

Analysis of Unemployment Insurance Program

Claimant Demographic Data

State Fiscal Year 2015-16

November 2017

Study conducted by

Survey and Applied Research Section
Audit & Evaluation Division
Policy, Accountability and Compliance Branch
Danell Brewster, MPPA
Michael Wright, MA

For

Equal Employment Opportunity Office
Employment Development Department

Acknowledgements

The Research Team

Danell Brewster, MPPA	Research Program Specialist II, Survey and Applied Research Section, Audit and Evaluation Division, Policy, Accountability and Compliance Branch
Michael Wright, MA	Research Program Specialist I, Survey and Applied Research Section, Audit and Evaluation Division, Policy, Accountability and Compliance Branch
Susan Ayres, MA	Research Manager II, Survey and Applied Research Section, Audit and Evaluation Division, Policy, Accountability and Compliance Branch

Special thanks to:

Julie Bloomquist	Unemployment Insurance Support Division, Unemployment Insurance Branch
Erika Knutson	Unemployment Insurance Support Division, Unemployment Insurance Branch
Alicia Stansbury	Unemployment Insurance Support Division, Unemployment Insurance Branch
Cheryl Swope	Business Intelligence Competency Center, Technology Governance Division, Information Technology Branch
Brian Tanimoto	Unemployment Insurance Support Division, Unemployment Insurance Branch
Le Truong	Unemployment Insurance Support Division, Unemployment Insurance Branch

The Survey and Applied Research Section thanks all who participated in this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	1
RESULTS BY RESEARCH QUESTION	2
METHODOLOGY	7
RESULTS	8
Overall Single Claimant Claims Processed by Protected Groups.....	8
Total Number of New Initial Claims	8
Total Number of Additional Claims.....	10
Total Number of New Initial and Additional Claims	12
Single Claimant Monetary Determinations by Protected Groups Overall.....	14
Single Claimant Non-Monetary Determinations by Protected Groups Overall.....	18
Single Claimant Non-Monetary Determination Disqualifications by Protected Groups: Separation Issues.....	22
Voluntary Quit Issues	22
Discharge for Misconduct Issues	25
All Other Separation Issues.....	29
Single Claimant Non-Monetary Determination Disqualifications by Protected Groups: Non-Separation Issues.....	32
Able, Available, and Actively Seeking Work Issues.....	32
Disqualifying or Deductible Income Issues.....	36
Refusal of Suitable Work Issues	40
Reporting Requirement Issues	43
All Other Non-Separation Issues	46

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Unemployment Insurance (UI) program administrators are directed to conduct statistical or other quantifiable data analyses of demographic records and data to determine whether their UI programs and activities are being conducted in a nondiscriminatory way. To address potential discrimination against clients once they enter California's UI program, we examined claims filed, monetary determinations, and non-monetary determinations data from July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016 (FY2015-16). If there was systemic discrimination in our UI program against people in protected groups such as race/ethnicity, gender, disability, or age, we would expect them to have statistically significant different disqualification or eligibility outcomes.

These analyses suggest no systemic discrimination against California's UI claimants based on race/ethnicity, gender, or disability in overall eligibility/disqualification outcomes on monetary determinations in FY2015-16. For the first time, we found a small practical difference by age, with more ineligibility determinations than expected for the *50 and older* group.

We found no systemic discrimination against California's UI claimants based on race/ethnicity, gender, disability, or age in overall eligibility/disqualification outcomes for non-monetary determinations. However, when broken to issue type, analyses of non-monetary determination outcomes revealed small practical significant differences in disqualification rates, more specifically outlined below. Although the practical effect is small on all of these issue types, the Department will conduct this examination annually to determine whether the small differences found persist through consecutive years and take any needed action.

Voluntary Quit: Although not a protected group, the youngest group had more disqualifications than expected (see page 24), a result also seen in the prior years analyzed (FY2012-13, FY2013-14, and FY2014-15).

Misconduct: The youngest group had more disqualifications than expected, as also seen in FY2013-14 and FY2014-15. (See page 28.) We also found a small practical significant difference for the *Hispanic* group, who had more disqualifications than expected, a result not seen in prior years. (See pages 25-26.)

Disqualifying or Deductible Income: We found a small practical significant difference affecting the two youngest groups, who had more disqualifications than expected (see page 39), as similarly seen in prior years. (In FY2014-15 all three younger groups had more disqualifications than expected; in FY2013-14 the youngest group had more than expected.) We also found a small practical significant difference for the *Black not Hispanic* and *Hispanic* groups, who had more disqualifications than expected, a result which persists from FY2014-15. (See pages 36-37.)

Reporting Requirements: The youngest group had more disqualifications than expected, as also seen in FY2013-14 and FY2014-15. (See page 45.)

All Other Non-Separation Issues: The youngest group had more disqualifications than expected, as also seen in FY2013-14 but not in FY2014-15. (See page 48.)

RESULTS BY RESEARCH QUESTION

Overall Single Claimant Claims Processed by Protected Groups

Total number of new initial claims made by race/ethnicity, gender, disability, and age.

- See pages 8-9 for results.

Total number of additional initial claims made by race/ethnicity, gender, disability, and age.

- See pages 10-11 for results.

Total number of new initial claims (new and additional) made by race/ethnicity, gender, disability, and age.

- See pages 12-13 for results.

Single Claimant Monetary Determinations by Protected Groups

Total number of monetary determinations made by race/ethnicity, gender, disability, and age are shown in the shaded “Total Cases” columns of tabulated results.

- See pages 14-17 for results.

Research questions for monetary determinations resulting in ineligibility by race/ethnicity, gender, disability, or age:

- **Is there a significant difference in eligibility for members of different racial/ethnic groups? If so, which ones and how do they differ?** There were no practical significant differences in claim eligibility by race/ethnicity.
- **Is there a significant difference in eligibility for members of different gender groups? If so, which ones and how do they differ?** There were no practical significant differences in claim eligibility by gender.
- **Is there a significant difference in eligibility for clients with a disability and those without one? If so, how do they differ?** There were no practical significant differences in claim eligibility by disability status.
- **Is there a significant difference in eligibility by age? If so, which ones and how do they differ?** We found a small practical significant difference in outcomes by age, with more ineligibility determinations than expected for the 50 and older group, a result not observed in prior analyses.

Single Claimant Non-Monetary Determinations by Protected Groups Overall

Total number of non-monetary determinations made by race/ethnicity, gender, disability, and age are shown in the shaded “Total Cases” columns of tabulated results.

- See pages 18-21 for results.

Research questions for non-monetary determination disqualification outcomes overall by race/ethnicity, gender, disability status, and age:

- **Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes for members of different racial/ethnic groups? If so, which ones and how do they differ?** There were no practical significant differences in disqualification outcomes overall by race/ethnicity.

- **Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes for different genders? If so, how do they differ?** There were no practical significant differences in disqualification outcomes overall by gender.
- **Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes for clients with a disability and those without one? If so, how do they differ?** There were no practical significant differences in disqualification outcomes overall by disability status.
- **Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes by age? If so, which ones and how do they differ?** There were no practical significant differences in disqualification outcomes overall by age.

Single Claimant Non-Monetary Determination Totals by Protected Groups: Separation Issues

Total number of non-monetary determinations made by race/ethnicity, gender, disability, and age are shown in the shaded “Total Cases” columns of tabulated results.

- Refer to the Table of Contents for results by issue type.

Research questions for disqualification outcomes by race/ethnicity, gender, disability status, and age in non-monetary determinations regarding separation from work issues:

Voluntary Quit

- **Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes for members of different racial/ethnic groups? If so, which ones and how do they differ?** There were no practical significant differences in disqualification outcomes by race/ethnicity.
- **Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes for different genders? If so, how do they differ?** There were no practical significant differences in disqualification outcomes by gender.
- **Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes for clients with a disability and those without one? If so, how do they differ?** There were no practical significant differences in disqualification outcomes by disability status.
- **Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes by age? If so, which ones and how do they differ?** We found a small practical significant difference in disqualification outcomes by age; the youngest group (up to 27) had more disqualifications on voluntary quit issues than expected. Although not a protected group, the youngest group also had more disqualifications in the prior years analyzed (FY2012-13, FY2013-14, and FY2014-15).

Discharge for Misconduct

- **Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes for members of different racial/ethnic groups? If so, which ones and how do they differ?** We found a small practical significant difference in disqualification outcomes by race/ethnicity; the Hispanic group had more disqualifications on misconduct issues than expected, a result not seen in the prior years analyzed.
- **Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes for different genders? If so, how do they differ?** There were no practical significant differences in disqualification outcomes by gender.

- **Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes for clients with a disability and those without one? If so, how do they differ?** There were no practical significant differences in disqualification outcomes by disability status.
- **Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes by age? If so, which ones and how do they differ?** We found a small practical significant difference in disqualification outcomes by age; the youngest group (up to 27) had more disqualifications on misconduct issues than expected, as also observed in FY2013-14 and FY2014-15.

All Other Separation Issues

- **Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes for members of different racial/ethnic groups? If so, which ones and how do they differ?** There were no practical significant differences in disqualification outcomes by race/ethnicity.
- **Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes for different genders? If so, how do they differ?** There were no practical significant differences in disqualification outcomes by gender.
- **Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes for clients with a disability and those without one? If so, how do they differ?** There were no practical significant differences in disqualification outcomes by disability status.
- **Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes by age? If so, which ones and how do they differ?** There were no practical significant differences in disqualification outcomes by age.

Single Claimant Non-Monetary Determination Totals by Protected Groups: Non-Separation Issues

Total number of non-monetary determinations made by race/ethnicity, gender, disability, and age are shown in the shaded “Total Cases” columns of tabulated results.

- Refer to the Table of Contents for results by issue type.

Research questions for disqualification outcomes by race/ethnicity, gender, disability status, and age in non-monetary determinations for non-separation from work issues:

Able, Available, and Actively Seeking Work

- **Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes for members of different racial/ethnic groups? If so, which ones and how do they differ?** There were no practical significant differences in disqualification outcomes by race/ethnicity.
- **Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes for different genders? If so, how do they differ?** There were no practical significant differences in disqualification outcomes by gender.
- **Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes for clients with a disability and those without one? If so, how do they differ?** There were no practical significant differences in disqualification outcomes by disability status.
- **Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes by age? If so, which ones and how do they differ?** There were no practical significant differences in disqualification outcomes by age.

Disqualifying or Deductible Income

- **Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes for members of different racial/ethnic groups? If so, which ones and how do they differ?** We found a small practical significant difference in disqualification outcomes by race/ethnicity. The *Black not Hispanic* and *Hispanic* groups had more disqualifications than expected, a result which persists from FY2014-15.
- **Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes for different genders? If so, how do they differ?** There were no practical significant differences in disqualification outcomes by gender.
- **Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes for clients with a disability and those without one? If so, how do they differ?** There were no practical significant differences in disqualification outcomes by disability status.
- **Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes by age? If so, which ones and how do they differ?** We found a small practical significant difference affecting the two youngest groups, who had more disqualification outcomes on disqualifying or deductible income issues than expected, as similarly seen in prior years. (In FY2014-15 all three younger groups had more disqualifications than expected; in FY2013-14 the youngest group had more than expected.)

Refusal of Suitable Work

- **Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes for members of different racial/ethnic groups? If so, which ones and how do they differ?** There were no practical significant differences in disqualification outcomes by race/ethnicity.
- **Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes for different genders? If so, how do they differ?** There were no practical significant differences in disqualification outcomes by gender.
- **Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes for clients with a disability and those without one? If so, how do they differ?** There were no practical significant differences in disqualification outcomes by disability status.
- **Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes by age? If so, which ones and how do they differ?** There were no practical significant differences in disqualification outcomes by age.

Reporting Requirements

- **Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes for members of different racial/ethnic groups? If so, which ones and how do they differ?** There were no practical significant differences in disqualification outcomes by race/ethnicity.
- **Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes for different genders? If so, how do they differ?** There were no practical significant differences in disqualification outcomes by gender.
- **Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes for clients with a disability and those without one? If so, how do they differ?** There were no practical significant differences in disqualification outcomes by disability status.
- **Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes by age? If so, which ones and how do they differ?** We found a small practical significant difference in disqualification outcomes by age; the youngest group had more disqualifications than expected, a result also observed in FY2013-14 and FY2014-15.

All Other Non-Separation Issues

- **Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes for members of different racial/ethnic groups? If so, which ones and how do they differ?** There were no practical significant differences in disqualification outcomes by race/ethnicity.
- **Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes for different genders? If so, how do they differ?** There were no practical significant differences in disqualification outcomes by gender.
- **Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes for clients with a disability and those without one? If so, how do they differ?** There were no practical significant differences in disqualification outcomes by disability status.
- **Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes by age? If so, which ones and how do they differ?** We found a small practical significant difference in disqualification outcomes by age; the youngest group had more disqualifications than expected on all other non-separation issues, a result also seen in FY2013-14 but not in FY2014-15.

METHODOLOGY

The Business Intelligence Competency Center within the Employment Development Department provided monetary and non-monetary determinations data for all initial and additional UI claims opened or reopened from July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016 (FY2015-16). This data included 3,163,168 records.

For single claimant claims processed and monetary determinations, the level of analysis was each claim. However, since claimants may have more than one non-monetary determination interview during their claim period, each with potentially different outcomes (disqualification or eligibility), the level of analysis for comparing non-monetary determination outcomes was each interview. Many interviews were only for clarification purposes in which eligibility or disqualification were not possible outcomes; clarification interviews were therefore excluded from analysis.

Some records did not have associated demographic information (age, gender, disability status, or race/ethnicity); we performed determination outcome analyses only on interviews for which we had both demographic and eligibility data.

SAR Section researchers measured the strength of association between overall outcomes and demographic characteristics to evaluate differences of practical significance. We used the Chi-Square Test of Independence and Cramer's V or Phi coefficient to measure association and determine the practical significant differences between groups on outcome indicators. We used the Mann-Whitney U test on age instead of a *t*-test, due to the non-normal distribution of the data. Researchers performed additional tests when practical significant differences appeared by the Chi-square Tests of Independence and minimum effect sizes (Cramer's V¹ or Phi > .10). Where the minimum effect size value exceeded .10, indicating a practical significant difference, we used the adjusted residual (a type of standard deviation) to evaluate differences between specific groups within the analysis.

¹ According to AcaStat's Applied Statistics Desktop Reference, Cramer's V is useful for comparing multiple Chi-Square test statistics and is generalizable across contingency tables of varying sizes. It is interpreted as a measure of the relative strength of an association between two variables. The coefficient ranges from 0 to 1 (perfect association). In practice, a Cramer's V of .10 provides a good minimum threshold for suggesting there is a substantive relationship between two variables. Values between .10-.29 (small association) .30-.49 (moderate association), .50+ (large association).
<http://www.acastat.com/statbook/statbook.html>

RESULTS

Overall Single Claimant Claims Processed by Protected Groups

Total number of new initial claims made by race/ethnicity, gender, disability, or age.

Race/Ethnicity

Table 1

Total New Claims by Combined Races/Ethnicities

Combined Races/Ethnicities	Frequency	Percent
White not Hispanic	261919	32.2
Black not Hispanic	66861	8.2
Hispanic	328805	40.4
American Indian or Alaskan Native, Hawaiian, Guamanian, Pacific Islander, Samoan	13043	1.6
Other Asian, Cambodian, Asian Indian, Japanese, Korean, Laotian	26532	3.3
Other	78052	9.6
Chinese	11930	1.5
Filipino	17619	2.2
Vietnamese	8358	1.0
Total	813119	100.0

Gender

Table 2

Total New Claims by Gender

Gender	Frequency	Percent
Female	348607	42.8
Male	465815	57.2
Total	814422	100.0

Disability Status

Table 3

Total New Claims by Disability Status

Disability Status	Frequency	Percent
No disability	741574	97.3
With a disability	20611	2.7
Total	762185	100.0

Age

Table 4

Total New Claims by Age Quartile

Age Quartile	Frequency	Percent
Up to 27	129863	28.5
28 thru 36	115432	25.3
37 thru 49	109724	24.1
50 and older	101077	22.2
Total	456096	100.0

Total number of additional initial claims made by race/ethnicity, gender, disability, or age.

Race/Ethnicity

Table 5

Total Additional Claims by Combined Races/Ethnicities

Combined Races/Ethnicities	Frequency	Percent
White not Hispanic	100668	31.2
Black not Hispanic	22788	7.1
Hispanic	138436	42.9
American Indian or Alaskan Native, Hawaiian, Guamanian, Pacific Islander, Samoan	4602	1.4
Other Asian, Cambodian, Asian Indian, Japanese, Korean, Laotian	7879	2.4
Other	36304	11.2
Chinese	3872	1.2
Filipino	5565	1.7
Vietnamese	2780	.9
Total	322894	100.0

Gender

Table 6

Total Additional Claims by Gender

Gender	Frequency	Percent
Female	128308	39.7
Male	194767	60.3
Total	323075	100.0

Disability Status

Table 7

Total Additional Claims by Disability Status

Disability Status	Frequency	Percent
No disability	295438	98.3
With a disability	5162	1.7
Total	300600	100.0

Age

Table 8

Total Additional Claims by Age Quartile

Age Quartiles	Frequency	Percent
Up to 27	33666	22.8
28 thru 36	35275	23.9
37 thru 49	38111	25.8
50 and older	40442	27.4
Total	147494	100.0

Total number of new initial claims (new and additional) made by race/ethnicity, gender, disability, or age.

Race/Ethnicity

Table 9

Total New and Additional Claims by Combined Races/Ethnicities

Combined Races/Ethnicities	Frequency	Percent
White not Hispanic	362587	31.9
Black not Hispanic	89649	7.9
Hispanic	467241	41.1
American Indian or Alaskan Native, Hawaiian, Guamanian, Pacific Islander, Samoan	17645	1.6
Other Asian, Cambodian, Asian Indian, Japanese, Korean, Laotian	34411	3.0
Other	114356	10.1
Chinese	15802	1.4
Filipino	23184	2.0
Vietnamese	11138	1.0
Total	1136013	100.0

Gender

Table 10

Total New and Additional Claims by Gender

Gender	Frequency	Percent
Female	476915	41.9
Male	660582	58.1
Total	1137497	100.0

Disability Status

Table 11

**Total New and Additional Claims
by Disability Status**

Disability Status	Frequency	Percent
No disability	1037012	97.6
With a disability	25773	2.4
Total	1062785	100.0

Age

Table 12

Total New and Additional Claims by Age Quartile

Age Quartile	Frequency	Percent
Up to 27	163529	27.1
28 thru 36	150707	25.0
37 thru 49	147835	24.5
50 and older	141519	23.4
Total	603590	100.0

Single Claimant Monetary Determinations by Protected Groups Overall

Total number of monetary determinations made by race/ethnicity, gender, disability, or age. The total monetary determinations made for each group appear in the shaded “Total Cases” column.

Total number of monetary determinations resulting in ineligibility by race/ethnicity, gender, disability, or age. The total monetary determinations resulting in ineligibility for each group appear in the “Ineligible” column.

Is there a significant difference in eligibility for members of different racial/ethnic groups? If so, which ones and how do they differ? Measures of association between claim eligibility outcomes and racial/ethnic group found no practical significant difference by race/ethnicity.

Table 13

Eligibility Outcomes for Monetary Determinations by Combined Races/Ethnicities

Combined Races/Ethnicities	Eligible	Ineligible	Total Cases
White not Hispanic	266288	178704	444992
	32.2%	29.9%	31.2%
Black not Hispanic	69040	62437	131477
	8.3%	10.5%	9.2%
Hispanic	334871	255102	589973
	40.4%	42.7%	41.4%
American Indian or Alaskan Native, Hawaiian, Guamanian, Pacific Islander, Samoan	13423	10158	23581
	1.6%	1.7%	1.7%
Other Asian, Cambodian, Asian Indian, Japanese, Korean, Laotian	26973	18934	45907
	3.3%	3.2%	3.2%
Other	79299	44694	123993
	9.6%	7.5%	8.7%
Chinese	12045	9147	21192
	1.5%	1.5%	1.5%
Filipino	17879	12059	29938
	2.2%	2.0%	2.1%
Vietnamese	8432	6104	14536
	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%
Total	828250	597339	1425589

Note: A Cramer’s V value of .056 on the Chi-square Test of Independence indicated no practical significant difference between groups on overall outcome. (Where value < .1, no or negligible association.)

Is there a significant difference in eligibility for members of different gender groups? If so, which ones and how do they differ? Measures of association between claim eligibility outcomes and gender found no practical significant difference by gender.

Table 14

Eligibility Outcomes for Monetary Determinations by Gender

Gender	Eligible	Ineligible	Total Cases
Female	355792	279591	635383
	42.9%	46.7%	44.5%
Male	473791	318825	792616
	57.1%	53.3%	55.5%
Total	829583	598416	1427999

Note: A Phi value of -.038 on the Chi-square Test of Independence indicated no practical significant difference between groups on overall outcome. (Where value > .1, no or negligible association.)

Is there a significant difference in eligibility for clients with a disability and those without one? If so, how do they differ? Measures of association between claim eligibility outcomes and disability status found no practical significant difference by disability status.

Table 15

Eligibility Outcomes for Monetary Determinations by Disability Status

Disability Status	Eligible	Ineligible	Total Cases
No disability	755425	549328	1304753
	97.3%	96.7%	97.0%
With a disability	21190	19006	40196
	2.7%	3.3%	3.0%
Total	776615	568334	1344949

Note: A Phi value of .018 on the Chi-square Test of Independence indicated no practical significant difference between groups on overall outcome. (Where value < .1, no or negligible association.)

Is there a significant difference in eligibility by age? If so, which ones and how do they differ? Testing with Mann-Whitney U* indicated a relationship between age and disqualification outcomes overall, showing the mean rank of ineligible cases to be higher (meaning older on average). However, these tests were unable to determine whether there is a practical significant difference. To better observe the strength of the relationship and more specifically account for differences with additional tests**, we grouped the cases into four equal age quartiles (see Table 16 below). Measures of association showed a small practical significant difference between the four age groups and eligibility outcomes on monetary determinations overall. Residual analyses showed the two oldest groups had proportionately more ineligibility determinations than expected. Additional testing confirmed that the higher incidence in the *50 and older* group largely accounted for the relationship indicated by the Cramer's V value. The differences between the other age groups were not practically significant.

Comparing to previous years analyzed (FY2012-13, 2013-14, and 2014-15), this is the first year that the older age group has been found to have an adverse practical significant difference (more ineligibility determinations) relative to the younger age groups.

*Mann-Whitney U test found an overall significant difference across ages for disqualification outcomes ($p < .05$). This test is equivalent to a *t*-test when data do not meet the *t*-test assumptions such as normal distribution and equal variances. Mann-Whitney U tests rank each value across the dataset from lowest to highest and sums these ranks for each group. It then compares the mean ranks for each group to determine a significant difference between them. However, this test does not assess the effect size of the difference to determine if it is a *practical* significant difference.

**Chi-square Test of Independence and Cramer's V.

Table 16
Age Quartiles

Age Statistics	Eligible	Ineligible	Total Cases
Number of cases	466064	250344	733189
Mean age	37.52	40.68	38.61
Median age	35.00	39.00	36.00
Std. Deviation around the mean age	13.031	13.735	13.363
Quartiles for age			
First quartile			Up to 27
Second quartile			28 thru 36
Third quartile			36 thru 49
Fourth quartile			50 and older

Note: The age quartiles bolded and shaded above were used for follow-up analyses. Not all cases received eligible/ineligible determinations; therefore, case totals varied by analyses.

Table 17

**Eligibility Outcomes for Monetary Determinations
by Age Groups**

Age Quartiles	Eligible	Ineligible	Total Cases
Up to 27	135083	52368	187451
	29.0%	20.9%	26.2%
Adjusted residual	74.1	-74.1 (less than expected)	
28 thru 36	117981	60718	178699
	25.3%	24.3%	24.9%
Adjusted residual	9.9	-9.9 (less than expected)	
37 thru 49	111120	64029	175149
	23.8%	25.6%	24.4%
Adjusted residual	-16.3	16.3 (more than expected)	
50 and older +*	101880	73229	175109
	21.9%	29.3%	24.4%
Adjusted residual	-69.4	69.4 (more than expected)	
Total	466064	250344	716408

Note: A Cramer's V value of .105 on the Chi-square Test of Independence indicated a small practical significant difference between groups on eligibility outcomes. Adjusted residuals above ± 2.0 are considered more or less than expected.

+* = had significantly more ineligible outcomes than expected.

Single Claimant Non-Monetary Determinations by Protected Groups Overall

For overall non-monetary determination disqualification outcomes by race/ethnicity, gender, disability status, and age:

Total number of non-monetary determinations made by race/ethnicity, gender, disability, or age. Total numbers of non-monetary determinations made appear in the shaded “Total Cases” column.

Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes for members of different racial/ethnic groups? If so, which ones and how do they differ? Measures of association between non-monetary disqualification outcomes overall and racial/ethnic group found no *practical* significant difference between these groups.

Table 18

Disqualification Outcomes by Combined Races/Ethnicities

Combined Races/Ethnicities	Disqualified	Eligible	Total Cases
White not Hispanic	125644	144911	270555
	30.1%	36.1%	33.0%
Black not Hispanic	51894	45139	97033
	12.4%	11.2%	11.9%
Hispanic	162840	136873	299713
	39.0%	34.1%	36.6%
American Indian or Alaskan Native, Hawaiian, Guamanian, Pacific Islander, Samoan	8454	6940	15394
	2.0%	1.7%	1.9%
Other Asian, Cambodian, Asian Indian, Japanese, Korean, Laotian	13625	13212	26837
	3.3%	3.3%	3.3%
Other	35842	35828	71670
	8.6%	8.9%	8.8%
Chinese	5257	5710	10967
	1.3%	1.4%	1.3%
Filipino	9701	8856	18557
	2.3%	2.2%	2.3%
Vietnamese	4160	3828	7988
	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%
Total	417417	401297	818714

Note: A Cramer’s V value of .070 on the Chi-square Test of Independence indicated no practical significant difference between groups on disqualification outcome. (Where value < .1, no or negligible association.)

Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes for different genders? If so, how do they differ? Measures of association between non-monetary disqualification outcomes overall and gender found no *practical* significant difference between the outcomes of males and females.

Table 19

Disqualification Outcomes by Gender

Gender	Disqualified	Eligible	Total Cases
Female	207283	189875	397158
	49.6%	47.1%	48.4%
Male	210582	213448	424030
	50.4%	52.9%	51.6%
Total	417865	403323	821188

Note: A Phi value of .025 on the Chi-square Test of Independence indicated no practical significant difference between groups on disqualification outcome. (Where value < .1, no or negligible association.)

Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes for clients with a disability and those without one? If so, how do they differ? Measures of association between non-monetary disqualification outcomes overall and disability status found no *practical* significant difference between the outcomes of people with or without disabilities.

Table 20

Disqualification Outcomes by Disability Status

Disability Status	Disqualified	Eligible	Total Cases
No disability	372324	360321	732645
	95.3%	96.0%	95.6%
With a disability	18522	14910	33432
	4.7%	4.0%	4.4%
Total	390846	375231	766077

Note: A Phi value of -.019 on the Chi-square Test of Independence indicated no practical significant difference between groups on disqualification outcome. (Where value > -.1, no or negligible association.)

Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes by age? If so, which ones and how do they differ? Testing with Mann-Whitney U* indicated a relationship between age and disqualification outcomes overall, showing the mean rank of disqualified cases to be lower (meaning younger on average). However, these tests were unable to determine whether there is a practical significant difference. To better observe the strength of the relationship and more specifically account for differences, we performed additional tests** using the age quartiles shown previously in Table 16. Measures of association showed no practical significant difference between the four age groups and non-monetary disqualification outcomes overall.

*Mann-Whitney U test found an overall significant difference across ages for disqualification outcomes ($p < .05$). This test is equivalent to a t -test when data do not meet the t -test assumptions such as normal distribution and equal variances. Mann-Whitney U tests rank each value across the dataset from lowest to highest and sums these ranks for each group. It then compares the mean ranks for each group to determine a significant difference between them. However, this test does not assess the effect size of the difference to determine if it is a *practical* significant difference.

**Chi-square Test of Independence and Cramer's V.

Table 21

Age Statistics by Disqualification Outcomes

Age Statistics	Disqualified	Eligible	Total Cases
Number of cases	418057	403504	821561
Mean age	36.93	39.14	38.01
Median age	34.00	37.00	35.00
Std. Deviation around the mean age	13.008	13.083	13.091

Table 22**Age Groups by Disqualification Outcomes**

Age Quartiles	Disqualified	Eligible	Total Cases
Up to 27	128222	94597	222819
	30.7%	23.4%	27.1%
28 thru 36	108431	104121	212552
	25.9%	25.8%	25.9%
37 thru 49	95810	103929	199739
	22.9%	25.8%	24.3%
50 and older	85594	100857	186451
	20.5%	25.0%	22.7%
Total	418057	403504	821561

Note: A Cramer's V value of .089 on the Chi-square Test of Independence indicated no practical significant difference between groups on disqualification outcome. (Where value < .1, no or negligible association.)

Single Claimant Non-Monetary Determination Disqualifications by Protected Groups: Separation Issues

Voluntary Quit Issues

For non-monetary determination disqualification outcomes on voluntary quit issues by race/ethnicity, gender, disability status, and age:

Total number of non-monetary determinations made by race/ethnicity, gender, disability, or age. Total numbers of non-monetary determinations on voluntary quit issues appear in the shaded “Total Cases” column.

Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes for members of different racial/ethnic groups? If so, which ones and how do they differ? Measures of association between disqualification outcomes and racial/ethnic group found no *practical* significant difference between these groups.

Table 23

Disqualification Outcomes for Voluntary Quit Separation Issues by Combined Races/Ethnicities

Combined Races/Ethnicities	Disqualified	Eligible	Total Cases
White not Hispanic	33277	23201	56478
	30.2%	35.5%	32.1%
Black not Hispanic	13225	7144	20369
	12.0%	10.9%	11.6%
Hispanic	43634	23648	67282
	39.6%	36.1%	38.3%
American Indian or Alaskan Native, Hawaiian, Guamanian, Pacific Islander, Samoan	2496	1215	3711
	2.3%	1.9%	2.1%
Other Asian, Cambodian, Asian Indian, Japanese, Korean, Laotian	4070	2048	6118
	3.7%	3.1%	3.5%
Other	7926	5196	13122
	7.2%	7.9%	7.5%
Chinese	1366	811	2177
	1.2%	1.2%	1.2%
Filipino	2906	1525	4431
	2.6%	2.3%	2.5%
Vietnamese	1340	646	1986
	1.2%	1.0%	1.1%
Total	110240	65434	175674

Note: A Cramer’s V value of .061 on the Chi-square Test of Independence indicated no practical significant difference between groups on disqualification outcome. (Where value < .1, no or negligible association.)

Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes for different genders? If so, how do they differ? Measures of association between disqualification outcomes and gender found no *practical* significant difference by gender.

Table 24

Disqualification Outcomes for Voluntary Quit Separation Issues by Gender

Gender	Disqualified	Eligible	Total Cases
Female	62345	34595	96940
	56.5%	52.8%	55.1%
Male	48005	30892	78897
	43.5%	47.2%	44.9%
Total	110350	65487	175837

Note: A Phi value of .036 on the Chi-square Test of Independence indicated no practical significant difference between groups on disqualification outcome. (Where value < .1, no or negligible association.)

Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes for clients with a disability and those without one? If so, how do they differ? Measures of association between disqualification outcomes and disability status found no practical significant difference by disability status.

Table 25

Disqualification Outcomes for Voluntary Quit Separation Issues by Disability Status

Disability Status	Disqualified	Eligible	Total Cases
No disability	99446	56768	156214
	95.4%	93.2%	94.6%
With a disability	4799	4115	8914
	4.6%	6.8%	5.4%
Total	104245	60883	165128

Note: A Phi value of .046 on the Chi-square Test of Independence indicated no practical significant difference between groups on disqualification outcome. (Where value < .1, no or negligible association.)

Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes by age? If so, which ones and how do they differ? Testing with Mann-Whitney U* indicated a relationship between age and disqualification outcomes overall, showing the mean rank of disqualified cases to be lower (meaning younger on average). However, these tests were unable to determine if there is a practical significant difference. To better observe the strength of the relationship and more specifically account for differences, we performed additional tests** using the age quartiles shown previously in Table 16. Measures of association showed a small practical significant difference between the four age groups for disqualification outcomes on voluntary quit issues. Residual analyses showed the youngest group had proportionately more disqualifications on voluntary quit issues than expected. Although not affecting a protected group, this result was also seen in the prior years analyzed (FY2012-13, FY2013-14, and FY2014-15).

*Mann-Whitney U test found an overall significant difference across ages for disqualification outcomes ($p < .05$). This test is equivalent to a t -test when data do not meet the t -test assumptions such as normal distribution and equal variances. Mann-Whitney U tests rank each value across the dataset from lowest to highest and sums these ranks for each group. It then compares the mean ranks for each group to determine a significant difference between them. However, this test does not assess the effect size of the difference to determine if it is a *practical* significant difference.

**Chi-square Test of Independence and Cramer's V.

Table 26

Age Groups for Voluntary Quit Separation Issues by Disqualification Outcomes, With Adjusted Residual Analyses

Age Quartiles	Disqualified	Eligible	Total Cases
Up to 27 +*	39875	15644	55519
	36.1%	23.9%	31.6%
Adjusted residual	53.4 (more than expected)	-53.4	
28 to 35	30866	19215	50081
	28.0%	29.3%	28.5%
Adjusted residual	-6.1 (less than expected)	6.1	
36 to 48	22737	16210	38947
	20.6%	24.7%	22.1%
Adjusted residual	-20.2 (less than expected)	20.2	
Over 48	16922	14452	31374
	15.3%	22.1%	17.8%
Adjusted residual	-35.6 (less than expected)	35.6	
Total	110400	65521	175921

Note: A Cramer's V value of .138 on the Chi-square Test of Independence indicated a small practical significant difference between groups on disqualification outcome. Adjusted residuals above ± 2.0 are considered more or less than expected.

+* = had significantly more disqualification outcomes than expected.

Discharge for Misconduct Issues

For non-monetary determination disqualification outcomes on misconduct issues by race/ethnicity, gender, disability status, and age:

Total number of non-monetary determinations made by race/ethnicity, gender, disability, or age. Total numbers of non-monetary determinations on misconduct issues appear in the shaded “Total Cases” column.

Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes for members of different racial/ethnic groups? If so, which ones and how do they differ? Measures of association between disqualification outcomes and racial/ethnic group showed a small practical significant difference between the ethnic groups for disqualification outcomes on misconduct issues. The *Hispanic*, *Black not Hispanic*, and *American Indian or Alaskan Native, Hawaiian, Guamanian, Pacific Islander, Samoan* groups had proportionately more disqualifications on misconduct issues than expected. Additional testing confirmed that the higher incidence in the *Hispanic* group largely accounted for the relationship indicated by the Cramer’s V value. The differences between the other racial/ethnic groups were not practically significant.

Comparing to previous years that have been analyzed (2012-13, 2013-14, and 2014-15), this is the first year that *Hispanic* has been found to have an adverse practical significant difference (more disqualifications) for disqualification outcomes on misconduct issues relative to other racial/ethnic groups. No adverse practical significant differences were found for any protected racial/ethnic groups for disqualification on misconduct issues in previous years.

Table 27

**Disqualification Outcomes for Discharge for Misconduct Separation Issues
by Combined Races/Ethnicities**

Combined Races/Ethnicities	Disqualified	Eligible	Total Cases
White not Hispanic	24473	73021	97494
	30.3%	38.1%	35.8%
Adjusted residual	-38.7 (less than expected)	38.7	
Black not Hispanic	12195	23930	36125
	15.1%	12.5%	13.2%
Adjusted residual	18.4 (more than expected)	-18.4	
Hispanic +*	31681	61122	92803
	39.2%	31.9%	34.0%
Adjusted residual	37.0 (more than expected)	-37.0	
American Indian or Alaskan Native, Hawaiian, Guamanian, Pacific Islander, Samoan	1847	3668	5515
	2.3%	1.9%	2.0%
Adjusted residual	6.3 (more than expected)	-6.3	
Other Asian, Cambodian, Asian Indian, Japanese, Korean, Laotian	1987	6103	8090
	2.5%	3.2%	3.0%
Adjusted residual	-10.1 (less than expected)	10.1	
Other	6054	15663	21717
	7.5%	8.2%	8.0%
Adjusted residual	-5.9 (less than expected)	5.9	
Chinese	468	2649	3117
	0.6%	1.4%	1.1%
Adjusted residual	-18.0 (less than expected)	18.0	
Filipino	1665	4115	5780
	2.1%	2.1%	2.1%
Adjusted residual	-1.4 (as expected)	1.4	
Vietnamese	447	1612	2059
	0.6%	0.8%	0.8%
Adjusted residual	-7.9 (less than expected)	7.9	
Total	80817	191883	272700

Note: A Cramer's V value of .10 on the Chi-square Test of Independence indicated a small practical significant difference between groups on disqualification outcome. Adjusted residuals above ± 2.0 are considered more or less than expected.

+* = had significantly more disqualification outcomes than expected.

Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes for different genders? If so, how do they differ? Measures of association between disqualification outcomes and gender found no practical significant difference by gender.

Table 28

**Disqualification Outcomes for Discharge for Misconduct
Separation Issues by Gender**

Gender	Disqualified	Eligible	Total Cases
Female	33109	87557	120666
	40.9%	45.6%	44.2%
Male	47787	104574	152361
	59.1%	54.4%	55.8%
Total	80896	192131	273027

Note: A Phi value of -.043 on the Chi-square Test of Independence indicated no practical significant difference between groups on disqualification outcome. (Where value > -.1, no or negligible association.)

Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes for clients with a disability and those without one? If so, how do they differ? Measures of association between disqualification outcomes and disability status found no practical significant difference by disability status.

Table 29

**Disqualification Outcomes for Discharge for Misconduct
Separation Issues by Disability Status**

Disability Status	Disqualified	Eligible	Total Cases
No disability	73938	174039	247977
	96.3%	96.1%	96.2%
With a disability	2879	6999	9878
	3.7%	3.9%	3.8%
Total	76817	181038	257855

Note: Chi-square Test of Independence did not find a significant difference between groups ($p=.153$).

Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes by age? If so, which ones and how do they differ? Testing with Mann-Whitney U* indicated a relationship between age and disqualification outcomes overall, showing the mean rank of disqualified cases to be lower (meaning younger on average). However, these tests were unable to determine whether there is a practical significant difference. To better observe the strength of the relationship and more specifically account for differences, we performed additional tests** using the age quartiles shown previously in Table 16. Measures of association showed a small practical significant difference between the four age groups for disqualification outcomes on misconduct issues. Residual analyses showed the two youngest groups had proportionately more disqualifications on misconduct issues than expected. Additional testing confirmed that the higher incidence in the *Up to 27* group largely accounted for the relationship indicated by the Cramer's V value. The differences between the other age groups were not practically significant. Although not pertaining to a protected group, this follows a trend seen in past analyses; we observed more disqualifications on misconduct issues in the youngest group in FY2013-14 and FY2014-15.

*Mann-Whitney U test found an overall significant difference across ages for disqualification outcomes ($p < .05$). This test is equivalent to a t -test when data do not meet the t -test assumptions such as normal distribution and equal variances. Mann-Whitney U tests rank each value across the dataset from lowest to highest and sums these ranks for each group. It then compares the mean ranks for each group to determine a significant difference between them. However, this test does not assess the effect size of the difference to determine if it is a *practical* significant difference.

**Chi-square Test of Independence and Cramer's V.

Table 30

**Age Groups for Discharge for Misconduct Separation Issues
by Disqualification Outcomes, With Adjusted Residual Analyses**

Age Quartiles	Disqualified	Eligible	Total Cases
Up to 27 +*	29874	48312	78186
	36.9%	25.1%	28.6%
Adjusted residual	62.2 (more than expected)	-62.2	
28 to 35	22801	50766	73567
	28.2%	26.4%	26.9%
Adjusted residual	9.5 (more than expected)	-9.5	
36 to 48	16952	49763	66715
	20.9%	25.9%	24.4%
Adjusted residual	-27.5 (less than expected)	27.5	
Over 48	11310	43376	54686
	14.0%	22.6%	20.0%
Adjusted residual	-51.2 (less than expected)	51.2	
Total	80937	192217	273154

Note: A Cramer's V value of .142 on the Chi-square Test of Independence indicated a small practical significant difference between groups on disqualification outcome. Adjusted residuals above ± 2.0 are considered more or less than expected.

+* = had significantly more disqualification outcomes than expected.

All Other Separation Issues

For non-monetary determination disqualification outcomes on all other separation issues by race/ethnicity, gender, disability status, and age:

Total number of non-monetary determinations made by race/ethnicity, gender, disability, or age. Total numbers of non-monetary determinations on all other separation issues appear in the shaded “Total Cases” column.

Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes for members of different racial/ethnic groups? If so, which ones and how do they differ? Measures of association between disqualification outcomes and racial/ethnic group found no practical significant difference between these groups.

Table 31

Disqualification Outcomes for Discharge for All Other Separation Issues by Combined Races/Ethnicities

Combined Races/Ethnicities	Disqualified	Eligible	Total Cases
White not Hispanic	463	2859	3322
	52.4%	40.5%	41.8%
Black not Hispanic	73	848	921
	8.3%	12.0%	11.6%
Hispanic	240	2466	2706
	27.2%	34.9%	34.1%
American Indian or Alaskan Native, Hawaiian, Guamanian, Pacific Islander, Samoan	30	155	185
	3.4%	2.2%	2.3%
Other Asian, Cambodian, Asian Indian, Japanese, Korean, Laotian	9	104	113
	1.0%	1.5%	1.4%
Other	58	516	574
	6.6%	7.3%	7.2%
Chinese	1	19	20
	0.1%	0.3%	0.3%
Filipino	6	77	83
	0.7%	1.1%	1.0%
Vietnamese	3	14	17
	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%
Total	883	7058	7941

Note: A Cramer's V value of .087 on the Chi-square Test of Independence indicated no practical significant difference between groups on disqualification outcome. (Where value < .1, no or negligible association.)

Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes for different genders? If so, how do they differ? Measures of association between disqualification outcomes and gender found no practical significant difference by gender.

Table 32

Disqualification Outcomes for All Other Separation Issues by Gender

Gender	Disqualified	Eligible	Total Cases
Female	230	1670	1900
	26.0%	23.6%	23.9%
Male	654	5401	6055
	74.0%	76.4%	76.1%
Total	884	7071	7955

Note: Chi-square Test of Independence did not find a significant difference between groups ($p=.115$).

Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes for clients with a disability and those without one? If so, how do they differ? Measures of association between disqualification outcomes and disability status found no practical significant difference by disability status.

Table 33

Disqualification Outcomes for All Other Separation Issues by Disability Status

Disability Status	Disqualified	Eligible	Total Cases
No disability	731	6310	7041
	90.6%	95.5%	95.0%
With a disability	76	296	372
	9.4%	4.5%	5.0%
Total	807	6606	7413

Note: A Phi value of $-.070$ on the Chi-square Test of Independence indicated no practical significant difference between groups on disqualification outcome. (Where value $> -.1$, no or negligible association.)

Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes by age? If so, which ones and how do they differ? Testing with Mann-Whitney U* indicated a relationship between age and disqualification outcomes overall, showing the mean rank of disqualified cases to be lower (meaning younger on average). However, these tests were unable to determine whether there is a practical significant difference. To better observe the strength of the relationship and more specifically account for differences, we performed additional tests** using the age quartiles shown previously in Table 16. Measures of association showed no practical significant differences between the four age groups for disqualification outcomes on other separation issues.

*Mann-Whitney U test found an overall significant difference between age and disqualification ($p < .05$). This test is equivalent to a *t*-test when data do not meet the *t*-test assumptions such as normal distribution and equal variances. Mann-Whitney U tests rank each value across the dataset from lowest to highest and sums these ranks for each group. It then compares the mean ranks for each group to determine a significant difference between them. However, this test does not assess the effect size of the difference to determine if it is a *practical* significant difference.

**Chi-square Test of Independence and Cramer's V.

Table 34

**Age Groups for All Other Separation Issues
by Disqualification Outcomes**

Age Quartiles	Disqualified	Eligible	Total Cases
Up to 27	149	1807	1956
	16.9%	25.6%	24.6%
28 thru 36	245	2028	2273
	27.7%	28.7%	28.6%
37 thru 49	321	1859	2180
	36.4%	26.3%	27.4%
50 and older	168	1377	1545
	19.0%	19.5%	19.4%
Total	883	7071	7954

Note: A Cramer's V value of .082 on the Chi-square Test of Independence indicated no practical significant difference between groups on disqualification outcome. (Where value $< .1$, no or negligible association.)

Single Claimant Non-Monetary Determination Disqualifications by Protected Groups: Non-Separation Issues

Able, Available, and Actively Seeking Work Issues

For non-monetary determination disqualification outcomes on Able, Available, and Actively Seeking Work issues by race/ethnicity, gender, disability status, and age:

Total number of non-monetary determinations made by race/ethnicity, gender, disability, or age. Total number of non-monetary determinations on Able, Available, and Actively Seeking Work issues appear in the shaded “Total Cases” column.²

Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes for members of different racial/ethnic groups? If so, which ones and how do they differ? Measures of association between disqualification outcomes and racial/ethnic group found no *practical* significant difference between these groups.

² Because multiple able and available issues may occur in a single transaction, duplicate entries could not be identified. This results in an over-count of the total number of able and available determinations. However, because we may reasonably assume that all groups have an equal probability of appearing in duplicate cases, including the duplicate cases should not affect the tests of practical significance.

Table 35

**Disqualification Outcomes for Able, Available, and Actively Seeking Work
Non-Separation Issues by Combined Races/Ethnicities**

Combined Races/Ethnicities	Disqualified	Eligible	Total Cases
White not Hispanic	64463	28131	92594
	32.6%	40.3%	34.6%
Black not Hispanic	20721	7717	28438
	10.5%	11.1%	10.6%
Hispanic	73654	20388	94042
	37.2%	29.2%	35.1%
American Indian or Alaskan Native, Hawaiian, Guamanian, Pacific Islander, Samoan	3901	1072	4973
	2.0%	1.5%	1.9%
Other Asian, Cambodian, Asian Indian, Japanese, Korean, Laotian	7350	2556	9906
	3.7%	3.7%	3.7%
Other	16494	6551	23045
	8.3%	9.4%	8.6%
Chinese	3772	1141	4913
	1.9%	1.6%	1.8%
Filipino	5537	1595	7132
	2.8%	2.3%	2.7%
Vietnamese	2045	662	2707
	1.0%	0.9%	1.0%
Total	197937	69813	267750

Note: A Cramer's V value of .087 on the Chi-square Test of Independence indicated no practical significant difference between groups on disqualification outcome. (Where value < .1, no or negligible association.)

Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes for different genders? If so, how do they differ? Measures of association between disqualification outcomes and gender found no practical significant difference by gender.

Table 36

Disqualification Outcomes for Able, Available, and Actively Seeking Work Non-Separation Issues by Gender

Gender	Disqualified	Eligible	Total Cases
Female	111248	35990	147238
	56.1%	51.5%	54.9%
Male	86903	33885	120788
	43.9%	48.5%	45.1%
Total	198151	69875	268026

Note: A Phi value of .041 on the Chi-square Test of Independence indicated no practical significant difference between groups on disqualification outcome. (Where value < .1, no or negligible association.)

Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes for clients with a disability and those without one? If so, how do they differ? Measures of association between disqualification outcomes and disability status found no practical significant difference by disability status.

Table 37

Disqualification Outcomes for Able, Available, and Actively Seeking Work Non-Separation Issues by Disability Status

Disability Status	Disqualified	Eligible	Total Cases
No disability	168619	61786	230405
	92.2%	94.9%	92.9%
With a disability	14216	3313	17529
	7.8%	5.1%	7.1%
Total	182835	65099	247934

Note: A Phi value of -.046 on the Chi-square Test of Independence indicated no practical significant difference between groups on disqualification outcome. (Where value > -.1, no or negligible association.)

Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes by age? If so, which ones and how do they differ? Testing with Mann-Whitney U* indicated a relationship between age and disqualification outcomes overall, showing the mean rank of disqualified cases to be lower (meaning younger on average). However, these tests were unable to determine whether there is a practical significant difference. To better observe the strength of the relationship and more specifically account for differences, we performed additional tests** using the age quartiles shown previously in Table 16. Measures of association showed no practical significant difference between the four age groups in disqualification rates for able, available, and actively seeking work non-separation issues.

*Mann-Whitney U test found an overall significant difference across ages for disqualification outcomes ($p < .05$). This test is equivalent to a t -test when data do not meet the t -test assumptions such as normal distribution and equal variances. Mann-Whitney U tests rank each value across the dataset from lowest to highest and sums these ranks for each group. It then compares the mean ranks for each group to determine a significant difference between them. However, this test does not assess the effect size of the difference to determine if it is a *practical* significant difference.

**Chi-square Test of Independence and Cramer's V.

Table 38

**Age Groups for Able, Available, and Actively Seeking Work
Non-Separation Issues by Disqualification Outcomes**

Age Quartiles	Disqualified	Eligible	Total Cases
Up to 27	50751	15318	66069
	25.6%	21.9%	24.6%
28 thru 36	46982	18714	65696
	23.7%	26.8%	24.5%
37 thru 49	46319	18024	64343
	23.4%	25.8%	24.0%
50 and older	54190	17848	72038
	27.3%	25.5%	26.9%
Total	198242	69904	268146

Note: A Cramer's V value of .050 on the Chi-square Test of independence indicated no practical significant difference between groups on disqualification outcome. (Where value $< .1$, no or negligible association.)

Disqualifying or Deductible Income Issues

For non-monetary determination disqualification outcomes on Disqualifying or Deductible Income issues by race/ethnicity, gender, disability status, and age:

Total number of non-monetary determinations made by race/ethnicity, gender, disability, or age. Total numbers of non-monetary determinations on Disqualifying or Deductible Income issues appear in the shaded “Total Cases” column.

Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes for members of different racial/ethnic groups? If so, which ones and how do they differ? Measures of association indicated a small practical significant difference in disqualification outcomes on disqualifying or deductible income issues by race/ethnicity. Residual analyses revealed that the *Hispanic* and *Black not Hispanic* groups had proportionately more disqualifications on disqualifying or deductible income issues than expected. Additional testing confirmed that the higher incidence in both groups accounted for the relationship indicated by the Cramer’s V value.

Comparing to previous years analyzed (FY2012-13, 2013-14, and 2014-15), *Hispanic* and *Black not Hispanic* groups were also found to have an adverse small practical significant difference (more disqualifications) for disqualification outcomes on disqualifying or deductible income issues relative to other racial/ethnic groups in FY2014-15. In FY2014-15, *Black not Hispanic* accounted for slightly more of the practical significant difference than *Hispanic*, whereas in the current year *Hispanic* accounted for more of the difference. No adverse practical significant differences were found for any protected racial/ethnic groups for disqualification outcomes on disqualifying or deductible income issues in FY2012-13 and 2013-14.

Table 39

**Disqualification Outcomes for Disqualifying or Deductible Income
Non-Separation Issues by Combined Races/Ethnicities**

Combined Races/Ethnicities	Disqualified	Eligible	Total Cases
White not Hispanic	15581	5591	21172
	30.8%	39.9%	32.7%
Adjusted residual	-20.3 (less than expected)	20.3	
Black not Hispanic +*	6254	698	6952
	12.3%	5.0%	10.8%
Adjusted residual	24.9 (more than expected)	-24.9	
Hispanic +*	17413	2937	20350
	34.4%	20.9%	31.5%
Adjusted residual	30.3 (more than expected)	-30.3	
American Indian or Alaskan Native, Hawaiian, Guamanian, Pacific Islander, Samoan	758	148	906
	1.5% (as expected)	1.1%	1.4%
Adjusted residual	3.9	-3.9	
Other Asian, Cambodian, Asian Indian, Japanese, Korean, Laotian	1579	575	2154
	3.1%	4.1%	3.3%
Adjusted residual	-5.7 (less than expected)	5.7	
Other	6351	3193	9544
	12.5%	22.8%	14.8%
Adjusted residual	-30.2 (less than expected)	30.2	
Chinese	799	375	1174
	1.6%	2.7%	1.8%
Adjusted residual	-8.6 (less than expected)	8.6	
Filipino	1200	310	1510
	2.4%	2.2%	2.3%
Adjusted residual	1.1 (as expected)	-1.1	
Vietnamese	707	194	901
	1.4%	1.4%	1.4%
Adjusted residual	.1 (as expected)	-.1	
Total	50642	14021	64663

Note: A Cramer's V value of .191 on the Chi-square Test of Independence indicated a small practical significant difference between groups on disqualification outcomes. Adjusted residuals above ± 2.0 are considered more or less than expected.

+* = had significantly more disqualification outcomes than expected.

Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes for different genders? If so, how do they differ? Measures of association between disqualification outcomes and gender found no practical significant difference by gender.

Table 40

**Disqualification Outcomes for Disqualifying or Deductible Income
Non-Separation Issues by Gender**

Gender	Disqualified	Eligible	Total Cases
Female	22755	5843	28598
	44.9%	41.7%	44.2%
Male	27933	8181	36114
	55.1%	58.3%	55.8%
Total	50688	14024	64712

Note: A Phi value of .027 on the Chi-square Test of Independence indicated no practical significant difference between groups on disqualification outcome. (Where value < .1, no or negligible association.)

Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes for clients with a disability and those without one? If so, how do they differ? Measures of association between disqualification outcomes and disability status found no practical significant difference by disability status.

Table 41

**Disqualification Outcomes for Disqualifying or Deductible Income
Non-Separation Issues by Disability Status**

Disability Status	Disqualified	Eligible	Total Cases
No disability	44542	10551	55093
	97.3%	96.4%	97.1%
With a disability	1245	397	1642
	2.7%	3.6%	2.9%
Total	45787	10948	56735

Note: A Phi value of .021 on the Chi-square Test of Independence indicated no practical significant difference between groups on disqualification outcome. (Where value < .1, no or negligible association.)

Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes by age? If so, which ones and how do they differ? Testing with Mann-Whitney U* indicated a relationship between age and disqualification outcomes overall, showing the mean rank of disqualified cases to be lower (meaning younger on average). However, these tests were unable to determine whether there is a practical significant difference. To better observe the strength of the relationship and more specifically account for differences, we performed additional tests** using the age quartiles shown previously in Table 16. Measures of association showed a small practical significant difference between the four age groups for disqualification outcomes on disqualifying or deductible income non-separation issues. Residual analyses showed the two youngest groups had more disqualifications than expected on disqualifying or deductible income non-separation issues. Additional testing confirmed that the differences were practically significant for groups when compared with the two older groups. Although not affecting a protected group, this result is similar to the results of prior years. In FY2014-15 all three younger groups had more disqualifications than expected; in FY2013-14 the youngest group had more than expected.

*Mann-Whitney U test found an overall significant difference across ages for disqualification outcomes ($p < .05$). This test is equivalent to a t -test when data do not meet the t -test assumptions such as normal distribution and equal variances. Mann-Whitney U tests rank each value across the dataset from lowest to highest and sums these ranks for each group. It then compares the mean ranks for each group to determine a significant difference between them. However, this test does not assess the effect size of the difference to determine if it is a *practical* significant difference.

**Chi-square Test of Independence and Cramer's V.

Table 42

Age Groups for Disqualifying or Deductible Income Non-Separation Issues by Disqualification Outcomes, With Adjusted Residual Analyses

Age Quartiles	Disqualified	Eligible	Total Cases
Up to 27 +*	9279	1197	10476
	18.3%	8.5%	16.2%
Adjusted Residual	27.8 (more than expected)	-27.8	
28 thru 36 +*	12297	2432	14729
	24.3%	17.3%	22.8%
Adjusted Residual	17.3 (more than expected)	-17.3	
37 thru 49	14255	3976	18231
	28.1%	28.3%	28.2%
Adjusted Residual	-.5 (as expected)	.5	
50 and older	14877	6427	21304
	29.3%	45.8%	32.9%
Adjusted Residual	-36.7 (less than expected)	36.7	
Total	50708	14032	64740

Note: A Cramer's V value of .166 on the Chi-square Test of Independence indicated a small practical significant difference between groups on disqualification outcome. Adjusted residuals above ± 2.0 are considered more or less than expected.

+* = had significantly more disqualification outcomes than expected.

Refusal of Suitable Work Issues

For non-monetary determination disqualification outcomes on Refusal of Suitable Work issues by race/ethnicity, gender, disability status, and age:

Total number of non-monetary determinations made by race/ethnicity, gender, disability, or age. Total numbers of non-monetary determinations on Refusal of Suitable Work issues appear in the shaded “Total Cases” column.

Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes for members of different racial/ethnic groups? If so, which ones and how do they differ? Measures of association between disqualification outcomes and racial/ethnic group found no *practical* significant difference between these groups.

Table 43

Disqualification Outcomes for Refusal of Suitable Work Non-Separation Issues by Combined Races/Ethnicities

Combined Races/Ethnicities	Disqualified	Eligible	Total Cases
White not Hispanic	314	1121	1435
	27.1%	31.2%	30.2%
Black not Hispanic	117	501	618
	10.1%	13.9%	13.0%
Hispanic	498	1292	1790
	42.9%	35.9%	37.6%
American Indian or Alaskan Native, Hawaiian, Guamanian, Pacific Islander, Samoan	20	60	80
	1.7%	1.7%	1.7%
Other Asian, Cambodian, Asian Indian, Japanese, Korean, Laotian	43	117	160
	3.7%	3.3%	3.4%
Other	88	319	407
	7.6%	8.9%	8.6%
Chinese	18	46	64
	1.6%	1.3%	1.3%
Filipino	51	120	171
	4.4%	3.3%	3.6%
Vietnamese	11	19	30
	0.9%	0.5%	0.6%
Total	1160	3595	4755

Note: A Cramer’s V value of .085 on the Chi-square Test of Independence indicated no practical significant difference between groups on disqualification outcome. (Where value < .1, no or negligible association.)

Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes for different genders? If so, how do they differ? Measures of association between disqualification outcomes and gender found no practical significant difference by gender.

Table 44

**Disqualification Outcomes for Refusal of Suitable Work
Non-Separation Issues by Gender**

Gender	Disqualified	Eligible	Total Cases
Female	579	1907	2486
	49.8%	53.0%	52.2%
Male	583	1690	2273
	50.2%	47.0%	47.8%
Total	1162	3597	4759

Note: Chi-square Test of Independence did not find a significant difference between groups ($p=.059$).

Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes for clients with a disability and those without one? If so, how do they differ? Measures of association between disqualification outcomes and disability status found no practical significant difference by disability status.

Table 45

**Disqualification Outcomes for Refusal of Suitable Work
Non-Separation Issues by Disability Status**

Disability Status	Disqualified	Eligible	Total Cases
No disability	1081	3302	4383
	96.4%	96.5%	96.5%
With a disability	40	120	160
	3.6%	3.5%	3.5%
Total	1121	3422	4543

Note: Chi-square Test of Independence did not find a significant difference between groups ($p=.923$).

Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes by age? If so, which ones and how do they differ? Testing with Mann-Whitney U* indicated a relationship between age and disqualification outcomes overall, showing the mean rank of disqualified cases to be lower (meaning younger on average). However, these tests were unable to determine if there is a practical significant difference. To better observe the strength of the relationship and more specifically account for differences, we performed additional tests** using the age quartiles shown previously in Table 16. Measures of association showed no practical significant difference between the four age groups for disqualification rates for refusal of suitable work non-separation issues.

*Mann-Whitney U test found an overall significant difference across ages for disqualification outcomes ($p < .05$). This test is equivalent to a t -test when data do not meet the t -test assumptions such as normal distribution and equal variances. Mann-Whitney U tests rank each value across the dataset from lowest to highest and sums these ranks for each group. It then compares the mean ranks for each group to determine a significant difference between them. However, this test does not assess the effect size of the difference to determine if it is a *practical* significant difference.

**Chi-square Test of Independence and Cramer's V.

Table 46

**Age Groups for Refusal of Suitable Work
Non-Separation Issues by Disqualification Outcomes**

Age Quartiles	Disqualified	Eligible	Total Cases
Up to 27	330	775	1105
	28.4%	21.5%	23.2%
28 thru 36	272	889	1161
	23.4%	24.7%	24.4%
37 thru 49	274	857	1131
	23.6%	23.8%	23.8%
50 and older	286	1077	1363
	24.6%	29.9%	28.6%
Total	1162	3598	4760

Note: A Cramer's V value of .075 on the Chi-square Test of independence indicated no practical significant difference between groups on disqualification outcome. (Where value $< .1$, no or negligible association.)

Reporting Requirement Issues

For non-monetary determination disqualification outcomes on Reporting Requirements by race/ethnicity, gender, disability status, and age:

Total number of non-monetary determinations made by race/ethnicity, gender, disability, or age. Total numbers of non-monetary determinations on Reporting Requirements appear in the shaded “Total Cases” column.

Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes for members of different racial/ethnic groups? If so, which ones and how do they differ? Measures of association between disqualification outcomes and racial/ethnic group found no *practical* significant difference between these groups.

Table 47

Disqualification Outcomes for Reporting Requirements Non-Separation Issues by Combined Races/Ethnicities

Combined Races/Ethnicities	Disqualified	Eligible	Total Cases
White not Hispanic	22694	20052	42746
	27.2%	29.4%	28.1%
Black not Hispanic	10101	6785	16886
	12.1%	9.9%	11.1%
Hispanic	36093	29228	65321
	43.2%	42.8%	43.0%
American Indian or Alaskan Native, Hawaiian, Guamanian, Pacific Islander, Samoan	1609	1048	2657
	1.9%	1.5%	1.7%
Other Asian, Cambodian, Asian Indian, Japanese, Korean, Laotian	2682	2342	5024
	3.2%	3.4%	3.3%
Other	7290	5882	13172
	8.7%	8.6%	8.7%
Chinese	1034	923	1957
	1.2%	1.4%	1.3%
Filipino	1492	1470	2962
	1.8%	2.2%	2.0%
Vietnamese	592	560	1152
	0.7%	0.8%	0.8%
Total	83587	68290	151877

Note: A Cramer’s V value of .044 on the Chi-square Test of Independence indicated no practical significant difference between groups on disqualification outcome. (Where value < .1, no or negligible association.)

Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes for different genders? If so, how do they differ? Measures of association between disqualification outcomes and gender found no practical significant difference by gender.

Table 48

**Disqualification Outcomes for Reporting Requirements
Non-Separation Issues by Gender**

Gender	Disqualified	Eligible	Total Cases
Female	35888	31378	67266
	42.9%	44.9%	43.8%
Male	47798	38577	86375
	57.1%	55.1%	56.2%
Total	83686	69955	153641

Note: A Phi value of -.020 on the Chi-square Test of Independence indicated no practical significant difference between groups on disqualification outcome. (Where value > -.1, no or negligible association.)

Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes for clients with a disability and those without one? If so, how do they differ? Measures of association between disqualification outcomes and disability status found no practical significant difference by disability status.

Table 49

**Disqualification Outcomes for Reporting Requirements
Non-Separation Issues by Disability Status**

Disability Status	Disqualified	Eligible	Total Cases
No disability	76181	62237	138418
	96.4%	97.1%	96.7%
With a disability	2816	1868	4684
	3.6%	2.9%	3.3%
Total	78997	64105	143102

Note: A Phi value of -.018 on the Chi-square Test of Independence indicated no practical significant difference between groups on disqualification outcome. (Where value > -.1, no or negligible association.)

Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes by age? If so, which ones and how do they differ? Testing with Mann-Whitney U* indicated a relationship between age and disqualification outcomes overall, showing the mean rank of disqualified cases to be lower (meaning younger on average). However, these tests were unable to determine whether there is a practical significant difference. To better observe the strength of the relationship and more specifically account for differences, we performed additional tests** using the age quartiles shown previously in Table 16. Measures of association showed a small practical significant difference between the four age groups for disqualification outcomes on reporting requirements issues. Residual analyses showed the two youngest groups had proportionately more disqualifications than expected on reporting requirements issues. Additional testing confirmed that the higher incidence in the *Up to 27* group largely accounted for the relationship indicated by the Cramer's V value. The differences between the other age groups were not practically significant. Although not affecting a protected group, this result was also seen in FY2013-14 and FY2014-15.

*Mann-Whitney U test found an overall significant difference across ages for disqualification outcomes ($p < .05$). This test is equivalent to a *t*-test when data do not meet the *t*-test assumptions such as normal distribution and equal variances. Mann-Whitney U tests rank each value across the dataset from lowest to highest and sums these ranks for each group. It then compares the mean ranks for each group to determine a significant difference between them. However, this test does not assess the effect size of the difference to determine if it is a *practical* significant difference.

**Chi-square Test of Independence and Cramer's V.

Table 50

Age Groups for Reporting Requirements Non-Separation Issues by Disqualification Outcomes, With Adjusted Residual Analyses

Age Quartiles	Disqualified	Eligible	Total Cases
Up to 27 +*	26618	15486	42104
	31.8%	22.1%	27.4%
Adjusted Residual	42.3 (more than expected)	-42.3	
28 thru 36	21017	16271	37288
	25.1%	23.2%	24.3%
Adjusted Residual	8.4 (more than expected)	-8.4	
37 thru 49	19499	18240	37739
	23.3%	26.1%	24.5%
Adjusted Residual	-12.6 (less than expected)	12.6	
50 and older	16604	19990	36594
	19.8%	28.6%	23.8%
Adjusted Residual	-40.0 (less than expected)	40.0	
Total	83738	69987	153725

Note: A Cramer's V value of .132 on the Chi-square Test of Independence indicated a small practical significant difference between groups on disqualification outcome. Adjusted residuals above ± 2.0 are considered more or less than expected.

+* = had significantly more disqualification outcomes than expected.

All Other Non-Separation Issues

For non-monetary determination disqualification outcomes on All Other Non-Separation Issues by race/ethnicity, gender, disability status, and age:

Total number of non-monetary determinations made by race/ethnicity, gender, disability, or age. Total numbers of non-monetary determinations on All Other Non-Separation Issues appear in the shaded “Total Cases” column.

Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes for members of different racial/ethnic groups? If so, which ones and how do they differ? Measures of association between disqualification outcomes and racial/ethnic group found no *practical* significant difference between these groups.

Table 51

Disqualification Outcomes for All Other Non-Separation Issues by Combined Races/Ethnicities

Combined Races/Ethnicities	Disqualified	Eligible	Total Cases
White not Hispanic	16875	11303	28178
	27.2%	34.4%	29.7%
Black not Hispanic	9470	3866	13336
	15.3%	11.8%	14.1%
Hispanic	24818	11635	36453
	40.0%	35.5%	38.4%
American Indian or Alaskan Native, Hawaiian, Guamanian, Pacific Islander, Samoan	1172	482	1654
	1.9%	1.5%	1.7%
Other Asian, Cambodian, Asian Indian, Japanese, Korean, Laotian	1592	1061	2653
	2.6%	3.2%	2.8%
Other	5784	3010	8794
	9.3%	9.2%	9.3%
Chinese	550	469	1019
	0.9%	1.4%	1.1%
Filipino	1274	629	1903
	2.1%	1.9%	2.0%
Vietnamese	520	362	882
	0.8%	1.1%	0.9%
Total	62055	32817	94872

Note: A Cramer’s V value of .093 on the Chi-square Test of Independence indicated no practical significant difference between groups on disqualification outcome. (Where value < .1, no or negligible association.)

Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes for different genders? If so, how do they differ? Measures of association between disqualification outcomes and gender found no practical significant difference by gender.

Table 52

**Disqualification Outcomes for All Other
Non-Separation Issues by Gender**

Gender	Disqualified	Eligible	Total Cases
Female	30743	16475	47218
	49.4%	50.2%	49.7%
Male	31432	16362	47794
	50.6%	49.8%	50.3%
Total	62175	32837	95012

Note: A Phi value of -.007 on the Chi-square Test of Independence indicated no practical significant difference between groups on disqualification outcome. (Where value > -.1, no or negligible association.)

Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes for clients with a disability and those without one? If so, how do they differ? Measures of association between disqualification outcomes and disability status found no practical significant difference by disability status.

Table 53

**Disqualification Outcomes for All Other
Non-Separation Issues by Disability Status**

Disability Status	Disqualified	Eligible	Total Cases
No disability	56760	30146	86906
	97.0%	96.9%	97.0%
With a disability	1745	958	2703
	3.0%	3.1%	3.0%
Total	58505	31104	89609

Note: Chi-square Test of Independence did not find a significant difference between groups ($p=.417$).

Is there a significant difference in disqualification outcomes by age? If so, which ones and how do they differ? Testing with Mann-Whitney U* indicated a relationship between age and disqualification outcomes overall, showing the mean rank of disqualified cases to be lower (meaning younger on average). However, these tests were unable to determine whether there is a practical significant difference. To better observe the strength of the relationship and more specifically account for differences, we performed additional tests** using the age quartiles shown previously in Table 16. Measures of association showed a small practical significant difference between the four age groups for disqualification outcomes on other non-separation issues. Residual analyses showed the two youngest groups had proportionately more disqualifications than expected. Additional testing confirmed that the higher incidence in the *Up to 27* group largely accounted for the relationship indicated by the Cramer's V value. The differences between the other age groups were not practically significant. Although not affecting a protected group, this result was also seen in FY2013-14 but not in FY2014-15.

*Mann-Whitney U test found an overall significant difference across ages for disqualification outcomes ($p < .05$). This test is equivalent to a *t*-test when data do not meet the *t*-test assumptions such as normal distribution and equal variances. Mann-Whitney U tests rank each value across the dataset from lowest to highest and sums these ranks for each group. It then compares the mean ranks for each group to determine a significant difference between them. However, this test does not assess the effect size of the difference to determine if it is a *practical* significant difference.

**Chi-square Test of Independence and Cramer's V.

Table 54

**Disqualification Outcomes for All Other
Non-Separation Issues by Age Quartile**

Age Quartiles	Disqualified	Eligible	Total Cases
Up to 27 +*	15473	6213	21686
	24.9%	18.9%	22.8%
Adjusted Residual	20.8 (more than expected)	-20.8	
28 thru 36	16658	7717	24375
	26.8%	23.5%	25.6%
Adjusted Residual	11.0 (more than expected)	-11.0	
37 thru 49	16450	8842	25292
	26.4%	26.9%	26.6%
Adjusted Residual	-1.6 (as expected)	1.6	
50 and older	13624	10079	23703
	21.9%	30.7%	24.9%
Adjusted Residual	-29.8 (less than expected)	29.8	
Total	62205	32851	95056

Note: A Cramer's V value of .107 on the Chi-square Test of Independence indicated a small practical significant difference between groups on disqualification outcome. Adjusted residuals above ± 2.0 are considered more or less than expected.

+* = had significantly more disqualification outcomes than expected.