An Analysis of Wyoming Unemployment Insurance Monetary Eligibility, 1993 and 2003

January 2005



An in-depth review of Wyoming Labor Market Information topics.

Catalog of Occasional Papers

Occasional Paper No. 1: Evaluation of Federal Training & Education Programs. (2004, October). Casper, WY: Wyoming Department of Employment, Research & Planning.

Contents:

Examining Workforce Investment Act Programmatic Outcomes by Sylvia D. Jones, M.A.

A Comparison of Employment and Enrollment Outcomes Based on Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Eligibility by Mark A. Harris, Ph.D.

Occasional Paper No. 2: An Analysis of Wyoming Unemployment Insurance Monetary Eligibility, 1993 and 2003. (2004, January). Casper, WY: Wyoming Department of Employment, Research & Planning.

Contents:

An Analysis of Wyoming Unemployment Insurance Monetary Eligibility, 1993 and 2003 by Sherry Wen.

Subscriptions, additional copies, and back issues are available free of charge. Please contact Susan Murray at smurra1@state.wy.us or (307) 473-3835.

Electronic copies are available at http://doe.state.wy.us/LMI/backiss.htm

Contents

Page

1

An Analysis of Wyoming Unemployment Insurance Monetary Eligibility, 1993 and 2003

by: Sherry Wen, Senior Economist

Wyoming Department of Employment Cynthia A. Pomeroy, Director

Research & Planning

Tom Gallagher, Manager

Workforce Information

Dr. Mark A. Harris, Supervisor

Krista R. Shinkle, Editor, (307) 473-3808, e-mail: kshink@state.wy.us Susan J. Murray, Associate Editor, (307) 473-3835, e-mail: smurra1@state.wy.us

Editorial Committee: David Bullard, Valerie A. Davis, Dr. Mark A. Harris, Susan J. Murray, Brad Payne, and Krista Shinkle.

© Copyright 2005 by the Wyoming Department of Employment, Research & Planning.

Department of Employment Nondiscrimination Statement

The Department of Employment does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, sex, age, or disability. It is our intention that all individuals seeking services from our agency be given equal opportunity and that eligibility decisions be based upon applicable statutes, rules, and regulations.

ISSN 1551-3629 (print) ISSN 1551-3637 (online) http://doe.state.wy.us/LMI

An Analysis of Wyoming Unemployment Insurance Monetary Eligibility, 1993 and 2003

by: Sherry Wen, Senior Economist

Abstract

Unemployment Insurance (UI) is a government program that offers financial assistance to workers who have lost their jobs through no fault of their own. This study examines how UI eligibility has changed from 1993 to 2003. We assume that all individuals who worked in Wyoming during second quarter 1993 (1993Q2) lost their jobs and applied for UI benefits in third quarter. We do the same thing for 2003Q2 and compare the results. In particular, what proportion of Wyoming employees would have been able to receive UI benefits? We present UI policy makers, legislators, and others with insights regarding the current UI system to assist them when faced with future UI decisions.

Our findings show that over the decade the proportion of Wyoming workers who would qualify for UI benefits, maximum UI benefits, or maximum UI duration all decreased to some degree. Other results remained fairly constant:

• Lower paying industries had more workers who would be ineligible for UI benefits than higher paying industries.

• Workers in lower paying industries also had a smaller chance of receiving maximum UI benefits than those working in higher paying industries. • Employees of prime working ages (25 to 54) were likely to qualify for UI benefits while workers older and younger were less likely.

• A much higher percentage of male than female workers would have been eligible for the maximum UI benefit.

• Seasonal workers were more likely to receive more UI benefits than nonseasonal workers, even if they earned the same total wages in the base period or had the same weekly wages before layoff.

Introduction

UI plays an important role in Wyoming's labor market. It aids workforce development because, theoretically, it retains skilled workers in the state, who are then available for future training and employment. Almost all employers pay UI taxes. In fiscal year 2003 (July 1, 2002 to June 30, 2003), 18,896 workers received UI benefits in Wyoming, which represents 7.7 percent of all persons who worked in the state

To qualify for UI benefits, an unemployed worker must meet monetary and nonmonetary eligibility criteria. Nonmonetary criteria require individuals to 1) have involuntarily separated from their employers or lost jobs through no fault of their own; 2) be able and available to work; and 3) be actively seeking work. To address the concerns raised about nonmonetary criteria in recent years, some states such as Kansas, Montana, and South Dakota have passed legislation allowing workers to qualify for UI benefits if they left their employment due to factors such as domestic violence, sexual harassment, pregnancy, and child care conflicts. We expect that women will be the primary beneficiaries of these changes. In general, individual workers can control nonmonetary eligibility to some degree.

Monetary criteria, more straightforward and easier to determine, require unemployed workers to have earned sufficient wage credits (a certain amount of wages) prior to losing their jobs. These criteria are less amenable to control by individual workers.

Wyoming applied two monetary eligibility criteria in 1993 and 2003. The first required an unemployed worker to have earned at least eight percent of the statewide annual average wage during the base period (Wyoming Employment Security Law, 2003). The base period is the first four of the last five completed calendar quarters preceding the one in which an unemployed worker filed an initial claim for UI benefits. The minimum base period wage was \$1,650 in 1993 and \$2,300 in 2003. The second required a worker's total base period wage be at least 1.4 times his/her high quarter wages in the base period.

The research presented here only focuses on monetary criteria. Our purpose is to determine whether monetary criteria still function as they

did 10 years ago and to answer the question of whether or not the UI system still provides a comparable level of support for the workforce. We compared data from 1993 and 2003 using UI Wage Records (Wage Records) and evaluated the impact of current UI laws on the eligibility of Wyoming workers for benefits. This study shows the comparative operational baselines when we assume that all employees who worked in Wyoming in the second quarter of 1993 or 2003 lost their jobs and applied for UI benefits in the third quarter. We seek to determine what has happened in terms of UI eligibility. In particular, what proportion of Wyoming employees would have been able to receive UI benefits? Additionally, we explore what their benefit levels may have been and how long they would have qualified. The wage replacement ratio and UI eligibility by industry, gender, and age are also examined.

Method

This research explores the current UI system in terms of eligibility and to determine if the system functioned the same in 1993 as in 2003. Using the same structure, we built two longitudinal study databases. Each database matched five quarters of Wage Records by social security numbers (SSNs): second quarter 1992 (1992Q2) to 1993Q2 and 2002Q2 to 2003Q2. Using the same quarter throughout the study avoided possible seasonal variations. Different quarters of the year and different points in time may have resulted in different UI eligibility situations.

Industry information was obtained from the Quarterly Census of Employment & Wages (QCEW) database. We also matched the SSNs with the demographic database (mainly based on the driver's license database) to obtain the age and sex of each Wyoming worker. Wyoming workers in this research include those who worked in Wyoming during the study periods whether they resided in Wyoming or another state. (Glover, 2001a & b). In order to create fair comparisons, the 1993 UI benefits were inflated to 2003 dollars based on the Consumer Price Index (U.S. Department of Labor, 2004).

A study on the Wyoming employment structure between 1993 and 2003 was also presented to give background on how Wyoming workers were distributed among industries and the major changes over the 10-year period. This information helps place the study of monetary eligibility in context, as monetary eligibility may be problematic in some industries. It is important to understand the share of total employment represented by these industries.

Results

Employment Structure

A total of 214,402 individuals worked in Wyoming in 1993Q2, while 232,229 worked in 2003Q2. Table 1 shows substantial differences in industry growth between 1993 and 2003. Individuals working in Construction, one of the most seasonally volatile industries and responsible for many UI claims, grew by 20.6 percent. Services grew by 15.2 percent, which comprises almost twothirds of the statewide net growth. Employment fell in Mining (-2.2%);

Table 1: Industry Distr	ibution o	of Wyomi	ing Work	ers, Seco	nd Quarter 19) 93 (1993(Q2) and 2	2003Q2				
			1993Q2		ľ			2003Q2				l
	Total	Female	Male	N/A	Industry Distribution	Total	Female	Male	N/A	Industry Distribution	Cł	lange
Industry [*]	Workers	(row %)	(row%)	(row %)	(co1%)	Workers	(row %)	(row %)	(row %)	(co1%)	Number	Percentage
Agriculture	3,386	21.9%	53.9%	24.2%	1.6%	4,030	28.0%	53.8%	18.2%	1.7%	644	19.0%
Mining	18,557	10.7%	84.9%	4.5%	8.7%	18,157	11.1%	81.4%	7.5%	7.8%	-400	-2.2%
Construction	16,873	9.5%	73.9%	16.6%	7.9%	20,350	9.3%	70.7%	20.1%	8.8%	3,477	20.6%
Manufacturing	10,714	26.9%	66.7%	6.4%	5.0%	9,792	23.2%	68.9%	8.0%	4.2%	-922	-8.6%
TCPU ^D	12,308	21.4%	73.4%	5.2%	5.7%	11,666	22.8%	68.2%	9.0%	5.0%	-642	-5.2%
Wholesale Trade	6,928	22.7%	71.6%	5.7%	3.2%	7,930	23.5%	70.9%	5.6%	3.4%	1,002	14.5%
Retail Trade	45,419	49.8%	36.5%	13.7%	21.2%	47,240	49.3%	36.4%	14.3%	20.3%	1,821	4.0%
FIRE ^c	8,544	65.9%	28.7%	5.3%	4.0%	8,360	67.4%	26.4%	6.2%	3.6%	-184	-2.2%
Services	74,549	58.5%	29.4%	12.1%	34.8%	85,896	56.8%	29.4%	13.8%	37.0%	11,347	15.2%
Public Administration ^d	15,107	44.5%	51.0%	4.5%	7.0%	18,171	44.8%	52.0%	3.2%	7.8%	3,064	20.3%
Unclassified ^e	2,017	30.4%	47.1%	22.5%	0.9%	637	20.9%	70.5%	8.6%	0.3%	-1,380	-68.4%
Total	214,402	42.3%	47.0%	10.7%	100.0%	232,229	42.1%	45.7%	12.2%	100.0%	17,827	8.3%
^a Standard Industrial Cla	ssificatior	1.										
^b Transportation, Commu	inications,	, & Public	2 Utilities	<i>i</i> .								
^c Finance, Insurance, &	Real Estat	e.										

Finance, insurance, & Real Es

^dExcludes federal government. ^eNo industry information available.

No moustry mormation available

N/A - Not available.

Manufacturing (-8.6%); Transportation, Communications, & Public Utilities (TCPU: -5.2%); and Finance, Insurance, & Real Estate (FIRE; -2.2%). However, the percentage distribution of individual workers across industries was similar (up or down within 1 percentage point) between 1993 and 2003, except Services, which gained 2.2 percentage points in 2003. Men make up over 70 percent of workers in Mining, Construction, and Wholesale Trade in both 1993 and 2003. On the other hand, women make up over 65 percent of workers in FIRE during the same period. Services, the largest industry, employed more than one-third of Wyoming workers in 2003. Retail Trade was second largest, providing jobs to more than 20 percent of Wyoming workers. Figure 1 shows that the age distribution of workers shifted to the right, indicating an aging of Wyoming's workforce. Almost half (48.6%) of the

workers in 1993 were between ages 16 and 34, but this age group decreased to 37.2 percent in 2003. In contrast, the number of workers between ages 35 and 54 increased from 22.7 percent in 1993 to 32.0 percent in 2003.

UI Eligibility

The proportion of workers who would have qualified for UI benefits was almost the same in 1993 (77.5%) and 2003 (76.8%; see Figure 2, page 5). These results should be interpreted as a minimum percentage of workers who would qualify for UI. Some workers move between states and would qualify for UI based on a combined wage claim. However, the potential combined wage claim workers are outside the scope of this research. For each year studied,

(Text continued on page 6)







about 10 percent were new Wyoming workers during second quarter and had no base period wage credit at all; approximately 13 percent could not have met at least one of the two wage credit requirements, for a total of 23 percent who would have been ineligible for UI. Figure 3 shows the industry distribution of workers who would not have been monetarily eligible because they did not meet wage credit requirements. As Figure 3 indicates, UI eligibility varies significantly across industries. For example, 25.3 percent of Agriculture workers in 1993 would not have qualified for UI benefits. In contrast, only 5.0 percent of Mining workers in the same year would not have qualified. In general, low paying industries such as Agriculture, Retail Trade, and Services had a larger percentage of workers who would have been monetarily ineligible for UI if they had lost their jobs. However, these three industries accounted for more than three-fourths (77.2%) of the total growth in Wyoming workers from 1993 to 2003 and employed more than one-half (52.5%) of Wyoming workers in 2003. Mining and TCPU paid higher wages, which resulted in more individuals qualifying for UI. However, Mining had the most significant increase in the percentage of UI ineligible workers (from 5.0% to 8.9%), followed by Construction (14.3% to 16.6%), and TCPU (7.2% to 8.3%). The eligibility scenario improved for Agriculture (with the percentage of ineligible workers decreasing from 25.3% to 20.5%), FIRE (from 11.8% to 7.9%), and Wholesale Trade (from 9.7% to 7.3%).

A comparison by gender shows that 15.1 percent of female workers in 1993 would not have qualified for UI had they lost their jobs, compared with 11.8 percent of male workers (see Figure 4). The proportions fell to 13.8 percent for female workers and 11.2 percent for male workers in 2003.

Figure 5 (see page 8) shows that both younger and older workers were more likely to have been ineligible for UI benefits than the middle age groups. For example, in 1993 and 2003 a little over 11 percent of workers between ages 16 and 24 would not qualify for UI benefits. For those who were 65 or older, 82.6 percent in 1993 and 49.9 percent in 2003 would have been ineligible for UI benefits. On the other hand, less than seven percent of the workers between ages 35 and 44 would have been ineligible. The differences across age groups were consistent, with the exception of those 65





or older. Part of the workers between ages 16 and 24 were probably students, who typically work part-time, and were more likely to be paid low wages. Some of the workers ages 65 or older are likely retirees and may only choose to work part-time. The large changes between 1993 and 2003 for this age group could be due to economic conditions during 2000 to 2003. Many workers who planned to retire during that time period lost their retirement money in the stock market, and chose to come back to work full time or to delay their retirement.

Potential UI Benefits Analyses

The research shows the benefit level for which Wyoming UI eligible workers would

likely qualify and the differences across industry, age, and sex.

Our study shows that Wyoming had 166,044 workers (77.5%) in 1993Q2 and 178,590 (76.8%) in 2003Q2 who would have qualified for UI benefits if they had lost their jobs (see Figure 2, page 5). However, UI benefits vary depending on how much a worker earned during the base period. By law, the weekly UI benefit that an eligible individual could receive is equal to four percent of his/her high quarter wage during the base period. The law limits the maximum weekly benefit to 55 percent of the previous year's statewide average weekly wage, so it changes every year. The maximum weekly benefit was \$220 in 1993 and \$306 in

2003. The maximum benefit an individual could receive for one year starting with the effective date of the initial claim is 30 percent of his/her base period wage, or 26 times his/her weekly benefit, whichever is less. The potential UI duration (the number of weeks an individual is able to receive UI benefits) is determined by the maximum benefit divided by the weekly benefit, up to a maximum of 26 weeks in a benefit year. Table 2 gives two examples of how base period wages determine an individual's UI benefits.

Generally, the greater the weekly benefit amount and the longer the duration of eligibility for receiving UI benefits, the easier it is for workers to overcome the financial difficulties of unemployment. Increased benefits also afford more flexibility to attend reemployment services and look for jobs.

To facilitate comparison, we converted the 1993 benefits to 2003 dollars using the Consumer Price Index (U.S. Department of Labor, 2004). As a result, the maximum UI benefit in Wyoming was \$281 per week with 26 weeks duration in 1993 and \$306 per week with 26 weeks in 2003. This represents an 8.9 percent real increase over 10 years.

Table 3 (see page 10) shows the distribution of Wyoming UI eligible workers by sex and potential UI benefits. Approximately 40 percent would have qualified for the maximum UI benefit in 1993 or 2003. About 56 percent of male workers and only about 25 percent of female workers would have been able to receive the maximum UI benefit (see Table 3 and Figures 6, 7, and 8, pages 10, 11, and 12). Eligibility would have also varied by industry and age. In Mining, 77.0 percent of workers would have been eligible for the maximum UI benefit in 2003, while only 14.8 percent of workers in Retail Trade would have been eligible (see Table 4 and Figures 9, 10, and 11, pages 13, 14, 15, and 16). The proportion of workers who would have qualified for the maximum UI benefit in each industry changed only slightly between 1993 and 2003, with the

(Text continued on page 11)

Table 2:	Example of	How Wyomin	ng Unemploy	yment Insu	rance (UI) Bene	efits are De	etermined,	2003			
Worker	Base Period Wages Quarter 1 Quarter 2 Quarter 3 Quarter		Quarter 4	Total Base Period Wage	High Quarter Wage	Weekly Benefit Amount ^a	Maximum Benefit 1 ^b	Maximum Benefit 2 ^b	Final Maximum Benefit ^b	Weeks Eligible ^c	
A B	\$2,600 \$350	\$2,400 \$600	\$2,500 \$2,500	\$2,700 \$0	\$10,200 \$3,450	\$2,700 \$2,500	\$108 Ineligible	\$3,060 Ineligible	\$2,808 Ineligible	\$2,808 Ineligible	26 Ineligible

^aThe weekly benefit is equal to four percent of an individual's high quarter wage or \$306 (the maximum amount allowed in 2003), whichever is less. In the example, Worker A would receive four percent of \$2,700 or \$108. Worker B is ineligible for UI benefits because the worker does not meet the requirement that a worker's total base period wage must be at least 1.4 times the high quarter wage. In the example, Worker B would have needed to earn at least \$3,500 (1.4 * \$2,500) to qualify for UI benefits.

^bThe maximum benefit an individual can receive is 30 percent of the worker's base period wage or 26 times the worker's weekly benefit, whichever is less. In the example, 30 percent of Worker A's base period wage is \$3,060. Worker A's weekly benefit times 26 is \$2,808. Therefore, Worker A's final maximum benefit is \$2,808 (the smaller of the two).

The number of weeks an individual is able to receive UI benefits is equal to the maximum benefit divided by the weekly benefit, up to 26 weeks.

Table 3: Distrib	ution of Wy	yoming Un	employm	ent Insura	nce (UI) Eli	gible Woı	kers by Sex and	Potential	UI Benefi	t Levels, 1	993 and 2	003		
	Percen	itage of UI	Eligible V	Vorkers in	<u>1993</u>			Percer	itage of Ul	Eligible W	orkers in	2003		
Female Workers	:						Female Worke	rs:						AWD
Benefit in		Duration	(Weeks of	Eligibility)		AWB ^a	Benefit		Duration	(Weeks of	Eligibility)	AWB ^a	% Change
2003 Dollars	10 -14	15 - 19	20 - 25	26	Total			10 -14	15 - 19	20 - 25	26	Total		-
=<\$100	3.5%	5.3%	6.3%	3.1%	18.2%		=<\$100	2.6%	4.1%	4.4%	2.1%	13.2%		
\$101 - \$200	3.2%	5.8%	12.2%	13.8%	35.0%	\$188	\$101 - \$200	3.8%	6.1%	11.1%	9.1%	29.9%	\$214	13.8%
\$201- \$280	0.7%	1.6%	5.0%	12.0%	19.3%		\$201 - \$305	1.5%	3.3%	8.5%	12.0%	25.3%		
\$281	0.2%	0.7%	2.1%	24.6%	27.5%		\$306	0.2%	1.7%	4.0%	25.6%	31.6%		
Total	7.6%	13.4%	25.6%	53.5%	100.0%		Total	8.1%	15.2%	28.0%	48.7%	100.0%		
Male Workers:							Male Workers							
Benefit in	Duration (Weeks of Eligibility)					Benefit		Duration	(Weeks of	Eligibility)			
2003 Dollars	10 -14	15 - 19	20 - 25	26	Total			10 -14	15 - 19	20 - 25	26	Total		
=<\$100	2.1%	2.2%	2.0%	1.0%	7.4%		=<\$100	1.7%	2.1%	1.7%	0.7%	6.2%		
\$101 - \$200	3.0%	3.6%	4.7%	4.3%	15.6%	\$240	\$101 - \$200	2.7%	3.5%	4.1%	2.7%	13.0%	\$263	9.6%
\$201- \$280	1.3%	2.2%	3.8%	6.7%	14.0%		\$201 - \$305	1.6%	3.0%	5.7%	6.7%	17.0%		
\$281	0.5%	1.5%	3.5%	57.6%	63.0%		\$306	0.4%	2.2%	5.3%	55.9%	63.8%		
Total	6.9%	9.6%	13.9%	69.6%	100.0%		Total	6.5%	10.7%	16.8%	66.0%	100.0%		
All Workers: ^b							All Workers: ^b							
Benefit in		Duration	(Weeks of	Eligibility)	1		Benefit		Duration	(Weeks of	Eligibility)		
2003 Dollars	10 -14	15 - 19	20 - 25	26	Total			10 -14	15 - 19	20 - 25	26	Total		
=<\$100	2.8%	3.6%	4.0%	2.0%	12.4%		=<\$100	2.4%	3.1%	3.0%	1.4%	9.9%		
\$101 - \$200	3.1%	4.6%	8.1%	8.7%	24.6%	\$216	\$101 - \$200	3.6%	4.9%	7.4%	5.6%	21.5%	\$238	10.2%
\$201- \$280	1.0%	1.9%	4.4%	9.1%	16.5%		\$201 - \$305	1.8%	3.3%	7.0%	8.9%	21.0%		
\$281	0.3%	1.1%	2.8%	42.2%	46.5%		\$306	0.4%	2.0%	4.7%	40.5%	47.6%		
Total	7.3%	11.4%	19.3%	62.0%	100.0%		Total	8.1%	13.4%	22.1%	56.4%	100.0%		
^a AWB - Average V (inflation adjuste ^b Includes those w	Veekly Bene d) and the 2 vorkers who	efit; inflatio 2003 maxir ose sex is n	on adjusted num weekl ot available	based on t y benefit ar e.	he Consum nount was \$	er Price ir \$306.	ndex and express	ed in 2003	dollars. Th	e 1993 ma:	ximum wee	ekly benefit	amount w	ras \$281



exceptions of Public Administration (up from 48.8% to 59.3%), TCPU (down from 68.4% to 60.6%), and Mining (down from 84.6% to 77.0%). Across all industries, it decreased by 1.7 percent (from 42.2% to 40.5%). Workers in the middle age groups would qualify more often than other age groups (see Figure 12, page 17). More than one-half of the workers between ages 35 and 54 would have qualified for the maximum UI benefit, while less than one-quarter of those 55 or older would have been at this level.

The proportion of workers eligible for the maximum UI duration fell by 5.6

(Text continued on page 15)





Table 4: Industry]	Distribution (of Wyoming V	Workers by P	otential Une	mployment	t Insuran	ce (UI) Benefit L	evels and l	Duration,	1993 and 2	2003			
		Percentage	of UI Eligibl	e Workers in	1993:			F	ercentage	of UI Eligi	ible Worke	ers in 2003	:	
Agriculture														
Benefit in	Du	ration (Week	s of Eligibili	ty)	l			Dura	tion (Week	s of Eligibi	ility)			AWB
2003 Dollars	10 -14	15 - 19	20 - 25	26	Total	AWB ^a	Benefit	10 -14	15 - 19	20 - 25	26	Total	AWB ^a	% Change
=<\$100	4.8%	4.4%	3.0%	4.0%	16.2%	÷100	=<\$100	4.2%	3.6%	3.3%	2.6%	13.7%		10.4%
\$101 - \$200	6.2% 1.6%	6.7% 2.7%	9.7% 7.1%	13.5%	36.0%	\$192	\$101 - \$200	5.6%	6.1% 4.3%	7.7%	9.1%	28.5%	\$212	10.4%
\$281 \$	0.3%	4.170 1.3%	5.0%	20.1%	21.270		\$201 - \$303 \$306	0.6%	4.370	4.4%	20.2%	31.470 26.6%		
Total	12.8%	15.1%	24.8%	47.3%	100.0%		Total	13.3%	15.5%	27.3%	43.9%	100.0%		
Mining		-	-						I					
Benefit in	Du	ration (Week	s of Eligibili	ty)	l			Dura	tion (Week	s of Eligibi	ility)			
2003 Dollars	10 -14	15 - 19	20 - 25	26	Total		Benefit	10 -14	15 - 19	20 - 25	26	Total		
=<\$100	0.4%	0.3%	0.3%	0.2%	1.3%		=<\$100	0.6%	0.5%	0.3%	0.2%	1.6%		
\$101 - \$200	1.1%	1.1%	1.0%	0.8%	3.9%	\$272	\$101 - \$200	1.4%	1.1%	1.0%	0.6%	4.0%	\$293	7.7%
\$201- \$280 \$201	1.1%	1.1%	1.0%	1.1%	5.4% 00.3%		\$201 - \$305 \$206	1.4%	2.1%	2.2%	1.0%	97.0%		
⊅201 Total	3.1%	3.8%	2.970 5.8%	87.3%	89.3 % 100.0%		৯১০০ Total	4.0%	6.5%	10.1%	79.4%	100.0%		
Construction	1		1	· · · · · ·				1						
Benefit in	Du	ration (Week	us of Eligibili [.]	ty)				Dura	tion (Week	s of Eligibi	ility)			
2003 Dollars	10 -14	15 - 19	20 - 25	26	Total		Benefit	10 -14	15 - 19	20 - 25	26	Total		
=<\$100	2.0%	1.2%	0.9%	0.7%	4.8%		=<\$100	1.7%	1.3%	0.8%	0.5%	4.3%		
\$101 - \$200	4.4%	4.6%	3.8%	3.0%	15.7%	\$243	\$101 - \$200	4.3%	4.1%	3.5%	2.1%	13.9%	\$263	8.2%
\$201- \$280	2.7%	4.2%	5.4%	8.4%	20.6%		\$201 - \$305	3.3%	5.2%	8.3%	6.8%	23.6%		
\$281 Total	1.0%	3.5% 13.5%	0.9% 17.0%	47.3% 59.5%	58.9% 100.0%		\$300 Total	10.3%	4.170 14 7%	8.2% 20.7%	44.9% 54.2%	58.2% 100.0%		
Monufacturing	10.075	10.075	11.070	05.070	100.070		IUlai	10.070	17.770	40.170	JT.27	100.070		
Banafit in	l Du	ration (Week	es of Eligibili	fv)				Dura	tion (Week	s of Eligibi	ilitv)			
2003 Dollars	10 -14	15 - 19	20 - 25	26	Total		Benefit	10 -14	15 - 19	20 - 25	26	Total		
=<\$100	1.6%	1.9%	1.5%	1.2%	6.3%		=<\$100	1.1%	1.3%	1.0%	0.7%	4.1%		
\$101 - \$200	2.8%	4.3%	6.6%	7.3%	21.0%	\$234	\$101 - \$200	2.5%	3.8%	4.8%	4.5%	15.6%	\$262	12.0%
\$201- \$280	1.4%	2.2%	5.0%	10.3%	18.9%		\$201 - \$305	1.3%	2.7%	8.5%	9.0%	21.5%		
\$281	0.3%	1.2%	3.0%	49.2%	53.8%		\$306	0.2%	1.7%	4.6%	52.4%	58.8%		
	0.170	9./70	10.270	60.070	100.070		Total	5.0%	9.470	10.070	00.770	100.070		
Transportation,	Dimmunicacio	ns, to rubit	Othities		i			I Dura	· · · · · /W1	- C 7014-016-0				
Benefit in 2003 Dollars	Du 10 -14	ration (Week 15 - 19	s of Eligibilit 20 - 25	ty) 26	Total		Benefit	Durat 10 -14	15 - 19	20 - 25	ility) 26	Total		
=<\$100	0.7%	0.9%	0.9%	0.7%	3.2%		=<\$100	0.7%	0.8%	1.1%	0.8%	3.4%		
\$101 - \$200	1.6%	2.2%	3.4%	4.0%	11.2%	\$255	\$101 - \$200	1.8%	2.7%	3.7%	3.1%	11.3%	\$272	6.6%
\$201- \$280	1.0%	1.8%	4.0%	5.5%	12.3%		\$201 - \$305	1.6%	2.9%	6.6%	6.6%	17.8%		
\$281	0.3%	1.1%	3.5%	68.4%	73.3%		\$306	0.4%	2.0%	4.5%	60.6%	67.6%		
Total	3.6%	6.1%	11.8%	78.5%	100.0%		Total	4.6%	8.4%	15.9%	71.1%	100.0%		
Wholesale Trade														
Benefit in 2003 Dollars	Du 10-14	ration (Week 15 - 19	s of Eligibilit	ty) 26	Total		Bonofit	Durat 10 -14	tion (Week 15 - 19	s of Eligibi	ility) 26	Total		
=<\$100	1.0%	1.9%	2.1%	1.5%	6.6%		=<\$100	1.2%	1.6%	1.7%	0.8%	5.2%		
\$101 - \$200	2.0%	3.4%	5.1%	7.0%	17.5%	\$239	\$101 - \$200	1.9%	2.7%	4.2%	4.1%	12.9%	\$264	10.5%
\$201- \$280	0.7%	1.5%	4.7%	10.6%	17.5%		\$201 - \$305	1.1%	2.0%	7.3%	10.3%	20.8%		
\$281	0.1%	1.1%	2.7%	54.6%	58.5%		\$306	0.2%	1.3%	5.1%	54.4%	61.1%		
Total	3.9%	7.9%	14.6%	73.6%	100.0%		Total	4.4%	7.6%	18.4%	69.7%	100.0%		
Retail Trade	1			ı.	ı			1						
Benefit in 2003 Dollars	Du 10 - 14	ration (Week 15 - 19	s of Eligibilit 20 - 25	ty) 26	Total		Benefit	Durat 10 -14	tion (Week 15 - 19	s of Eligibi 20 - 25	ility) 26	Total		
=<\$100	5.7%	8.6%	9.8%	4.2%	28.3%		=<\$100	4.7%	7.6%	7.4%	2.8%	22.4%		
\$101 - \$200	4.0%	7.3%	14.1%	14.6%	40.0%	\$161	\$101 - \$200	5.1%	8.5%	14.2%	9.9%	37.8%	\$181	12.4%
\$201- \$280	0.6%	1.5%	4.4%	7.0%	13.5%		\$201 - \$305	1.4%	3.0%	8.4%	8.4%	21.2%		
\$281 Totol	0.2%	0.5%	1.7%	15.7%	18.2%		\$306 Totol	0.2%	1.0%	2.6%	14.8%	18.6%		
a AWP Average We	oldu Ponofitui	17.9%	30.0%	41.0%	100.0%	w and awn	10tal	II.5%	20.0%	32.6%	35.9%	100.0%	\$0.91	
(inflation adjusted)	and the 2003	maximum we	ekly benefit a	mount was \$	r Price inde	x and exp	ressed in 2003 d	.ollars. The	1993 maxi	mum weeki	ly benefit a	mount was	\$281	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			5											
											(Tabl	e continu	ied on p	age 14)

(Table 4 Continued from page 13)

Percentage of UI Eligible Workers in 1993:

Percentage of UI Eligible Workers in 2003:

Finance, Insurance, & Real Estate

Benefit in	Du	Duration (Weeks of Eligibility)						Dura	tion (Week	s of Eligib			AWB	
2003 Dollars	10 -14	15 - 19	20 - 25	26	Total	AWB ^a	Benefit	10 -14	15 - 19	20 - 25	26	Total	AWB ^a	% Change
=<\$100	2.1%	2.3%	2.3%	2.4%	9.2%		=<\$100	1.2%	1.6%	1.8%	2.1%	6.6%		
\$101 - \$200	3.1%	4.4%	8.0%	13.8%	29.3%	\$215	\$101 - \$200	2.0%	3.3%	6.6%	8.5%	20.4%	\$243	13.0%
\$201- \$280	0.9%	1.6%	6.3%	15.1%	24.0%		\$201 - \$305	1.1%	2.4%	9.7%	15.6%	28.8%		
\$281	0.2%	0.6%	2.5%	34.3%	37.5%		\$306	0.2%	0.8%	4.2%	38.9%	44.2%		
Total	6.4%	8.9%	19.2%	65.6%	100.0%		Total	4.5%	8.1%	22.3%	65.2%	100.0%		

Services

Benefit in	Du	ration (Weel	s of Eligibili	ty)				Dura	tion (Week	s of Eligib	ility)			
2003 Dollars	10 -14	15 - 19	20 - 25	26	Total		Benefit	10 -14	15 - 19	20 - 25	26	Total		
=<\$100	3.0%	4.1%	4.6%	2.0%	13.7%		=<\$100	2.6%	3.4%	3.3%	1.5%	10.8%		
\$101 - \$200	3.5%	5.4%	10.5%	9.4%	28.8%	\$207	\$101 - \$200	4.5%	5.9%	8.8%	6.0%	25.2%	\$229	10.6%
\$201- \$280	0.9%	2.0%	4.8%	9.3%	17.0%		\$201 - \$305	2.1%	4.1%	7.4%	8.7%	22.3%		
\$281	0.3%	1.0%	2.6%	36.7%	40.5%		\$306	0.4%	2.5%	4.9%	33.9%	41.7%		
Total	7.7%	12.5%	22.4%	57.4%	100.0%		Total	9.6%	15.8%	24.4%	50.2%	100.0%		

Public Administration^b

Benefit in	Du	Duration (Weeks of Eligibility)						Dura	tion (Week	s of Eligib				
2003 Dollars	10 -14	15 - 19	20 - 25	26	Total		Benefit	10 -14	15 - 19	20 - 25	26	Total		
=<\$100	1.8%	1.2%	1.2%	1.1%	5.3%		=<\$100	1.2%	1.0%	1.0%	0.5%	3.7%		
\$101 - \$200	1.9%	2.1%	3.3%	9.3%	16.6%	\$239	\$101 - \$200	1.5%	2.0%	2.6%	4.1%	10.1%	\$271	13.4%
\$201- \$280	0.5%	1.1%	3.2%	22.3%	27.0%		\$201 - \$305	0.7%	1.5%	3.8%	17.2%	23.2%		
\$281	0.2%	0.6%	1.6%	48.8%	51.2%		\$306	0.1%	0.7%	2.9%	59.3%	63.1%		
Total	4.4%	4.9%	9.3%	81.4%	100.0%		Total	3.5%	5.2%	10.2%	81.0%	100.0%		

^aAWB - Average Weekly Benefit; inflation adjusted based on the Consumer Price index and expressed in 2003 dollars. The 1993 maximum weekly benefit amount was \$281 (inflation adjusted) and the 2003 maximum weekly benefit amount was \$306.

^bExcludes federal government.







percentage points (62.0% to 56.4%) from 1993 to 2003 (see Table 3 and Figure 8, pages 10 and 12). This decrease took place in all industries with larger decreases occurring in Mining (-7.9%),

TCPU (-7.4%), and Services (-7.2%; see Table 4, pages 13 and 14).

The potential average weekly benefit amount varies greatly across industries



(see Table 4, pages 13 and 14). For example in 2003, the average weekly benefit was \$293 in Mining but only \$181 in Retail Trade. The average weekly benefit amount increased in all industries from 1993 to 2003, but the pace of growth was different among industries. After adjusting the 1993 amounts for inflation, the smallest growth was 6.6 percent (from \$255 per week to \$272 per week) in TCPU and the largest was 13.4 percent (from \$239 per week to \$271 per week) in Public Administration.

Wage Replacement Rate

The wage replacement rate shows the proportion of the unemployed workers' pre-unemployment weekly wage that would have been replaced by the weekly UI benefit. A higher wage replacement rate means more stable purchasing power during unemployment. We used the average weekly wage during 1993Q2 and 2003Q2.

Only about 20 percent of Wyoming UI eligible workers would have been able to obtain a 70 percent or higher wage replacement rate had they lost jobs in 1993Q3 or 2003Q3 (see Figure 13, page 18). More than one-half of the workers in Mining in 1993 would have had less than a 30 percent wage replacement rate. This proportion decreased in 2003, but still exceeded 40 percent. Only about 20 percent of Mining workers would have had a wage replacement rate of 50 percent or higher. In contrast, more than 70 percent of workers in Retail Trade or



Agriculture would have received a 50 percent or higher wage replacement rate and close to 30 percent would have obtained a wage replacement rate of 70 percent or higher. Nearly 60 percent of male workers, compared with 35 percent or fewer female workers, would have wage replacement rates of less than 50 percent (see Figure 14, page 19). More younger and older workers would have obtained higher wage replacement rates than the middle age groups (see Figure 15, see page 20). Of workers 65 or older, 62.6 percent of them in 1993 and 37.6 percent in 2003 would have received a 70 percent or higher wage replacement rate, but only



about 12 percent of those between ages 35 to 44 could have matched this replacement rate each year.

In general, the higher the weekly wage a worker earned before being laid off, the lower the wage replacement rate the individual would be able to receive and vice versa (see Figure 16, page 21). However, this was not always the case. As shown in Figure 16, some workers earned the same level of preunemployment weekly wages as other workers but would receive totally different wage replacement rates (varies from less than 20% to 100%). One of the main reasons for this difference is that the weekly benefit amount an individual would qualify for is based on 4% of his/her high quarter wage in the base period. In other words, those who worked in a more seasonal industry earning large unevenly distributed quarterly wages throughout the year would likely receive



a higher weekly UI benefit amount than those who worked in a less seasonal industry with stable quarterly wages, even if they earned the same amount of wages in the base period or had the same weekly wages before layoff. The two examples in Table 5 (see page 22) show the differences in terms of UI eligibility based on current UI benefit formulas for seasonal and non-seasonal workers with the same wage level. In Example 1, Worker A is a non-seasonal worker who earned the same quarterly wage of \$2,500 during each of the four quarters in the base period. Worker B is a seasonal worker (only worked two quarters a year) who earned \$2,500 in the second quarter and \$7,500 in the



third quarter. Both had the same total base period wage of \$10,000 and the same weekly wage of \$192. If they lost their jobs, seasonal Worker B would be eligible for a \$300 UI benefit per week, resulting in a 100 percent weekly wage replacement rate; while Worker A would only be eligible for \$100 per week, which amounts to a 52 percent wage replacement rate. Worker B would only be eligible for 10 weeks of UI benefits while Worker A would be eligible for 26 weeks. Worker B would still get \$400 more than Worker A in terms of maximum UI benefits for the benefit year under the regular UI program. Example 2 tells a story similar to Example 1, only at a higher wage income level (\$24,000 total base period wage). The results show that seasonal Worker B would collect \$66

more in UI benefits per week and \$960 more in UI benefits in the benefit year than Worker A. If the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation (TEUC; U.S. Department of Labor) program is in effect as in 2003 (or another extended benefits program), seasonal Worker B in Example 1 above would likely collect another 13 weeks of benefits or \$3,900 (\$300 * 13) before Worker A even finishes collecting regular UI benefits.As shown in these examples, the current UI system favors seasonal workers.

Discussion

Our study shows that in both 1993 and 2003 nearly 77 percent of Wyoming workers would qualify for UI benefits if

Table 5: Comparison of Insurance (UI) Eligibili	of Same Wage ity Based on	e Level Wyo Current Ul	oming Non Benefit Fo	-seasonal ormula	(Worker A) a	nd Season	ul (Woi	ker B)	Work	er's Unemp	loyment	
		Base Peri	od Wages	d Wages		se Base P ge Aver:	Base Period Average		al in	Average Weekly Wage in	Weekly Benefit Amount	Final WBA (max=\$
	2002Q2	2002Q3	2002Q4	2003Q1	(BW)	Weekly	Wage	2003	Q2	2003Q2	(WBA)	306)
Example 1:												
Worker A:	\$2,500	\$2,500	\$2,500	\$2,500	\$10,0	00	\$192	\$2,	500	\$192	\$100	\$100
Worker B:	\$2,500	\$7,500	\$0	\$0	\$10,0	00	\$192	\$2,	500	\$192	\$300	\$300
Benefit Difference:												\$200
Example 2:												
Worker A:	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$24,0	00	\$462	\$6,	000	\$462	\$240	\$240
Worker B:	\$6,000	\$12,000	\$6,000	\$0	\$24,0	00	\$462	\$6,	000	\$462	\$480	\$306
Benefit Difference:												\$66
	V	,										
	Not carried fi colunm ab WBA (ma	te: rom last ove Final x=\$306)	Maxin Bene Amou (26*final	Maximum Benefit Amount1		Final MB	We		We Rep Rate 2003	ekly Wage blacement e Based on 302's Wage		
		,	(,	(,			5.010		<u>t</u> 8-		
Worker A:		\$100		\$2,600	\$3,000	\$2.60	0	26		52.0%		
Worker B:		\$100		\$7,800	\$3,000	\$3.00	0	10	156	5%>100%		
Benefit Difference:		\$200		<i></i> ,000	40,000	\$40	0					
		• • • •										
Example 2:												
Worker A:		\$240		\$6,240	\$7,200	\$6,24	0	26		52.0%		
Worker B:		\$306		\$7,956	\$7,200	\$7,20	0	24		66.3%		
Benefit Difference:		\$66				\$96	0					

MBA - Maximum Benefit Amount.

Note: If the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation (TEUC) is in effect, the seasonal worker (B) would likely receive 13 weeks more in benefits than worker (A).

they lost their jobs involuntarily. However, only 20 percent of them would receive a 70 percent or higher wage replacement rate. In general, low paying industries had a larger percentage of workers who would not qualify for UI benefits than high paying industries. Workers in lower paying industries also had a much smaller chance of receiving the maximum UI benefit than those working in higher paying industries. Individual workers with high wages generally receive lower wage replacement rates due to the limitation of the weekly benefit amount. Statewide, the proportion of workers who would have been eligible for the maximum UI benefit decreased slightly from 1993 to 2003. The proportion of workers eligible for the maximum UI duration fell in all industries, with the largest decreases in Mining, TCPU, and Services. In addition, the current UI system appears to support seasonal workers more than non-seasonal workers. In other words, those who worked in a more seasonal industry earning unevenly distributed quarterly wages throughout the year would more likely receive a higher weekly UI benefit amount and total UI benefits than those who worked in a less seasonal industry with stable quarterly wages, even if they earned the same amount of wages in the base period or had the same weekly wages before layoff.

The UI program has been in operation since 1935. The primary purpose is to provide temporary financial support to unemployed workers if they involuntarily separate from their employment. Unfortunately, the same benefit amount may have different consequences among unemployed workers since their living standards could vary largely based on their pre-unemployment wage levels. For example, while the current maximum weekly UI benefit amount of \$305 may take care of a large part of one worker's basic living expenses (rent, food, gas, etc.), that amount may not even cover another's monthly house payment. This research does not judge whether the current UI system functions well or not, or determine a reasonable benefit level. It provides information on the potential outcomes under the current UI system, the proportion of Wyoming workers eligible for UI and for various UI benefit levels, and differences among industries, age groups, and sex of workers. We present UI policy makers, legislators, and others with insights into the current UI system to assist them when faced with future UI decisions. For a complete picture, UI

eligibility studies may need to be conducted periodically in the future.

References

- Glover, T. (2001a, April). Enhancing the quality of Wage Records for analysis through imputation: Part one. Wyoming Labor Force Trends. Casper, WY: Wyoming Department of Employment, Research & Planning.
- Glover, T. (2001b, June). Enhancing the quality of Wage Records for analysis through imputation: Part two. Wyoming Labor Force Trends. Casper, WY: Wyoming Department of Employment, Research & Planning.
- U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2004, October 19). *Consumer Price Index, all urban consumers, U.S. city average, all items* [Table]. Retrieved March 24, 2004, from ftp://ftp.bls.gov/pub/special. requests/cpi/cpiai.txt
- U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration. (n.d.) *Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation.* Retrieved March 24, 2004, from http://workforcesecurity. doleta.gov/unemploy/factsheetteuc.asp
- Wyoming Employment Security Law, W.S. § 27-3-306(d)(i) (1993).