

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 228 453

CE 035 589

AUTHOR Cole, Joyce Couch; Bragman, Ruth  
 TITLE Employers' Perceptions of Hiring the Qualified Disabled.  
 PUB DATE Nov 82  
 NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the Mid-South Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, November 1982).  
 PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)  
 EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.  
 DESCRIPTORS Adults; Career Education; \*Counselor Attitudes; Counselors; \*Disabilities; \*Employer Attitudes; \*Employment Potential; \*Employment Practices; Rehabilitation Counseling; \*Vocational Rehabilitation  
 IDENTIFIERS \*Rehabilitation Counselors

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted to determine how the business community in a large mid-southern city perceived disabled persons and the types of information potential employers of handicapped individuals desired concerning specific handicapping conditions. The study also explored differences in perceptions of employers and vocational rehabilitation counselors of the job potential of individuals with visible and non-visible handicaps. Employers and counselors completed questionnaires regarding information they might have wanted to know about handicapped applicants. They also attended separate workshops at which they viewed videotapes of an individual with a visible handicap (C-6 Quadraplegia) and an individual with a non-visible handicap (Wegener's Granulomatosis) and then checked all jobs on a job list for which they felt the individuals were qualified or could be trained. Employers received information on interviewing handicapped individuals, job modifications and accommodations, and general information on disabilities. Results indicated employers had little awareness of different types of disabilities and potentials of disabled individuals. They were able to identify appropriately suitable jobs for the individual with a visible handicap but not for the individual with a non-visible handicap. Counselors were able to appropriately identify job potential. Counselors' concerns focused on individuals with visible disabilities; employers' concerns focused on non-visible disabilities. (Six tables are appended.) (YLB)

\*\*\*\*\*  
 \* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made \*  
 \* from the original document. \*  
 \*\*\*\*\*

ED228453

CE

Employers' Perceptions  
of Hiring the Qualified Disabled

Paper Presented

At

The Annual Convention of the Mid-South Educational Research Association

New Orleans

November, 1982

Joyce Couch Cole  
Ruth Bragman

Memphis State University  
Department of Special Education and Rehabilitation

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION  
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION  
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as  
received from the person or organization  
originating it.  
Minor changes have been made to improve  
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-  
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE  
position or policy.

Sponsored

- by a Faculty Research Grant  
from Memphis State University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS  
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

JC Cole

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES  
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

2.

02035589

## Employers' Perceptions of Hiring the Qualified Disabled

The advent of Public Laws 94-142 (The Education of All Handicapped Children Act of 1975), 94-482 (The Education Amendments of 1976, Title II), and 93-112 (The Rehabilitation Act of 1973) has highlighted the right to education and employment of the handicapped. Although significant advances have been made in these areas, there are still numerous shortcomings. One of the areas with notable problems is that of job opportunities for the handicapped. According to a recent report supported by the Office of Education (now referred to as Office of Planning, Budgeting and Evaluation), only forty percent of the handicapped adults in the United States are employed during a given year, compared to 73 percent of the nondisabled population (Levitan & Taggart, 1976). Many plans have been developed to facilitate the job placement of the handicapped; however, most plans have focused on the cooperation between vocational education, special education, and vocational rehabilitation. Few plans have included the local business community (Fafard & Haubrich, 1981; Heller, 1981; Jenkins & Odle, 1980; Wimmer, 1981). The usual model for assisting the handicapped to find employment involves a single member of the primary agency serving the handicapped. This individual is responsible for contacting local business to locate a job for a specific handicapped individual after his/her vocational evaluation and/or training is complete (Razeghi, 1979; Simek, Matilsky & Banks, 1979). To date, the few models involving the business community are situated in small communities which have only one center that is involved in the training of the handicapped (Stone, 1979; Wright, 1980). In these types of programs members of business community usually serve on an advisory council. The effectiveness of this type of program in a large urban area, however, is questionable. In large cities

there are numerous vocational-technical centers, secondary education programs, and rehabilitation programs that serve the handicapped. At any given time there may be more than 1,000 disabled individuals seeking employment. In addition, the large city often has hundreds of different industries with a variety of concerns that could not be addressed by one advisory council. What is needed in this setting is a system that takes into account the needs of the business community, maintains a list of the jobs available to any given time that are suitable for the handicapped, and provides the information that each business needs to have in order to facilitate the employment of the handicapped individual. In addition, this same information would be of great service to the various agencies that serve the handicapped in providing them with the most suitable vocational placement. This placement process must be continuous to insure appropriate placement, rather than the "hit and miss" procedure now being used.

The Vocational Evaluation Lab, in the Department of Special Education and Rehabilitation at Memphis State University, conducted a three month follow-up, in the Fall of 1981, of 36 clients who had been evaluated in the lab during a four (4) month period. Of the 36 clients, eight (8) were employed, 14 were in training programs and 14 were not actively involved in any type of program. When various rehabilitation counselors were questioned as to why these clients were not placed the common answers were: "There are no suitable jobs available for these individuals," "The business community will not hire them due to unrealistic expectations", and "There was not enough time to place them".

Prior to this follow-up study the Department of Special Education and Rehabilitation at Memphis State University had been contacted by the Chairman of the Handicapped Committee of the Rotary Club, to develop a job placement service for the business community. The Chairman stated that the business

community was desirous of hiring the handicapped but has had limited success in the past in getting appropriate referrals, if any, from the various agencies working with the handicapped. He stated that this problem has been compounded since the employers cannot contact Employment Security for handicapped referrals without contacting numerous other agencies because of discrimination among the non-handicapped. In addition, handicapped individuals not directly involved with an agency working with the handicapped are not aware of the increased interest of employers wanting to hire the handicapped, and where these jobs may exist.

This conflict in views is not new, but there is no information as to what the business community means by saying they want to hire the disabled. The statement itself raises numerous questions for rehabilitation workers such as: "Does the business community want individuals with visible handicaps or with non-visible handicaps?" "Will the employer make modifications and adaptations in the job and/or job area for the handicapped persons?" "Does the employer need information about the disability before hiring or interviewing the handicapped individual?" "Does the employer want a guarantee of additional services, such as a follow-up service to assist in solving any employment problems that may arise?" The Department of Special Education and Rehabilitation initiated a study to attempt to find answers to these questions.

#### Purpose

The purpose of this study was to determine how the business community in a large mid-southern city perceived the disabled and to determine the types of information by potential employers of the handicapped desire concerning specific handicapping conditions and/or individuals. In addition, this study explored the differences in employers' perceptions of job potential of individuals with

visible and non-visible handicaps. Likewise, differences in Vocational Rehabilitation Counselors' perceptions of job potential of individuals with visible and non-visible handicaps were explored with the results from both groups being compared. The information from the study was then used to determine the feasibility of developing a placement service for the disabled as an additional component to the Department of Special Education and Rehabilitation's Vocational Evaluation Lab.

### Research Questions

1.0 Will employers differ in their views as to the job potential of handicapped individuals if the individual has a visible handicap or if the individual has a non-visible handicap?

2.0 Will vocational rehabilitation counselors differ in their views as to the job potential of handicapped individuals if the individual has a visible handicap or if the individual has a non-visible handicap?

3.0 Will employers differ from vocational rehabilitation counselors in their views as to the job potential of an individual with a visible handicap?

4.0 Will employers differ from vocational rehabilitation counselors in their views as to the job potential of an individual with a non-visible handicap?

5.0 Will employers desire any information concerning a handicapping condition of an individual other than information that is directly related to the applicant's suitability for a specific job?

6.0 Will employers' desired information concerning a handicapping condition differ from that which vocational rehabilitation counselors provide?

7.0 Will employers desire a service specifically developed for job placement of the handicapped?



8.0 Will vocational rehabilitation counselors desire a service specifically developed for job placement of the handicapped?

### Methodology

#### Instruments

**Interview Videotape:** Two 10 minute videotapes were developed. One tape was an individual with a visible handicap (C-6 Quadraplegia) and the other tape was an individual with a non-visible handicap (Wegener's Granulomatosis) (see Appendix A for permission forms). Both interviews were conducted by a doctoral student in vocational rehabilitation and followed the guidelines of interviewing as given in Personnel Interviewing Theory and Practice (Lopez, 1975) (see Appendix B for interview questions). At no time was the individual's handicap directly addressed.

**Job Potential Checklist:** Two lists were developed, one for each of the handicapped individuals discussed above. Each list included fifteen (15) possible jobs. Five (5) of the choices were realistic job choices (one was the current employment of the individual), five (5) of the choices were unrealistic job choices and five (5) of the choices were under-employment choices (see Appendices Ca and Cb for form examples).

**Job-Match Questionnaire:** A brief 10 question questionnaire was developed to be given to members of the Rotary Club in order to determine the general interest in the project and to obtain names of personnel directors to be involved in this study. (see Appendix D for an example of this questionnaire).

**Employer's Questionnaire:** A detailed 15 question questionnaire was developed from data collected in a pilot study by Hiller and Bragman (1981) as to information employers may want to know about handicapped applicants (see Appendix E for an example of this questionnaire).

Counselor's Questionnaire: A modified questionnaire similar to the Employer's Questionnaire was developed and directed to the concerns of vocational rehabilitation counselors (see Appendix F for an example of this questionnaire).

### Procedures

To determine the general interest in the project and to obtain names of personnel directors to be involved in this study the Job-Match questionnaire was given to 300 members of the Rotary Club during their regular meeting on May 11, 1982. The chairman of the Handicapped Committee was responsible for the distribution and collection of these questionnaires. This data collection took 15 minutes. Only thirty-five questionnaires were completed.

From the thirty-five (35) questionnaires returned a list of twenty-three (23) individuals who were interested in the project was determined. Each of these individuals was contacted by phone and asked if he/she was willing to complete a more detailed questionnaire and attend an awareness workshop. All of the individuals agreed to complete the questionnaire and twenty (20) also agreed to participate in the workshop. Questionnaires with return postage paid envelopes were mailed to the twenty-three (23) individuals who agreed to complete them.

Through the Handicapped Student Services at Memphis State University two (2) college students were identified who were white, male, and attractive. One individual had a visible disability (wheelchair dependent, paralyzed from the 6th vertebrae). The other individual had a non-visible handicap (Wegener's Granulomatosis, a disorder in which scar tissue develops around the vital organs). The researchers met with these individuals to discuss the purpose of the project and what would occur in the video-taped interviews. These individuals were then video-taped at the Memphis State University Media Center.



The Director of the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation in Memphis was contacted and the purpose of the project was explained. It was arranged to meet with all the vocational rehabilitation counselors in Memphis on August 9, 1982.

On the scheduled date a meeting was held at 8:30 a.m. with the vocational rehabilitation counselors of Memphis. The counselors were asked to first complete the Counselors' Questionnaire. They then viewed the video-tape of the individual with a non-visible handicap and were asked to check all jobs on the Job-List for which they felt the individual was qualified or could be trained. The counselors then viewed the video-tape of the individual with the visible disability and were asked to check all jobs on the Job-List for which the individual was qualified or could be trained. A discussion was then held as to the purpose of this project. In addition, the counselors were asked to state their concerns in respect to the project.

The date for the workshop for the employers was set for August 10, 1982 in the dining room of the Alumni Club at Memphis State University. One meeting was held from 12:00 to 1:00 and another was held from 4:00 to 5:00. All individuals who had been interested in attending the workshop were contacted two (2) weeks prior to the workshop and sent a letter of reminder with a map of the campus one (1) week before.

The program for the workshop is given in Appendix G. At the beginning of the workshop the employers viewed the video-tape of the individual with a non-visible disability and were asked to check all jobs on the Job-List for which they felt the individual was qualified or could be trained. The employers then viewed the video-tape of the individual with a visible disability and were asked to check all jobs on the Job-List for which they felt the individual was qualified or could be trained. Following the viewing of the tapes a discussion about the individuals viewed was held. A presentation was then given on guidelines for

interviewing the handicapped, job modifications and accommodations, and general information about different disabilities. In addition, the employers discussed their concerns about hiring the handicapped. Information about Tax Credits was distributed (see Appendix H). Due to problems with conflicting scheduling of the initial workshops an additional workshop was scheduled for September 1, 1982 at the Alumni Club. All employers who were unable to attend the previous workshops were contacted two (2) weeks prior to the workshop. A letter of reminder and map were sent to these employers one (1) week prior to the workshop. In addition, the twelve (12) employers who agreed to attend were called the day of the workshop.

### Subjects

From the thirty-five (35) persons who completed the Job-Match questionnaire twenty-three (23) stated they were interested in the project. A summary of the results of this questionnaire is given in Table 1. From the twenty-three interested individuals, seventeen (17) returned the more detailed Employer's Questionnaire and eleven (11) individuals actually attended one of the two workshops and participated in the study. Twenty-five (25) Vocational Rehabilitation Counselors completed the Counselor's Questionnaire and participated in the study.

-----  
 Insert Table 1 About Here  
 -----

### Results

Research Question 1.0: Eleven (11) employers participated in the study. Table 2 presents the frequencies of responses on the Job-Check List for the individual with a visible handicap and Table 3 presents the frequencies of responses on the Job-Check List for the individual with a non-visible handicap. These responses were then divided into realistic choices, unrealistic choices and under-employment

choices. Since the number of unrealistic choices selected was so low (only one (1) for the individual with a visible handicap) analysis was done only on realistic and under-employment choices. The break-down of job choices is given in Table 4. The Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test (Conover, 1980) was used to determine if there was a difference in the over-all number of choices. There was no significant difference in the number of responses given (the T value obtained was .2087 with  $p = .417$ ). Chi-square was used to determine if there was a difference in the distribution of responses for the individual with a visible handicap and the individual with a non-visible handicap in respect to realistic and under-employment choices. There was a difference in the distribution of the choices (the Chi-square with 1 df obtained was 4.05 with  $p < .05$ ). The Wilcoxon Signed Ranks test was then used to determine if there was a difference in the number of responses of realistic jobs for the individual with a visible handicap and the individual with a non-visible handicap. There was a significant difference between the number of realistic jobs (the T value was 2.807 with  $p = .0002$ ). The visible handicap was significantly higher in realistic jobs. Similarly, the Wilcoxon Signed Ranks test was used for under-employment choices. There was no significant difference in the number of under-employment choices (the T value obtained was .668 with  $p = .748$ ).

-----  
 Insert Tables 2, 3, 4 About Here  
 -----

Research Question 2.0: Twenty-five (25) Vocational Rehabilitation Counselors participated in the study. Table 2 presents the frequencies of responses on the Job-Check List for the individual with a visible handicap and Table 3 presents the frequencies of responses on the Job-Check List for the individual with a non-visible handicap. These responses were then divided into realistic choices, unrealistic

choices and under-employment choices. Since the number of unrealistic choices was so low (three (3) for the individual with a non-visible handicap), all analysis was done on realistic and under-employment choices only. The breakdown of job choices is given in Table 5. The Wilcoxon Signed Ranks test was used to determine if there was a difference in the over-all number of choices. There was no significant difference in the number of responses given (the T value obtained was .3838 with  $p = .649$ ). Chi-square was then used to determine if there was a difference in the distribution of responses for the individual with a visible handicap and the individual with a non-visible handicap in respect to realistic and under-employment choices. There was no difference in the distribution of the choices (the Chi-square with 1df obtained was .514 with  $p > .05$ ). The Wilcoxon Signed Ranks test was used to determine if there was a difference in the number of responses of realistic jobs for the individual with a visible handicap and the individual with a non-visible handicap and to determine if there was a difference in under-employment jobs. There was no difference in either realistic or under-employment choices ( $T = .688$ ,  $p = .253$ ;  $T = .291$ ,  $p = .615$ , respectively).

-----  
 Insert Table 5 About Here  
 -----

Research Question 3.0: To determine if there was a difference between employers and vocational rehabilitation counselors' views of the job potential of an individual with a visible handicap the Chi-square test was used. There was a significant difference in the distribution of the choices for the employers and the vocational rehabilitation counselors (the Chi-square obtained with 1 df was 4.79 with  $p < .05$ ). The Median Test was then used to determine if there was a difference in the number of over-all choices. There was no difference in the number of choices (the Chi-square value obtained was 1.66 with  $p > .05$ ). The Median Test was also used to

determine if there was a difference in the number of realistic choices and in the number of under-employment choices. There was a difference in the view of the employers and the counselors in respect to under-employment choices for the individual with a visible disability but not in respect to realistic choices (the Chi-squares obtained were 6.53 with  $p < .05$  and .130 with  $p > .05$  respectively). The employers were significantly higher on the under-employment.

Research Question 4.0: To determine if there was a difference between employers' and vocational rehabilitation counselors' views of the job potential of an individual with a non-visible handicap the Chi-square test was used. There was a significant difference in the distribution of the choices for the employers and the vocational rehabilitation counselors (the Chi-square obtained with 1 df. was ~~4~~ 66 with  $p < .05$ ). The Median Test was used to determine if there was a difference in the number of over-all choices. There was no-difference in the number of choices (the Chi-square obtained was .080 with  $p > .05$ ). The Median Test was also used to determine if there was a difference in the number of realistic choices and in the number of under-employment choices. There was a difference in the view of the employers and the counselors in respect to realistic and under-employment choices for the individual with a non-visible disability (the Chi-squares obtained were 10.60 with  $p < .05$  and 4.15 with  $p < .05$ , respectively). The employers were significantly lower on the realistic and significantly higher on the under-employment.

Research Question 5.0: The results of the Employers' Questionnaire are given in Table 6. From inspection of the Table it can be noted that the employers wanted to know: 1) the general effects of the disability on the job, 2) general information about the disability and 3) the legal concerns. The employers also expected the disabled interviewee to state his/her limitations and abilities as well as volunteer information about the disability. In follow-up discussions at the

workshop the employers added that this information should always be job related.

-----  
 Insert Table 6 About Here  
 -----

Research Question 6.0: The results of the counselors' questionnaire are given in Table 6. From inspection of this table it can be noted that in respect to information desired and information supplied there is little difference between the employers and the counselors. The largest differences, however, are in respect to the first five (5) questions which are related to when information should be supplied and about which disabilities this information should be supplied.

Question 1 dealt with modifications of the interviewing. For the employers, the three highest ranked disabilities requiring interview modification were: Learning Disabled, Mentally Retarded, and Emotionally Disturbed (in order of highest to lowest). Each of these disabilities was non-visible. For the rehabilitation counselors, the four highest ranked disabilities requiring interview modification were: Hearing Impaired, Mentally Retarded, Neurologically Impaired and Visually Impaired (in order of highest to lowest).

Question 2 dealt with job modifications. For the employers, the three highest ranked disabilities requiring job modifications were: Wheelchair Dependent, Visually Impaired, and Cerebral Palsied (in order of highest to lowest). For the counselor, the three highest ranked disabilities requiring job modifications were: Wheelchair Dependent, Cerebral Palsied, and Epileptic, (in order of highest to lowest).

Question 3 dealt with receiving information concerning the handicapped before interviewing. For the employers, the four highest ranked disabilities that required information concerning the handicapped before interviewing were: Cerebral Palsied, Emotionally Disturbed, Learning Disabled, Mentally Retarded, and Neurologically



Impaired. For the counselors, the three highest ranked disabilities requiring information before the interview were: Cerebral Palsied, Wheelchair Dependent, Emotionally Disturbed.

Question 4 dealt with receiving information concerning the handicapped before hiring. For the employers, the five highest ranked disabilities requiring information before hiring were: Cerebral Palsied, Drug Addicted, Emotionally Disturbed, Mentally Retarded and Wheelchair Dependent. For the counselor, the three highest ranked disabilities requiring information before hiring were: Cerebral Palsied, Wheelchair Dependent, Epileptic.

Question 5 dealt with obtaining information about the handicapped after hiring. For the employers the five highest ranked disabilities were: Epileptic, Hearing Impaired, Mentally Retarded, Speech Impaired, and Visually Impaired.

Three (3) employers, however, noted that it was too late by this time. For the counselors, the five highest ranked disabilities requiring information after hiring were: Wheelchair Dependent, Visually Impaired, Hearing Impaired, Mentally Retarded, and Cerebral Palsied.

Research Question 7.0: Of the 17 employers who completed the Employers' Questionnaire, 15 stated that they would like a service specifically designed for the placement of disabled (one stated he/she would not like the service and one did not check this question). Only three (3) stated they would pay for the service however, thirteen employers stated that they would also like a follow-up service to the placement service although only three (3) stated they would pay for this service. During the discussions in the workshop many ideas were generated concerning the service. These included: 1) having the placement service act as a clearing-house and networking facility to all other agencies, 2) developing a computerized program to expedite job-matching procedures for employers and clients, 3) providing consultation to employers concerning legal implications

such as hiring and firing the handicapped, and 4) providing follow-up to employers to eliminate problems and ensure successful placement.

Research Question 8.0: All the vocational rehabilitation counselors desired a service specifically developed for job placement of the handicapped which included a follow-up service.

### Discussion

The findings from this study give additional insight into the conflicting views between the business community and the rehabilitation field as to hiring the disabled. It is evident that a closer network of communication must be developed between these two sectors to provide awareness of each other's needs. It is paramount that they work together with rehabilitation agencies providing continuous awareness workshops, follow-up services and qualified disabled persons to meet the specified needs of the business community. As the results of the study indicate until this communication network is established the feasibility of developing a job placement service for the disabled at the present time is questionable.

The major concern of this study relates to the low response rate from the business community both in respect to involvement in the development of a placement service for the qualified disabled and in respect to the hiring of the qualified disabled. Only thirty-five (35) of more than 300 members of the Rotary Club completed the initial JOB-MATCH questionnaire. This was approximately 10% of the group that had originally contacted the researchers to begin the placement project. The question, then, is: Why was the response rated so low.

One factor, of course, may be that the present economic situation is not conducive to any type of employment service. Many employers stated they were not hiring anyone, disabled or otherwise. Another factor may have been

the manner in which the questionnaire was presented to the members. Since the researchers could not be present during the meetings, there is no way to determine how it was administered. The third factor, lack of awareness of disabilities became apparent only when the results of the research study from the few individuals interested in hiring the disabled were analyzed.

An examination of the results from the research study, the questionnaire, and the discussion with the employers in the workshop, clearly indicates a limited awareness of what "disabled" means. The employers had little awareness of different types of disabilities and the potentials of individuals with different disabilities. One interesting finding, however, is that the employers were able to appropriately identify which jobs were the most suitable for the individual with a visible disability, but were not able to appropriately identify jobs for the individual with a non-visible disability. This lack of knowledge about non-visible handicaps was also pointed out by the questionnaires. When the employers were questioned about non-visible disabilities, the answers also reflected a lack of knowledge concerning them.

As expected, The Vocational Rehabilitation Counselors, trained in the area of rehabilitation, were able to appropriately identify job potential for disabled individuals. When the questionnaires from the employers and the counselors were compared; among other discrepancies, it was found that while the counselor's concerns focused more on individuals with visible disabilities, the employers concerns focused more on non-visible disabilities.

The results of this study strongly support the need for a systematic project to enhance employer awareness of the various disabilities.

The focus of this project should include; on-going awareness workshops to discuss various visible and non-visible disabilities and related implications concerning myths and misconceptions about the multitude of jobs qualified disabled

persons can perform.

Secondly, rehabilitation agencies need to act as a coordinated network to provide employers with information on: job modifications, accommodations, current legislation concerning the handicapped nationwide organizations interested in the handicapped awareness audio-visual materials for employers, strategies for successfully employing the disabled, etc.

Thirdly, rehabilitation agencies need to offer support services to employers by providing a comprehensive follow-up to placement. This could include responding to a problem, assessing for modifications, staying in contact with both employer and employee to ensure satisfactory placement. At the same time, the business community must identify and specify its needs to the various agencies working for the handicapped.

Until this on-going communication is established, conflicting views between rehabilitation agencies and the business community will remain and qualified disabled persons will continue to be underplaced or unemployed.

## References

- Cónover, W. J. Practical nonparametric statistics (2nd edition). New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1980.
- Fafard, M. E. & Haubrich, P. A. Vocational and social adjustment of learning disabled young adults: A follow-up study. Learning Disability Quarterly, 1981, 4, 122-130.
- Hartley, N. Channeling students into the mainstream. Voc Ed, 1978, 39-42.
- Heller, H. W. Secondary education for handicapped students: In search of a solution. Exceptional Children, 1981, 47 582-589
- Hiller, R. & Bragman, R. Personnel recruiter's perceptions of interviewing the disabled. Paper presented at the annual convention of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Lexington, Kentucky, November, 1981.
- Jenkins, W. M. & Odle, S. J. Special education, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation: A spectrum of services to the handicapped. In J. W. Schifani, R. M. Andersen, & S. J. Odle (Eds.), Implementing learning in the least restrictive environment. Baltimore: University Park Press, 1980.
- Levitan, S. & Taggart, R. Jobs for the disabled. Washington, D.C.: George Washington University Center for Manpower Policy Studies, 1976.
- Lopez, F. M. Personnel interviewing: Theory and interviewing (2nd edition). New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975.
- Morgan, H. & Cogger, J. The interviewer's manual. New York: Drake-Beam and Associates, Inc. 1980.
- Razeghi, J. A. Consumer involvement in career and vocational education for handicapped students. In C. J. Kokaska (Ed.) Career futures for exceptional individuals. Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children, 1979.

Simek, T. S., Matilsky, P. I., & Banks, J. S. Career education: A collaborative planning process between community and school. In C. J. Kokaska (Ed.) Career futures for exceptional individuals. Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children, 1979.

Stone, R. M. Mainstreaming the handicapped into business and industry. In C. J. Kokaska (Ed.) Career futures for exceptional individuals. Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children, 1979.

Wimmer, D. Functional learning curricula in the secondary schools. Exceptional Children. 1981, 47, 610-616.

Wright, Local implementation of P.L. 94-142: Update report on the second year of a longitudinal study. (draft) Stanford: Stanford Research Institute, 1980.



Table 1

Summary of Results of JOB-MATCH Questionnaire

<u>Questions</u>	<u>Responses</u>		
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Blank</u>
1. Would your company be receptive to a service especially developed to assist you in hiring qualified disabled individuals?	30	2	3
2. Would you be willing to pay \$50-\$75 for the service?	20	8	7
3. Are you familiar with the Tax Reform Act of 1976?	11	10	4
4. Are you familiar with the Federal Job Tax Credit?	21	13	1
5. Would you like to receive information about these credits?	27	10	4
6. Would you like to receive additional information and/or workshops about hiring the qualified disabled?	23	7	5
7. Would you be agreeable to our forwarding you to your Personnel Director a questionnaire?	23	11	1

Table 2

## Job Potential Checklist for Visible Disability

<u>Job</u>	<u>Employer</u>	<u>Counselor</u>
Air Conditioning Repairperson ***	0	0
Sales *	9	18
Lawyer *	6	16
Computer Programming *	1	4
Pilot ***	0	0
Teller **	4	5
Packer ***	1	0
Surgeon ***	0	0
Public Relations * A	10	23
Cashier **	4	3
Construction Worker ***	0	0
Counter Attendant **	3	4
Secretary/Receptionist **	2	2
Payroll Clerk **	7	6
Corporate President *	2	4
TOTAL	49	85

\* Realistic

\*\* Under-employment

\*\*\* Unrealistic

A Actual Job

Table 3

## Job Potential Checklist for Non-Visible Disability

<u>Job</u>	<u>Employers</u>	<u>Counselors</u>
Payroll Clerk **	8	11
Lawyer *	0	7
Computer Programming * A	11	25
Teller **	7	7
Pilot ***	0	0
Sound Engineer ***	0	2
Secretary/Receptionist **	2	7
Corporate President *	0	1
Air Conditioning Repairperson ***	0	1
Packer **	2	2
Construction Worker ***	0	0
Cashier **	8	5
Public Relations *	4	21
Surgeon ***	0	0
Sales *	1	17
TOTAL	43	92

\* Realistic  
 \*\* Under-employment  
 \*\*\* Unrealistic  
 A Actual Job

Table 4

Break-down of Job Choices of Employers\*

	Appropriate	Under-employment	
Visible Handicapped	28	20	48
Non-Visible Handicapped	16	27	43
	44	47	

TOTAL = 91

\*n = 11

Table 5.

Break-down of Job Choices of Vocational Rehabilitation Counselors\*

	Appropriate	Under-employment	
Visible Handicapped	65	20	85
Non-Visible Handicapped	65	26	91
	130	46	

TOTAL = 176

\*n = 25

Table 6

Results of Employer\* and Counselor\*\* Questionnaire

1. Interviews need to be modified when interviewing an individual who is:

<u>Disability</u>	<u>Employer</u>	<u>Counselor</u>
Cerebral Palsied	7	8
Drug Addicted	6	2
Emotionally Disturbed	8	7
Epileptic	4	4
Hearing Impaired	5	22
Learning Disabled	11	6
Mentally Retarded	10	17
Neurologically Impaired (Head Trauma)	5	14
Speech Impaired	5	13
Visually Impaired	5	14
Wheelchair Dependent	4	13

2. Jobs and/or areas need to be modified when an individual is hired who is:

<u>Disability</u>	<u>Employer</u>	<u>Counselor</u>
Cerebral Palsied	9	16
Drug Addicted	4	1
Emotionally Disturbed	7	1
Epileptic	6	12
Hearing Impaired	8	15
Learning Disabled	7	4
Mentally Retarded	8	5
Neurologically Impaired (Head Trauma)	5	14
Speech Impaired	5	5
Visually Impaired	10	15
Wheelchair Dependent	13	25

3. Information about an individual's disability is necessary BEFORE INTERVIEWING an individual who is:

<u>Disability</u>	<u>Employer</u>	<u>Counselor</u>
Cerebral Palsied	13	16
Drug Addicted	10	8
Emotionally Disturbed	12	13
Epileptic	11	16
Hearing Impaired	11	14
Learning Disabled	12	14
Mentally Retarded	12	13
Neurologically Impaired (Head Trauma)	12	13
Speech Impaired	10	11
Visually Impaired	11	15
Wheelchair Dependent	11	19



Table 6 Cont:

4. Information about an individual's disability is necessary BEFORE HIRING an individual who is:

<u>Disability</u>	<u>Employer</u>	<u>Counselor</u>
Cerebral Palsied	14	18
Drug Addicted	13	10
Emotionally Disturbed	13	13
Epileptic	12	16
Hearing Impaired	11	12
Learning Disabled	12	12
Mentally Retarded	13	13
Neurologically Impaired (Head Trauma)	12	13
Speech Impaired	12	10
Visually Impaired	12	13
Wheelchair Dependent	13	17

5. Information about an individual's disability is necessary AFTER HIRING an individual who is:

<u>Disability</u>	<u>Employer</u>	<u>Counselor</u>
Cerebral Palsied	7	6
Drug Addicted	7	4
Emotionally Disturbed	7	5
Epileptic	8	5
Hearing Impaired	8	6
Learning Disabled	7	4
Mentally Retarded	8	6
Neurologically Impaired (Head Trauma)	7	4
Speech Impaired	8	3
Visually Impaired	8	7
Wheelchair Dependent	7	9

6. Information that is desired includes:

<u>Information</u>	<u>Employer</u>	<u>Counselor</u>
Legal concerns	11	5
General information about disability	14	21
Effects of disability on job performance	16	20
Other (specify)	3	2

7. Information should be supplied by:

<u>Source</u>	<u>Employer</u>	<u>Counselor</u>
Orally by a professional	7	11
Pamphlets, booklets, brochures	5	7
Written report by a professional	13	21
Handicapped individual	10	7
Other (specify)	0	1

Table 6 Cont:

8. During the interview the handicapped individual should:

<u>Behavior</u>	<u>Employer</u>	<u>Counselor</u>
Volunteer information about the disability	14	9
State limitations as well as abilities	16	21
Never mention the disability	0	1
Other (specify)	0	4

9. Would you use a service specifically developed for the placement of disabled individuals?

	<u>Employer</u>	<u>Counselor</u>
Yes	15	25
No	1	0

10. Would you be willing to pay for this service?

	<u>Employer</u>	<u>Counselor</u>
Yes	3	
No	12	

11. Would you use a follow-up service to assist in solving any employment problems that could arise involving a disabled employee?

	<u>Employer</u>	<u>Counselor</u>
Yes	13	25
No	3	0

12. Would you be willing to pay for a follow-up service?

	<u>Employer</u>	<u>Counselor</u>
Yes	3	
No	12	

\*N = 17  
 \*\*N = 25