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This supplement to the reemployment topic area research synthesis, “What do we know about the effectiveness of reemployment initiatives?” provides a brief description of the research findings for all reports reviewed in the reemployment topic area of the Clearinghouse for Labor Evaluation and Research (CLEAR). This supplement is a more detailed companion to the information provided in the concise reemployment research synthesis, which is based on the results of CLEAR’s systematic review of causal research on reemployment interventions for Unemployment Insurance (UI) claimants. This supplement includes all the studies reviewed in this topic area, regardless of whether the study received a high, moderate, or low causal evidence rating, whereas the research synthesis only includes studies that received high or moderate causal evidence ratings, because we have greater confidence that the impacts reported by those studies are attributable to the interventions examined. For a more detailed summary of each study—including an overview of the study design, intervention, findings, and considerations for interpreting the findings—please review the study’s profile online at the CLEAR reemployment topic area or by following the study-specific profile links below.

About the reemployment topic area

CLEAR’s reemployment topic area focuses on interventions designed to help UI claimants return to work more quickly, draw lower UI benefits, and improve their employment and earnings. For this topic area, CLEAR identified causal research examining the impacts of reemployment interventions on UI benefit receipt, employment, and earnings. CLEAR searched the existing literature for causal research relevant to this topic area’s focus. Please see the CLEAR Review Protocol for Unemployment Insurance Reemployment Topic Area to learn more about the literature search parameters and the specific criteria used to determine which studies were eligible for inclusion in the systematic review. CLEAR’s search included all reports published before August 2018.

About the evidence base

For the reemployment topic area, CLEAR identified 43 reports that were eligible for review. Within these reports, 50 distinct studies received a high or moderate causal evidence rating, which means that we have a good degree of confidence that the impacts reported in those studies are attributable to the interventions examined. This supplement lists each of the 43 reports, describes how the studies map to the reports, and provides links to each study’s CLEAR profile summary to learn more. The number of studies is not the same as the number of reports because findings from a single study may be presented in multiple reports (for example, a five-year study of a program may have an early report on short-term impacts and a later report on long-term impacts), and findings from multiple studies may be presented in a single report (for example, a report that presents findings from evaluations of distinct interventions).

The interventions examined in these studies fell into six categories (Table 1). We describe each intervention category in specific sections of this supplement. In addition, please see the reemployment synthesis for information on the evidence guidelines used to determine the causal evidence ratings.

---

1 See the CLEAR Causal Evidence Guidelines, Version 2.1 for information on the evidence guidelines used to determine the causal evidence ratings.
2 The literature search was not restricted to reports published within a specific time period, but rather included all publications prior to August 2018. The earliest report identified that was eligible for review was published in 1978.
3 This table appears as Table 2 in the reemployment synthesis.
for a concise summary of these interventions along with a high-level discussion of what we know about their effectiveness based on existing research.

### Table 1. Overview of the evidence base

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th># Studies</th>
<th>Reduction in UI benefit receipt</th>
<th>Short-term employment</th>
<th>Short-term earnings</th>
<th>Long-term employment</th>
<th>Long-term earnings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; 2&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; 3&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; 3&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSA services</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; 6&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; 12&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; 7&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; 10&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt; 1&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; 6&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reemployment bonuses</td>
<td>14&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; 8&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; 6&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; 4&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt; 1&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; 10&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt; 1&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt; 3&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profiling</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; 1&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt; 1&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; 4&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt; 2&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; 4&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt; 1&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; n.a. n.a.</td>
<td>n.a. n.a.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More stringent contact</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; 1&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt; 1&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; 2&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt; 1&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less stringent contact</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt; 1&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; 1&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; 1&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; 1&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt; 1&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**

- <sup>a</sup> Indicates the number of studies that found at least one favorable impact in the outcome domain. These studies had at least one statistically significant favorable impact in the outcome domain and no statistically significant unfavorable impacts.
- <sup>b</sup> Indicates the number of studies that found at least one unfavorable impact in the outcome domain. These studies had at least one statistically significant unfavorable impact in the outcome domain and no statistically significant favorable impacts.
- <sup>c</sup> Indicates the number of studies that found no statistically significant impacts in the outcome domain.
- <sup>d</sup> Indicates the number of studies with mixed impacts in the outcome domain. These studies had some statistically significant favorable and some statistically significant unfavorable impacts in the outcome domain.

Finally, n.a. indicates that none of the studies examined these outcomes.

<sup>1</sup> One study has a reemployment bonus bundled with JSA services.

<sup>2</sup> Long-term outcomes are those measured more than one year after program entry.

## REPORTS AND STUDIES OF REEMPLOYMENT INTERVENTIONS

This section of the supplement provides a completing listing of the reports and studies in this topic area. The section is organized in subsections corresponding to the six intervention categories listed in Table 1 and an additional section for other interventions:

A. Reemployment and Eligibility Assessment (REA)

B. Job search assistance (JSA) services

C. Reemployment bonuses

D. Profiling

E. More stringent employer contact requirements

F. Less stringent employer contact requirements

G. Other interventions
In each subsection, we provide a brief description of each intervention listed in Table 1 and cite the reports examining the intervention and the studies contained in each report, with links to profiles that summarize each study. Some reports appear in more than one intervention subsection because the studies contained within them evaluated different reemployment interventions.

The reference list also includes additional sources and related reports for some of the studies reviewed. Related reports examine the same study as the listed study, but information from related reports was not used to complete the review of the listed study. In contrast, additional sources examine the same study as the listed study, and information from additional sources was used to complete the review of the listed study. In some cases, additional sources are the published versions of a working paper or research report. As noted below, some of these additional sources or related reports were not reviewed separately by CLEAR because they contained the same data and analyses as the reviewed study.

In subsection G, we provide a list of reports of studies that were not included in Table 1 or the reemployment synthesis (https://clear.dol.gov/sites/default/files/CLEAR%20Reemployment%20Synthesis%20November%202018.pdf) because they examined an intervention that was not primarily reemployment services or because all the studies of the intervention received a low causal evidence rating; while the studies may be useful for some purposes, we do not have confidence that the impacts reported by those studies are attributable to the interventions examined.

A. Reemployment and Eligibility Assessment (REA)

Overview: UI claimants selected to participate in REA receive up to three mandatory in-person sessions in which workforce staff assess their eligibility for UI benefits, provide an orientation to the American Job Center and its services, share labor market information, develop a reemployment plan, and make referrals to additional services. Failure to attend these REA sessions can affect continuance of benefits. In 2015, the Reemployment Services and Eligibility Assessment program replaced REA, supplementing REA program services by providing direct reemployment services. Evidence reviewed on this intervention type included seven studies with high or moderate causal evidence and one study with low causal evidence. Results from the one study with low causal evidence were not included in the synthesis because the synthesis only included studies with high or moderate causal evidence ratings.

Included in the synthesis


- Study 1: Minnesota Reemployment and Eligibility Assessment Initiative
  - No detectable impact on UI benefit receipt, short-term employment, or short-term earnings
  - Did not estimate impacts on long-term employment or long-term earnings
  - Causal evidence rating: Moderate

- Study 2: Intensive Minnesota Reemployment and Eligibility Assessment Initiative
  - Favorable impacts on UI benefit receipt
  - No detectable impact on short-term employment or short-term earnings
  - Did not estimate impacts on long-term employment or long-term earnings
  - Causal evidence rating: Moderate
• Study 3: North Dakota Reemployment and Eligibility Assessment Initiative
  - No detectable impact on UI benefit receipt, short-term employment, or short-term earnings
  - Did not estimate impacts on long-term employment or long-term earnings
  - Causal evidence rating: High for UI benefit receipt outcomes and Moderate for employment and earnings outcomes


• Study 4a: Nevada Reemployment and Eligibility Assessment Initiative
  - Favorable impacts on UI benefit receipt, short-term employment, long-term employment, short-term earnings, and long-term earnings
  - Causal evidence rating: High
  - Related reports:
    - Michaelides, M. (2013a). *Are reemployment services effective in periods of high unemployment? Experimental evidence from the great recession*. Unpublished manuscript. Retrieved from http://www.sole-jole.org/13417.pdf. This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.
    - Michaelides, M. (2013b). *Are reemployment services effective in periods of high unemployment? Experimental evidence from the UI system*. Unpublished manuscript. Retrieved from http://www.sole-jole.org/13417.pdf. This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.
    - Michaelides, M., & Mueser, P. (2018). *Are reemployment services effective? Experimental evidence from the great recession*. *Journal of Policy Analysis & Management, 37*(3), 546-570. This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.


• Study 4b: Nevada Reemployment and Eligibility Assessment Initiative

---

4 The letter “a” here denotes that other reports cover study 4. Please see the appendix [add hyperlink] describing report and study categorization for more details.

5 Related reports examine the same study as the listed study, but information from related reports was not used to complete the review of the listed study. In contrast, additional sources examine the same study as the listed study and information from additional sources was used to complete the review of the listed study. In some cases, additional sources are the published versions of a working paper or research report.
- Favorable impacts on UI benefit receipt, short-term employment, long-term employment, short-term earnings, and long-term earnings
- Causal evidence rating: High

- Related reports:
  - Poe-Yamagata et al. (2011)
  - Michaelides (2013a). *This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.*
  - Michaelides (2013b). *This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.*
  - Michaelides and Mueser (2018). *This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.*
  - Manoli et al. (2018)


- **Study 4c: Nevada Reemployment and Eligibility Assessment Initiative**
  - Favorable impacts on UI benefit receipt
  - Did not estimate impacts on short-term employment, long-term employment, short-term earnings, or long-term earnings
  - Causal evidence rating: High
  - Related reports:
    - Michaelides et al. (2012)
    - Michaelides (2013a). *This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.*
    - Michaelides (2013b). *This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.*
    - Michaelides and Mueser (2018). *This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.*
    - Manoli et al. (2018)

- **Study 5: Florida Reemployment and Eligibility Assessment Initiative**
  - Favorable impacts on UI benefit receipt, short-term employment, and short-term earnings
  - Did not estimate impacts on long-term employment or long-term earnings
  - Causal evidence rating: High

- **Study 6: Idaho Reemployment and Eligibility Assessment Initiative**
  - Favorable impacts on UI benefit receipt
Did not estimate impacts on short-term employment, long-term employment, short-term earnings, or long-term earnings
- Causal evidence rating: High

- Study 7: Illinois Reemployment and Eligibility Assessment Initiative
  - Favorable impacts on UI benefit receipt
  - Did not estimate impacts on short-term employment, long-term employment, short-term earnings, or long-term earnings
  - Causal evidence rating: High

Not included in the synthesis


- Study 8: Nevada Claimant Placement Project. *This study was excluded from the synthesis because it received a low causal evidence rating.*
  - Favorable impacts on UI benefit receipt
  - Did not estimate impacts on short-term employment, long-term employment, short-term earnings, or long-term earnings
  - Causal evidence rating: Low
  - Access profile here: https://clear.dol.gov/study/nevada-claimant-placement-project-steinman-1978

B. Job search assistance (JSA) services

Overview: UI claimants receive assistance and training in job search techniques, including, for example, job search workshops, preparing a resume, and interview training. Evidence reviewed on this intervention type included 15 studies with high or moderate causal evidence and three studies with low causal evidence. Results from the latter three studies were not included in the synthesis because the synthesis only included studies with high or moderate causal evidence ratings.

Included in the synthesis


- Study 1a: New Jersey Job Search Assistance
  - Favorable impacts on UI benefit receipt and long-term earnings
  - No detectable impacts on short-term employment, long-term employment, or short-term earnings
  - Causal evidence rating: High

---
\(^6\) This study was conducted long before the REA initiative began. However, the features of Nevada Claimant Placement Project were very similar to the implementation of REA in Nevada.

- Related reports:
  - Anderson, P. (1990). The effect of a reemployment bonus with the possibility of recall: Experimental evidence from New Jersey. Unpublished manuscript. Retrieved from http://harris.princeton.edu/pubs/pdfs/263.pdf. This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.

- Study 2a: New Jersey Job Search Assistance and Training
  - Favorable impacts on UI benefit receipt
  - No detectable impacts on short-term employment, long-term employment, short-term earnings, or long-term earnings
  - Causal evidence rating: High

  - Related reports:
    - Anderson (1990). This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.
    - Corson et al. (1989)


- Study 3: Maryland Work Search Workshop
  - Favorable impacts on UI benefit receipt
  - No detectable impacts on short-term employment or short-term earnings
  - Did not estimate impacts on long-term employment or long-term earnings
  - Causal evidence rating: High
Klepinger, D., Johnson, T., and Joesch, J. (2002). Effects of unemployment insurance work-search requirements: The Maryland experiment. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review, 56*(1), 3-22. *This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.*


- **Study 4: Men’s Job Search Assistance, Texas**
  - No detectable impacts on UI benefit receipt, short-term employment, or short-term earnings
  - Did not estimate impacts on long-term employment or long-term earnings
  - Causal evidence rating: Moderate

- **Study 5: Women’s Job Search Assistance, Texas**
  - Favorable impacts on UI benefit receipt or short-term earnings
  - No detectable impacts on short-term employment
  - Did not estimate impacts on long-term employment or long-term earnings
  - Causal evidence rating: Moderate


- **Study 6: South Carolina Job Search Assistance**
  - Favorable impacts on UI benefit receipt and long-term employment
  - No detectable impacts on short-term employment
  - Did not estimate impacts on short-term earnings or long-term earnings
  - Causal evidence rating: High

- **Study 7: Enhanced South Carolina Job Search Assistance**
  - Favorable impacts on UI benefit receipt and long-term employment
  - No detectable impacts on short-term employment
  - Did not estimate impacts on short-term earnings or long-term earnings
  - Causal evidence rating: High

---

7 Related reports examine the same study as the listed study, but information from related reports was not used to complete the review of the listed study. In contrast, additional sources examine the same study as the listed study and information from additional sources was used to complete the review of the listed study. In some cases, additional sources are the published versions of a working paper or research report.

**Study 1b: New Jersey Job Search Assistance**
- Favorable impacts on UI benefit receipt, short-term employment, and short-term earnings
- Did not estimate impacts on long-term employment or long-term earnings
- Causal evidence rating: High
- Related reports:
  - Anderson (1990). *This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.*
  - Anderson et al. (1991)
  - Corson and Haimson (1996)

**Study 2b: New Jersey Job Search Assistance and Training**
- Favorable impacts on UI benefit receipt and short-term employment
- No detectable impacts on short-term earnings
- Did not estimate impacts on long-term employment or long-term earnings
- Causal evidence rating: High
- Related reports:
  - Anderson (1990). *This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.*
  - Anderson et al. (1991)
  - Corson and Haimson (1996)


**Study 1c: New Jersey Job Search Assistance**
- No detectable impacts on UI benefit receipt, long-term employment, or long-term earnings
- Did not estimate impacts on short-term employment or short-term earnings
- Causal evidence rating: High
- Access profile here: https://clear.dol.gov/study/new-jersey-unemployment-insurance-reemployment-demonstration-project-six-year-follow-and
- Related reports:
  - Anderson (1990). *This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.*
  - Anderson et al. (1991)
  - Anderson (1992)
  - Corson et al. (1989)

- Study 2c: New Jersey Job Search Assistance and Training
  - No detectable impacts on UI benefit receipt, long-term employment, or long-term earnings
  - Did not estimate impacts on short-term employment or short-term earnings
  - Causal evidence rating: High

- Related reports:
  - Anderson (1990). *This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.*
  - Anderson et al. (1991)
  - Anderson (1992)
  - Corson et al. (1989)


- Study 8: D.C. Structured Job Search Assistance
  - Favorable impacts on UI benefit receipt, long-term employment, and long-term earnings
  - No detectable impacts on short-term employment or short-term earnings
  - Causal evidence rating: High
  - Access profile here: [https://clear.dol.gov/study/assisting-unemployment-insurance-claimants-long-term-impacts-job-search-assistance](https://clear.dol.gov/study/assisting-unemployment-insurance-claimants-long-term-impacts-job-search-assistance)

- Study 9: D.C. Individualized Job Search Assistance
  - No detectable impacts on UI benefit receipt, short-term employment, long-term employment, short-term earnings, or long-term earnings
  - Causal evidence rating: High
  - Access profile here: [https://clear.dol.gov/study/assisting-unemployment-insurance-claimants-long-term-impacts-job-search-assistance](https://clear.dol.gov/study/assisting-unemployment-insurance-claimants-long-term-impacts-job-search-assistance)

- Study 10: D.C. Individualized Job Search Assistance and Training
  - Favorable impacts on UI benefit receipt
  - No detectable impacts on short-term employment, long-term employment, short-term earnings, or long-term earnings
  - Causal evidence rating: High
  - Access profile here: [https://clear.dol.gov/study/assisting-unemployment-insurance-claimants-long-term-impacts-job-search-assistance](https://clear.dol.gov/study/assisting-unemployment-insurance-claimants-long-term-impacts-job-search-assistance)
• Study 11: Florida Structured Job Search Assistance
  - No detectable impacts on UI benefit receipt, short-term employment, long-term employment, short-term earnings, or long-term earnings
  - Causal evidence rating: High
  - Access profile here: https://clear.dol.gov/study/assisting-unemployment-insurance-claimants-long-term-impacts-job-search-assistance

• Study 12: Florida Individualized Job Search Assistance
  - Favorable impacts on UI benefit receipt
  - No detectable impacts on short-term employment, long-term employment, short-term earnings, or long-term earnings
  - Causal evidence rating: High
  - Access profile here: https://clear.dol.gov/study/assisting-unemployment-insurance-claimants-long-term-impacts-job-search-assistance

• Study 13: Florida Individualized Job Search Assistance and Training
  - No detectable impacts on UI benefit receipt, short-term employment, long-term employment, short-term earnings, or long-term earnings
  - Causal evidence rating: High
  - Access profile here: https://clear.dol.gov/study/assisting-unemployment-insurance-claimants-long-term-impacts-job-search-assistance


• Study 14: Washington Alternative Work Search Intensive Services
  - No detectable impacts on UI benefit receipt, short-term employment, or short-term earnings
  - Did not estimate impacts on long-term employment or long-term earnings
  - Causal evidence rating: High
  - Additional source:
    - Johnson, T., & Klepinger, D. (1994). Experimental evidence on Unemployment Insurance work-search policies. Journal of Human Resources, 29(3), 695-717. This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.

Wisconsin Department of Industry, Labor, and Human Relations. (1984). Wisconsin Job Service: ERP Pilot Project final report. Madison, WI: DILHR. This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.

• Study 15: Wisconsin Job Search Workshop
  - No detectable impacts on UI benefit receipt
  - Did not estimate impacts on short-term employment, long-term employment, short-term earnings, or long-term earnings
  - Causal evidence rating: High
Not included in the synthesis


- **Study 16: Wisconsin Strengthening Connections.** *This study was excluded from the synthesis because it received a low causal evidence rating.*


- **Study 1d: New Jersey Job Search Assistance.** *This analysis was excluded from the synthesis because it did not examine any of the five outcomes covered in the research synthesis.*


  - Related reports:
    - Anderson (1990). *This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.*
    - Anderson et al. (1991)
    - Corson et al. (1989).
    - Corson and Haimson (1996)


- **Study 17: Nevada Job Search Assistance and Training.** *This study was excluded from the synthesis because it received a low causal evidence rating.*


- **Study 18: Washington WorkSource Job Search Services.** *This study was excluded from the synthesis because it received a low causal evidence rating.*


C. Reemployment bonuses

**Overview:** UI claimants receive a cash incentive for returning to work within a certain time frame. Evidence reviewed on this intervention type included 14 studies with high or moderate causal evidence. Results from three additional studies were excluded from the synthesis because they did not examine any of the five
outcomes covered in the research synthesis. In addition, results from several reports were excluded from the synthesis because they pooled results from studies included in the synthesis and did not constitute separate studies.⁸

**Included in the synthesis**


- **Study 1a: New Jersey Job Search Assistance and Reemployment Bonus**
  - Favorable impacts on UI benefit receipt, short-term employment, and short-term earnings
  - No detectable impacts on long-term employment or long-term earnings
  - Causal evidence rating: High
  - Related reports:
    - Anderson (1990). *This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.*
    - Corson et al. (1989)
    - Corson and Haimson (1996)


- **Study 1b: New Jersey Job Search Assistance and Reemployment Bonus**
  - Favorable impacts on UI benefit receipt, short-term employment, and short-term earnings
  - Did not estimate impacts on long-term employment or long-term earnings
  - Causal evidence rating: High
  - Related reports:
    - Anderson (1990). *This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.*
    - Anderson et al. (1991)
    - Anderson (1992)
    - Corson and Haimson (1996)
    - Decker (1994)

---

⁸ Several reports examined pooled results for the Pennsylvania Reemployment Bonus Experiment and the Washington Reemployment Bonus Experiment.

- **Study 2:** Pennsylvania Reemployment Bonus Demonstration, low bonus with short qualification period
  - No detectable impacts on UI benefit receipt
  - Mixed impacts on short-term employment and short-term earnings
  - Did not estimate impacts on long-term employment or long-term earnings
  - Causal evidence rating: High for UI benefit receipt outcomes and Moderate for employment and earnings outcomes
  - Related reports:
    - Decker, P., O’Leary, C., & Woodbury, S. (2001a). Bonus impacts on receipt of Unemployment Insurance. In Philip K. Robins & Robert G. Spiegelman (Eds.), *Reemployment bonuses in the Unemployment Insurance system: Evidence from three field experiments* (pp. 105-150). Kalamazoo, MI: W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research. *This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.*
    - Decker, P., O’Leary, C., & Woodbury, S. (2001b). Impacts on employment and earnings. In Philip K. Robins & Robert G. Spiegelman (Eds.), *Reemployment bonuses in the Unemployment Insurance system: Evidence from three field experiments* (pp. 151-174). Kalamazoo, MI: W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research. *This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.*

- **Study 3:** Pennsylvania Reemployment Bonus Demonstration, low bonus with long qualification period
  - Favorable impacts on UI benefit receipt and short-term earnings
  - No detectable impacts on short-term employment
  - Did not estimate impacts on long-term employment or long-term earnings
  - Causal evidence rating: High for UI benefit receipt outcomes and Moderate for employment and earnings outcomes
  - Related reports:
    - Decker and O’Leary (1995)
    - Decker et al. (2001a). *This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.*
    - Decker et al. (2001b). *This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.*
    - O’Leary et al. (2005)
• Study 4: Pennsylvania Reemployment Bonus Demonstration, high bonus with short qualification period
  - No detectable impacts on UI benefit receipt, short-term employment, or short-term earnings
  - Did not estimate impacts on long-term employment or long-term earnings
  - Causal evidence rating: High for UI benefit receipt outcomes and Moderate for employment and earnings outcomes
  - Related reports:
    ▪ Decker and O’Leary (1995)
    ▪ Decker et al. (2001a). This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.
    ▪ Decker et al. (2001b). This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.
    ▪ O’Leary et al. (2005)

• Study 5: Pennsylvania Reemployment Bonus Demonstration, high bonus with long qualification period
  - Favorable impacts on UI benefit receipt
  - No detectable impacts on short-term employment or short-term earnings
  - Did not estimate impacts on long-term employment or long-term earnings
  - Causal evidence rating: High for UI benefit receipt outcomes and Moderate for employment and earnings outcomes
  - Related reports:
    ▪ Decker and O’Leary (1995)
    ▪ Decker et al. (2001a). This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.
    ▪ Decker et al. (2001a). This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.
    ▪ O’Leary et al. (2005)

• Study 6: Pennsylvania Reemployment Bonus Demonstration, high but declining bonus
  - No detectable impacts on UI benefit receipt, short-term employment, or short-term earnings
  - Did not estimate impacts on long-term employment or long-term earnings
  - Causal evidence rating: High for UI benefit receipt outcomes and Moderate for employment and earnings outcomes
  - Related reports:
    ▪ Decker and O’Leary (1995)
    ▪ Decker et al. (2001a). This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.
Decker et al. (2001b). *This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.*

O’Leary et al. (2005)


- **Study 1c: New Jersey Job Search Assistance and Reemployment Bonus**
  - Favorable impacts on UI benefit receipt
  - No detectable impacts on long-term employment or long-term earnings
  - Did not estimate impacts on short-term employment or short-term earnings
  - Causal evidence rating: High
  - Access profile here: https://clear.dol.gov/study/new-jersey-unemployment-insurance-reemployment-demonstration-project-six-year-follow-and
  - Related reports:
    - Anderson (1990). *This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.*
    - Anderson et al. (1991)
    - Anderson (1992)
    - Corson et al. (1989)
    - Decker (1994)

- **Study 7a: Illinois Job Search Incentive**
  - Favorable impacts on UI benefit receipt
  - No detectable impacts on long-term earnings
  - Did not measure impacts on short-term employment, long-term employment, or short-term earnings
  - Causal evidence rating: High
  - Access profile here: https://clear.dol.gov/study/new-jersey-unemployment-insurance-reemployment-demonstration-project-six-year-follow-and
  - Related reports:
    - Woodbury, S., & Spiegelman, R. (1987). Bonuses to workers and employers to reduce unemployment: Randomized trials in Illinois. *American Economic Review, 77*(4), 513-530. *This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.*
    - Decker (1994)
    - Decker et al. (2001a). *This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.*
    - Decker et al. (2001b). *This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.*


- **Study 7b: Illinois Job Search Incentive**
- Favorable impacts on UI benefit receipt
- No detectable impacts on long-term earnings
- Did not measure impacts on short-term employment, long-term employment, or short-term earnings
- Causal evidence rating: High
- Additional source:
  - Woodbury and Spiegelman (1987). This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.

- Related reports:
  - Decker (1994)
  - Decker et al. (2001a). This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.
  - Decker et al. (2001b). This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.

- Study 8: Illinois Hiring Incentive
  - Favorable impacts on UI benefit receipt
  - No detectable impacts on long-term earnings
  - Did not measure impacts on short-term employment, long-term employment, or short-term earnings
  - Causal evidence rating: High
  - Additional source:
    - Woodbury and Spiegelman (1987). This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.


- Study 9: Washington Reemployment Bonus Experiment, low bonus with short qualification period
  - No detectable impacts on UI benefit receipt or short-term earnings
  - Did not measure impacts on short-term employment, long-term employment, or long-term earnings
  - Causal evidence rating: High
  - Additional sources:
    - O’Leary, C., Spiegelman, R., & Kline, K. (1993). Reemployment incentives for Unemployment Insurance beneficiaries: Results from the Washington Reemployment Bonus Experiment. Kalamazoo, MI: W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research. This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.
    - O’Leary, C., Spiegelman, R., & Kline, K. (1995). Do bonus offers shorten unemployment insurance spells? Results from the Washington experiment. Journal of Policy Analysis and Management, 14(2), 245-269. This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.
- Related reports:
  - Decker and O’Leary (1995)
  - Decker et al. (2001a). *This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.*
  - Decker et al. (2001b). *This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.*
  - O’Leary et al. (2005)

- Study 10: Washington Reemployment Bonus Experiment, medium bonus with short qualification period
  - No detectable impacts on UI benefit receipt or short-term earnings
  - Did not measure impacts on short-term employment, long-term employment, or long-term earnings
  - Causal evidence rating: High

- Related reports:
  - O’Leary et al. (1993). *This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.*
  - O’Leary et al. (1995). *This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.*
  - Decker and O’Leary (1995)
  - Decker et al. (2001a). *This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.*
  - Decker et al. (2001b). *This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.*
  - O’Leary et al. (2005)

- Study 11: Washington Reemployment Bonus Experiment, high bonus with short qualification period
  - Favorable impacts on UI benefit receipt
  - No detectable impacts on short-term earnings
  - Did not measure impacts on short-term employment, long-term employment, or long-term earnings
  - Causal evidence rating: High

- Related reports:
  - O’Leary et al. (1993). *This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.*
  - O’Leary et al. (1995). *This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.*
  - Decker and O’Leary (1995)
  - Decker et al. (2001a). *This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.*
  - Decker et al. (2001b). *This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.*
- O’Leary et al. (2005)

**Study 12: Washington Reemployment Bonus Experiment, low bonus with long qualification period**
- Favorable impacts on UI benefit receipt
- No detectable impacts on short-term earnings
- Did not measure impacts on short-term employment, long-term employment, or long-term earnings
- Causal evidence rating: High
- Related reports:
  - O’Leary et al. (1993). *This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.*
  - O’Leary et al. (1995). *This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.*
  - Decker and O’Leary (1995)
  - Decker et al. (2001a). *This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.*
  - Decker et al. (2001b). *This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.*
  - O’Leary et al. (2005)

**Study 13: Washington Reemployment Bonus Experiment, medium bonus with long qualification period**
- No detectable impacts on UI benefit receipt or short-term earnings
- Did not measure impacts on short-term employment, long-term employment, or long-term earnings
- Causal evidence rating: High
- Related reports:
  - O’Leary et al. (1993). *This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.*
  - O’Leary et al. (1995). *This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.*
  - Decker and O’Leary (1995)
  - Decker et al. (2001a). *This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.*
  - Decker et al. (2001b). *This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.*
  - O’Leary et al. (2005)

**Study 14: Washington Reemployment Bonus Experiment, high bonus with long qualification period**
- Favorable impacts on UI benefit receipt
- No detectable impacts on short-term earnings
- Did not measure impacts on short-term employment, long-term employment, or long-term earnings
- Causal evidence rating: High

- Related reports:
  - O’Leary et al. (1993). *This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.*
  - O’Leary et al. (1995). *This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.*
  - Decker and O’Leary (1995)
  - Decker et al. (2001a). *This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.*
  - Decker et al. (2001b). *This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.*
  - O’Leary et al. (2005)

Not included in the synthesis


- Study 1d: New Jersey Job Search Assistance and Reemployment Bonus. *This analysis was excluded from the synthesis because it did not examine any of the five outcomes covered in the research synthesis.*
  - Related reports:
    - Anderson (1990). *This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.*
    - Anderson et al. (1991)
    - Corson et al. (1989)
    - Decker (1994)
    - Corson and Haimson (1996)


- Study 15: New Jersey Reemployment Bonus. *This study was excluded from the synthesis because it did not examine any of the five outcomes covered in the research synthesis.*
  - Related reports:
    - Anderson (1990). *This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.*
    - Anderson et al. (1991)
    - Corson et al. (1989)
    - Corson and Haimson (1996)

- Study 16: Illinois Reemployment Bonus. *This study was excluded from the synthesis because it did not examine any of the five outcomes covered in the research synthesis.*

- Related reports:
  - Spiegelman and Woodbury (1987)
  - Decker (1994)
  - Decker et al. (2001a). This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.
  - Decker et al. (2001b). This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.


- Study 17: Pennsylvania and Washington Reemployment Bonuses. This study was excluded from the synthesis because it did not examine any of the five outcomes covered in the research synthesis.


- Study 6 (pooled results): Pennsylvania Reemployment Bonus Experiment, any bonus. This study was excluded from the synthesis because it pooled results from studies included in the synthesis and did not constitute a separate study.
  - Favorable impacts on UI benefit receipt
  - No detectable impacts on short-term earnings
  - Did not measure impacts on short-term employment, long-term employment, or long-term earnings
  - Causal evidence rating: Low

- Additional sources:
  - Corson et al. (1992)

- Related reports:

- Study 14 (pooled results): Washington Reemployment Bonus Experiment, any bonus. This study was excluded from the synthesis because it pooled results from studies included in the synthesis and did not constitute a separate study.
• Favorable impacts on UI benefit receipt
• No detectable impacts on short-term earnings
• Did not measure impacts on short-term employment, long-term employment, or long-term earnings
• Causal evidence rating: High
• Access profile here: https://clear.dol.gov/study/cost-effectiveness-targeted-reemployment-bonuses-oleary-et-al-2005

- Additional sources:
  - O’Leary et al. (1998). This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report.

- Related reports:
  - O’Leary et al. (1993). This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.
  - O’Leary et al. (1995). This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.
  - Decker and O’Leary (1995)
  - Spiegelman et al. (1992)
  - Decker et al. (2001a). This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.
  - Decker et al. (2001b). This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.


• Study 14 (pooled results): Washington Reemployment Bonus Experiment, any bonus. This study was excluded from the synthesis because it pooled results from studies included in the synthesis and did not constitute a separate study.
  - Favorable impacts on UI benefit receipt
  - No detectable impacts on short-term earnings
  - Did not measure impacts on short-term employment, long-term employment, or long-term earnings
  - Causal evidence rating: High

- Related reports:
  - O’Leary et al. (1993). This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.
  - O’Leary et al. (1995). This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.
  - Decker and O’Leary (1995)
  - Decker et al. (2001). This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.
  - O’Leary et al. (2005)
D. Profiling

Overview: Sites identify UI claimants at higher risk of exhausting unemployment benefits and try to provide them with enhanced employment services. These services may include an orientation, providing labor market information, and referrals to job search training or resume training workshops. Evidence reviewed on this intervention type included eight studies with high or moderate causal evidence. One study was not included in the synthesis because it received a low causal evidence rating and the synthesis only included studies with high or moderate causal evidence ratings.

Included in the synthesis


- Study 1: Kentucky Worker Profiling and Reemployment Services
  - Favorable impacts on UI benefit receipt and short-term earnings
  - Did not measure impacts on short-term employment, long-term employment, or long-term earnings
  - Causal evidence rating: High
  - Access profile here: [https://clear.dol.gov/study/threat-reemployment-services-more-effective-services-themselves-evidence-random-assignments-ui](https://clear.dol.gov/study/threat-reemployment-services-more-effective-services-themselves-evidence-random-assignments-ui)
  - Additional source:
    - Black, D., Smith, J., Berger, M., & Noel, B. (2002). Is the threat of reemployment services more effective than the services themselves? Experimental Evidence from the UI System. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research. *This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.*
  - Related report:
    - Galdo, J. C. (2006). Three essays in programme evaluation (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest. (Accession No. 304941896). *This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.*


- Study 2: Connecticut Worker Profiling and Reemployment Services
  - Favorable impacts on UI benefit receipt
  - No detectable impacts on short-term employment or short-term earnings
  - Did not measure impacts on long-term employment or long-term earnings
  - Causal evidence rating: Moderate
  - Additional source:
    - Dickinson, K., Decker, P., & Kreutzer, S. (2002). Evaluation of WPRS systems. In Randall W. Eberts, Christopher J. O’Leary, and Stephen A. (Eds.), *Targeting employment services*. Kalamazoo, MI: W.E. Upjohn Institute, 61-90. *This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.*
• Study 3: Illinois Worker Profiling and Reemployment Services
  - Favorable impacts on UI benefit receipt
  - No detectable impacts on short-term employment or short-term earnings
  - Did not measure impacts on long-term employment or long-term earnings
  - Causal evidence rating: Moderate
  - Additional source: Dickinson et al. (2002). *This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.*

• Study 4: Kentucky Worker Profiling and Reemployment Services
  - No detectable impacts on short-term employment or short-term earnings
  - Unfavorable impacts on UI benefit receipt
  - Did not measure impacts on long-term employment or long-term earnings
  - Causal evidence rating: Moderate
  - Additional source: Dickinson et al. (2002). *This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.*

• Study 5: Maine Worker Profiling and Reemployment Services
  - Favorable impacts on UI benefit receipt and short-term earnings
  - No detectable impacts on short-term employment
  - Did not measure impacts on long-term employment or long-term earnings
  - Causal evidence rating: Moderate
  - Additional source: Dickinson et al. (2002). *This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.*

• Study 6: New Jersey Worker Profiling and Reemployment Services
  - Favorable impacts on UI benefit receipt and short-term earnings
  - Unfavorable impacts on short-term employment
  - Did not measure impacts on long-term employment or long-term earnings
  - Causal evidence rating: Moderate
  - Additional source: Dickinson et al. (2002). *This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.*
• Study 7: South Carolina Worker Profiling and Reemployment Services
  - No detectable impacts on UI benefit receipt
  - Unfavorable impacts on short-term employment or short-term earnings
  - Did not measure impacts on long-term employment or long-term earnings
  - Causal evidence rating: Moderate
  - Additional source:
    ▪ Dickinson et al. (2002). This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.


• Study 8: Florida Priority Reemployment Services (PREP)
  - Favorable impacts on UI benefit receipt and short-term employment
  - No detectable impacts on short-term earnings
  - Did not measure impacts on long-term employment or long-term earnings
  - Causal evidence rating: High
  - Additional source:
    ▪ Poe-Yamagata et al. (2011)

Not included in the synthesis


• Study 9. Kentucky Profiling. This study was excluded from the synthesis because it received a low causal evidence rating.

E. More stringent employer contact requirements

Overview: UI claimants typically have to engage in job search and contact a certain number of employers to continue receiving unemployment compensation. Some interventions of this type represented more stringent requirements than usual practice: for example, the intervention required more employer contacts, verifying the contacts, or both. Evidence reviewed on this intervention type included four studies with high or moderate causal evidence and two studies with low causal evidence. Results from the latter two were not included in the synthesis because the synthesis only included studies with high or moderate causal evidence ratings.

Included in the synthesis

• Study 1: New Jersey Increased Employer Contact Pilot
  - Favorable impacts on UI benefit receipt
  - Did not estimate impacts on short-term employment, long-term employment, short-term earnings, or long-term earnings
  - Causal evidence rating: High


• Study 2: Maryland Increased Employer Contact Requirement
  - Favorable impacts on UI benefit receipt
  - No detectable impacts on short-term employment or short-term earnings
  - Did not estimate impacts on long-term employment or long-term earnings
  - Causal evidence rating: High
  - Related reports:
    ▪ Klepinger et al. (2002). This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.

• Study 3: Maryland Employer Contact Verification
  - No detectable impacts on UI benefit receipt, short-term employment, or short-term earnings
  - Did not estimate impacts on long-term employment or long-term earnings
  - Causal evidence rating: High
  - Related reports:
    ▪ Klepinger et al. (2002). This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.


• Study 4a: Washington Alternative Work Search New Work Search
  - No detectable impacts on UI benefit receipt, short-term employment, or short-term earnings
  - Did not estimate impacts on long-term employment or long-term earnings
  - Causal evidence rating: High
  - Related reports:
    ▪ Johnson and Klepinger (1994). This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.


- Study 4b: Washington Alternative Work Search New Work Search
  - Favorable impacts on UI benefit receipt and short-term employment
  - No detectable impacts on long-term employment, short-term earnings, or long-term earnings
  - Causal evidence rating: High

- Related reports:
  - Johnson and Klepinger (1994). *This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.*

**Not included in the synthesis**


- Study 5: New Jersey Repeal of Mandatory Employment Services Registration. *This study was excluded from the synthesis because it received a low causal evidence rating.*
  - Favorable impacts on UI benefit receipt
  - Did not estimate impacts on short-term employment, long-term employment, short-term earnings, or long-term earnings
  - Causal evidence rating: Low


- Study 6: Statewide policies requiring additional contacts. *This study was excluded from the synthesis because it received a low causal evidence rating.*
  - No detectable impacts on UI benefit receipt, short-term employment, or long-term employment
  - Did not estimate impacts on short-term earnings or long-term earnings
  - Causal evidence rating: Low

- Additional source:
  - Toohey, D. (2014). *Job rationing in recessions: Evidence from work-search requirements.* Newark, DE: University of Delaware. *This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.*
F. Less stringent employer contact requirements

Overview: UI claimants typically have to engage in job search and contact a certain number of employers to continue receiving unemployment compensation. Some interventions of this type represented less stringent requirements than usual practice: for example, they required fewer or no employer contacts. Evidence reviewed on this intervention type included two studies with high or moderate causal evidence. Evidence reviewed from the synthesis because it pooled results from studies included in the synthesis and did not constitute a separate study.

Included in the synthesis


- Study 1: Maryland No Employer Contact Verification
  - Favorable impacts on short-term employment or short-term earnings
  - No detectable impacts on UI benefit receipt
  - Did not estimate impacts on long-term employment or long-term earnings
  - Causal evidence rating: High


- Study 2a: Washington Alternative Work Search Exception Reporting
  - No detectable impacts on short-term employment or short-term earnings
  - Unfavorable impacts on UI benefit receipt
  - Did not estimate impacts on long-term employment or long-term earnings
  - Causal evidence rating: High
  - Related reports:
    - Johnson and Klepinger (1994). *This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.*
    - Lachowska et al. (2016).


- Study 2b: Washington Alternative Work Search Exception Reporting
  - No detectable impacts on short-term employment, long-term employment, short-term earnings, or long-term earnings
  - Unfavorable impacts on UI benefit receipt
  - Causal evidence rating: High
Not included in synthesis


- Study 2 (pooled results): Washington Alternative Work Search Exception Reporting. *This study was excluded from the synthesis because it pooled results from studies included in the synthesis and did not constitute a separate study.*
  - No detectable impacts on long-term employment, short-term earnings, or long-term earnings
  - Unfavorable impacts on UI benefit receipt and short-term employment
  - Causal evidence rating High

- Additional source:
  - Lachowska et al. (2016)

- Related reports:
  - Johnson and Klepinger (1991)
  - Johnson and Klepinger (1994). *This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.*

G. Other interventions

**Overview:** Four studies that primarily represented self-employment or mental health interventions but included reemployment components were reviewed by CLEAR, but they were excluded from the synthesis. Two additional studies that were excluded examined programs that implemented bundles of reemployment interventions; these studies were excluded because they received a low causal evidence rating and the synthesis only included studies with high or moderate causal evidence ratings.

**Not included in the synthesis**


- Study 1a: Washington State Self-Employment and Enterprise Development. *This analysis was excluded from the synthesis because it primarily examined a self-employment intervention.*

- **Study 1b**: Washington State Self-Employment and Enterprise Development. *This analysis was excluded from the synthesis because it primarily examined a self-employment intervention.*

- **Study 2**: Massachusetts Enterprise Project. *This study was excluded from the synthesis because it primarily examined a self-employment intervention.*


- **Study 3**: Washington and Oregon Labor Exchange. *This study was excluded from the synthesis because it received a low causal evidence rating.*


- **Study 4**: Significant Improvement Demonstrations. *This study was excluded from the synthesis because it received a low causal evidence rating.*
  - Access profile here: [https://clear.dol.gov/study/evaluation-significant-improvement-demonstration-grants-provision-reemployment-services-ui-0](https://clear.dol.gov/study/evaluation-significant-improvement-demonstration-grants-provision-reemployment-services-ui-0)


- **Study 5a**: Michigan Prevention Research Center JOBS I. *This study was excluded because it primarily examined a mental health intervention.*
  - Additional source:
    - Caplan, R., Vinokur, A., Price, R., & van Ryn, M. (1989). Job seeking, reemployment, and mental health: A randomized field experiment in coping with job loss. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74*(5), 759-769. *This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.*

• Study 6: Michigan Prevention Research Center JOBS II. *This study was excluded because it primarily examined a mental health intervention.*
  - Additional source:
    - Vinokur, A., Price, R., & Schul Y. (1995). Impact of the JOBS intervention on unemployed workers varying in risk for depression. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 23*(1), 39–74. *This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.*


• Study 5b: Michigan Prevention Research Center JOBS I. *This study was excluded because it primarily examined a mental health intervention.*
  - Additional sources:
    - Caplan et al. (1989). *This report was not reviewed because the findings were presented in another report that was reviewed.*
    - Vinokur et al. (1995)
In this appendix, we provide a detailed description of how we categorized reports and studies for the reemployment topic area. CLEAR reviewed 43 reports in this topic area. A total of 19 reports were excluded from the reemployment synthesis for various reasons (Figure 1). Accounting for these exclusions, the synthesis covers studies included in 24 reports (43 reports in the topic area minus 19 reports excluded).

How this supplement identifies distinct studies

In this supplement, each distinct study has its own study number (for example, Study 1). When two or more examinations of the same intervention do not constitute separate studies, they will have the same study number with a letter appended. For example, three reports examining effects of REA interventions each contained a study of the Nevada Reemployment and Eligibility Assessment Initiative. In the synthesis, we identified these as Studies 4a, 4b, and 4c. We do not count these as separate studies—4a, 4b, and 4c count as one study. Finally, when one study reports a separate estimate of an intervention’s effect (for example, at one site), and another reports a pooled estimate (for example, site-specific impacts aggregated to report an overall result), the study on the separate estimate will receive a number, and the study on the aggregated estimate will receive a number and the note “(pooled results).” For example, Study 6 under the reemployment bonuses intervention category examined a particular type of bonus used in the state of Pennsylvania, and Study 6 (pooled results) reported an aggregated estimate of the impacts of all types of bonuses used in the state. In this case, Study 6 (pooled results) does not constitute a separate study.

Figure 1. Flow chart for inclusion in the research synthesis

---

9 See the CLEAR Reemployment Review Protocol for information on the research included in this topic area.