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Traditional perspective on disability focuses on individual

Our study is motivated by a broader framework.

Accommodations important but unequally accessed

- Workplace accommodations associated with:
  - Better employment outcomes (Burkhauser et al. 1995; Cook et al. 2015)
  - Delayed labor market exit among workers approaching retirement age (Hill et al. 2016)

- Receipt of accommodations
  - Varies by race and education (Clay and Alston, 2016; Hill et al. 2016)
  - Is higher among those with assertive personality traits (Hill et al. 2016)
Questions addressed in this study

1. Can accommodations address commonly cited employment barriers?
2. Are specific accommodations associated with higher job retention?
3. Which subgroups of individuals with disabilities are less likely to receive accommodations?
Sample included 3,000 applicants to state vocational rehabilitation (VR) agencies in 2014
- Includes Mississippi, New Jersey, and Ohio
- Ages 25–60

By applying to state VR, these individuals have demonstrated an interest in work

Survey includes information on
- Health and impairments
- Demographics and education
- Current and past employment
- Reasons for not working
- Receipt of accommodations
Limit sample to those with some experience with employment

• Varied employment history
  – 34% working at VR application
  – 51% have worked both before and after disability onset
  – 22% have not worked since disability onset
Can accommodations address common employment barriers?

- The 66% of respondents who were not working at the time of the survey were asked to report the reason(s) they were not working.
- Could report multiple reasons.
Nonworking applicants cited a number of employment barriers
Perceived barriers varied by type of disability

Percentage

Condition  Cannot find job  Discouraged  Lack skills  Accessibility  Transportation  Fear of losing benefits

Physical only  Sensory only  Psychiatric only  Multiple disabilities

14
Are specific accommodations associated with higher job retention?

- Estimated relationship between employment status and receipt of accommodation at most recent (current or last) job:
  - Flexible schedule
  - Job coach
  - Modified job duties
  - Help with transportation
  - Equipment or modified work space
  - Personal care assistant

- Controlled for demographics and impairments
Accommodations associated with significantly higher employment rates

Relative to an overall employment rate of 34%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>flexible schedule</th>
<th>modified job duties</th>
<th>transportation</th>
<th>personal care assistant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted difference in employment rates among applicants who had received accommodation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical only</td>
<td>↑8</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>↑8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensory only</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>↑8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatric only</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple disabilities</td>
<td>↑6</td>
<td>↑8</td>
<td>↑10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Which subgroups are less likely to receive accommodations?

- Individuals who:
  - Have physical or sensory disabilities only
  - Report poor health
  - Are older
  - Have had their disability for longer

- They were also more likely to report inaccessibility as a barrier
Summary

- One-third of nonworking people with disabilities reported employment barriers that could be addressed by accommodations.
- Receiving certain accommodations (transportation, flexible work schedule, and personal care attendant) is positively correlated with job retention.
- Perceived barriers and receipt of accommodations vary across subgroups.
Implications for practice

● Our findings are encouraging because they point to specific factors that practitioners and employers can address.

● The fact that accommodations to address commonly perceived barriers are positively associated with employment suggests the need for additional efforts to expand provision.

● Policies and programs can empower employers to better understand how to provide effective accommodations.
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Introduction:
Health problems affect the labor force

- Every year, millions of Americans lose jobs and leave the workforce because of health problems (Hollenbeck 2015)

- They experience reduced income, employers face reduced profits, and government loses taxes and pays more in disability benefits and health care (Schimmel and Stapleton 2012; Anand and Ben-Shalom 2017; Ben-Shalom and Burak 2016)
Central question

● Which factors affect whether employers provide accommodations to, and ultimately retain, employees with health problems?
In-depth interviews with 14 employers in Arkansas
- 5 referrals from Arkansas Rehabilitation Services
- 8 referrals from a professional society
- 1 referral from a respondent

Respondents described cases when employees developed or disclosed health problems

Identifying details have been anonymized
## Sample characteristics

### Sample characteristics (n=50 cases)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industries</th>
<th>Health conditions*</th>
<th>Status at interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finance/insurance</td>
<td>Cancer</td>
<td>Stayed at organization 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care/social assistance</td>
<td>Musculoskeletal condition</td>
<td>Left due to health 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>Sensory impairment</td>
<td>Left for other reason 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational services</td>
<td>Leg/knee/foot injury</td>
<td>Terminated 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Mental/behavioral disorder</td>
<td>Status not provided 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation/warehousing</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Does not sum to 50 because respondents could report multiple health conditions.
Findings
Main argument

- Societal factors
- Employer factors
- Employee factors

Employer action
Society-level factors
Employers appreciate public resources

- Employers received valuable information and resources from programs like DOL’s Job Accommodation Network and the Arkansas Vocational Rehabilitation Agency’s Stay-at-Work/Return-to-Work program.
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Employer-level factors
Ample resources facilitate accommodations

- Financial resources, staff capacity, and other private resources helped employers provide accommodations

“We probably spent at least a year working [to accommodate] the individual, despite the frustrations, and the hardships, and all the extra manpower that was required.”

--Human resources (HR) director describes efforts to accommodate an employee with a cognitive disability
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- The employer’s ability to effectively communicate with
  - The employee
  - HR staff
  - Supervisors
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  was a key factor influencing the employer’s understanding in what accommodations were needed and how to facilitate retention.
The employer’s ability to effectively communicate with:
- The employee
- HR staff
- Supervisors
- Doctors
- Insurance providers

was a key factor influencing the employer’s understanding in what accommodations were needed and how to facilitate retention.
"[The employee] cited that he had an anxiety disorder and he presented documentation [to the HR group] from a health care provider… We had to convey to him the company's position from the standpoint of the expectation for him to be able to do certain things… [We told him] we can't just take certain functions off your plate but we can modify your work hours and maybe modify the number of [supervisees] that you are responsible for…

We engaged with his managers after we discussed the issues with him.”

--HR staff member describes successfully orchestrating communication among an employee with an anxiety disorder, the employee’s supervisor, and the employee’s doctor
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Employee-level factors
Employees who had worked at their organization for four or more years were more likely to be retained than those with shorter tenure.

— An HR Director summarizes her decision not to attempt to accommodate a new employee who developed a back problem shortly after being hired.
Tenure

• Employees who had worked at their organization for four or more years were more likely to be retained than those with shorter tenure.

“The individual hadn’t been with the company very long. That’s typically when you’re going to see retention not working out [because you don’t] feel compelled to have to offer as much as you would someone who put in [more] time with the organization.”

– An HR director summarizes her decision not to attempt to accommodate a new employee who developed a back problem shortly after being hired
Work performance

● Employee work performance before onset of a health problem appeared to affect employer efforts to accommodate and retain workers.

● 6 of 14 employers cited good performance as a factor that incentivized them to “make more of an effort” to accommodate employees.
“Brand new employee, been here two months. Picking up her twins after school – [when she has a terrible traffic accident resulting in] multiple, multiple surgeries. [Despite this], the employee’s manager said, ‘I know they don’t qualify for FMLA, however, what I’ve seen in two months is the type of employee I want. Whatever it takes, I want them back.’”

-- HR manager describes how an employee’s performance incentivized accommodations
Type of work

- It was more challenging to accommodate and retain workers in physically active roles than those in sedentary roles.
Type of work

- It was more challenging to accommodate and retain workers in physically active roles than those in sedentary roles
  - A director of HR at a health services organization described feeling like her “hands were tied” when a nurse developed a back problem
Musculoskeletal conditions and conditions that could be addressed with ergonomic adjustments described as “low-hanging fruit”

Mental and behavioral health conditions, terminal illnesses, and health problems that hindered the ability to perform basic activities of daily living were challenging to accommodate.
“It is almost impossible [to retain employees with mental and behavioral health conditions] because I think they don’t expect [their employer] to be acting in their best interest. So when we call to find out how they are doing, they are really suspicious. It is really difficult to get information back.”

-- HR professional describes challenges retaining employees with mental and behavioral health conditions
Policy implications
Policy implications

- Bolstering employer resources and improving the flow of information could help employers accommodate employees.
- When early intervention requires employer involvement, take employee characteristics into account.
References


Acknowledgments and disclaimer

- Funded by National Institute on Disability, Independent Living, and Rehabilitation Research (NIDILRR), under the Rehabilitation and Research Training Center on Employment Policy and Measurement (cooperative agreement 9ORT5037-02-00)

- The findings and conclusions are those of the authors and do not represent the policy of HHS or NIDILRR.

- The authors retain sole responsibility for any errors or omissions.
Contact information

Alix Gould-Werth
Center for Studying Disability Policy
Mathematica Policy Research
1100 1st Street NE, 12th Floor
Washington, DC 20002
(202) 552-6493

agouldwerth@mathematica-mpr.com

Kimberly Phillips, PhD
University of New Hampshire
Institute on Disability
Main objective

Identify the practices used by employers to increase the employment of people with disabilities and the effectiveness of these practices.
Description

• 3,085 supervisors from across the country
• Drawn from Qualtrics Business-to-Business panel
• Subject areas:
  – Recruiting & hiring, onboarding & training, retention & accommodation
• Within each subject area:
  – Processes and practices and their effectiveness
  – Commitment from supervisors and upper management
  – Open-ended question to obtain examples
## Company size (number of employees)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of employees</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 - 99</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 - 499</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 - 999</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 +</td>
<td>1,082</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Supervisory experience of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How long at employer</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 to 5</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 to 10</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 to 20</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 or more</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How long supervising</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 or fewer</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 to 5</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 to 10</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 or more</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How many supervised</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 to 5</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 to 10</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 to 20</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 or more</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Experience supervising people with disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Hearing</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Vision</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Mobility</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Cognitive</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No experience</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## General experience with disability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any experience</strong></td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Own</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Someone close</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambulatory</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No experience</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Improve corporate culture and practices

Underutilized effective practices seen as feasible

Common practices are effective for many - Universal Design

Upper management’s commitment is key to success of employees with disabilities and their supervisors
Commitment of upper management and importance to supervisor
Hiring PWD

Upper management commitment

- Very: 20%
- Somewhat: 45%
- Not very: 26%
- Not at all: 10%
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Importance to supervisor

- Very: 22%
- Somewhat: 46%
- Not very: 24%
- Not at all: 8%
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- Upper management commitment:
  - Very: 43%
  - Somewhat: 40%
  - Not very: 13%
  - Not at all: 5%

- Importance to supervisor:
  - Very: 78%
  - Somewhat: 18%
  - Not very: 3%
  - Not at all: 2%
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Upper management commitment

- Very: 47%
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- Not very: 10%
- Not at all: 4%

Importance to supervisor

- Very: 66%
- Somewhat: 28%
- Not very: 4%
- Not at all: 2%
Organizational processes

- Has process?
- Effective?
- As effective for PWD?
Recruiting process

- Has process: 84%
- Process effective
- As effective PWD
  - Yes
  - No
  - Don't know
Recruiting process

- Has process: 84%
- Process effective: 90%
- As effective PWD: N/A
Recruiting process

- Has process: 84%
- Process effective: 90%
- As effective PWD: 61%

Yes  No  Don't know
Organizational hiring goals

- Diversity: 57%
- Disability: 28%
Organizational hiring goals

- Diversity: 57%
- Disability: 28%
- Disability as diversity: 12%
“Moderate” to “a lot” of effort spent on recruiting

- General: 74%
- Diversity: 69%
- Disability: 44%
Process: Supporting new employees learn job

- Has process: 86%
- Process effective
  - Yes
  - No
  - Don't know
- As effective PWD
Process: Supporting new employees learn job

- Has process: 86%
- Process effective: 93%
- As effective PWD: Yes

Options:
- Yes
- No
- Don't know
Process: Supporting new employees learn job

- Has process: 86%
- Process effective: 93%
- As effective PWD: 73%

Categories:
- Yes
- No
- Don't know
Process: Request accommodations

- Has process: 66%
- Process effective: [Bar chart showing distribution]
- Orientation:
  - Yes
  - No
  - Don't know
Process: Request accommodations

- Has process: 66%
- Process effective: 96%
- Orientation:
  - Yes
  - No
  - Don't know
Process: Request accommodations

- Has process: 66%
- Process effective: 96%
- Orientation: 59%

Categories: Yes, No, Don't know
Centralized accommodation fund

- Has fund:
  - 49% Yes
  - 35% No
  - 16% Don't know

- Effective:
  - Yes
  - No
  - Don't know
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Centralized accommodation fund

- 49% Has fund
- 35% Effective
- 16% Has fund
- 94% Effective

Options:
- Yes
- No
- Don't know
Specific practices
Recruiting: Partner with disability organizations

- Don’t know: 35%
  - Feasible?: 85%
- No: 38%
  - Feasible?: 66%
- Yes: 27%
  - Effective?: 95%
Training practices: Short-term outside assistance

Uses practice?

- No: 56%, Feasible?: 70%
- Sometimes: 25%, Effective?: 82%
- Yes: 19%, Effective?: 89%

As effective PWD?: Yes, 86%
Training practices: Job shadowing

- **Uses practice?**
  - Yes: 61%
  - Sometimes: 27%
  - No: 12%

- **Effective?**
  - Yes: 98%

- **Feasible?**
  - Yes: 70%

- **As effective PWD?**
  - Yes: 75%

- **As effective PWD?**
  - Yes: 80%
Accommodation practices: Job sharing

- Yes: 13% uses practice, 95% effective, 92% as effective for PWD, 84% feasible
- Sometimes: 37% uses practice, 86% effective, 84% as effective for PWD, 48% feasible
- No: 57% does not use practice
Accommodation practices: work from home (at least some of the time)

- No: 45% (21% feasible)
- Sometimes: 38% (74% effective, 69% as effective for PWD)
- Yes: 18% (85% effective, 87% as effective for PWD)
Key takeaways
Commitment/importance

• The importance that supervisors give to hiring PWD mirrors their perceived commitment of senior management to hiring PWD

• Supervisors attach much more importance to supporting PWD learning the job and providing accommodations than they believe that upper management is committed to doing the same
Effective processes

• Most employers have recruiting and training processes
  – Most believe they are as effective for PWD

• Many (66%) employers have accommodation processes
  – Nearly all believe they are effective
  – Support needed for 34% that don’t have them
Specific practices

• The findings suggest some opportunities:
  – Practices that few employers use
  – When used, they are effective
  – When not used, they are feasible

• In particular:
  – Partnering with disability organization in recruiting
  – Short-term outside training assist. (e.g., job coach)
  – Job sharing
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