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PREFACE

This bibliography is a companion volume to the National Commission's general bibliography of unemployment insurance (UI) materials entitled Unemployment Insurance: An Annotated Bibliography. Both bibliographies were developed as basic reference tools for state and Federal UI program personnel and for researchers in this and related fields.

This volume was designed to provide ready access to materials containing information and data on the UI programs of individual states. It contains a subject index, which provides access to the referenced materials by subject and state, and the bibliography itself, which consists of a state-by-state listing of relevant UI materials. When an abstract or annotation was available, the entry in the bibliography is annotated.

The bibliography is being produced in looseleaf form to facilitate periodic updates. Such updates will involve revision of both the bibliography itself and the subject index. Each update package will consist of a complete replacement for the index and revised pages to be inserted in the bibliography itself.

Although every effort was made to provide complete and accurate coverage of the available UI literature, users of this bibliography are bound to discover omissions and errors. The National Commission requests that such observations be communicated to the Commission staff so that additions and corrections can be incorporated into updates of this bibliography. The Commission also requests that individuals working in the UI field inform the staff when they have published new studies or reports so the updates will be as comprehensive and as current as possible.

Please address all comments to:

Raymond Munts
Research Director
National Commission on Unemployment Compensation
1815 Lynn Street, Suite 440
Rosslyn, Virginia 22209
(703) 235-2790

AFTER SEPTEMBER, 1980, ALL COMMENTS SHOULD BE ADDRESSED TO:

CHIEF, DIVISION OF RESEARCH
UIS, ETA, DOL - ROOM 7402
601 D Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20213
(202) 376-6413
USER'S GUIDE

This bibliography consists of a subject index and a state-by-state listing of documents containing information and data relevant to individual state UI program. Documents are identified within each state listing by document number: The document number consists of a state's two-letter Post Office abbreviation and a numeral assigned when the entry was processed. The document number is the link between the bibliography entry and the subject index.

The entries in this bibliography were developed from UI-related documents identified by searching 17 different bibliographic data bases. Many of the entries appear with annotations. Some of these annotations are abbreviated versions of the annotations appearing in the general UI bibliography; the others were prepared from abstracts provided by the data bases. An entry drawn from the general UI bibliography has a number in parentheses at the end of its annotation: This is the document number of the cited material in the general bibliography, and the reader can use this number to locate the more comprehensive annotation provided for the reference in the general bibliography.

The subject index is alphabetically arranged by topic. Under each subject entry is a listing of each state for which there is at least one document containing state-specific information on that topic. Under each state listing appear the document number(s) of the pertinent material(s). If a particular document was drawn from the general UI bibliography, the document's state bibliography number is followed by its number in the general bibliography. This allows the user to refer directly from the index to the general bibliography if desired. A typical listing in the subject index appears as follows:

ABUSE
New Jersey
NJ-6, NJ-9 (69)

The following is a complete list of the topical entry terms used in the subject index of this bibliography.
SUBJECT INDEX

ABUSE

Arizona
AZ-8

Kansas
KS-5 (309)

Nebraska
NE-3

New Jersey
NJ-6, NJ-9 (89)

New York
NY-10

ADMINISTRATION (FEDERAL)

California
CA-13 (202)

Connecticut
CT-10 (59)

Maine
ME-7 (59)

Massachusetts
MA-9 (59)

Missouri
MO-7 (168), MO-9 (182)

Montana
MT-2

New Hampshire
NH-3 (59)

New Jersey
NJ-5 (236)

New York
NY-6, NY-9, NY-14, NY-27 (213), NY-29 (323)

Rhode Island
RI-5 (59)

ADMINISTRATION (STATE)

Alabama
AL-8 (193)

California
CA-13 (202)

Colorado
CO-1

Connecticut
CT-7, CT-10 (59)

Delaware
DE-3

Hawaii
HI-5

Idaho
ID-2

Illinois
IL-7, IL-8
ADMINISTRATION (STATE) Continued

Kansas
  KS-2
Louisiana
  LA-2
Maine
  ME-7 (59)
Maryland
  MD-4
Massachusetts
  MA-6, MA-9 (59)
Nevada
  NV-5
New Hampshire
  NH-3 (59)
New Jersey
  NJ-5 (288)
New York
  NY-10, NY-14, NY-17, NY-30
North Carolina
  NC-1
North Dakota
  ND-5 (199)
Ohio
  OH-3
Pennsylvania
  PA-9 (142), PA-11 (194)
Puerto Rico
  PR-4
Rhode Island
  RI-5 (59)
Utah
  UT-3

AGRICULTURAL WORKERS (BENEFITS)
California
  CA-9 (204)
Hawaii
  HI-1
Minnesota
  MN-1
Ohio
  OH-1

AGRICULTURAL WORKERS (COVERAGE)
California
  CA-9 (204)
Connecticut
  CT-1, CT-2, CT-3, CT-4
Delaware
  DE-1, DE-2
Florida
  FL-2, FL-3, FL-5, FL-6
Hawaii
  HI-1
Maine
  ME-1, ME-3
AGRICULTURAL WORKERS (COVERAGE) Continued
Maryland
    MD-2, MD-3
Massachusetts
    MA-1, MA-2, MA-3
Minnesota
    MN-1
New Hampshire
    NH-1
New Jersey
    NJ-1, NJ-2
New York
    NY-2, NY-7
Ohio
    OH-1, OH-2
Pennsylvania
    PA-1, PA-2
Rhode Island
    RI-1, RI-2
Texas
    TX-1, TX-2, TX-3
Vermont
    VT-1, VT-2
Washington
    WA-2

BENEFIT ADEQUACY
Alaska
    AK-2, AK-6
Arizona
    AZ-15 (25), AZ-16 (26)
California
    CA-3 (232)
Georgia
    GA-4 (37)
Illinois
    IL-3 (37)
Maryland
    MD-6 (37)
Missouri
    MO-9 (182)
New Jersey
    NJ-9 (69), NJ-5 (286)
New York
    NY-12 (324), NY-29
Pennsylvania
    PA-10 (190)
South Carolina
    SC-1, SC-3 (48)
Washington
    WA-6 (37)

APPEALS
California
    CA-6, CA-8, CA-14
Louisiana
    LA-2
Michigan
    MI-3, MI-4
New Jersey
    NJ-5 (286)
Pennsylvania
    PA-4, PA-12 (327)

BENEFIT DURATION
Alaska
    AK-2
Arizona
    AZ-14 (09), AZ-20 (348)
California
    CA-3 (232), CA-7 (310)
Colorado
    CO-2 (45)
Florida
    FL-7 (51)
BENEFIT DURATION (Continued)

Georgia
  GA-4 (37), GA-6 (151),
  GA-7 (341)

Idaho
  ID-3 (205)

Illinois
  IL-3 (37)

Maryland
  MD-6 (37)

Missouri
  MO-8 (318), MO-9 (182)

New Jersey
  NJ-9 (69)

New York
  NY-23 (51), NY-28 (214),
  NY-11 (333), NY-29 (323),
  NY-31 (331)

North Carolina
  NC-2 (121)

Ohio
  OH-5 (51), OH-7 (318)

Oregon
  OR-7 (51)

Pennsylvania
  PA-7 (09), PA-10 (190),
  PA-6, PA-13 (318),
  PA-14 (341)

South Carolina
  SC-3 (48)

Utah
  UT-4 (190)

Washington
  WA-5 (45), WA-6 (37)

BENEFIT EXHAUSTION

Alabama
  AL-4 (113)

California
  CA-15 (113), CA-16 (114),

Connecticut
  CT-11 (113)

Florida
  FL-7 (51)

Georgia
  GA-4 (37), GA-7 (341)

Idaho
  ID-6, ID-3 (205)

Illinois
  IL-3 (37)

Maine
  ME-8 (113)

Maryland
  MD-6 (37)

Massachusetts
  MA-10 (113)

Michigan
  MI-5 (113)

Minnesota
  MN-4 (113)

Missouri
  MO-5 (114)

Montana
  MT-3 (113)

Nevada
  NV-7 (113), NV-8 (114)

New Jersey
  NJ-10 (113)

New York
  NY-11 (333), NY-23 (51),
  NY-24 (113), NY-25 (114),
  NY-28 (214), NY-31 (331)

North Dakota
  ND-4 (113)
BENEFIT EXHAUSTION (Continued)

Ohio
   OH-5 (51)
Oregon
   OR-7 (51), OR-8 (113)
Pennsylvania
   PA-14 (341)
Puerto Rico
   PR-3 (113)
Rhode Island
   RI-6 (113)
South Dakota
   SD-4
Vermont
   VT-8 (113), VT-4
Washington
   WA-6 (37), WA-7 (113)
West Virginia
   WV-9 (113)
Wisconsin
   WI-5 (114)

BENEFIT FORMULAS

Alabama
   AL-1, AL-5 (121)
Alaska
   AK-1
Arizona
   AZ-3, AZ-5, AZ-14 (09)
   AZ-15 (25)
California
   CA-7 (114)
   CA-10
Connecticut
   CT-5, CT-12 (347)
Hawaii
   HI-7
Idaho
   ID-5
Kentucky
   KY-1 (347)
Michigan
   MI-4, MI-6 (347)
Montana
   MT-2
Nebraska
   NE-5 (347)
New Jersey
   NJ-5 (286)
Puerto Rico
   PR-5 (347)
South Carolina
   SC-3 (48)
South Dakota
   SD-2 (347)
Wisconsin
   WI-6 (347)

BENEFITS

Alabama
   AL-1, AL-5 (121)
Alaska
   AK-1
Arizona
   AZ-3, AZ-5, AZ-14 (09)
   AZ-15 (25)
California
   CA-7 (310), CA-16 (114)
Colorado
   CO-2 (45)
Connecticut
   CT-5
Florida
   FL-7 (51), FL-8 (121)
Georgia
   GA-5 (121)
BENEFITS (Continued)

Idaho
  ID-1, ID-4
Illinois
  IL-5
Kansas
  KS-5 (309)
Louisiana
  LA-3, LA-5 (121)
Mississippi
  MS-3 (121)
Missouri
  MO-5 (114)
Nevada
  NV-8 (114)
New Jersey
  NJ-7, NJ-5 (286)
New York
  NY-1, NY-5, NY-8, NY-21, NY-23 (51), NY-25 (114), NY-28 (214), NY-29
North Carolina
  NC-2 (121)
Ohio
  OH-5 (51)
Oregon
  OR-1, OR-4, OR-7 (51)
Pennsylvania
  PA-6, PA-7 (09), PA-8 (120)
South Carolina
  SC-1, SC-3 (48), SC-4 (121)
South Dakota
  SD-1
Tennessee
  TN-4 (121)
Vermont
  VT-5
Washington
  WA-5 (45)
West Virginia
  WV-5
Wisconsin
  WI-1, WI-3

BENEFITS (STATISTICS)

California
  CA-7 (310)
Hawaii
  HI-7
Idaho
  ID-5
Kansas
  KS-1
Louisiana
  LA-1
New Jersey
  NJ-7
New York
  NY-31 (331)
Oregon
  OR-1
Pennsylvania
  PA-6
Tennessee
  TN-2
West Virginia
  WV-2
Wyoming
  WY-2

BUSINESS CYCLE EFFECTS ON UI

Alabama
  AL-5 (121)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Claimant Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>CA-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CA-10 (59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>FL-8 (121)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>GA-5 (121)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>LA-5 (121)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>MS-3 (121)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>NC-2 (121)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>SC-4 (121)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>TN-4 (121)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Claimant Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>MD-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>MA-9 (59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>MO-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>MT-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>NE-4 (209)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>NV-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>NH-3 (59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>NY-3, NY-19, NY-26 (209), NY-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>NC-1, NC-3 (205)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>ND-2, ND-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>OH-6 (190)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>OR-5 (205)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>RI-5 (59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>SC-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>SD-1, SD-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>TN-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>WV-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>WY-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CLAIMS
Arizona
   AZ-11 (312)
New York
   NY-19
West Virginia
   WV-2
Wisconsin
   WI-4

CLAIMS (STATISTICS)
Alabama
   AL-2
Arizona
   AZ-11 (312)
Hawaii
   HI-7
Kansas
   KS-1
Louisiana
   LA-1, LA-3
Massachusetts
   MA-4
Missouri
   MO-2
Montana
   MT-1
New Hampshire
   NH-2
New Jersey
   NJ-7
New York
   NY-3, NY-18
North Carolina
   NC-1
North Dakota
   ND-1
Oregon
   OR-1
Tennessee
   TN-2
Wisconsin
   WI-4
Wyoming
   WY-2

COVERAGE
Alabama
   AL-5 (121)
California
   CA-9 (204)
Connecticut
   CT-5
Florida
   FL-1, FL-4, FL-8 (121)
Georgia
   GA-5 (121)
Hawaii
   HI-8
Illinois
   IL-2, IL-4, IL-5
Louisiana
   LA-5 (121)
Maine
   ME-2, ME-4
Massachusetts
   MA-4
Mississippi
   MS-3 (121)
Missouri
   MO-1
New York
   NY-8, NY-21, NY-28 (214)
COVERAGE (Continued)

North Carolina
   NC-2 (121)
Ohio
   OH-6 (190)
Oregon
   OR-1
South Carolina
   SC-4 (121)
South Dakota
   SD-1
Tennessee
   TN-4 (121)
Utah
   UT-1
Vermont
   VT-3
Washington
   WA-3
West Virginia
   WV-7, WV-8 (209)

DEPENDENT BENEFITS

Alaska
   AK-6
Arizona
   AZ-15 (25)
Georgia
   GA-4 (37)
Illinois
   IL-3 (37)
Maryland
   MD-6 (89)
New Jersey
   NJ-5 (286)
New York
   NY-29
Washington
   WA-6 (37)

DOMESTIC WORKERS

New York
   NY-12 (324), NY-20

EFFECTS OF UI ON BUSINESS CYCLE

Georgia
   GA-6 (151)

ELDERLY WORKERS

Arizona
   AZ-17 (190), AZ-11 (312)
Georgia
   GA-4 (37)
Hawaii
   HI-6
Illinois
   IL-3 (37)
Maryland
   MD-6 (37)
New Jersey
   NJ-9 (69)
New York
   NY-16
Washington
   WA-6 (37)

ELIGIBILITY

Alabama
   AL-3
Alaska
   AK-3, AK-7 (205)
Hawaii
   HI-9 (205)
Massachusetts
   MA-8
Mississippi
   MS-2
Missouri
   MO-7 (168)
ELIGIBILITY (Continued)

Montana
   MT-2
New Jersey
   NJ-5 (286)
New York
   NY-31 (331)
North Carolina
   NC-3 (205)
Pennsylvania
   PA-12 (327)

EXHAUSTEES

California
   CA-16 (114)
Connecticut
   CT-8, CT-9, CT-10 (59)
Georgia
   GA-3 (35), GA-4 (37)
Illinois
   IL-3 (37), IL-9 (35)
Maine
   ME-7 (59)
Maryland
   MD-5 (35), MD-6 (37)
Massachusetts
   MA-9 (59)
Missouri
   MO-5 (114)
Nevada
   NV-8 (114)
New Hampshire
   NH-3 (59)
New Jersey
   NJ-9 (69)
New York
   NY-11 (333), NY-25 (114), NY-31 (331)
North Dakota
   ND-3
Pennsylvania
   PA-9 (142)
Vermont
   VT-5
Wisconsin
   WI-2

EMPLOYER RECORDS AND REPORTING

California
   CA-9 (204)
New Jersey
   NJ-5 (286)
West Virginia
   WV-3

EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

Missouri
   MO-7 (188), MO-9 (182)
New York
   NY-9, NY-15, NY-27 (213), NY-29 (323)
New York
   NY-11 (333), NY-25 (114), NY-31 (331)
North Dakota
   ND-3
Rhode Island
   RI-3, RI-5 (59)
South Dakota
   SD-4
Vermont
   VT-4, VT-6, VT-7
Washington
   WA-4 (35), WA-6 (8)
Wisconsin
   WI-5 (114)
EXHAUSTION RATE

Georgia
GA-7 (341)
New Jersey
NJ-9 (69)
New York
NY-29 (323), NY-31 (331)
Pennsylvania
PA-14 (341)

Connecticut
CT-11 (113)
Florida
FL-8 (121)
Georgia
GA-4 (37), GA-5 (121), GA-7 (341)
Idaho
ID-6 (113)
Illinois
IL-3 (37)
Kansas
KS-5 (309)
Louisiana
LA-5 (121)
Maine
ME-8 (113)
Maryland
MD-1, MD-6 (37)
Massachusetts
MA-10 (113)
Michigan
MI-5 (113)
Minnesota
MN-4 (113)
Mississippi
MS-3 (121)
Missouri
MO-5 (114)
Montana
MT-3 (113)
Nevada
NV-7 (113), NV-8 (114)

EXPERIENCE RATING

Arizona
AZ-9
California
CA-3 (232)
Connecticut
CT-6
Hawaii
HI-2
Minnesota
MN-1
New Jersey
NJ-3, NJ-5 (286), NJ-11 (295)
New York
NY-13
South Dakota
SD-5

EXTENDED BENEFITS

Alabama
AL-4 (113), AL-5 (121)
California
CA-7 (310), CA-15 (113), CA-16 (114)
EXTENDED BENEFITS (Continued)

New Jersey
  NJ-10 (113)

New York
  NY-4, NY-11 (333), NY-24 (113), NY-25 (114), NY-31 (331)

North Carolina
  NC-2 (121)

North Dakota
  ND-4 (113)

Ohio
  OH-6 (190)

Oregon
  OR-8 (13)

Pennsylvania
  PA-14 (341)

Puerto Rico
  PR-3 (113)

Rhode Island
  RI-6 (113)

Utah
  UT-1

Vermont
  VT-4, VT-8 (113)

Washington
  WA-6 (37), WA-7 (113)

West Virginia
  WV-9 (113)

Wisconsin
  WI-5 (114)

FEDERAL LEGISLATION

Hawaii
  HI-10 (225)

Pennsylvania
  PA-9 (142)

FINANCING

Alabama
  AL-1

Arizona
  AZ-4 (224), AZ-9, AZ-12

California
  CA-6

Florida
  FL-4, FL-6, FL-7 (51)

Hawaii
  HI-2, HI-3

Idaho
  ID-4, ID-5

Illinois
  IL-1

Kansas
  KS-5 (309)

Maine
  ME-5

Missouri
  MO-3, MO-4

Montana
  MT-2

Nebraska
  NE-2

Nevada
  NV-3
FINANCING (Continued)

New Jersey
NJ-5 (286)

New York
NY-4, NY-23 (51),
NY-28 (214)

Ohio
OH-5 (51)

Oregon
OR-2, OR-3, OR-7 (51)

South Carolina
SC-2

South Dakota
SD-6

Utah
UT-2

West Virginia
WV-1

INCOME MAINTENANCE

Alaska
AK-6

California
CA-3 (232)

Georgia
GA-4 (37)

Illinois
IL-3 (37)

Indiana
IN-2 (281)

Kansas
KS-5 (309)

Maryland
MD-6 (37)

New York
NY-31 (331)

Pennsylvania
PA-3

Washington
WA-6 (37)

INTERSTATE CLAIMS

New York
NY-30

North Dakota
ND-5 (199)

FRAUD

California
CA-13 (202)

Kansas
KS-5 (309)

New Jersey
NJ-5 (286), NJ-6

New York
NY-10

Ohio
OH-3

IMPORT-IMPACTED WORKERS

Connecticut
CT-10 (59)

Maine
ME-7 (59)

Massachusetts
MA-9 (59)
INTERSTATE COMPARISONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>AL-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>AZ-6, AZ-18 (289), AZ-19 (290)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>CA-4 (289), CA-5 (290)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>CT-12 (347)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>FL-8 (121)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>GA-4 (37), GA-5 (121)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>IL-3 (37), IL-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>KY-1 (347)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>LA-1, LA-5 (121)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>MD-6 (37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>MA-5 (289), MA-7 (290)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>MI-6 (347)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>MN-5 (289), MN-6 (290)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>MS-3 (121)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>MO-6 (159)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>NE-5 (347)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>NC-2 (121)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>PR-5 (347)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>SC-4 (121)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>SD-2 (347)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>TN-4 (121)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>WA-6 (37), WA-8 (289), WA-9 (290)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>WI-6 (347)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

JOB SEARCH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>AZ-11, AZ-16 (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>CA-3 (232)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>CO-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>GA-3 (35), GA-4 (37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>IL-3 (37), IL-9 (35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>IN-2 (281)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>KS-5 (309)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>MD-5 (35), MD-6 (37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>MO-7 (168), MO-8 (318), MO-9 (182)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>MT-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
JOB SEARCH (Continued)

New Jersey
   NJ-9 (69)
New York
   NY-11 (333)
Ohio
   OH-7 (318)
Pennsylvania
   PA-3, PA-9 (142),
   PA-13 (318)
Washington
   WA-1, WA-4 (35),
   WA-5 (45), WA-6 (37)

LABOR MARKET CONDITIONS

Alabama
   AL-5 (121)
Arizona
   AZ-1, AZ-3, AZ-7,
   AZ-10, AZ-11 (312)
Florida
   FL-8 (121)
Georgia
   GA-5 (121)
Hawaii
   HI-3, HI-4
Louisiana
   LA-5 (121)
Maryland
   MD-1
Mississippi
   MS-3 (121)
Nevada
   NV-8
New York
   NY-31 (331)
North Carolina
   NC-2 (121)

Pennsylvania
   PA-5
Puerto Rico
   PR-1, PR-2
South Carolina
   SC-4 (121)
South Dakota
   SD-4
Tennessee
   TN-4 (121)
Washington
   WA-1
West Virginia
   WV-2, WV-8 (209)

LABOR UNIONS

Arizona
   AZ-2
California
   CA-11
Hawaii
   HI-8, HI-10 (225)
Iowa
   IA-1
New York
   NY-28 (214)
Pennsylvania
   PA-4, PA-12 (327)
Puerto Rico
   PR-2

MANPOWER TRAINING

Pennsylvania
   PA-9 (142)
PART-TIME WORKERS

Alabama
   AL-5 (121)
Connecticut
   CT-12 (347)
Florida
   FL-8 (121)
Georgia
   GA-5 (121)
Kentucky
   KY-1 (347)
Louisiana
   LA-5 (121)
Michigan
   MI-6 (347)
Mississippi
   MS-3 (121)
Nebraska
   NE-5 (347)
North Carolina
   NC-3 (121)
Puerto Rico
   PR-5 (347)
South Dakota
   SD-2 (347)
Wisconsin
   WI-3, WI-6 (347)

Indiana
   IN-1
Iowa
   IA-2
Louisiana
   LA-4
Massachusetts
   MA-7 (290)
Minnesota
   MN-6 (290)
Missouri
   MO-3, MO-9 (182)
New Jersey
   NJ-4, NJ-6, NJ-8, NJ-11 (295)
New York
   NY-14, NY-29 (323)
North Dakota
   ND-5 (199)
Ohio
   OH-4
Puerto Rico
   PR-4
Texas
   TX-4
Utah
   UT-1, UT-3
Washington
   WA-9 (290)
Wisconsin
   WI-2, WI-3

QUALIFICATIONS

California
   CA-6, CA-8, CA-11
QUALIFICATIONS (Continued)

Iowa
   IA-1
Kansas
   KS-3 (190), KS-5 (309)
Minnesota
   MN-2
Missouri
   MO-7 (168)
Nebraska
   NE-3, NE-4 (209)
New Jersey
   NJ-5 (286)
New York
   NY-26 (209)
Pennsylvania
   PA-4
Tennessee
   TN-1, TN-5 (190)
West Virginia
   WV-4 (190)

STATE FINANCING

Alabama
   AL-1
Arizona
   AZ-4 (224), AZ-6, AZ-9, AZ-12
California
   CA-6
Florida
   FL-1, FL-4, FL-7 (51)
Hawaii
   HI-2, HI-3
Idaho
   ID-4, ID-5
Illinois
   IL-1
Maine
   ME-5
Missouri
   MO-3, MO-4
Montana
   MT-2
Nebraska
   NE-2
Nevada
   NV-3
New Jersey
   NJ-11 (295)
New York
   NY-4, NY-23 (51)

SEASONAL WORKERS

Arizona
   AZ-11 (312)
California
   CA-7 (310), CA-9 (204)
Maine
   ME-6

STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT WORKERS

Florida
   FL-1
Kansas
   KS-4
Maine
   ME-2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>OH-5</td>
<td>(51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>OR-2, OR-3, OR-7</td>
<td>(51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>SC-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>UT-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>WV-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>IA-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>KY-1</td>
<td>(347)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>LA-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>ME-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>MA-6, MA-8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>MI-2, MI-3, MI-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>MN-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>NJ-4, NJ-11</td>
<td>(295)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>NY-1, NY-10, NY-17, NY-26 (209), NY-28 (214)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>PA-11</td>
<td>(194)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>PR-5</td>
<td>(347)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>RI-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>SD-2</td>
<td>(347)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>TN-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>TX-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>UT-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>VT-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STATE LEGISLATION (Continued)

West Virginia
WV-3, WV-6

Wisconsin
WI-2

SUPPLEMENTAL BENEFITS

California
CA-16 (114), CA-7 (310)

Georgia
GA-2, GA-4 (37)

Hawaii
HI-1

Illinois
IL-3 (37)

Maryland
MD-6 (37)

Mississippi
MS-1

Missouri
MO-5 (114)

Nevada
NV-8 (114)

New York
NY-25 (114)

Washington
WA-6 (37)

Wisconsin
WI-5 (114)

New Jersey
NJ-5 (286), NJ-11 (295)

New York
NY-13, NY-22, NY-28 (214)

Oregon
OR-3, OR-4, OR-6

TAXABLE WAGE BASE

Illinois
IL-1

Iowa
IA-3

New Jersey
NJ-11 (295)

South Dakota
SD-3

TAXING UI BENEFITS

Georgia
GA-3 (35), GA-4 (37)

Illinois
IL-9 (35), IL-3 (37)

Maryland
MD-5 (35), MD-6 (37)

Washington
WA-4 (35), WA-6 (37)

TRUST FUNDS

Alabama
AL-1

Arizona
AZ-4 (224), AZ-9, AZ-12

Hawaii
HI-3

Minnesota
MN-1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>NJ-9</td>
<td>NJ-9 (69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>NY-11</td>
<td>NY-11 (333), NY-28 (214), NY-31 (331)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>NC-2</td>
<td>NC-2 (121)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>ND-1</td>
<td>ND-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>PA-3</td>
<td>PA-3, PA-7 (09), PA-8 (120), PA-14 (341)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>SC-3</td>
<td>SC-3 (48), SC-4 (121)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>TN-4</td>
<td>TN-4 (121)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>WA-1</td>
<td>WA-1, WA-5 (45), WA-6 (37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>WV-2</td>
<td>WV-2, WV-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>AZ-2</td>
<td>AZ-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>CA-11</td>
<td>CA-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>HI-8</td>
<td>HI-8, HI-10 (225)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>NY-28</td>
<td>NY-28 (214)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>PA-4</td>
<td>PA-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>AZ-3</td>
<td>AZ-3, AZ-5, AZ-14 (09)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WAGES (Continued)

Colorado
  CO-2 (45)

Georgia
  GA-4 (37)

Hawaii
  HI-4

Idaho
  ID-1

Illinois
  IL-3 (37)

Iowa
  IA-1

Maryland
  MD-6 (37)

Missouri
  MO-1, MO-2

Nevada
  NV-4

New Hampshire
  NH-2

North Carolina
  NC-1

Oregon
  OR-4

Pennsylvania
  PA-7 (09), PA-8 (37)

Puerto Rico
  PR-1

South Dakota
  SD-1

Vermont
  VT-3

Washington
  WA-1, WA-5 (45), WA-6 (37)

West Virginia
  WV-8 (209)

WAITING PERIOD

Nebraska
  NE-4 (209)

New Jersey
  NJ-5 (286)

North Dakota
  ND-5 (199)

WOMEN WORKERS

Alabama
  AL-5 (121)

Arizona
  AZ-11 (312)

California
  CA-7 (310)

Colorado
  CO-2 (45)

Florida
  FL-8 (121)

Georgia
  GA-4 (37), GA-5 (121)

Illinois
  IL-3 (37)

Louisiana
  LA-5 (121)

Maryland
  MD-6 (37)

Michigan
  MI-4

Mississippi
  MS-3 (121)

North Carolina
  NC-2 (121)
WOMEN WORKERS (Continued)

South Carolina
    SC-4 (121)

Tennessee
    TN-4 (121)

Washington
    WA-5 (45), WA-6 (37)

WORK TEST

Missouri
    MO-7 (168)
BIBLIOGRAPHY WITH ANNOTATIONS

Alabama

AL-1 Alabama Department of Industrial Relations, Research and Statistics Division.


A study of estimated benefit costs and reserves required to maintain an adequate trust fund.

AL-2 Alabama Department of Industrial Relations, Research and Statistics Division.


AL-3 Alabama Department of Industrial Relations.


AL-4 U.S. Department of Labor, Manpower Administration, Unemployment Insurance Service.


This report summarizes the experiences of each of the 19 states that participated in Title II of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 1971. Referred to as Temporary Compensation (TC), this UI program lasted from December 29, 1971 to September 30, 1972. This report presents a state-by-state examination of TC experience, comparing regular UI recipients with TC recipients in terms of coverage, benefit amount, benefit duration, work force breakdown by industry, and demographic characteristics. (113).

AL-5 Maclachlan, Gretchen, et.al.


This report is a collection of papers examining the effects of a recession on southern workers. Some major conclusions are: (1) Southern black workers have been harder hit by recession layoffs than southern white workers, (2)
southern black unemployment is underestimated since a large number of unemployed blacks are not counted as unemployed because their employers are not required by State law to contribute to the UI program (a situation particularly evident in construction and construction-related industries), and (3) that "sub-employment," defined by the authors to include the unemployed, discouraged workers, workers involuntarily employed part time, and workers earning below the poverty line, would be a more accurate measure of southern economic hardship.

The report also discusses (1) 1974-1976 developments in Congress concerning unemployment, (2) the plight of women in the South during recessionary periods, and (3) basic UI policies in Southern states. Charts, tables. (121).

AL-6 Raley, Nan H., and Curtis C. Hall.


This article discusses the success of an electronic data processing seminar for field auditors that was jointly organized and administered by the Alabama Unemployment Compensation agency and the University of Alabama in 1966. (193).
Alaska

AK-1 Sewell, Kellus N., Naomi K. Smith and Mary Klimas.

Alaska Employment Security Division, Research and Analysis Section.


AK-2 Sewell, Kellus N.

Alaska Employment Security Division, Research and Analysis Section.


AK-3 Withers, Elfrieda.

Research and Analysis Section, Employment Security Division.


AK-4 Alaska Employment Security Division, Research and Analysis Section.


AK-5 Alaska Employment Security Division, Research and Analysis Section.


AK-6 Alaska Employment Security Division, Research and Analysis Section.


This article reviews a "Benefit Entitlement Study" covering the years 1958 through 1962. This study is a byproduct of the Continuous Wage and Benefit History program maintained by the Alaskan UI system. Based on an analysis of the characteristics of midyear (1961) workers and on the work histories of midyear workers in prior and subsequent years, several alternative proposals are developed for level of earnings eligibility requirements that best represent labor force attachment. (205).
AZ-1 Arizona Employment Security Commission, Unemployment Compensation Division.


AZ-2 Bohlander, George W.


Arizona labor relations are shaped by the many forces that influence the expansion of business and unionism in the state. Several bills are currently before the state legislature covering such areas as Medicaid repeal, unemployment insurance appeals, workmen's compensation and prohibitions on use of strike breakers. Tables.

AZ-3 Arizona Employment Security Commission, Unemployment Compensation Division.


AZ-4 Arizona Department of Economic Security, Bureau of Information and Research Analysis.


Arizona recognized that high unemployment rates prior to the publication of this report (in September of 1975) and the expansion of the definition of covered employment in the preceding 15 years had placed a severe financial strain on its UI system. To provide for future solvency of the UI system through 1981, this report: (1) examines the present status of Arizona's UI system; (2) computes unemployment projections for the state through 1981; and (3) makes recommendations for changes to Arizona law to meet future liabilities as estimated from the unemployment projections. The recommendations include increasing the taxable wage base, eliminating the adjustment for interest earned on the trust fund balance, and revision of the schedule used to determine the required income for the program.

The text is well supported by graphs and tables explaining the existing and alternative paths of Arizona's UI program. (224).


AZ-6 Arizona Department of Economic Security, Research and Statistics Bureau.


AZ-7 Arizona Employment Security Commission, Unemployment Compensation Division.


Prepared for the Advisory Council meeting of April 16, 1971.


This report analyzes the operations of the "noncharge" benefit payment provision of the unemployment insurance program in Arizona that allows, under certain separation conditions, for benefits paid to former employees of an individual base period employer to be charged only to the pooled fund rather than directly to the employer's account.

AZ-10 Arizona Employment Security Commission, Unemployment Compensation Division.


AZ-11 Arizona Department of Economic Security.


This study examines the personal characteristics of Arizona claimants who remained unemployed during a six-month period of "full employment." Interviews were conducted with a sample of 2,718 claimants unemployed 3 weeks or more, and with all 948 claimants who remained unemployed 15 weeks (or exhausted benefits). The study correlated the reasons for initial and continued unemployment with: sex, separation status, age, racial or ethnic background, family responsibility, education, usual weekly wage, and primary occupation and industry. The results were not analyzed for statistical significance. (312).
AZ-12 Arizona Employment Security Commission, Unemployment Compensation Division.


AZ-13 Arizona Review.


AZ-14 Classen, Kathleen P.


The author concludes that a $10.00 increase in the weekly benefit amount results in 1.1 weeks increased duration of unemployment. The research is based on Continuous Wage and Benefit History random samples (excluding only claimants without earnings records in 1968, 1969, or 1970) for Pennsylvania and Arizona for 1968-1970. (09).

AZ-15 Burgess, Paul L., Jerry L. Kingston and Chris Walters.

U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Unemployment Insurance Service.


To provide an empirical basis for policy decisions regarding the percentage of former wages UI benefits should replace, researchers analyzed data from interviews with 3,196 Arizona UI beneficiaries who filed a first claim in the year beginning in September 1975, and who received benefits for at least five consecutive weeks. The measure of benefit adequacy here is the ratio of weekly benefit amount (WBA) to the beneficiary's former weekly share of the household's necessary and obligated expenses. Analysis of alternative benefit formulas shows that either raising the maximum WBA or providing dependents allowance would increase the overall adequacy ratio, and would most affect the groups that currently have the lowest adequacy ratios. (25).

To assess practical adjustments by UI beneficiaries to prolonged unemployment, researchers analyzed data from interviews with Arizona UI beneficiaries after 5, 13, and 25 consecutive weeks of compensated unemployment in the year beginning in September 1975. Most households that made adjustments made them before the thirteen week interview. Nonbeneficiary income increased in 30-40 percent of the households. One-fourth to one-third of the beneficiary households exhausted their savings.

This book also includes data from a sample of UI beneficiaries who became reemployed. 62 Tables. (26).


This article reviews unemployment insurance related studies prepared during 1965. The description of each study includes a statement of purpose, an explanation of the data, and all findings or results. The Arizona study considers pensioners. (190).


To make intercity comparisons of the effectiveness of the Service-to-Claimants projects conducted in Boston, Minneapolis-St. Paul, San Francisco-Oakland, Phoenix and Seattle in 1969-1970, the authors summarize the principal findings of each project and make "test vs. control group" and "test group only" comparisons. The authors assume familiarity with the individual city reports (see Document #290 in this bibliography) and do not define terms, explain evaluation criteria, or detail the limitations of the data. 4 Tables. (289).
Burgess, Paul L., and Jerry L. Kingston.

*The Five Cities Service-to-Claimants Projects*, 5 Volumes, all published in December 1972. Specific title as follows:

- The Phoenix Service-to-Claimants Project

To evaluate the Five Cities Service-to-Claimant project conducted in each of five metropolitan areas (Phoenix, San Francisco-Oakland, Seattle, Boston and Minneapolis-St. Paul), these reports examine long- and short-run effectiveness of the project. In each city, the claimants participating in this project were identified as being "job-ready" but not "job-attached." The claimants were randomly divided into test and control groups. Persons in the test groups received specialized job search assistance, while those in the control groups received conventional assistance.

In the first phase of the short-run analysis of each city's experience, the authors evaluate the differential experiences of the test and control group using these criteria:

1. claim series duration
2. number spells of unemployment in the benefit year
3. total benefits paid in the benefit year

The second phase of the short-run evaluation is based on participants in the test groups only, and examines the differential experiences of those with high vs. low ratings on employability factors for the same three variables and for known unemployment proportions. (290).

Burgess, Paul, and Jerry Kingston.


The authors of this report explore the possibility of using multiple linear discriminant analysis to develop "reasonably accurate screening profiles" of UI claimants. Because resources for specialized UI services are limited, and because the needs of claimants are so diverse, claimant profiles that would help identify the level and type of assistance appropriate for each claimant could significantly enhance the ability of policy and program planners to spend UI funds in the most cost effective manner.

To analyze the usefulness of discriminant analysis techniques in developing such profiles, the authors use the techniques to establish a classification matrix for two sets of mutually exclusive categories: (1) claimants who experience
unemployment of short (1–4 weeks), medium (5–15 weeks) and long (16 or more weeks) duration; and (2) exhaustees and nonexhaustees. Variables are developed from the Phoenix Service-to-Claimants (STC) Project, and the discriminant functions for each set of categories are estimated on the basis of personal and labor market characteristics of these (STC) claimants. (348).
Arkansas

AR-1 Arkansas Employment Security Division.

California

CA-1 Sevick, Charles, Gene Inman and Frederick Nichols.


CA-2 California Legislature, Joint Committee on Unemployment Compensation Disability Insurance.


CA-3 Vickery, Clair.


Using both national data and California data, this author evaluates the following three issues relating to UI: benefit adequacy, financing, and the impact of UI on the unemployment rate. Findings of this study show that, contrary to public opinion, UI benefits are generally inadequate for families whose primary worker is unemployed. (232).

CA-4 Burgess, Paul L., and Jerry L. Kingston.


To make intercity comparisons of the effectiveness of the Service-to-Claimants projects conducted in Boston, Minneapolis-St. Paul, San Francisco-Oakland, Phoenix and Seattle in 1969-1970, the authors summarize the principal findings of each project and make "test vs. control group" and "test group only" comparisons. The authors assume familiarity with the individual city reports (see Document #290 in this bibliography) and do not define terms, explain evaluation criteria, or detail the limitations of the data. 4 Tables. (289).
The Five Cities Service-to-Claimants Projects, 5 Volumes, all published in December 1972. Specific title as follows:

- The San Francisco-Oakland Service-to-Claimants Project

To evaluate the Five Cities Service-to-Claimant project conducted in each of five metropolitan areas (Phoenix, San Francisco-Oakland, Seattle, Boston and Minneapolis-St. Paul), these reports examine long- and short-run effectiveness of the project. In each city, the claimants participating in this project were identified as being "job-ready" but not "job-attached." The claimants were randomly divided into test and control groups. Persons in the test groups received specialized job search assistance, while those in the control groups received conventional assistance.

In the first phase of the short-run analysis of each city's experience, the authors evaluate the differential experiences of the test and control group using these criteria:

1. claim series duration
2. number spells of unemployment in the benefit year
3. total benefits paid in the benefit year

The second phase of the short-run evaluation is based on participants in the test groups only, and examines the differential experiences of those with high vs. low ratings on employability factors for the same three variables and for known unemployment proportions. (290).

California Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board.


California Employment Development Department, Employment Data and Research Division.


This study examines 5,657 California UI claimants and relates the claimants' benefit experience (both benefit duration and benefit amount) to age, sex, ethnic group, marital status, family size, education, occupation, and industry. The data were collected from questionnaires filled out by claimants, wage schedules completed by employers and Employment Development Department records. The study was conducted between July 1, 1976 and June 30, 1977. During that period the Extended Duration Program, the Emergency Extended Unemployment Act of 1974, and the Federal Extended Benefits programs were all in effect. (310).

This article discusses the probable effect of the unemployment insurance appeals board (UIAB). Its decisions will reflect the more liberal stance of the new administration. The UIAB hears appeals resulting from unemployment insurance and unemployment disability insurance disputes and from questions on taxes collected to support these two programs. Greater efforts will be made to settle cases without formal litigation, and the boards will scrutinize carefully fees granted applicants' attorneys.


This article was written in 1967 in support of proposals to extend UI coverage to agricultural workers in California. The author refutes the two major arguments against covering farm workers: (1) costs would be prohibitive because of the seasonal and unstable nature of much farmwork, and (2) the program would be expensive and difficult to administer because farmers do not keep adequate records. (204).


The Trade Dispute Disqualification Under the California Unemployment Insurance Act. 1948, 26pp.

Unemployment Insurance Code, Annotated, of the State of California, Adopted April 21, 1953, with amendments up to and including those of the 1970 legislature. 1971, 717pp. Annotated and indexed by the publisher's editorial staff.
CA-13  Halcrow, Douglas H.


This article reviews the evaluation procedure followed by the San Francisco Regional Office during the 1960's in the investigation of local office and central office handling of interstate UI claims. The evaluation was conducted to determine the source of delays in UI payments. (202).

CA-14  Walters, Dan.


CA-15  U.S. Department of Labor, Manpower Administration, Unemployment Insurance Service.


This report summarizes the experiences of each of the 19 states that participated in Title II of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 1971. Referred to as Temporary Compensation (TC), this UI program lasted from December 29, 1971 to September 30, 1972. This report presents a state-by-state examination of TC experience, comparing regular UI recipients with TC recipients in terms of coverage, benefit amount, benefit duration, work force breakdown by industry, and demographic characteristics. (113).

CA-16  U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Unemployment Insurance Service.


This report provides information on the labor force status and the extent of the public assistance program participation during the two months following exhaustion of FSB benefits by UI beneficiaries during 1975. Data covers five states including California. This study uses previously sampled groups (UI exhaustees who later received FSB) to obtain information on post-FSB experience. Information was obtained by mail questionnaire and response rates ranged from 67 percent in Wisconsin to 92 percent in New York. (114).
Colorado

CO-1 Colorado Division of Employment.


The publication also contains state rules and regulations.

CO-2 Felder, Henry E.


This report reviews a study conducted in Denver and Seattle to determine the effects of nonwage income including welfare payments, on work disincentives and post-unemployment wages. Seattle UI males showed a longer duration of unemployment than non-UI males; in contrast, Seattle UI females and all of the sampled Denver UI recipients showed shorter periods of unemployment. The author hypothesizes that these differences were caused by variations in state UI requirements and by individual and demographic characteristics that affect the behavior of nonwage recipients. (45).
Connecticut

CT-1  Farrish, Raymond.


CT-2  University of Connecticut, College of Agriculture and Natural Resources.


CT-3  University of Connecticut, College of Agriculture and Natural Resources.


CT-4  Taylor, John, and Raymond Farrish.


CT-5  Connecticut General Assembly, Joint Legislative Program Review Committee.


CT-7  Connecticut Labor Department.


This document has four volumes: (1) Labor Statutes, (2) Labor Regulations, (3) Unemployment Compensation Statutes, and (4) Unemployment Compensation Regulations.
CT-8 Connecticut Labor Department.


CT-9 Connecticut Labor Department


CT-10 U.S. General Accounting Office.


To evaluate the adjustment assistance benefits paid through the Trade Act of 1974 to New England workers, this report analyzes the characteristics of a random sample of 239 individuals from a population of 7,820 receiving benefits under the Trade Act from April 3, 1975 through December 31, 1976. The report includes responses to the findings by states and Federal officials and comparisons of (1) characteristics of benefit recipients under the Trade Act who exhausted benefits with the recipients who had not, (2) recipients of Trade Act benefits, by industry, and (3) Trade Act recipients and UI claimants not receiving Trade Act benefits. (59).

CT-11 U.S. Department of Labor, Manpower Administration, Unemployment Insurance Service.


This report summarizes the experiences of each of the 19 states that participated in Title II of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 1971. Referred to as Temporary Compensation (TC), this UI program lasted from December 29, 1971 to September 30, 1972. This report presents a state-by-state examination of TC experience, comparing regular UI recipients with TC recipients in terms of coverage, benefit amount, benefit duration, work force breakdown by industry, and demographic characteristics. (113).

For administrative convenience, most states disregard the part-time earnings of UI claimants (up to a certain fraction of the weekly benefit amount). After that point is reached, however, benefits are reduced dollar for dollar by additional earnings. This dollar for dollar reduction of benefits constitutes a marginal "tax" rate of 100 percent on the additional earnings. The author of this paper feels this tax rate, which exists in 42 states, decreases the incentive for unemployed workers to obtain part-time work.

The author analyzes the partial benefit schedules in South Dakota, Kentucky, Connecticut, Puerto Rico, Michigan, Nebraska and Wisconsin. He discusses partial benefit data from Wisconsin in detail; these data show that workers significantly adjust their partial work schedules to serve their economic interests. (347).
Delaware

DE-1  Elterich, Joachim, and Raymond Farrish.

The Impact of Extending Unemployment Insurance to Agriculture in Delaware, Part I. Bulletin 392, Agricultural Experiment Station, University of Delaware, 1972.

DE-2  Elterich, Joachim, and Richard Bieker.

The Impact of Extending Unemployment Insurance to Agriculture In Delaware, Part II. Agricultural Experiment Station, University of Delaware, 1973.

DE-3  Delaware Unemployment Compensation Commission.

District of Columbia

DC-1 Mohbat, Joseph.

"So You Think It's Easy Money," Washingtonian, VIII (June 1973), 53-54, 56,58-60, 62, 64.

This author presents factual information on Washington, D.C.'s UI program and uses a personal approach to explore the feelings and emotions of both the unemployed and the employees who operate D.C.'s Unemployment Compensation program. (160).
Florida

FL-1 Florida Division of Employment Security, Office of Research and Statistics.


FL-2 Polopolus, Leo, and Robert Emerson.

*Florida Agricultural Employers and the Impact of Extending Unemployment Insurance to Agriculture.* Florida Agricultural Experiment Station, University of Florida, 1973.

FL-3 Polopolus, Leo, and Robert D. Emerson.

*Florida Agricultural Labor and Unemployment Insurance.* Florida Agricultural Experiment Station, University of Florida, 1975, 55pp.

FL-4 Florida Department of Commerce, Office of Research and Planning.

*Florida Employment and Payrolls Covered by the Unemployment Compensation Law.*

FL-5 Moses, Galen, and Leo Polopolus.

*The Impact of Extending Unemployment Insurance to Agricultural Workers in Florida.* Florida Agricultural Experiment Station, University of Florida, 1972.

FL-6 Emerson, Robert.

*Migration and the Cost of Unemployment Protection for Agricultural Workers.* Florida Agricultural Experiment Station, University of Florida, 1972.

FL-7 Kauffman, Peter W., et al.

U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Unemployment Insurance Service.

*An Analysis of Some of the Effects of Increasing the Duration of Regular Unemployment Insurance Benefits.* 1978.
Based on sample data collected for Ohio, New York, Florida, and Oregon in 1973, 1974, and 1975, this report estimates the cost of one alternative formula for extending UI benefits from 26 to 39 weeks and compares this estimate to actual costs incurred in 1975 (when an extended benefits program was in operation). The authors also estimate the effects of their formula on average duration of unemployment, benefit exhaustion rates, and the distribution of claimants by population groups. The authors include 75 figures that provide summaries by state and breakdowns by all topic areas of the report. (51).

Maclachlan, Gretchen, et al.


This report is a collection of papers examining the effects of a recession on southern workers. Some major conclusions are: (1) Southern black workers have been harder hit by recession layoffs than southern white workers, (2) Southern black unemployment is underestimated since a large number of unemployed blacks are not counted as unemployed because their employers are not required by State law to contribute to the UI program (a situation particularly evident in construction and construction-related industries), and (3) that "sub-employment," defined by the authors to include the unemployed, discouraged workers, workers involuntarily employed part time, and workers earning below the poverty line, would be a more accurate measure of southern economic hardship.

The report also discusses (1) 1974-1976 developments in Congress concerning unemployment, (2) the plight of women in the South during recessionary periods, and (3) basic UI policies in Southern states. Charts, tables. (121).
GA-1 Georgia Employment Security Agency.


GA-2 Schaffer, Beverly K.


GA-3 Corson, Walter and Walter Nicholson.

Mathematica Policy Research.

U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Unemployment Insurance Service.


To assess family behavior responses to UI benefit exhaustion, researchers interviewed over 2,000 exhaustees in four cities (Atlanta, Baltimore, Chicago, Seattle). Interviews were held at the time of exhaustion (October 1974) and four months later (February 1975). 135 Tables. (35).


Mathematica Policy Research.


This study reports the results of a three-wave longitudinal interview of over 2,000 individuals who exhausted their regular unemployment insurance benefits in October 1974. Interviews were conducted at the time of exhaustion, four months later, and more than one year after exhaustion in Atlanta, Baltimore, Chicago, and Seattle. The present report includes a summary of the entire study and a detailed analysis of the Wave III interview. Issues examined in detail include labor market experiences of exhaustees, exhauettees' participation in the extended UI benefits program (implemented in early 1975), exhauettees' income, assets, and consumption patterns, use of transfer programs by exhauettees, and gaps in health insurance coverage experienced by exhauettees. (37).
GA-5  Maclachian, Gretchen, et. al.


This report is a collection of papers examining the effects of a recession on southern workers. Some major conclusions are: (1) Southern black workers have been harder hit by recession layoffs than Southern white workers, (2) Southern black unemployment is underestimated since a large number of unemployed blacks are not counted as unemployed because their employers are not required by State law to contribute to the UI program (a situation particularly evident in construction and construction-related industries), and (3) that "sub-employment," defined by the authors to include the unemployed, discouraged workers, workers involuntarily employed part time, and workers earning below the poverty line, would be a more accurate measure of southern economic hardship.

The report also discusses (1) 1974-1976 developments in Congress concerning unemployment, (2) the plight of women in the South during recessionary periods, and (3) basic UI policies in Southern states. Charts, tables. (121).

GA-6  Newton, Floyd C., and Harvey S. Rosen.


In this econometric study the authors attempt to provide some alternative estimates of the effect of UI on duration of unemployment. Data comes from Georgia's unemployment insurance files for the period 1974-1976 and consists of two groups: those who had benefit years beginning before July 1, 1975, and those whose benefit years began after that date. The data is randomly selected and includes 627 observations. The major conclusion suggested by the model is that the opportunity cost of unemployment and the potential length of benefit duration have significant effects upon duration of unemployment. (151).

GA-7  Hight, Joseph E.


The author of this article uses 1972-1974 time series data from Pennsylvania and Georgia to estimate the relationships between the exhaustion of UI benefits and the insured unemployment rate (IUR) and the duration of benefits. Regression analysis shows that the exhaustion rate rises as the insured unemployment rate rises, and that the provision of longer benefit duration reduces the exhaustion rate. In order to maintain exhaustion rates in Georgia and Pennsylvania at a "reasonably low 15 percent" the author calculates that benefit duration should be 30 weeks at an IUR below 4 percent, 40 weeks between 4 and 6 percent, and 50 weeks above 6 percent. (341.)
HI-1  Hawaii Unemployment Insurance Division.


HI-2  Migita, Lloyd.

Office of the Legislative Reference Bureau, State of Hawaii.


This report discusses: (1) Hawaii's unemployment insurance program, (2) alternative unemployment insurance financing, (3) the benefit ratio and revised reserve ratio financing systems, and (4) study conclusions and recommendations.

HI-3  Hawaii Department of Labor and Industrial Relations.


HI-4  Ferber, R., and K. Sasaki.


HI-5  Hawaii Employers Council.


HI-6  Hawaii Department of Labor and Industrial Relations.

Dawson, Paul.

Department of Labor and Industrial Relations, Research and Statistics Office.

Unemployment Insurance Fact Book: Historical Unemployment Insurance Data from the Start of the Program in Hawaii to the Present. 1971, 33pp.

Helman, G.

"Court Decision is Bad News for Strikers," Nation's Business, LXIII, No.12, (December 1975), 70.

This article analyzes a decision on granting compensation to workers who walk off jobs voluntarily. The case involved the Hawaii telephone company.


This article reviews a September 1966 report describing the personal characteristics and benefit entitlement of Hawaii's UI claimants during calendar year 1965. The report, entitled "The Unemployment Insurance Claimant - 1965," was also based on data collected under a Continuous Wage and Benefit History program. (205).

Kadzik, Peter J.


This author examines the apparent contradiction in court rulings on whether Federal labor law preempts state payments of UI benefits to strikers. In Hawaiian Telephone Co. v. Department of Labor and Industrial Relations, the court suspended state UI benefit payments to strikers. In Grinnell Corp. v. Hackett, (the case was not closed as of the publication date) the court placed emphasis on the state interest involved in UI benefit payment and noted that a balancing of Federal and state issues might be necessary. The author details how the court reviewed the Congressional intent of UI laws and the issues of state interests involved. The author concludes: "Adequate adjudication of these difficult problems requires a balancing process that should include consideration of the Congressional intent with respect to preemption, the degree of infringement, the area of Federal labor policy infringed upon, the degree of Federal concern, and the state's interest in the activity causing the infringement." (225).
Idaho Department of Employment, Bureau of Research and Analysis.


Idaho Department of Employment.


This article reviews the report "The Insured Unemployed in Idaho, Duration and Exhaustions of Unemployment Insurance." The report points out important facts about claimants who drew one or more full weeks of benefits in the 1963-1964 benefit year. In addition, the report compares certain experiences of all claimants with those of claimants who exhausted their benefits. (205).

Idaho Department of Employment, Bureau of Research and Analysis.


Idaho Department of Employment, Bureau of Research and Analysis.


U.S. Department of Labor, Manpower Administration, Unemployment Insurance Service.


This report summarizes the experiences of each of the 19 states that participated in Title II of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 1971. Referred to as Temporary Compensation (TC), this UI program lasted from December 29, 1971 to September 30, 1972. This report presents a state-by-state examination of TC experience, comparing regular UI recipients with TC recipients in terms of coverage, benefit amount, benefit duration, work force breakdown by industry, and demographic characteristics. (113).
IL-1  Illinois Bureau of Employment Security, Division of Unemployment Compensation.

   Effects of an Increase in the Tax Base for Unemployment Compensation in

IL-2  Illinois State Employment Service, Chicago Research and Statistics Unit.

   Employed Workers Covered by the Illinois Unemployment Compensation Act in
   the Chicago Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area, 1955-1965, by Chicago
   Postal Zones, Geographic Areas, and ISES Office Areas. 1967.

IL-3  Corson, Walter, Walter Nicholson and Felicity Skidmore.

   Mathematica Policy Research.

   Experiences of Unemployment Insurance Recipients during the First Year After
   Research, August 1976.

   This study reports the results of a three-wave longitudinal interview of over
   2000 individuals who exhausted their regular unemployment insurance benefits
   in October 1974. Interviews were conducted at the time of exhaustion, four
   months later, and more than one year after exhaustion in four sites: Atlanta,
   Baltimore, Chicago, and Seattle. The general purpose of the study is to
   investigate the impact of the exhaustion of UI benefits on exhaustees and their
   families. The present report includes a summary of the entire study and a
detailed analysis of the Wave III interviews. Issues examined in detail include
   labor market experiences of exhaustees, exhaustees' participation in extended
   UI benefits program (implemented in early 1975), exhaustees' income, assets,
   and consumption patterns, use of transfer programs by exhaustees, and gaps in
   health insurance coverage experienced by exhaustees. (37).

IL-4  Chicago Area Labor Market Analysis Unit.

   Employed Workers Covered by the Illinois Unemployment Compensation Act,
   1955-62.

IL-5  Illinois Bureau of Employment Security, Division of Unemployment Compensation.

   Fact Book on Unemployment Compensation in Illinois, the United States, and
   Selected Industrial States. 1969.

IL-6  Illinois Bureau of Employment Security, Division of Unemployment Compensation.

Illinois Department of Labor.


Illinois General Assembly, Joint Committee on Unemployment Compensation.


Corson, Walter and Walter Nicholson.

Mathematica Policy Research.

U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Unemployment Insurance Service.


To assess family behavior responses to UI benefit exhaustion, researchers interviewed over 2,000 exhaustees in four cities (Atlanta, Baltimore, Chicago, Seattle). Interviews were held at the time of exhaustion (October 1974) and four months later (February 1975). 135 tables. (35).
Indiana

IN-1 Indiana Legislative Council.

Interim Study on Unemployment Compensation. 1975, 8pp.

IN-2 Stephenson, Stanley P., Jr.


The policy research issue addressed in this report is the manner in which aspects of public unemployment insurance (UI) and an experimental negative income tax (NIT) program interacted in affecting the unemployment behavior of black, low-income participants in the Gary Income Maintenance Experiment between 1971 and 1974. (281).
IA-1  Iowa Employment Security Commission, Research and Statistics Division.

    The Effects of the Disqualification Provision under the Iowa Unemployment Insurance Program. 1969.

IA-2  Sinieropi, A.


    This monograph comments on Iowa State labor legislation dealing with discrimination in employment, hours of work, occupational safety, wages, unemployment insurance, employment injuries benefits, labor disputes, etc. References.

IA-3  Iowa Employment Security Commission, Research and Statistics Division.

    Taxable Wage Base Study. 1970.
Kansas

KS-1 Kansas Employment Security Division, Research and Information Department.


KS-2 Administrative Management.

"Phones Now Get Them Where They Used to Drive - $30,000 Cheaper," Administrative Management, XXXVII, No. 5 (May 1970), 23, 60, 62.

The Unemployment Insurance tax division of the state of Kansas has been able to make more efficient use of its time and personnel through more effective telephone planning. They were taught an organized approach for using the phone for employer contact and all aspects of pre-call planning. The direct savings to the division, after figuring telephone costs and savings on two staff positions, are $29,000 per year.


This article unemployment insurance related studies prepared during 1965. The description of each study includes a statement of purpose, an explanation of the data, and all findings or results. The Kansas study considers nonmonetary disqualifications.(190)

KS-4 Daicoff, Darwin W.

University of Kansas.

Kansas Employment Security Division, Research and Information Department, and Manpower Administration, Unemployment Insurance Service.


This article, by a free-lance writer who received unemployment benefits while making only pro forma efforts to obtain employment, presents a rather cynical view of UI cheating. He reports that because he received $72 a week tax free UI income from the Kansas Division of Employment, he did not need to work. He also notes that because the UI provisions require only that a claimant seek "suitable work," he had to look for work only as a reporter. The author believes that elimination of such abuse is administratively impossible: If people do not want to work, they will devise a way around the UI job search rules.

The author proposes that abuse be reduced by replacing the "crazy-quilt" of government subsidies to individuals with a guaranteed annual income or a negative income tax. He cites the high and increasing costs of UI programs and the results of recent studies by Feldstein, Classen, Marston, and Holen and Horowitz to support his proposal. (309).

For administrative convenience, most states disregard the part-time earnings of UI claimants (up to a certain fraction of the weekly benefit amount). After that point is reached, however, benefits are reduced dollar for dollar by additional earnings. This dollar for dollar reduction of benefits constitutes a marginal "tax" rate of 100 percent on the additional earnings. The author of this paper feels this tax rate, which exists in 42 states, decreases the incentive for unemployed workers to obtain part-time work.

The author analyzes the partial benefit schedules in South Dakota, Kentucky, Connecticut, Puerto Rico, Michigan, Nebraska and Wisconsin. He discusses partial benefit data from Wisconsin in detail; these data show that workers significantly adjust their partial work schedules to serve their economic interests. (347).
Louisiana

LA-1 Louisiana Department of Employment Security, Research and Statistics Unit.


LA-3 Louisiana Department of Employment Security, Research and Statistics Unit.

*Unemployment Insurance and Related Statistics in Louisiana.*

LA-4 Public Affairs Research Analysis.


This report is a collection of papers examining the effects of a recession on Southern workers. Some major conclusions are: (1) Southern black workers have been harder hit by recession layoffs than Southern white workers; (2) Southern black unemployment is underestimated since a large number of unemployed blacks are not counted as unemployed because their employers are not required by State law to contribute to the UI program (a situation particularly evident in construction and construction-related industries); and (3) that "sub-employment," defined by the authors to include the unemployed, discouraged workers, workers involuntarily employed part time, and workers earning below the poverty line, would be a more accurate measure of Southern economic hardship.

The report also discusses: (1) 1974-1976 developments in Congress concerning unemployment; (2) the plight of women in the South during recessionary periods; and (3) basic UI policies in Southern states. (121).
Maine

ME-1 Farrish, Raymond.


ME-3 Farrish, Raymond, and John Taylor.

The Impact of Extending Unemployment Insurance to Agriculture in Maine. Storrs Agricultural Experiment Station, University of Connecticut, 1973.


ME-6 Maine Legislature Interim Committee on Seasonal Employment.


ME-7 U.S. General Accounting Office.


To evaluate the adjustment assistance benefits paid through the Trade Act of 1974 to New England Workers, this report analyzes the characteristics of a random sample of 239 individuals from a population of 7,820 receiving benefits under the Trade Act from April 3, 1975 through December 31, 1976. The report includes responses to the findings by states and Federal officials and comparisons of: (1) characteristics of benefit recipients under the Trade Act
who exhausted benefits with the recipients who had not; (2) recipients of Trade Act benefits, by industry; and (3) Trade Act recipients and UI claimants not receiving Trade Act benefits. (59).

ME-8

U.S. Department of Labor, Manpower Administration, Unemployment Insurance Service.


This report summarizes the experiences of each of the 19 states that participated in Title II of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 1971. Referred to as Temporary Compensation (TC), this UI program lasted from December 29, 1971 to September 30, 1972. This report presents a state-by-state examination of TC experience, comparing regular UI recipients with TC recipients in terms of coverage, benefit amount, benefit duration, work force breakdown by industry, and demographic characteristics. (113).
Maryland

MD-1  Maryland Department of Employment Security.


MD-2  Covey, Roger, and A. Stewart Holmes.

The Economic Impact of Extending Unemployment Insurance to Agriculture in Maryland. Miscellaneous Publication 825, Agricultural Experiment Station, University of Maryland, 1973.

MD-3  Holmes, A. Stewart, and Roger Covey.

Extension of Unemployment Insurance to Maryland Agriculture. Agricultural Experiment Station, University of Maryland, 1973.

MD-4  Maryland Department of Employment Security.


MD-5  Corson, Walter, and Walter Nicholson.

Mathematica Policy Research.

U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration. Unemployment Insurance Service.


To assess family behavior responses to UI benefit exhaustion, researchers interviewed over 2,000 exhausters in four cities (Atlanta, Baltimore, Chicago, and Seattle). Interviews were held at the time of exhaustion (October 1974) and four months later (February 1975). 135 tables. (35).

MD-6  Corson, Walter, Walter Nicholson and Felicity Skidmore.

Mathematica Policy Research.


21-1
This study reports the results of a three-wave longitudinal interview of over 2,000 individuals who exhausted their regular employment insurance benefits in October 1974. Interviews were conducted at the time of exhaustion, four months later, and more than one year after exhaustion in Atlanta, Baltimore, Chicago and Seattle. The present report includes a summary of the entire study and a detailed analysis of the Wave III interview. Issues examined in detail include labor market experiences of exhaustees, exhaustees' participation in the extended UI benefits Program (implemented in early 1975), exhaustees' income, assets, and consumption patterns, use of transfer programs by exhaustees, and gaps in health insurance coverage experienced by exhaustees. (37).
Massachusetts

MA-1 Crossman, Bradford.

Economics of Extending Unemployment Insurance to Agricultural Workers in Massachusetts. Report Number I, College of Agriculture and Natural Resources, University of Massachusetts, 1972.

MA-2 Crossman, Bradford.

Economics of Extending Unemployment Insurance to Agricultural Workers in Massachusetts. Report Number II, College of Agriculture and Natural Resources, University of Massachusetts, 1973.

MA-3 Crossman, Bradford.

The Impact of Extending Unemployment Insurance to Agricultural Workers in Massachusetts. Report II. Agricultural Experiment Station, University of Massachusetts, 1974, 19pp.

This paper examines cost rates under alternative unemployment coverage provisions and the number of agricultural employers and workers in Massachusetts that would be affected by the proposed provisions.

MA-4 Massachusetts Labor Area Research Department, Research and Information Service.

The Insured Unemployed in Selected Geographic Subdivisions in Massachusetts. 1975.

MA-5 Burgess, Paul L., and Jerry L. Kingston.


To make intercity comparisons of the effectiveness of the Service-to-Claimants projects conducted in Boston, Minneapolis-St. Paul, San Francisco-Oakland, Phoenix and Seattle in 1969-1970, the authors summarize the principal findings of each project and make "test vs. control group" and "test group only" comparisons. The authors assume familiarity with the individual city reports (see Document #290 in this bibliography) and do not define terms, explain evaluation criteria, or detail the limitations of the data. 4 Tables. (289).
MA-6 Massachusetts Division of Employment Security.


MA-7 Burgess, Paul L., and Jerry L. Kingston.

The Five Cities Service-to-Claimants Projects, 5 Volumes, all published in December 1972. Specific title as follows:

- The Boston Service-to-Claimants Project: An Evaluation of Short- and Long-run Effectiveness

To evaluate the Five Cities Service-to-Claimant project conducted in each of five metropolitan areas (Phoenix, San Francisco-Oakland, Seattle, Boston and Minneapolis-St. Paul), these reports examine long- and short-run effectiveness of the project. In each city, the claimants participating in this project were identified as being "job-ready" but not "job-attached." The claimants were randomly divided into test and control groups. Persons in the test groups received specialized job search assistance, while those in the control groups received conventional assistance.

In the first phase of the short-run analysis of each city's experience, the authors evaluate the differential experiences of the test and control group using these criteria:

1. claim series duration
2. number spells of unemployment in the benefit year
3. total benefits paid in the benefit year

The second phase of the short-run evaluation is based on participants in the test groups only, and examines the differential experiences of those with high vs. low ratings on employability factors for the same three variables and for known unemployment proportions. (290).

MA-8 Nation's Business.


MA-9 U.S. General Accounting Office.

To evaluate the adjustment assistance benefits paid through the Trade Act of 1974 to New England workers, this report analyzes the characteristics of a random sample of 239 individuals from a population of 7,820 receiving benefits under the Trade Act from April 3, 1975 through December 31, 1976. The report includes responses to the findings by state and Federal officials and comparisons of: (1) characteristics of benefit recipients under the Trade Act who exhausted benefits with the recipients who had not, (2) recipients of Trade Act benefits, by industry, and (3) Trade Act recipients and UI claimants not receiving Trade Act benefits. (59).

MA-10 U.S. Department of Labor, Manpower Administration, Unemployment Insurance Service.


This report summarizes the experiences of each of the 19 states that participated in Title II of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 1971. Referred to as Temporary Compensation (TC), this UI program lasted from December 29, 1971 to September 30, 1972. This report represents a state-by-state examination of TC experience, comparing regular UI recipients with TC recipients in terms of coverage, benefit amount benefit duration, work force breakdown by industry, and demographic characteristics. (113).


MI-2  Michigan Legislative Service Bureau.

A Ten Year Comparison of Legislative Action, 1957–1966, in the Fields of
Higher Education, Elementary and Secondary Education, Senior Citizens, Water
and Air Pollution, Workmen's Compensation, Unemployment Compensation,
Mental Health, County Governmental Reform and Migratory Labor. 1968.

MI-3  Rossen, Jordan.

791.

This article reviews decisions by Michigan courts interpreting the Michigan

MI-4  Rossen, Jordan.


This article surveys court decisions interpreting the Michigan Employment
Security Act. The author also discusses unemployment compensation for
maternity leave and back to work payments.

MI-5  U.S. Department of Labor, Manpower Administration, Unemployment Insurance
Service.

A Report on Experience Under the Emergency Unemployment Compensation

This report summarizes the experiences of each of the 19 states that participated
Referred to as Temporary Compensation (TC), this UI program lasted from
December 29, 1971 to September 30, 1972. This report represents a state-by-
state examination of TC experience, comparing regular UI recipients with TC
recipients in terms of coverage, benefit amount benefit duration, work force
breakdown by industry, and demographic characteristics. (113).

For administrative convenience, most states disregard the part-time earnings of UI claimants (up to a certain fraction of the weekly benefit amount). After that point is reached, however, benefits are reduced dollar for dollar by additional earnings. This dollar for dollar reduction of benefits constitutes a marginal "tax" rate of 100 percent on the additional earnings. The author of this paper feels this tax rate, which exists in 42 states, decreases the incentive for unemployed workers to obtain part-time work.

The author analyzes the partial benefit schedules in South Dakota, Kentucky, Connecticut, Puerto Rico, Michigan, Nebraska and Wisconsin. He discusses partial benefit data from Wisconsin in detail; these data show that workers significantly adjust their partial work schedules to serve their economic interests. (347).
Minnesota

MN-1 Minnesota Department of Manpower Services.


This 1969-1972 study of the impact of extending UI benefits to agricultural workers in Minnesota considers six possible coverage levels and analyzes the effects of each on employers and workers. The report includes a description of the economic characteristics of the surveyed workers, statistical presentations of the findings and frequent comparisons between Minnesota and national figures.

MN-2 Minnesota Law Review.


MN-3 Minnesota Department of Employment Services.


MN-4 U.S. Department of Labor, Manpower Administration, Unemployment Insurance Service.


This report summarizes the experiences of each of the 19 states that participated in Title II of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 1971. Referred to as Temporary Compensation (TC), this UI program lasted from December 29, 1971 to September 30, 1972. This report represents a state-by-state examination of TC experience, comparing regular UI recipients with TC recipients in terms of coverage, benefit amount benefit duration, work force breakdown by industry, and demographic characteristics. (113).

MN-5 Burgess, Paul L., and Jerry L. Kingston.


To make intercity comparisons of the effectiveness of the Service-to-Claimants projects conducted in Boston, Minneapolis-St. Paul, San Francisco-Oakland,
Phoenix and Seattle in 1969-1970, the authors summarize the principal findings of each project and make "test vs. control group" and "test group only" comparisons. The authors assume familiarity with the individual city reports (see Document #290 in this bibliography) and do not define terms, explain evaluation criteria, or detail the limitations of the data. 4 Tables. (289).

MN-6 Burgess, Paul L., and Jerry L. Kingston.

The Five Cities Service-to-Claimants Projects, 5 Volumes, all published in December 1972. Specific title as follows:

— The Minneapolis-St. Paul Service-to-Claimants Project

To evaluate the Five Cities Service-to-Claimant project conducted in each of five metropolitan areas (Phoenix, San Francisco-Oakland, Seattle, Boston and Minneapolis-St. Paul), these reports examine long- and short-run effectiveness of the project. In each city, the claimants participating in this project were identified as being "job-ready" but not "job-attached." The claimants were randomly divided into test and control groups. Persons in the test groups received specialized job search assistance, while those in the control groups received conventional assistance.

In the first phase of the short-run analysis of each city's experience, the authors evaluate the differential experiences of the test and control group using these criteria:

(1) claim series duration

(2) number spells of unemployment in the benefit year

(3) total benefits paid in the benefit year

The second phase of the short-run evaluation is based on participants in the test groups only, and examines the differential experiences of those with high vs. low ratings on employability factors for the same three variables and for known unemployment proportions. (290).
Mississippi

MS-1 Mississippi Employment Security Commission.


MS-3 Maclachlan, Gretchen, et.al.


This report is a collection of papers examining the effects of a recession on Southern workers. Some major conclusions are: (1) Southern black workers have been harder hit by recession layoffs than Southern white workers; (2) Southern black unemployment is underestimated since a large number of unemployed blacks are not counted as unemployed because their employers are not required by State law to contribute to the UI program (a situation particularly evident in construction and construction-related industries); and (3) that "sub-employment," defined by the authors to include the unemployed, discouraged workers, workers involuntarily employed part time, and workers earning below the poverty line, would be a more accurate measure of Southern economic hardship.

The report also discusses: (1) 1974-1976 developments in Congress concerning unemployment; (2) the plight of women in the South during recessionary periods; and (3) basic UI policies in Southern states. Charts, tables. (121).
Missouri

MO-1 Missouri Division of Employment Security, Research and Analysis Section.


MO-2 Missouri Division of Employment Security, Research and Analysis Section.


MO-3 Missouri Division of Employment Security, Research and Analysis Section.


MO-4 Missouri Division of Employment Security.


MO-5 U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Unemployment Insurance Service.


This report provides information on the labor force status and the extent of public assistance program participation during the two months following exhaustion of FSB benefits by UI beneficiaries during 1975. Data covers five states: California, Missouri, Nevada, New York, and Wisconsin. Since all of these states except Missouri had already conducted a study of individuals who exhausted their Regular Unemployment Insurance (RUI) entitlement during part of 1973 and 1974, this study uses these previously sampled groups (RUI exhausteres who later received FSB) to obtain information on post-FSB experience. Information was obtained by mail questionnaire and response rates ranged from 67 percent in Wisconsin to 92 percent in New York. (114).
MO-6  Price Waterhouse and Company.

State Tax Comparison Study. St. Louis, MO: Price Waterhouse & Co., August

This study, performed for the Division of Commerce and Industrial
Development of the State of Missouri, compares certain tax liabilities to be
incurred in 21 states. The study's purpose is to attract corporate development
to Missouri by pointing out the comparative benefits available to corporations
under the Missouri tax structure. The study includes six separate tax liabilities
or tax-related expenses that might be incurred by a typical manufacturing
operation, including: (1) income tax, (2) sales and use tax, (3) property tax, (4)
unemployment tax, (5) worker's compensation tax, and (6) franchise tax. (159).

MO-7  Stevens, David W., and V. Christine Austermann.

Equity and Efficiency Considerations in the Unemployment Insurance 'Work
Test': An Analysis of Local Office Administrative Practice. ASPER/CON-
73/0119/A; Human Resources Research Program. Columbia, MO: University of
Missouri, Columbia, October 1975.

In this report, the authors attempt to assess the impact of variations in
administrative procedures in different Employment Service and UI local offices.
The sources of the information used for the study are offices located in Kansas
City and St. Joseph, Missouri, and the experiences of claimants associated with
those offices. (168).

MO-8  Crosslin, Robert L.

Unemployment Insurance and Job Search: Empirical Relationships and
Interpretations. State College, MS: Mississippi State University, June 1975.

This paper argues that although UI reduces the costs of unemployment, it also
permits a more intensive job search, and that due to these dual influences the
directional effect of UI on the duration of unemployment cannot be predicted
"a priori." The author designs a model to test the relationship between benefits
and job search behavior using three data sources: the St. Louis Service-to-
Claimants program of 1972-1973, the 1970 Cleveland Experimental Labor
Market Orientation project, and the Supplemental Labor Market Information
project conducted in Pittsburgh in 1967.

The author finds that his analysis did not support a strong positive relationship
between UI and the duration of unemployment or the level of asking wage. The
study did show, however, that difficulty with transportation during job search is
the dominant factor affecting unemployment duration, and that more intensive
job search is connected with a shorter duration of unemployment. The author
recommends that UI claimants with transportation problems be identified in the
early processing cycle, and that they receive special counseling or supplemental
benefits in the form of bus or subway tokens. He also suggests areas of future
research. 71 tables. (318).

26-2
Austermann, V. Christine, Robert L. Crosslin and David W. Stevens.


This study reports the results of an evaluation of the job search assistance rendered to a group of UI beneficiaries under the Service-to-Claimants Project (STCP) in St. Louis, Missouri. The authors tested duration, benefit and effectiveness of assistance variables against the serviced/non-serviced status of claimants and found no differences between the two groups. (182).
MT-1 Montana Unemployment Compensation Commission, Research and Analysis Section.


MT-2 Montana Division of Employment Security, Office of the Legislative Auditor.


MT-3 U.S. Department of Labor, Manpower Administration, Unemployment Insurance Service.


This report summarizes the experiences of each of the 19 states that participated in Title II of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 1971. Referred to as Temporary Compensation (TC), this UI program lasted from December 29, 1971 to September 30, 1972. This report represents a state-by-state examination of TC experience, comparing regular UI recipients with TC recipients in terms of coverage, benefit amount, benefit duration, work force breakdown by industry, and demographic characteristics. (113).
NE-1 Nebraska Division of Employment.


NE-2 Nebraska Division of Employment.

*Financing Unemployment Insurance in Nebraska.*

NE-3 Nebraska Division of Employment.


This article summarizes the Nebraska study "Loss of Benefits Because of Delayed Filing," which attempts to identify the characteristics associated with claimants most likely to lose benefits because of delay in filing. (209).

NE-5 Munts, Raymond.


For administrative convenience, most states disregard the part-time earnings of UI claimants (up to a certain fraction of the weekly benefit amount). After that point is reached, however, benefits are reduced dollar for dollar by additional earnings. This dollar for dollar reduction of benefits constitutes a marginal "tax" rate of 100 percent on the additional earnings. The author of this paper feels this tax rate, which exists in 42 states, decreases the incentive for unemployed workers to obtain part-time work.

The author analyzes the partial benefit schedules in South Dakota, Kentucky, Connecticut, Puerto Rico, Michigan, Nebraska and Wisconsin. He discusses partial benefit data from Wisconsin in detail; these data show that workers significantly adjust their partial work schedules to serve their economic interests. (347).
Nevada

NV-1 Rosakrans, Ruth I.
Nevada Employment Security Department, Research and Statistics Section.
Characteristics of Nevada's Long-Term Unemployed. 1964.

NV-2 Nevada Employment Security Department, Research and Statistics Section.
Estimates of Solvency of the Nevada State Unemployment Compensation Fund in the Post-war Period.

NV-3 Butler, Robert T.

NV-4 Nevada Employment Security Department, Research and Statistics Section.
Nevada Employment and Payrolls.

NV-5 Nevada Employment Security Department.

NV-6 Nevada Employment Security Department, Manpower Information and Research Section.
Unemployment Compensation and the Nevada Worker. 1967.

NV-7 U.S. Department of Labor, Manpower Administration, Unemployment Insurance Service.
This report summarizes the experiences of each of the 19 states participating in Title II of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 1971. Referred to as Temporary Compensation (TC), this UI program lasted from December 29, 1971 to September 30, 1972. The report presents a state-by-state examination of TC experience, comparing regular UI recipients with TC recipients in terms of coverage, benefit amount, benefit duration, work force breakdown by industry, and demographic characteristics. (113).

U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Unemployment Insurance Service.


This report provides information on the labor force status and the extent of public assistance program participation during the two months following exhaustion of FSB benefits by UI beneficiaries during 1975. Data covers five states: California, Missouri, Nevada, New York, and Wisconsin. Since all of these states except Missouri had already conducted a study of individuals who exhausted their Regular Unemployment Insurance (RUI) entitlement during part of 1973 and 1974, this study uses these previously sampled groups (RUI exhausters who later received FSB) to obtain information on post-FSB experience. Information was obtained by mail questionnaire and response rates ranged from 67 percent in Wisconsin to 92 percent in New York. (114).
New Hampshire

NH-1 Jansen, Edmund, Jr.


NH-3 U.S. General Accounting Office.


To evaluate the adjustment assistance benefits paid through the Trade Act of 1974 to New England workers, this report analyzes the characteristics of a random sample of 239 individuals from a population of 7,820 receiving benefits under the Trade Act from April 3, 1975 through December 31, 1976. The report includes responses to the findings by states and Federal officials and comparisons of: (1) characteristics of benefit recipients under the Trade Act who exhausted benefits with the recipients who had not, (2) recipients of Trade Act benefits, by industry, and (3) Trade Act recipients and UI claimants not receiving Trade Act benefits. (59).
New Jersey

NJ-1 Luke, George, and John Carncross.

An Analysis of the Variables Related to the Extension of Unemployment Insurance to Farm Workers In New Jersey. Bulletin 827, Agricultural Experiment Station, Rutgers University, 1972.

NJ-2 Luke, George W.

Critical Issues in Extending Unemployment Insurance to Farm Workers in New Jersey. New Brunswick, Department of Agricultural Economics and Marketing, New Jersey Agricultural Experiment Station, Rutgers University, State University of New Jersey, 1974, 60pp.

This paper provides a description of the demographic characteristics of the New Jersey farm labor force. It emphasizes the impact of an unemployment insurance program on the Puerto Rican workers who make up the largest part of that labor force. It concludes with a discussion of the potential impact of an unemployment insurance program on the future size of the farm labor force, examining those factors of production that might be substituted for labor to offset increased labor costs in New Jersey.

NJ-3 New Jersey Department of Labor and Industry, Division of Planning and Research.


NJ-4 New Jersey Legislature, Labor Relations Committee.


Starting in January 1978, the New Jersey Employment Security Council conducted a one-year review and analysis of the State's unemployment compensation laws and of the administration of the UI program. The Council held hearings in five New Jersey cities and also received written statements on UI policy. This report presents the Council's recommendations for strengthening the New Jersey UI program. (286).
New Jersey Legislature, Office of Fiscal Affairs, Division of Program Analysis.

Special Program Analysis of Unemployment Insurance Fraud Detection and Control Activity in the New Jersey Division of Unemployment and Disability Insurance. 34pp.

This study analyzes the effect of fraud in undermining the stability of the New Jersey unemployment insurance trust fund.

Bonfanti, Vincent, and Barbara Hammonds.

New Jersey Department of Labor and Industry, Division of Planning and Research.


New Jersey State Department of Labor and Industry, Unemployment Insurance Task Force.


Munts, Raymond, and Irwin Garfinkel.


Based on an examination of empirical studies, this monograph discusses the work disincentives and duration of unemployment issues as controversial effects of UI benefits. The three types of indirect evidence examined are: cross-sectional studies using subjects from different groups as to income level, age, sex, etc.; a 3-year New Jersey experimental study; and studies on transfer programs such as Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) and Old Age Insurance (OAI). The direct evidence used was obtained from post-exhaustion studies conducted by state UI agencies. (69).

U.S. Department of Labor, Manpower Administration, Unemployment Insurance Service.

This report summarizes the experiences of each of the 19 states that participated in Title II of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 1971. Referred to as Temporary Compensation (TC), this UI program lasted from December 29, 1971 to September 30, 1972. This report represents a state-by-state examination of TC experience, comparing regular UI recipients with TC recipients in terms of coverage, benefit amount, benefit duration, work force breakdown by industry, and demographic characteristics. (113).

NJ-11 Diefenbach, Donald L.


This report examines in detail the problems and issues involved in financing New Jersey's UI program. The author formulates recommendations for repaying the $735 million borrowed by the UI system from FUTA and from other state resources, rebuilding the state UI trust fund, and restructuring the tax system to provide long-range financial stability for the program. (295).
New York

NY-1 New York State Division of Employment, Research and Statistics Office.


Considerations in Extending Unemployment Insurance to Agricultural Workers in New York State. Agricultural Experiment Station, Cornell University, 1973.

NY-3 New York State Division of Employment, Research and Statistics Office.


NY-4 Goldwater, Leonard F.

New York State Division of Employment, Research and Statistics Office.


NY-5 Entes, Ruth, and Gladys R. Webbink.

New York State Division of Employment.


NY-6 Ratner, Stanley, and Louis Leonardo.


The Human-Resources Administration is the New York City agency responsible for handling all the various welfare, unemployment, and medical-care payment distributions for the city. It included a civil service staff of approximately 28,000 people. Until recently, all time-sheet maintenance plus administration
of employee-benefits, sick pay, vacation, and so forth were handled manually. In early 1973 the HRA met with representatives of the International Business Machine Corporation to develop a new computer system. Now every employee punches his "time-clock", a computer terminal, with a magnetically encoded employee identification card and immediately updates all records.

NY-7 The Impact of Extending Unemployment Insurance to Agricultural Workers in New York State. Agricultural Experiment Station, Cornell University, 1972.

NY-8 New York State Division of Employment.


NY-9 Jick, Todd.


The New York State Continuity of Employment (COE) Committee was established to handle issues of public sector worker displacement in New York State. Its membership consists of an equal number of management and union officials, and it is chaired by a neutral party. The Committee studies worker displacement problems caused by economic or program cutbacks in state agencies. The social and psychological consequences of layoffs are being studied. Under the threat of lay-offs, many good workers have chosen to quit voluntarily, resulting in costly retraining and a loss of organizational effectiveness. Action programs are designed to deliver direct benefits to displaced employees.

NY-10 Dooley, Ann.

"New York Matches Files, Finds 7,000 Welfare Cheats," Computerworld, XIII, No. 10 (March 5, 1979), 7.

This article describes a computer cross-check system that matches welfare recipients with all wage earners in a legislative effort to trim its welfare rolls. Initial findings indicate 70,655 persons on both rolls, and about 7,000 of those are believed to be receiving funds fraudulently. Individuals who were earning wages while collecting unemployment insurance totaled 15,356 according to the first quarterly matchup. A law passed by the State legislature last July at the request of Gov. Hugh Carey mandated the state departments of labor, taxation, finance, and social services to coordinate their efforts and try to find duplications and errors.
Puerto Rico

PR-1 Helfield, D.M.


According to this paper, the minimum wage committee process cannot be phased out without harm to the Puerto Rican economy. Industry committees are still functioning for all wage levels except those that have already reached the statewide statutory minimum. The implications of federal minimum wage legislation on the Puerto Rican economy are discussed.

PR-2 Colon, R.H.


This paper is the report of a committee appointed to meet labor problems, strikes, public health and safety. Strike action and arbitration processes are integral elements of collective bargaining. However strikes, unlike arbitration, result in great economic and social costs. Conflict resolution is discussed.

PR-3 U.S. Department of Labor, Manpower Administration, Unemployment Insurance Service.


This report summarizes the experiences of each of the 19 states that participated in Title II of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 1971. Referred to as Temporary Compensation (TC), this program lasted from December 29, 1971 to September 30, 1972. This report presents a state-by-state examination of TC experience, comparing regular UI recipients with TC recipients in terms of coverage, benefit amount, benefit duration, work force breakdown by industry, and demographic characteristics. (113).

PR-4 Rohrlich, G.F.

This article examines Puerto Rico's development of numerous social insurance programs. The abundance of such programs and overlapping functions leads the author to recommend changes amounting to consolidation and much tighter coordination of programs.

PR-5 Munts, Raymond.


For administrative convenience, most states disregard the part-time earnings of UI claimants (up to a certain fraction of the weekly benefit amount). After that point is reached, however, benefits are reduced dollar for dollar by additional earnings. This dollar for dollar reduction of benefits constitutes a marginal "tax" rate of 100 percent on the additional earnings. The author of this paper feels this tax rate, which exists in 42 states, decreases the incentive for unemployed workers to obtain part-time work.

The author analyzes the partial benefit schedules in South Dakota, Kentucky, Connecticut, Puerto Rico, Michigan, Nebraska and Wisconsin. He discusses partial benefit data from Wisconsin in detail; these data show that workers significantly adjust their partial work schedules to serve their economic interests. (347)