Job Results: A Case Study

Jobseekers are struggling to find suitable jobs

Even though unemployment is rising in Europe as a result of Covid-19, employers are struggling to find qualified candidates for vacancies.

**Unemployment is rising in the Eurozone**

- **8.1%** as of 1 October
- **13.2 million** unemployed workers across **19 Euro countries**
- **9.5%** predicted for 2020

Unemployment predicted to rise through 2020-2021

Source: [Eurostat](https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat) and [EC Economic Forecast](https://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/medium_term_forecast_en)

**SMEs provide two-thirds of net new jobs, but struggle to find the right candidates for their job vacancies**

- **62%** find recruitment a challenge
- **89%** report few or no qualified applicants

Jobseekers find it difficult to discover information about vacancies

- **Only 51%** SMEs regularly post vacancies on recruitment sites
- and many do not have websites to advertise their jobs
- **Only 55%** users find it easy to find job information online

Source: Internal Google research

Despite there being large numbers of jobseekers and considerable vacancies, there’s a matching problem: qualified candidates are struggling to find suitable jobs.
Google’s job results seek to solve the matching problem.

They make it easier for jobseekers to find vacancies, and for businesses to advertise vacancies to large numbers of jobseekers.

Job results are deduplicated, up-to-date, and provide more information about job openings compared to the blue link results that Google would otherwise show.

Job results allow jobseekers to more easily identify job openings that are relevant to them, and to click through to third-party sites to learn more and apply for a job.

Google’s job results are open to all interested sites, including recruitment sites. And Google shows a carousel of recruitment sites above the unit to enhance choice even further.

They benefit jobseekers, employers, and recruitment sites

1. **Filled vacancies**
   Google’s job results led to [X million] vacancies being filled in Europe last year.

2. **Recruitment sites’ testimony**
   Recruitment sites like Reed and Randstad attest to the benefit of job results. Snagajob has seen a 17% increase in traffic volume since launch; ZipRecruiter reported a 4.5 times higher conversion rate.

3. **Press reports**
   The benefit of Google’s job results is consistently reported in the press. For example, the *Berliner Morgenpost*, *FAZ*, *Haufe.de*, and the *Hamburger Abendblatt* have each reported that Google’s job results will make job seeking easier and more transparent.

4. **Employment ministers**
   Employment ministers such as the Belgian Minister of Economy, Innovation and Employment and the Belgian Minister of Employment and Digital Transition have expressed support for job results.

5. **User surveys**
   European users have also attest to the benefit of job results in surveys. When users are presented with a search results page with job results compared to a page without job results, users prefer the page with job results.
But general bans on unequal treatment may imperil jobs results and risk a return to blue links

Some government reports propose introducing general bans on platforms engaging in unequal treatment.

Google’s job results show the unintended consequences that could arise from such generalized bans.

Some complainants have claimed by showing job results, Google engages in unequal treatment of a separate Google service.

With jobs results, recruitment sites already have equal access to job results and they win traffic from these results to their sites.

If complainants deem that insufficient, the risk is that Google would be forced to eliminate jobs results from its pages in Europe and return to show plain blue links.

This would harm jobseekers, employers, recruitment sites, and innovation in Europe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jobseekers</th>
<th>Employers</th>
<th>Recruitment Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jobseekers would lose out because instead of a helpful way to find vacancies, they would see inferior blue links</td>
<td>Employers would lose out because they will receive fewer qualified candidates applying for their vacancies</td>
<td>Recruitment sites would lose out because they will receive less high-quality traffic to their sites</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bans on unequal treatment risk hamstringing a search service from introducing any kind of enhanced feature on their page. Any technical improvement requires a platform to treat itself differently from third parties. An abstract ban on unequal treatment would risk outlawing beneficial innovation in search design and freeze technical development.
The Turkey experience shows that these risks are real

The Turkish Competition Authority (TCA) claimed Google engaged in unequal treatment of comparison shopping services (CSSs) compared to Google Shopping by showing a unit that groups product ads for merchant offers with images (the shopping unit).

Google offered to provide CSSs with equal access to the shopping unit as it provides to Google Shopping. But the TCA rejected that remedy, so Google had no alternative but to remove shopping units in Turkey and revert to showing text ads.

This harms Turkish users and Turkish e-commerce sites. Turkish sites explain that removing the shopping unit “left thousands of e-commerce companies and individuals in a difficult situation”; “advertising cost of the SMEs will increase”; “the removal of the Unit is expected to have a negative impact”; “small and medium enterprises will be the most affected”

Product ads have lower costs and are more effective than text ads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost per click</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Product ads are more relevant for users when searching for products

82% of users prefer search results pages with shopping units
Case-specific analyses and constructive dialogue lead to better outcomes than blanket bans

**Google’s job results benefit jobseekers, employers, and recruitment sites**

Google provides open and equal access to all sites, including recruitment sites, that wish to participate in job results. Many recruitment sites participate in these results and stress the benefit they derive from them.

**Google provides access to recruitment sites that wish to participate in job results**

Google provides access to recruitment sites that wish to participate in job results. They fill a societal need by helping millions of jobseekers in Europe find available job vacancies.

**Serious harm could arise from general bans on unequal treatment**

General bans on unequal treatment could ultimately force Google to remove jobs results and show only plain blue links, harming jobseekers, employers, and recruitment sites.

**Concerns of unequal treatment should be assessed based on the facts and constructive dialogue**

Instead of presumptions, concerns of unequal treatment should be assessed based on the facts and constructive dialogue. This allows solutions to be reached that enhance consumer choice, promote innovation, and preserve quality for all participants.