Although automated services have received a steadily rising share of public labor exchange funding, the effectiveness of automated and self-serve JSA provided by the ES is not known and should be evaluated. Administrative data systems should be modified to record data on self-service use of automated JSA so as to assess its value to job seekers and employers. Such information could inform the design of new systems to improve the linkage of UI to one-stop career centers that might facilitate a faster return to work by UI beneficiaries.

Research into new ways of linking UI beneficiaries to reemployment services should be conducted in the new environments of remote initial and continued claims through telephone and Internet, and of reemployment services that are either automated or housed in one-stop centers where UI and ES are only two partners among many agencies. Such research could evaluate alternative methods of establishing linkages for UI beneficiaries to reemployment services such as: 1) required Internet job search with automated validation of search activity; 2) required telephone calls to an automated job-search information and referral system; 3) required telephone calls to an ES staff person for job search assistance; or 4) required response to an ES call-in for referral to a job order.

References

- Anderson, Patricia M. 2000. "Monitoring and Assisting Active Job Search." In *Labour Market Policies and the Public Employment Service*, David Grubb, Stanislav Benes, and Douglas Lippoldt, eds. Paris: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, pp. 217–240.
- Balducci, David E., Terry R. Johnson, and R. Mark Gritz. 1997. "The Role of the Employment Service." In *Unemployment Insurance in the United States: Analysis of Policy Issues*, Christopher J. O'Leary and Stephen A. Wandner, eds. Kalamazoo, MI: W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research, pp. 457–503.
- Benus, Jacob, Arden Hall, Patty Gwartney-Gibbs, Marilyn Coon, Caren Cole, Diane Leeds, and Doug Brent. 1977. "The Effectiveness of Counseling in the U.S. Employment Service: A Pilot Study." Report prepared by Stanford Research Institute (SRI) under contract no. 20-06-75-48 for the Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, August.
- Black, Dan, Jeffrey Smith, Mark Berger, and Brett Noel. 2003. "Is the Threat of Reemployment Services More Effective than the Services Themselves? Experimental Evidence from the UI System." *American Economic Review* 93 (4): forthcoming.
- Burgess, Paul L., and Jerry L. Kingston. 1987. *An Incentives Approach to Improving the Unemployment Compensation System*. Kalamazoo, MI: W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research.
- Corson, Walter, Paul T. Decker, Sherri M. Dunstan, Anne R. Gordon, Patricia Anderson, and John Homrighausen. 1989. "New Jersey Unemployment Insurance Reemployment Demonstration Project." Unemployment Insurance Occasional Paper No. 89-3. Washington, DC: Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor.
- Corson, Walter, David Long, and Walter Nicholson. 1985. "Evaluation of the Charleston Claimant Placement and Work Test Demonstration." Unemployment Insurance Occasional Paper No. 85-2. Washington, DC: Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor.
- Decker, Paul T., Robert B. Olson, Lance Freeman, and Daniel H. Klepinger. 2000. "Assisting Unemployment Insurance Claimants: The Long-Term Impact of the Job Search Assistance Demonstration." OWS Occasional Paper 2000-02. Washington, DC: Office of Workforce Security, Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor.

- Dickinson, Katherine P., Paul T. Decker, Suzanne D. Kreutzer, and Richard W. West. 1999. "Evaluation of Worker Profiling and Reemployment Services: Final Report." Research and Evaluation Report Series 99-D. Washington, DC: Office of Policy and Research, Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor.
- Dolton, Peter, and Donal O'Neill. 1996. "The Long-Run Effects of Unemployment Monitoring and Work-Search Programs: Experimental Evidence from the United Kingdom." *Economic Journal* 106 (2): 387–400.
- . 2002. "The Long-Run Effects of Unemployment Monitoring and Work-Search Programs: Experimental Evidence from the United Kingdom." *Journal of Labor Economics* 20 (2, part 1): 381–403.
- Jacobson, Louis, and Ian Petta. 2000. "Measuring the Effect of Public Labor Exchange (PLX) Referrals and Placements in Washington and Oregon." OWS Occasional Paper 2000-06. Washington, DC: Office of Workforce Security, Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor.
- Johnson, Terry R., C. Eric Munson, Samuel Weiner, Asi Cohen, Marilyn L. Coon, and Susan E. McNicoll. 1981. "Findings from a Survey of the U.S. Employment Service Counseling Program." Menlo Park, CA: SRI International (March).
- Johnson, Terry R., Katherine P. Dickinson, Richard W. West, Susan E. McNicoll, Jennifer M. Pfister, Alex L. Stagner, and Betty J. Harris. 1983. "A National Evaluation of the Impact of the United States Employment Service." Final report prepared by SRI International under Contract No. 23-06-79-04 for the Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor (June).
- Johnson, Terry R., Katherine P. Dickinson, and Richard W. West. 1985. "An Evaluation of the Impacts of ES Referrals on Applicant Earnings." *The Journal of Human Resources* 20(1): 117–137.
- Johnson, Terry R., and Daniel H. Klepinger. 1991. "Evaluation of the Impacts of the Washington Alternative Work Search Experiment." Unemployment Insurance Occasional Paper 91-4. Washington, DC: Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor.
- . 1994. "Experimental Evidence on Unemployment Insurance Work-Search Policies." *The Journal of Human Resources* 29 (3): 695–717.
- Katz, Arnold. 1991. "The Length of Joblessness and the Employment Service with Special Reference to Philadelphia and Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, 1979–1987." In *The Potential Effectiveness of the Employment Service in Serving Dislocated Workers under EDWAA: Evidence from the 1980s*, Carol J. Romero, Donald Cox,

and Arnold Katz, eds. Washington, DC: National Commission for Employment Policy, pp. 17–61.

Klepinger, Daniel H., Terry R. Johnson, Jutta M. Joesch, and Jacob M. Benus. 1998. "Evaluation of the Maryland Unemployment Insurance Work Search Demonstration." Unemployment Insurance Occasional Paper No. 98-2. Washington, DC: Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor.

Messenger, Jon, Carolyn Peterson-Vaccaro, and Wayne Vroman. 2002. "Profiling in Self-Employment Assistance Programs." In *Targeting Employment Services*, Randall W. Eberts, Christopher J. O'Leary, and Stephen A. Wandner, eds. Kalamazoo, MI: W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research, pp. 113–157.

O'Leary, Christopher J. Forthcoming. "Evaluating the Effectiveness of Labor Exchange Services." In *Labor Exchange Policy in the United States: History, Effectiveness, and Prospects*, David E. Balducchi, Randall W. Eberts, and Christopher J. O'Leary, eds. Kalamazoo, MI: W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research.

Vroman, Wayne. 2002. "Low Benefit Reciprocity in State Unemployment Insurance Programs." Office of Workforce Security Occasional Paper 2002-02. Washington DC: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration.

U.S. Department of Labor. 2002. "Calendar Year 2001 Benefits Accuracy Measurement Report." Washington, DC. Accessed at <<http://ows.doleta.gov/unemploy/pdf/bamcy2001.pdf>>.

———. 2003. *Comparison of State Unemployment Insurance Laws*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor.

Table 1. A Comparison of State Job Search Policies

State Statute	Initial/Continued claims method ^d	Work Test	Actively seeking work	Exceptions	Contacts	Validation of Work Test & Refusal of Suitable Work (RSW)	Job Search Assistance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Alabama 25-4-77	Phone/ Phone	Reg. with ES	X	Definite recall date; approved training; union hiring hall	Custom for occupation	Random eligibility reviews; Benefits Accuracy Measurement (BAM); ESD notifies UCD of failure; Employers may report RSW; toll-free UC fraud hot line	Direct JSA and core services: Assessment, planning, LMI, job referrals, job search workshops, self-service materials
Alaska 23.20.406	Phone/ Phone	No		Work test for extended benefits			JSA, placement service, LMI, job search workshops, referrals
Arizona 23-771	Phone/ Phone	Reg. with ES			Custom for occupation	Claimant signs certification of understanding on job search; Claimant must take job referral	Job referrals, randomly selected for WPRS services: resume, interview skills, training, support
Arkansas 11-10-507	Phone/ Phone	Reg. and report to ES regularly	X ^a	Job attached; union hiring hall; employment date within 10 weeks	3 to 5 per week, at least one in person for MSA residents; 2 to 4 per week for residents in other labor market areas	After 13 or 19 weeks employer contacts must be submitted on an agency- provided form; agency may validate contacts; periodic agency review of claimant's job search requirement; if no search reported on continued claim, must contact local office within 7 days to avoid suspension. ES registration and services can be validated online.	Job referrals, LMI, guidance. Additional staff hired using the reemployment assistance grant, provide ES services to UI claimants only.
California CUIC 1253	Phone/ Mail	Reg. and report to ES regularly	X	Job attached		Continued claim by mail	CalJOBS-Internet, resume prep, interview skills, LMI, job clubs, English language training Special services: dislocated, ex- offenders, disabled, public assistance, older workers

State Statute	Initial/Continued claims method ^d	Work Test	Actively seeking work	Exceptions	Contacts	Validation of Work Test & Refusal of Suitable Work (RSW)	Job Search Assistance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Colorado 8-73-107	Phone/Phone	Test, but not by ES	X	Awaiting recall; union hiring hall; definite employment date soon	Customary for occupation and labor market	Claimant must keep a record of employer contacts on UC agency provided form, and must present record if requested.	Participation in JSA required if WPRS-profiled and -referred.
Connecticut 31-235	Phone/Phone weekly	Reg. with ES	X	Definite recall date; age 62+; approved training	Customary for occupation (min. 3/wk)	Claimant must keep record of contacts that is subject to verification at any time; Eligibility Review Program (ERP) weekly random selection, two prior weeks' work search reviewed; failure to phone-certify job search weekly leads to an eligibility review.	Participate in JSA if WPRS-referred
Delaware 3314(3)-19			X ^a	Definite recall date; approved training; illness after est.; voc. training	One in person per week	Random validation through Benefit Quality Control Employer signature card for search attempts dropped since burdensome to employers; Delaware has an ERP	WPRS for profiling and referral to reemployment services
DC	Claims at one-stop/bi-weekly continued		X ^c		2 weekly, not documented on claim	DC ERP requires documentation of job contacts in previous 2 weeks	Workshops at one-stops: resume, Internet job search, interviewing, how to apply, evaluate options, make a job search plan.
Florida 443.091(1)	Mail, phone, Internet	Reg. with ES	X	Job-attached recall w/in 8 wks; union hall; seasonal, mass layoff or labor dispute; professional or highly technically trained; reside in an unserved one-stop-center area; approved training	Customary work search record form UC20A	Must report to the ES every two weeks; Florida ERP includes review of contacts recorded in UC20A; automated check on attendance at ERP and WPRS.	WPRS profiled must participate in reemployment services called Priority ReEmployment Planning (PREP). Resource rooms available: LMI, vacancies, training, Internet, resume, fax, copy, telephone, etc.

State Statute	Initial/Continued claims method ^d	Work Test	Actively seeking work	Exceptions	Contacts	Validation of Work Test & Refusal of Suitable Work (RSW)	Job Search Assistance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Georgia 34-8-195	In person, Intranet	Reg. with ES	X ^b	Recall date w/i 6 wks, approved training, partial claimants, union hiring hall members, affected by a strike, lockouts must register	As directed	ERP at 5, 9, 14 weeks; recall date within 6 weeks validated by the employer; partial claimants are coded	WPRS and state-based Claimant Assistance Project (CAP) mandatory orientation plus additional services
Hawaii 383-29	Phone, in person, weekly or bi-weekly	Reg. with ES	^a	Approved union hiring hall; job-connected; affected by strike	As directed	Must keep record of contacts on form and present record if asked; contacts subject to verification by claims staff	Eligibility & WPRS interviews; One-Stop/WDD referral
Idaho	Phone, in person Internet/ weekly	Reg. with ES	X		As directed	Claimants must provide record of work search as requested; key weeks audited and verified by BPC staff	Assistance ongoing throughout benefit period; customized according to local labor-market conditions and claimant needs
Illinois 820 ILCS 400/500		Reg. with ES	X	Job-attached; affected by labor dispute; definite recall date w/i 4 wks; union member partially unemployed		Claimant must maintain weekly search record and is required to provide it as requested	Registered for ISM, Internet resume prep, workshops, job clubs, LMI
Indiana IC 22-4-14	Internet, in person, phone	Reg. with ES	X	Job-attached w/ definite recall date, union hall members		Weekly search efforts listed on vouchers; blank vouchers rejected, benefits held until claimant contacted and eligibility decided by agency; Random compliance verification	Resume writing; workshops; counseling; referral

State Statute	Initial/Continued claims method ^d	Work Test	Actively seeking work	Exceptions	Contacts	Validation of Work Test & Refusal of Suitable Work (RSW)	Job Search Assistance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Iowa	In person, phone/phone weekly	Reg. with ES WDO	X	Job-attached w/ reasonable recall date; enrolled in approved school/training program; union hall members; accepted voluntary layoff vs. bumping; voluntary shared work claimant	2 in-person weekly	Written work-search history record required; must be presented as requested	WPRS referral, resume writing, interviewing skills, work search
Kansas	Mail, Internet, phone, in person	Reg. with ES	X		Minimum 1 per week		Services available online, or visit WDC
Kentucky KRS 341.350	In person	Reg. with ES	X	Involved in mass layoff w/ recall date; involved in labor dispute w/ probable recall date; partially employed; union hiring hall members	Minimum 1 per week	Required to maintain log of contacts	Resume writing, job matching, skills testing, interviewing skills, marketing techniques, Internet job searching, workshops, referral
Louisiana R.S. 23	In person, phone	Reg. with ES	X	Job-attached w/ recall date w/i 30-45 days; union hiring hall members; enrolled in approved training program	As directed; minimum 1 per week in person	Maintain unemployment booklet	Internet resume posting, workshops, interviewing skills, referral, resume writing
Maine 26 MRSA 1082; 1192	In person, phone	Reg. with ES	X	Job attached w/ definite recall date w/in 6 wks; involved in mass layoff or strike	Weekly	UI call-center staff review weekly claim cards for work search contacts	Job referrals, resume & interview prep, career counseling, job training
Maryland UI Law Sect. 8-903	In person	Reg. with ES	X ^p	Job attached w/ definite recall date	Minimum 2 per week	Verified through BAM/QC program	Electronic/online job search workshops, interviewing skills, resume preparation

State Statute	Initial/Continued claims method ^d	Work Test	Actively seeking work	Exceptions	Contacts	Validation of Work Test & Refusal of Suitable Work (RSW)	Job Search Assistance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Massachusetts MGL 151A	In person, phone	Reg. with ES	X		Min. 1 con 3 days/wk; union members must contact hiring hall weekly	Work search & activity log may be reviewed at any time	Career planning, job training, resume writing, interviewing/skills improvement, local LMI
Michigan	In person, mail	Reg. with ES	X ^a	Job attached w/expected recall date w/in 45 days & written notice of recall from employer; suitable work unavailable; attending classes full-time		MWA staff verify resume as entered in MTB	Self-service via MTB internet-based system and resource rooms; job search workshops; planning, assessment and skills testing, career counseling, LMI, resume writing
Minnesota 268.085	Initial application coded into 4 categories		X	Enrolled in unemployment assistance training; serving on jury duty; union hiring hall member; job attached w/ definite recall date w/in 45 days; reside in a location where unemployment is so high that active work search is nearly futile	Reasonable and diligent/customary		
Mississippi 71-5-511		Reg. with ES				Periodic eligibility review; must show active work search for claimant to continue receiving benefits	WIN Job Center resource rooms, staff-assisted core services: resume preparation, LMI, job search planning, placement assistance, career counseling
Missouri 228.040	Phone, in person, Internet/ in person at least once every 4 weeks	Reg. with ES	X ^a	union hiring/referral facility member	As directed	Claimants asked weekly for number of contacts; BAM; ERP	Provided by WFD, one-stop centers, automatic job matching

State Statute	Initial/Continued claims method ^d	Work Test	Actively seeking work	Exceptions	Contacts	Validation of Work Test & Refusal of Suitable Work (RSW)	Job Search Assistance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Montana 39-51-2104	Phone, in person, Internet	Reg. with ES	X	Job attached w/definite recall date; union hiring hall members		Provide as requested	Job service via Internet One-Stop; those profiled receive one-on-one work-search planning, resume construction, training skills, testing, referral
Nebraska		Reg. with ES			Calculated reasonably	Certified weekly	May be core or intensive, depending on claimant skill set and job readiness
Nevada NAC 612	In person, phone, Internet, by appt.	Reg. with ES			Reasonable and customary	May be asked to report to ES for a job referral; Log contacts in handbook that may be verified during future interviews	Workshops, LMI, counseling, testing
New Hampshire		Reg. with ES	X	Enrolled in approved voc. training; involved in mass temp. layoff; partially employed; union hiring hall member; job attached w/ definite recall date w/in 4 wks if not seasonal; 16 wks if seasonal		Registration in Job Matching System required, failure to do so disqualifies	Reemployment services provided to randomly selected claimants; job matching system provides computer matches and generates referrals
New Jersey 43:21-4	In person, phone		X		3 in-person weekly	ERI, QC	Career Beacon Workshops: self-management skills, LMI Research, effective job search, marketing/resume, interviewing, training
New Mexico 51-1-5A	In person	Reg. with ES	X ^a		Reasonable & customary; as directed; to continue claim, minimum 2 different each week or if union member contacting union as required	Required to attest weekly to active work search	

State Statute	Initial/Continued claims method ^d	Work Test	Actively seeking work	Exceptions	Contacts	Validation of Work Test & Refusal of Suitable Work (RSW)	Job Search Assistance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
New York 18-7-591	In person/ phone			Job attached w/ recall date; members of union hiring hall	As directed	Periodic Eligibility & Employability Review (PEER) Interview	One-Stop Centers w/Resource Room: Internet job search, resume prep, interviewing techniques; intensive services as needed: counseling, short-term pre-vocational services, occupational training, OJT, adult ed., ESL, etc.
North Carolina NCGS 96-13			X ^{a,c}	Seasonal; job attached and attending approved vocational program; affected by strike; union hiring hall members	Minimum of 2 in-person contacts on 2 different days each week; Extended: 3 in-person contacts/3 different days each week	Must complete and present Work Search Record form weekly	
North Dakota 52-06-01	In person, telephone	Reg. with ES	X	Job attached	2 per week		One-Stop Centers—workshops; individual assistance, online job matching
Ohio 4141.29	In person	Reg. with ES & Ohio JobNet	X ^a	Job attached w/ recall date within 45 days; attending approved training program		Claimant keeps record and shall produce such record for examination as requested; job contacts reviewed randomly	WPRS; workshops, resume prep, interview techniques, LMI, career counseling; intensive includes referrals, education and training
Oklahoma 240:10-3	In person, phone	Reg. with ES	X ^c	Involved in temporary layoff; job attached and involved in mass layoff; resides in area not served			Job search workshops: Application/Resume completion; Interviewing Techniques; Marketable Skills; LMI; Internet Use; Job Retention
Oregon ORS 657.155		Reg. with ES	X		Reasonable and customary	Must furnish evidence of work search as requested	Job and career-center resources; Internet access, LMI, referrals, self-employment assistance (SEA) program via WPRS
Pennsylvania		No				Active work search not required	Job clubs, CareerLink orientation, job search workshops, testing, interviewing skills, resume preparation, referral to education and/or training as necessary.

State Statute	Initial/Continued claims method ^d	Work Test	Actively seeking work	Exceptions	Contacts	Validation of Work Test & Refusal of Suitable Work (RSW)	Job Search Assistance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Puerto Rico P.L. #74	In person			Job attached and subject to recall; union hiring hall attachment; partial or interstate claimants			Job search workshops include topics on change, control of emotion, self-esteem, motivation, application/resume preparation, interviewing skills, job retention
Rhode Island 28.44.12	In person, mail, phone	Reg. with ES	X	Temporary layoff w/ definite recall date within 12 wks; involved in labor dispute; union hiring hall member	As directed		Workshops, job fairs, job matching
South Carolina 41-35-110		Reg. with ES	X	Enrolled in approved training program	As directed	Required to complete Form UCB-303 weekly and submit at each eligibility review	Retraining guidance, job matching
South Dakota	In person	Reg. with ES			2 per week	Work search efforts must be recorded and are randomly verified	Workshops, referrals
Tennessee TCA 50-7-302	In person, mail, phone	Reg. with ES		Job attached	As prescribed; customary		Internet job searching, job search workshops, LMI, training referral, support services referral, resume preparation
Texas TLC 207.021	In person, phone	Reg. with ES			As directed	Record work search contacts on weekly log; required to register w/ job matching system within 7 days; work search logs are verified randomly	Resource rooms, workshops, counseling, resume preparation, referrals
Utah 35A-4	In person	Reg. with ES	X	Enrolled in approved training program; attached to union; labor dispute; job attached w/ definite recall date; seasonal	Min. 2 new contacts each week or as directed	Keep detailed weekly record of contacts and present it as requested	
Vermont 1343		Reg. with ES	X ^c	Job attached w/ recall date	3 contacts per week average	Produce evidence of work search upon request	

State Statute	Initial/Continued claims method ^d	Work Test	Actively seeking work	Exceptions	Contacts	Validation of Work Test & Refusal of Suitable Work (RSW)	Job Search Assistance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Virginia 60.2-612(7)(a)			X	Job attached w/ reasonable expected recall date	Usual & customary; 1 per week if labor market unemployment rate is 10-14.9%; waived if 15% or higher	Must report weekly contacts. Randomly selected clients are interviewed in-depth regarding their job search and contacts. Each employer identified is contacted and verified	Coaching, mentoring, job interviewing techniques, resume writing
Washington	Phone, paper, Internet	Reg. with ES	X ^c	Partially employed; shared work; standby; union attached; approved training	3/week or documented in-person activity at the service center	Job search-log completion; randomly selected for review and verification	Job Hunter workshops, LMI, skill identification, resume writing, interviewing skills, job search techniques
West Virginia 21A-6-1		Reg. with ES	X	Enrolled in approved training program; jury duty; hiring hall unemployed; job attached	Customary	Claimant must certify weekly job contacts	Counseling, job search & placement assistance
Wisconsin DWD 127	In person, mail	Reg. with ES	X ^c	Job attached w/ recall date within 12 wks; union hall members; jury duty; enrolled and participating in approved training program; layoff due to disaster at employment location	As directed; however, a minimum number may be required	Claimants may be required to produce evidence of work search efforts at any time	Employment workshops
Wyoming WS 27-3-306		Reg. with ES	X	Job attached w/recall date within 12 wks; labor union members; enrolled in approved training program	Customary		LMI, skill assessment, talent bank access, Internet access, counseling

NOTES:

^aEmployees temporarily laid off for not more than 45 days deemed available for work and actively seeking work if the employer notifies the agency that the layoff is temporary in DE, MI, OH; for no more than 8 wks. in AR and MO; and for no more than 4 wks. or if the individual has an offer in writing for full-time work that will begin in 4 wks. in NM. Individual customarily employed in seasonal employment must show that he is actively seeking work for which he is qualified by past experience or training during the nonseasonal period in NC. Claimant must make an active search for work if he voluntarily left work because of marital obligations or approaching marriage in HI.

^bAnd is bona fide in the labor market, GA. Not applicable to persons unemployed because of plant shutdown of 10–26 weeks if conditions justify, or to persons 60 or over who have been furloughed and are subject to recall; blindness or severe handicap do not make a person ineligible if the person was employed by the Maryland Workshop for the Blind prior to his unemployment in MD.

^cRequirement not mandatory; see text, OK, VT, WA, WI; by judicial interpretation in DC; by regulation in NC.

^dThe methods of taking initial and continued UI claims summarized in this column are those reported on the survey of states conducted by the National Association of State Workforce Agencies (NASWA). For the most current summary of the extent of automation to telephone and Internet claims-taking see the ITSC Web site. http://www.itsc.state.md.us/info_tech/infotech.asp#tic > Accessed February 4, 2004.

Table 2. Studies on the Effectiveness of Job Interview Referrals

Authors (year published)	Title	Design	Sample	Findings
Johnson, Terry R., Katherine P. Dickinson, Richard W. West, Susan E. McNicoll, Jennifer M. Pfiester, Alex L. Stagner, and Betty J. Harris (1983)	A National Evaluation of the Impact of the United States Employment Service	P1: ES job referral P2: Early ES job referral C: Registered but received no services	National: 30 offices in 27 states July 1980 to May 1981 8,000 ES applicants	P1: 23** percent earnings gain for all women, UI claimants and non-claimants. Nil impacts for men. P2: Large earnings gains for women, modest earnings gains for men. Among men, bigger effects for men over 45 and in urban areas. Comments: Displacement effects possible. Results not affected by selectivity bias correction. Comparison group somewhat advantaged.
Katz, Arnold (1991)	The Length of Joblessness and the ES with Special Reference to Philadelphia and Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, 1979–1987.	P1: ES placements P2: ES job referral C: No ES services	Pennsylvania: 1979–1987 5% sample of UI recipients, 16,470 jobless spells	P1: Reductions in duration of joblessness increased with time delay in applying for ES. Up to ! 23.7** weeks. P2: Reductions in duration of joblessness increased with time delay in applying for ES. Up to ! 20.5** weeks. Similar impacts in combination with JSA. Comments: Must control for delay in application, ES as a backstop, JSA most effective early.
Jacobson, Louis, and Ian Petta (2000)	Measuring the Effect of Public Labor Exchange (PLX) Referrals and Placements in Washington and Oregon.	P1: Job Placements C1: Job Referrals P2: Job Referrals C2: Not Referred	Washington: Survey of 587 during 1998 administrative data on 328,815 spells, 1987 to mid-1995 Oregon: administrative data on 138,280 spells during 1995.	Washington survey data: P1: strong work record ! 7.2 weeks, weak work record ! 3.8 weeks Washington administrative data: P1: ! 7.7 weeks. P2: ! 2.1 weeks Oregon administrative data: P1: ! 4.6 weeks. P2: ! 1.1 weeks

Source: O’Leary (Forthcoming).

Notes: P: participant group, C: comparison group. B/C: Benefit-cost ratio.

* (**) Statistically significant at the 90 (95) percent confidence level in a two-tailed test.

Table 3. Studies on the Effectiveness of Job Search Assistance

Authors (year published)	Title	Design	Sample	Findings
Corson, Walter, David Long and Walter Nicholson (1985)	Evaluation of the Charleston Claimant Placement and Work Test Demonstration	T1: Stronger work test T2: T1 plus enhanced placement services T3: T2 plus JSW C: Customary work test	Charleston, SC: February to December, 1983 T: 4,247 C: 1,428	T1: ! 0.55* weeks UI T2: ! 0.61** weeks UI T3: ! 0.76** weeks UI Impacts greater on men and construction workers.
Johnson, Terry R., and Daniel H. Klepinger (1991)	Evaluation of the Impacts of the Washington Alternative Work Search Experiment	T1: Exception reporting T2: New work search policy T3: Intensive services C: Existing work search policy	Tacoma, WA: July 1986 to August 1987 T: 6,763 C: 2,871	T1: +3.34** weeks UI T2: +0.17 weeks UI T3: ! 0.47* weeks UI Exits increased preceeding required service participation.
Klepinger, Daniel H., Terry R. Johnson, Jutta M. Joesch, and Jacob M. Benus (1998)	Evaluation of the Maryland Unemployment Insurance Work Search Demonstration	T1: Report four employer contacts weekly T2: Two contacts required weekly, but no reporting T3: Report 2 contacts weekly plus a 4-day JSW T4: Report two contacts weekly and both verified C1: Standard policy: report two contacts weekly but contacts not verified C2: Standard policy, but told data was to be used in an evaluation study	Maryland, six offices January 1, 1994 to December 31, 1994 Combined sample: 23,758 monetarily eligible new initial UI claimants	T1: ! 0.7** weeks UI T2: +0.4* weeks UI T3: ! 0.6** weeks UI T4: ! 0.9** weeks UI Impacts identical against either control group, suggesting no Hawthorne Effect present. Treatments 1, 3 and 4 had no earnings impact. Treatment 2 raised earnings by 4** percent.
Dolton, Peter, and Donal O'Neill (2002)	Effects of Unemployment Monitoring and Work-Search Programs in the UK	T: Restart program in UK: Call-in and intensive JSA after 6 continuous months on claim. C: No Restart program, JSA after 12 months	UK Employment Service: Inflow in 1989, tracked for five years T: 7,462 C: 472	T: Short term: shorter durations for both males and females. Long term: males had unemployment rates 6 percentage points lower after 5 years. No difference for females.

Source: O'Leary (Forthcoming).

Notes: T: experimental treatment group, C: experimental control group, JSW: job search workshop.

* (**) Statistically significant at the 90 (95) percent confidence level in a two-tailed test.

Table 4. Studies on the Effectiveness of Targeted Job Search Assistance

Authors (year published)	Title	Design	Sample	Findings
Corson, Walter, Paul T. Decker, Sherri M. Dunstan, Anne R. Gordon, Patricia Anderson and John Homrighausen (1989)	New Jersey Unemployment Insurance Reemployment Demonstration Project	T1: JSA T2: JSA plus training or relocation assistance T3: JSA plus a cash bonus C: Eligibility: first UI payment, age, tenure, temporary layoffs, union	New Jersey: July 1986 to June 1987 T: 8,675 C: 2,385	T1: ! 0.47** weeks of UI T2: ! 0.48** weeks of UI T3: ! 0.97** weeks of UI 6 Year T1: ! 0.76 weeks of UI 6 Year T2: ! 0.93 weeks of UI 6 Year T3: ! 1.72** weeks of UI
Decker, Paul T., Robert B. Olson, Lance Freeman and Daniel H. Klepinger (2000)	Assisting Unemployment Insurance Claimants: The Long-Term Impact of the Job Search Assistance Demonstration	T1: Structured JSA T2: Individualized JSA T3: T2 plus training C: Not on standby or a union hiring hall member, and predicted likely to exhaust UI entitlement	DC and Florida DC: June 1995 to June 1996 8,071 claimants FL: March 1995 to March 1996 12,042 claimants	DC T1: ! 1.13** weeks of UI DC T2: ! 0.47** weeks of UI DC T3: ! 0.61** weeks of UI FL T1: ! 0.41** weeks of UI FL T2: ! 0.59** weeks of UI FL T3: ! 0.52** weeks of UI
Dickinson, Katherine P., Paul T. Decker, Suzanne D. Kreutzer, and Richard W. West (1999)	Evaluation of Worker Profiling and Reemployment Services: Final Report	P: WPRS-profiled and referred to early JSA. C: Profiled but not referred (not on standby or a union hiring hall member)	CT, IL, KY, ME, NJ, SC: July 1995 and December 1996. P: 92,401 C: 295,920	CT: ! 0.25** weeks of UI IL: ! 0.41** weeks of UI KY: ! 0.21* weeks of UI ME: ! 0.98** weeks of UI NJ: ! 0.29** weeks of UI SC: 0.02 weeks of UI
Black, Dan, Jeffrey Smith, Mark Berger, and Brett Noel (2001)	Is the Threat of Reemployment Services More Effective than the Services Themselves? Experimental Evidence from the UI System	T: WPRS-profiled and referred to early JSA reemployment services C: Profiled and in the same predicted UI exhaustion cohort as T, but not referred to JSA	Kentucky October 1994 to June 1996 T: 1,236 C: 745	In the benefit year T: ! 2.2 weeks of UI, T: ! \$143 in UI benefits T: \$1,054 earnings

Source: O'Leary (Forthcoming).

Notes: T: experimental treatment group, P: participant group, C: experimental control group or comparison group, JSW: job search workshop.

* (**) Statistically significant at the 90 (95) percent confidence level in a two-tailed test.