DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 282 084 CE 047 339

TITLE The ICD Survey II: Employing Disabled Americans. A Nationwide Survey of 920 Employers. Study No. 864009.

INSTITUTION Harris (Louis) and Associates, Inc., New York, N.Y.; International Center for the Disabled, New York, NY.; National Council on the Handicapped, Washington, DC.; President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, Washington, D.C.

SPONS AGENCY Employment and Training Administration (DOL), Washington, D.C.; Office of Human Development Services (DHHS), Washington, D.C.; Social Security Administration (DHHS), Washington, DC.

PUB DATE Mar 87

GRANT 12D70260-2-01; 90DD0133; 996339698-02

NOTE 142p.; For a related document, see ED 278 189.

PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Adults; Career Education; *Disabilities; *Employer Attitudes; Employment Opportunities; *Employment Practices; *Equal Opportunities (Jobs); Job Performance; Job Training; *Labor Turnover; National Surveys; *Vocational Rehabilitation

ABSTRACT

A survey explored what 921 managers nationwide are doing to employ disabled people and return disabled employees to work. It identified barriers that prevent employers from hiring disabled people and steps public and private sectors could take to increase their employment. Employers gave their disabled employees high marks as hard working, reliable, and productive employees. The cost of employing disabled people was not a significant barrier. Most employers appeared willing to consider the employment of more disabled people if they are qualified. Survey evidence indicated that employment of disabled people is unlikely to increase significantly without new stimulation. Most employers believed that their company was doing enough to employ disabled people, that a shortage of qualified disabled job applicants was a major barrier, and that the hiring of the disabled had a lower priority than the hiring of minority groups and the elderly. They said that a majority of employees who became disabled returned to work. Employers were supportive of rehabilitation of employees who became disabled and felt their companies were doing enough to rehabilitate them. Most managers supported proposed initiatives and policy changes to increase employment of disabled people and the concept that civil rights laws should apply. (The questionnaire is appended.) (YLB)

ICD

INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR THE DISABLED

Study No. 864009

THE ICD SURVEY II:
EMPLOYING DISABLED AMERICANS

A Nationwide Survey of 920 Employers

Conducted for

ICD-International Center for the Disabled

New York, New York

In Cooperation With

National Council on the Handicapped

and

The President's Committee on Employment

of the Handicapped

March 1987

Harris Survey Directors

Humphrey Taylor, President

Michael R. Kagay, Ph.D.,
Vice President

Stuart Leichenko,
Research Associate

ICD Survey Staff

John B. Wingate
Executive Director
Nina M. Hill, Ph.D.
Survey Director
Thomas G. Mehnert,
Assistant Survey Director
Mary E. Boyd
Research Analyst
Sanders W. Davis, M.D.,
Medical Director

LOUIS HARRIS AND ASSOCIATES, INC.

New York, New York

The material in this project was prepared in part under Grant No. 90DD0133 from the Office of Human Development Services - U.S. Department of Health and Human Services; Grant No. 996339698-02 from the Employment and Training Administration - U.S. Department of Labor under the authority of Title III, part B of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973, as amended; and Grant No. 12D70260-2-01 from Social Security Administration - U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

FOREWORD AND ACKNOWLEDGMENTS FROM ICD

ICD-International Center for the Disabled, in cooperation with the National Council on the Handicapped, and The President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped is proud to have made this survey possible. This is the first major nationwide survey to study comprehensively employer attitudes, policies and experiences pertaining to the hiring, training, retention and job performance of disabled individuals. The survey also focuses on a series of initiatives which could be taken by employers, government, private rehabilitation agencies, foundations, and by disabled citizens themselves to promote employment of individuals with disabilities.

The new survey is a follow-up study to the 1986 The ICD Survey of Disabled Americans: Bringing Disabled Americans into the Mainstream. This document identified "not working" as "the truest definition of what it means to be disabled in the United States today." Two-thirds of disabled persons between the ages of 16 and 64 are not working. Of these 12.4 million people, 8.2 million want to work. We hope that the results of the new survey will inform and guide policymakers and rehabilitation professionals in their efforts to improve the employment status of disabled Americans.

A study of this magnitude required the commitment, dedication and expert help of many individuals. We would particularly like to thank Jeremiah Milbank, Jr. who perceived the need for a study of employment issues arising from the findings of the first survey.

We would also like to thank the National Council on the Handicapped, particularly Mrs. Sandra S. Parrino, Chairperson, Lex Frieden, Executive Director and Ethel Briggs, Adult Services Specialist, for their invaluable guidance. We owe much to The President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, especially Harold Russell, Chairman and Jay Rochlin, Acting Executive Director for their continued assistance.

We are grateful to the Office of Human Development Services - U.S. Department of Health and Human Services; to the Employment and Training Administration - U.S. Department of Labor; Social Security Administration - U.S. Department of Health and Human Services; The President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped in cooperation with the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services - U.S. Department of Education; The Leon Lowenstein Foundation, The Manufacturers Hanover Trust Company, The Commonwealth Fund, The Hoffman LaRoche Foundation, General Mills, Incorporated, 3M Corporation and E.I. duPont de Nemours & Company, Incorporated for their support of this survey project.

Members of the ICD Survey Committee included John B. Wingate, Executive Director of ICD, Nina M. Hill, Ph.D., Survey Director, Thomas G. Mehnert, Assistant Survey Director, Mary E. Boyd, Research Analyst and Sanders W. Davis, M.D., Medical Director of ICD.

We gratefully acknowledge the expertise contributed by distinguished members of industry, rehabilitation, government and consumer advocacy in the development of this survey. Their names are listed below. It has once again been our pleasure to work with Louis Harris and Associates. As expected, they have provided us with valuable insights into a critical issue affecting the lives of disabled Americans.

Survey Advisors

Adrienne Asch
Senior Human Rights Specialist
New York State Division of
Human Rights
New York, NY

C. William Bechman
Director, Employee Relations
ICD-International Center for
the Disabled
New York, NY

Paul Ashton
Member, The President's Committee
on Employment of the Handicapped
Licensed Psychologist
Assessment and Career Services
3M
St. Paul, MN

Iwona Blazewski
Employment Interviewer
First Nationwide Bank
New York, NY

Frank Bowe, Ph.D.
Chairman, U.S. Congress Commission
on Education of the Deaf
Washington, DC

Mary E. Boyd
Research Analyst
ICD-International Center for
the Disabled
New York, NY

Jack Brauntuch
Executive Director
J.M. Foundation
New York, NY

Ethel Briggs
Adult Services Specialist
National Council on the Handicapped
Washington, DC

Robert L. Burgdorf, Jr.
Research Specialist
National Council on the Handicapped
Washington, DC

James R. Campbell
Consultant, The President's Committee
on Employment of the Handicapped
New York, NY

Sanders W. Davis, M.D.
Medical Director
ICD-International Center for
the Disabled
New York, NY

Richard Drach
Member, The President's Committee
on Employment of the Handicapped
Consultant
Affirmative Action Section
Employee Relations Department
E.I. duPont de Nemours & Company, Inc.
Wilmington, DE

Joe Easterday
Research Associate
Indiana University
Bloomington, IN

Bessie Edwards
Manager of Training and Development
Paragon Cable-Manhattan
New York, NY

Valerie Ellien, Ph.D.
NYU Rehabilitation Counseling Department
Employment Research & Training Center
New York, NY

Sharon Feffer
Employee Relations Manager
Republic National Bank
New York, NY

Elizabeth (Buffy) A. Fetter
Consultant
Marketing Research and Strategic
Planning
Minneapolis, MN

Donna Fingerhut
Director, Education and Training
ICD-International Center for
the Disabled
New York, NY

Frederick L. Francis
Director of Marketing, Outreach
and Placement
New York State Education Department
Office of Vocational Rehabilitation
Albany, NY

Lex Frieden
Executive Director
National Council on the Handicapped
Washington, DC

Donald Galvin, Ph.D.
Director of Strategic Planning
National Rehabilitation Hospital
Washington, DC

Thomas G. Garlock
Former Director, Employee
Rehabilitation Service
ICD-International Center for
the Disabled
New York, NY

Joseph Greenblum
Social Science Research Analyst
Division of Disability Studies
Social Security Administration
Baltimore, MD

Paul G. Hearne
Executive Director
Just One Break, Incorporated
New York, NY

Nina M. Hill, Ph.D. (Survey Director)
Director, Clinical Services and
Professional Education
ICD-International Center for
the Disabled
New York, NY

Joan Hoeffel
Rehabilitation Coordinator
Xerox Corporation
Webster, NY

Herbert Krauss, Ph.D.
Director, Rehabilitation Research
ICD-International Center for
the Disabled
New York, NY

Elisa G. Lederer
Director, Placement
ICD-International Center for
the Disabled
New York, NY

William T. Leonard
Corporate Manager of Recruitment
McGraw-Hill, Incorporated
New York, NY

Patricia J. Livingston, Ph.D.
Chair, Rehabilitation Counseling
Department
New York University
New York, NY

Michael I. Markowitz
Director of Personnel
The New School for Social Research
New York, NY

Henry McCarthy, Ph.D.
Louisiana State University
School of Allied Health Professions
Department of Rehabilitation
Counseling
New Orleans, LA

Thomas G. Mehnert (Assistant Survey
Director)
Director, Quality Assurance
ICD-International Center for
the Disabled
New York, NY

Jeremiah Milbank, Jr.
Member, National Council on the
Handicapped
President, ICD-International Center
for the Disabled
New York, NY

Malcolm H. Morrison, Ph.D.
Acting Director
Division of Disability Studies
Social Security Administration
Baltimore, MD

Tom O'Bryant
Chairman, Employer Committee
The President's Committee
on Employment of the Handicapped
Champion International Corporation
Stamford, CT

Edward J. O'Malley
Director, Personnel Department
The Port Authority of New York
and New Jersey
New York, NY

Sandra S. Parrino
Chairperson
National Council on the Handicapped
Washington, DC

Paul A. Rivera, D.P.S.
Manager of Corporate EEO and Compliance
Xerox Corporation
Stamford, CT

Jay Rochlin
Acting Executive Director
The President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped
Washington, DC

Bernard Rosenberg, M.A., CRC, NCC
Director, Vocational Rehabilitation
ICD-International Center for the Disabled
New York, NY

Barbara Ross
Assistant Director, Employee Relations
ICD-International Center for the Disabled
New York, NY

Ruth Ellen Ross
Manager, Plans, Projects and Services
The President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped
Washington, DC

Harold Russell
Chairman
The President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped
Washington, DC

Gail Schwartz
Director, Institute for Rehabilitation and Disability Management
Washington Business Group on Health
Washington, DC

David Vandergoot, Ph.D.
Vice-President of Research
Human Resources Center
Albertson, NY

Donald Windey
Vice-President, Human Resources
Republic National Bank
New York, NY

John B. Wingate
Executive Director
ICD-International Center for the Disabled
New York, NY

Harold E. Yuker, Ph.D.
Psychology Department
Hofstra University
Hempstead, NY

CONTENTS

(CONTINUED)

CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

TABLES

(CONTINUED)

TABLES (CONTINUED)

(CONTINUED)

TABLES (CONTINUED)

(CONTINUED)

TABLES (CONTINUED)

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this survey is to learn what employers across the nation are doing to employ disabled people and return disabled employees to work, and what their experiences with disabled employees have been. The survey also seeks to identify barriers that prevent employers from hiring disabled people, and steps that the public and private sector could take to increase the employment of disabled people.

This is the first nationwide survey of managers to focus primarily on issues concerning the employment of disabled people. It is hoped that the results will provide guidance to employers, disability advocates, rehabilitation and placement agencies, and legislators who are working to help disabled people enter the mainstream as productive members of society.

The need for this research was made clear by the ICD Survey of Disabled Americans: Bringing Disabled Americans into the Mainstream, conducted for ICD and the National Council on the Handicapped by Louis Harris and Associates in 1985.

The survey of disabled Americans found that two-thirds of all working-age disabled persons are not working, even though a large majority of this group say that they would like to work. Disabled persons are, therefore, much less likely to be working than any other demographic group under 65, including black teenagers. The challenge presented by these findings is how to induce the private and public sectors to effect policies and programs which will bring many more disabled people into the workforce.

That survey found that work makes a vast qualitative difference in the lives of disabled Americans. Comparisons between working and non-working disabled people show that those who work are more satisfied with life, much less likely to consider themselves disabled, and much less likely to say that their disability has prevented them from reaching their full abilities as a person. Working disabled persons also are better educated and have more money than do non-working disabled persons.

The survey identified a number of barriers which many disabled people cite as important reasons why they are not working, as well as measures of disabled people's work experience. But these findings provided few guides which could be used to stimulate and encourage the employment of many more disabled people. This new survey is designed to fill this gap.

Specifically, the survey provides:

-- A comparison of current recruiting efforts made for disabled people and those made for other groups.

-- Managers' comparisons between disabled and non-disabled job applicants.

-- Managers' opinions about the prevalence of job discrimination against disabled people.

-- Measures of the prevalence of company policies or programs for the hiring of disabled people.

-- The percentage of companies that have hired disabled people in the past three years and in the past year.

-- The most important reasons why some companies have not hired disabled people.

-- Comparisons of the job performance of disabled and non-disabled employees.

-- Comparisons of the cost of employing disabled and non-disabled employees.

-- The percentage of companies that have made accommodations for disabled employees, and the cost of these accommodations.

-- Managers' experiences with job initiatives and training programs for disabled people.

-- Measures of the prevalence of various disability management programs for current employees who become disabled.

-- Managers' reactions to 13 initiatives and policy changes that have been proposed to increase employment of disabled people.

The Samples

The survey is based on interviews with four separate samples of managers: 210 interviews with top managers, 301 interviews with equal employment opportunity (EEO) managers, 210 interviews with department heads and line managers, and 200 interviews with top managers in very small companies (that employ 10-49 people). In all, 921 interviews were conducted with managers of 921 different companies.

Top managers were defined as corporate executives with at least the rank of senior vice president. The EEO sample is composed of managers who have responsibility for equal employment opportunity at their company locations. The third sample is of department heads and line managers in a variety of company departments, ranging from sales to accounting and finance. Top managers in very small companies, the fourth sample, were defined as principals or ranking officers. Generally, managers were speaking from their current knowledge and experience without drawing on detailed company records.

It should be noted that while each sample was drawn to be a representative cross-section of each category of manager, the aggregate data is not strictly projectable to any population. In most tables therefore the replies of top managers, EEO officers, line managers and small business managers are shown separately.

The first three samples are each stratified into three equal subgroups of managers in large companies (10,000 or more employees), medium-sized companies (1,000-9,999 employees), and small companies (50-999 employees). For example, there are 70 interviews with top managers in large companies, 70 with top managers in medium-sized companies, and 70 interviews with top managers in small companies.

All interviews were conducted in September and October, 1986, from the Harris firm's central telephone facility in New York City. Interviews averaged 25 minutes in length.

Appendix A contains additional information about the survey methodology.

Terminology

There are many different terms used to describe people with disabilities, the most common of which are "disabled" and "handicapped." Managers commonly use these two terms to describe two different populations of people with disabilities. People who already are disabled before they begin working for a company usually are considered "handicapped" by managers. Questions in this survey that refer to this population use the adjective "handicapped." Managers commonly think of "disabled" people as current employees who become disabled because of injury, illness, or other health conditions. There are also survey questions about this group, and they use the adjective "disabled."

However, this report uses the word "disabled" throughout to describe all disabled people, defined as "people with physical, seeing, hearing and speech disabilities, or emotional or mental disabilities, or long-term health problems".

Notes on Reading the Tables

An asterisk (*) on a table signifies a value of less than one-half percent (0.5%). A dash (-) represents a value of zero. Percentages may not always add up to 100% because of computer rounding, multiple answers from respondents, or the elimination of "no answers."

Public Release of Survey Findings

All Louis Harris and Associates surveys are designed to adhere to the code of standards of the Council of American Survey Research Organizations (CASRO) and the code of the National Council of Public Polls (NCPP). Because data from this survey will be released to the public, any release must stipulate that the complete report will also be available, rather than simply an excerpt from the survey findings.

Project Responsibility

The director of this project at Louis Harris and Associates was Humphrey Taylor, President. The chief analyst was Stuart Leichenko, Research Associate. He worked under the supervision of Michael R. Kagay, Ph.D., Vice President and Division Head.

Louis Harris and Associates would like to thank ICD-International Center for the Disabled for sponsoring this research. We would in particular like to thank Jeremiah Milbank Jr. and Jack Brauntuch of the J.M. Foundation, and John B. Wingate, Dr. Nina M. Hill, Dr. Sanders Davis, Thomas G. Mehnert and Mary E. Boyd of ICD-International Center for the Disabled. We are also greatly in debt to the many other people who contributed to the development of the questionnaire. However, responsibility for topics, question wordings, the findings, and for their interpretation rests solely with Louis Harris and Associates.

SURVEY HIGHLIGHTS

This summary provides an overview of the survey findings. Many findings described in the chapters of the report do not appear in this summary. Readers are urged to read the chapters in order to understand the full findings of the survey.

Employers' Experiences With Disabled Employees

1. Overwhelming majorities of managers give disabled employees a good or excellent rating on their overall job performance. Only one in twenty managers say that disabled employees' job performance is only fair, and virtually no one says that they do poor work.

Twenty-four percent of top managers give disabled employees an excellent performance rating, 64% rate their job performance as good, 5% call it only fair, and 1% call it poor.

Twenty-percent of equal employment opportunity (EEO) officers say that disabled employees do an excellent job, 71% say that they do a good job, 4% say only fair, and none rate their job performance as poor.

Twenty-seven percent of department heads and line managers give disabled employees an excellent rating, 64% rate their job performance as good, 3% call it only fair, and none said that disabled employees do a poor job.

2. Nearly all disabled employees do their jobs as well or better than other employees in similar jobs.

The great majority of managers say that disabled employees work as hard or harder than non-disabled employees, and are as reliable and punctual or more so. They produce as well or better than non-disabled employees, and

demonstrate average or better than average leadership ability. They are also ambitious. In other words, disabled employees are an asset to any employer.

Line managers' comparisons between disabled and non-disabled employees are indicative of the total responses:

-- On willingness to work hard: 46% of line managers rate disabled employees as better than non-disabled employees, and 33% rate them about the same.

-- On reliability: 39% rate disabled employees as better than non-disabled employees, and 42% rate them about the same.

-- On attendance and punctuality: 39% rate disabled employees as better than non-disabled employees, and 40% rate them about the same.

-- On productivity: 20% rate disabled employees as better, and 57% rate them about the same as non-disabled employees.

-- On desire for promotion: 23% rate disabled employees as better, and 55% rate them about the same as non-disabled employees.

-- On leadership ability: 10% rate disabled employees as better, and 62% rate them about the same as non-disabled employees.

3. Eight out of ten department heads and line managers feel that disabled employees are no harder to supervise than non-disabled employees. Eighty-four percent of line managers who have supervised disabled employees, and 80% of those who have not, feel this way.

4. The majority of managers (60% of top managers and 61% of E.E.O. officers) report that their companies can provide in-house training for disabled employees.

The Cost of Employing and Accommodating Disabled People

1. Cost should not be a barrier to increased employment of disabled people. A three-fourths majority of all three manager groups say that the average cost of employing a disabled person is about the same as the cost of employing a non-disabled person.

Eighty-one percent of top managers, 79% of EEO officers, and 75% of department heads and line managers say that it costs about the same amount to employ either a disabled or non-disabled person. Only 13% to 17% of these managers consider it more expensive to employ a disabled person.

2. Large majorities of managers also say that making accommodations for disabled employees is not expensive. The cost of accommodations rarely drives the cost of employment above the average range of costs for all employees.

3. About half of EEO officers (48%) say that their company has made accommodations for disabled employees. The most common accommodations are the removal of architectural barriers in the workplace, the purchase of special equipment for disabled employees, and adjusting work hours or restructuring jobs for disabled employees.

A recent federal study emphasized that accommodations, when needed, are a crucial step toward the full integration of disabled employees into the workforce.

Most managers whose companies have not made accommodations say that they were not needed. However, the survey did not determine the extent to which accommodations were actually needed. Nevertheless, it seems likely that many managers could benefit from further education about the excellent performance record achieved by disabled employees, the generally low cost of accommodations, and their effectiveness in helping people do their jobs well.

Recent Hiring of Disabled People

1. Strong performance evaluations and an absence of cost barriers have not translated into widespread hiring of disabled employees. Only 43% of EEO officers say that their company has hired a disabled employee in the past year. This number does not take account of the hiring of people with "invisible disabilities" or those who do not self-identify as disabled.

2. Large companies are much more likely to hire disabled employees than are smaller companies. Fifty-two percent of companies with at least 10,000 employees have hired disabled people in the past year. That percentage drops to 27% for companies with 50-999 employees, and 16% for companies with 10-49 employees. These differences reflect, at least in part, the obvious fact that large employers hire more people of all kinds. The survey does not provide information on whether the proportion of disabled employees hired is greater among large, medium-sized or small companies.

3. Companies that have federal contracts are also more likely to hire disabled people than are companies without federal contracts. Federal law requires companies that have federal contracts in excess of $2,500 to provide equal employment opportunities to disabled people.

Barriers to Increased Hiring of Disabled People

1. Companies that have not hired disabled people in the past three years say that a lack of qualified applicants is the most important reason. Sixty-six percent of managers say that a lack of qualified applicants is an important reason why they have not hired disabled people.

The message in this finding is clear: increase the pool of qualified disabled people through education and appropriate training efforts. A new generation of disabled people are now being educated under the auspices of the 1975 Education for All Handicapped Children Act. These young people must also receive the training necessary to enter the profession of their choice.

Millions of unemployed disabled people who finished their education before 1975 also need to acquire additional job skills. The 1985 ICD Survey of Disabled Americans showed that only one-third of working-age disabled people are employed either full-time or part-time, even though a two-thirds majority of unemployed disabled persons want to work. The evidence suggests many employers could acquire valuable employees and help more disabled people to become productive members of society.

2. A second key barrier is that few companies have established a policy or program for the hiring of disabled employees. Only 37% of managers say that their company has such a policy or program, and these are mostly large companies.

Employment of disabled people would increase dramatically if many more companies established these policies. Sixty-seven percent of companies that have such a hiring policy have hired disabled employees in the past year, compared to only 42% of companies that do not have a policy. The active dissemination of these employment policies raises the consciousness of managers, and increases the likelihood that they will try harder to employ disabled people. Many companies could clearly do much more in this area.

3. Top managers can play a vital role in raising the consciousness of middle managers about employing disabled people, and ensuring that hiring policies are followed. In companies that have such a policy, 88% of top managers say that they play an active role in disseminating the policy.

4. But managers generally display a low level of consciousness toward disabled people as a group, which is another barrier to their increased employment. The consciousness of all managers -- top, middle, and line supervisors -- toward disabled people needs to be raised. Many managers are not aware that unemployed disabled people want to work, and are capable of becoming loyal, productive employees.

For example, only one in ten top managers display a strongly optimistic attitude toward disabled people as a potential source of employees. Both minority groups and elderly people are more likely to be considered an excellent source of employees by top managers, than are disabled people.

5. Job discrimination remains one of the most persistent barriers to increased employment of disabled people. A three-fourths majority of managers feel that disabled people often encounter discrimination from employers.

This finding supports the anecdotal evidence of job discrimination that disability advocates and journalists have gathered for years. Until discrimination from employers is eliminated, large numbers of unemployed disabled people may never join the working mainstream of American life.

6. The majority of managers say that their companies can provide in-house training for disabled employees. Sixty percent of top managers and 61% of EEO officers say their companies can do this. Among small businesses, however, only 46% of managers say they can provide in-house training. The main reasons why employers cannot provide in-house training are the lack of special training for managers, the lack of special equipment and architectural barriers.

The Rehabilitation of Disabled Employees

1. Most employers who have dealt with employees who become disabled say that a majority of these employees return to work. Only relatively small minorities (from 22% to 8%) of the four employer groups say that a majority of their disabled employees remain disabled or take early retirement.

2. Most employers are supportive of, and committed to, the rehabilitation of employees, who become disabled. Approximately three-quarters of each of the three types of managers surveyed feel that employers have a responsibility to rehabilitate disabled employees. Equally large majorities feel the rehabilitation of disabled employees is cost-effective. Disability management programs widely used include light duty, part-time work or flexible hours (72%), trial work periods (38%), the use of private rehabilitation vendors (36%) and medical case management (35%).

3. Most employers (70%-74%) believe that their companies are doing enough to rehabilitate disabled employees. Only tiny minorities (8%-16%) believe they should make greater efforts. These findings suggest that, as things are, employers are unlikely to significantly increase their rehabilitation efforts.

What Companies Plan to Do in the Near Future

1. Most managers think that their company is already doing enough to employ disabled people, and should not make greater efforts to employ them. Sixty-seven percent of top managers, 71% of EEO officers, and 70% of department heads and line managers think that their companies are doing enough now to employ disabled people.

2. Majorities of managers also think it is somewhat likely or very likely that their companies will make greater efforts to employ disabled people in the next three years. Between 57% and 63% of managers think that their company will make some greater efforts to increase employment of disabled people. From 28% to 38% think that this will not happen.

Many managers are willing to try harder to employ disabled people, and may do so. But they expect rehabilitation and placement agencies to shoulder most of the burden of producing qualified applicants.

Managers Rate the Effectiveness of Proposed Policy Changes

1. Managers express strong support for many different proposed initiatives and policy changes designed to help increase employment of disabled people. These include steps and changes that could be taken by employers, federal and state agencies, legislatures, private rehabilitation agencies and placement services, and foundations.

These proposals are thought to have the most potential:

-- Establishing direct training and recruiting programs with schools and vocational rehabilitation agencies: 54% of managers rate this very effective, and 38% rate it somewhat effective.

-- Having more companies provide internships or part-time jobs to disabled persons as an introduction to full-time jobs: 35% rate this very effective, and 53% rate it somewhat effective.

-- Having employers explain specific functional requirements as part of job descriptions for open positions: 35% rate this very effective, and 45% rate it somewhat effective.

-- Having the government provide additional tax deductions for expensive accommodations, or share in their cost: 27% consider this very effective, and 47% consider it somewhat effective.

-- Having the government subsidize salaries for severely disabled employees for a trial period: 26% rate this very effective, and 42% rate it somewhat effective.

-- Having disability professionals give technical assistance or counsel to employers for accommodations or problems with specific employees: 24% rate this very effective, and 57% rate it somewhat effective.

-- Having chief executive officers establish voluntary employment targets for disabled people: 24% rate this very effective, and 48% rate it somewhat effective.

When asked what they see as the most important steps that public and private agencies should take to help employers employ more disabled people, many managers mention programs which would increase the numbers of job-qualified disabled people, or which would better inform employers about qualified applicants.

2. Substantial majorities of all types of managers support the concept that civil rights laws which protect minorities against discrimination should also apply to disabled people. E.E.O. officers (80%) are the most supportive of this extension of civil rights laws, top managers (56%) the least supportive.

IN CONCLUSION

There are several important findings in this survey which are very encouraging:

-- Employers give their disabled employees high marks as hard working, reliable and productive employees.

-- The cost of employing disabled people is not a significant barrier.

-- Most employers appear to be willing to consider the employment of more disabled people if they are qualified.

However, the evidence of this survey is that, without some new stimulation, the employment of disabled people is unlikely to increase significantly:

-- Most managers think their company is already doing enough to employ disabled people and should not make greater efforts to do so.

-- Most employers believe that the shortage of disabled job applicants with appropriate qualifications is a major barrier to their employing more disabled people.

-- Employers give the hiring of disabled people a lower priority than the hiring of people from minority groups and the elderly. And disabled people are the least likely to be viewed as an excellent source of employees.

Reviewing the data, and reading between the lines of some of the responses, it is clear that most managers give the recruitment of disabled people a very low priority, and that little societal or business pressure is brought to bear on them to give it a higher priority.

Efforts to increase the employment of disabled people will only succeed therefore if:

1. There is an increase in the number of job applicants who are perceived by employers to be qualified.

2. Employers give the employment of disabled people a higher priority.

This survey suggests a number of steps that leaders in government, business and voluntary organizations could take to raise the consciousness of employers on these issues.

CHAPTER 1: MANAGERS ASSESS DISABLED JOB APPLICANTS

Recruiting Efforts and Attitudes Toward Disabled Persons

The survey results show that companies are more likely to make special recruiting efforts for people from minority groups than they are for disabled people. Seventy-two percent of EEO officers and 50% of line managers say that their companies currently make a special effort to recruit people from minority groups. In comparison, 60% of EEO officers and only 33% of line managers believe that their companies do special recruiting for disabled people (Table 1-1). One explanation for this difference is presumably the legal requirement for recruiting minorities.

Companies with federal contracts are much more likely than those without such contracts to make special efforts to hire both minorities and disabled people.

Another possible explanation is suggested in top managers' attitudes toward disabled people as a potential source of employees. Top managers were asked to consider their company's future employment needs, and rate three groups as potential sources of employees -- people in minority groups, disabled people, and elderly people (Table 1-2). The results are as follows:

-- Twenty-seven percent of top managers consider minority groups an excellent potential source of employees, 54% consider them good, 14% rate them as only fair, and 2% rate them as poor.

   The results for elderly people are 14% excellent, 42% good, 27% only fair, and 13% poor.

-- Ten percent give disabled people an excellent rating, 51% rate them as good, 31% consider them only fair, and 5% rate them as a poor potential source of employees.

Disabled people are the least likely to be viewed as an excellent source of employees, and are about as likely as elderly people to be considered as only fair or poor. Only one in ten top managers -- people with at least the rank of senior vice president -- display a strongly optimistic attitude towards disabled people as potential employees.

Observations:

1. Disabled people are about as likely as elderly people to receive strong consideration for hiring from top managers. It is difficult not to see this as evidence of negativism, or at least a lack of enthusiasm, toward disabled people. These attitudes pose a barrier to increased employment of disabled people.

2. These findings sharply contradict the positive ratings given to disabled job applicants by EEO officers and line managers (see Table 1-3) and the high marks awarded to disabled employees for their job performance (see Chapter 4).

Q.2

Table 1-1

A COMPARISON OF SPECIAL RECRUITING EFFORTS FOR MINORITY GROUPS AND DISABLED PERSONS

Q.: Does your company currently make a special effort to recruit (READ EACH ITEM), or not?

	Base	People From Minority Groups	Disabled People
EEO Officers	(301)	%	%
Makes a special effort		72	60
Does not make		27	30
Not sure		1	10
Department Heads/Line Managers	(210)	%	%
Makes a special effort		50	33
Does not make		46	53
Not sure		4	14
Companies with Federal Government Contracts	(273)	%	%
Makes a special effort		82	56
Does not make		16	41
Not sure		2	3
Companies without Federal Government Contracts	(570)	%	%
Makes a special effort		49	28
Does not make		47	67
Not sure		3	5

Q.30

Table 1-2

TOP MANAGERS RATE DISABLED PEOPLE
AS A POTENTIAL SOURCE OF EMPLOYEES

Q.: When you think of your company's employment needs in the next few years, how would you rate (READ EACH ITEM) as a potential source of employees -- excellent, good, only fair, or poor?

Base: 210		Excellent	Good	Only Fair	Poor	Not Sure	Refused
People in minority groups	%	27	54	14	2	2	-
Handicapped people	%	10	51	31	5	2	*
Elderly people	%	14	42	27	13	4	-

*Less than 0.5%.

EEO and Line Managers Rate Disabled Job Applicants

EEO officers and line managers compared disabled and non-disabled job applicants on a number of criteria. Substantial majorities of both manager groups rate disabled applicants as equal to, or better than, non-disabled applicants on: formal education, job skills, ability to sell themselves, leadership potential, communication skills, and past experience (Table 1-3).

Among EEO officers, majorities ranging from 60% to 64% consider disabled applicants about the same as non-disabled applicants on formal education, job skills, leadership potential, and communication skills. Minorities of 10% to 13% rate disabled applicants better than non-disabled applicants on all of these criteria except one, the ability to sell themselves, for which 23% of EEO officers rate disabled applicants superior.

Line managers give disabled job applicants virtually the same evaluations for all six criteria as those given by EEO officers. For example, 27% of line managers rate disabled applicants as better than non-disabled applicants on their ability to sell themselves.

Observation:

Both EEO officers and line managers say that a lack of past experience hurts disabled applicants most. The problem, of course, is how to gain experience when one can't get a job. One way in which this can be addressed is internship and other on-the-job training programs.

Q.3

Table 1-3

MANAGERS RATE DISABLED JOB APPLICANTS

Q.: In general, how would you compare handicapped job applicants to most non-handicapped applicants on their (READ ITEM) -- are handicapped applicants better, worse, or about the same as most non-handicapped applicants?

		EEO Officers						
Base: 301		Better	Worse	About the Same	Doesn't Apply (Vol.)	Depends (Vol.)	Not Sure	Refused
Formal education	%	13	7	63	6	5	5	1
Job skills	%	13	9	60	7	7	3	-
Ability to sell themselves	%	23	16	46	6	4	5	*
Leadership potential	%	10	6	64	6	6	8	-
Communication skills	%	11	6	61	5	12	5	-
Past experience	%	10	26	45	6	6	7	1

		Department Heads/Line Managers						
Base: 210		Better	Worse	About the Same	Doesn't Apply (Vol.)	Depends (Vol.)	Not Sure	Refused
Formal education	%	13	6	60	10	2	10	-
Job skills	%	14	5	58	10	5	9	-
Ability to sell themselves	%	27	10	42	10	2	9	-
Leadership potential	%	9	8	62	10	2	9	-
Communication skills	%	11	5	61	9	6	7	*
Past experience	%	9	20	45	11	2	12	-

*Less than 0.5%.

CHAPTER 2: JOB DISCRIMINATION AND CIVIL RIGHTS LAWS

Job Discrimination Against Disabled People

Large majorities of top managers (72%), EEO officers (76%), department heads/line managers (80%), and small business managers (70%) feel that disabled people often encounter job discrimination from employers (Table 2-1).

Observation:

This assertion by three-fourths of managers supports the anecdotal evidence of job discrimination against disabled people that disability advocates and journalists have gathered for many years. Discrimination by employers remains a barrier to increased employment of disabled people.

The 1985 ICD Survey of Disabled Americans found that only one-third of working-age disabled people are employed either full-time or part-time, even though a two-thirds majority of unemployed disabled people want to work. Until job discrimination and other employment barriers are eliminated, large numbers of disabled people may not enter the working mainstream of American life.

Q.7

Table 2-1

PERCENTAGE OF EMPLOYERS WHO FEEL DISABLED PEOPLE ENCOUNTER JOB DISCRIMINATION

Q.: Do you feel that handicapped people often encounter job discrimination from employers, or not?

	Top Management	EEO Officers	Department Heads/ Line Managers	Small Business Managers
Base	210	301	210	200
	%	%	%	%
Yes, encounter discrimination	72	76	80	70
Do not encounter	17	15	11	18
Not sure	11	7	9	12
Refused	-	1	-	1

Whether Civil Rights Laws Should Also Cover Disabled People

All four manager groups were asked if the civil rights laws that cover minorities against discrimination should also cover disabled persons. Majorities of top managers, EEO officers, line managers, and small business managers think that they should. But EEO officers and line managers express much stronger support than top managers. Eighty percent of EEO officers and 72% of line managers support coverage for disabled people by anti-discrimination laws. Only 56% of top managers take this view, a far smaller majority (Table 2-2).

Observation:

This is, perhaps, one of the more surprising findings in the survey. It is, however, typical of the attitudes of business executives reported in this survey who are shown to be generally supportive of policies which would help disabled people.

This is the second finding to suggest that EEO officers and line managers are closer to the problems faced by disabled employees, and are more supportive of change than are top managers.

Q.6

Table 2-2

WHETHER CIVIL RIGHTS LAWS SHOULD ALSO COVER DISABLED PEOPLE

Q.: Do you think that the civil rights laws that cover minorities against discrimination should also cover handicapped persons, or not? (IF RESPONDENT SAYS THAT LAWS ALREADY COVER THEM, PROBE WITH: Do you think that civil rights laws should or should not ...?)

	Top Management	EEO Officers	Department Heads/ Line Managers	Small Business Managers
Base	210	301	210	200
	%	%	%	%
Should cover	56	80	72	65
Should not cover	30	16	19	26
Not sure	13	4	8	9
Refused	*	-	*	1

*Less than 0.5%.

CHAPTER 3: HIRING POLICIES TOWARD DISABLED PEOPLE

Prevalence of Hiring Policies or Programs for Disabled People

Thirty-seven percent of all managers interviewed say that their company has an established policy or program for the hiring of disabled people (Table 3-1).

Companies that employ at least 10,000 people are two to nine times more likely to have a hiring policy than are companies with less than one thousand employees. Sixty-two percent of managers in companies with at least 10,000 employees say that they have a hiring policy for disabled people, compared to 24% in companies with 50-999 employees and a mere 7% in companies with 10-49 employees.

Observation:

If one accepts the premise that establishing equal employment policies for disabled people is a necessary step toward their full employment, then these results show a long haul ahead for the advocacy movement. It will be many years until large majorities of all managers say that their company has an established policy for employing disabled people.

Federal law requires companies that have federal contracts in excess of $2,500 to effect equal employment hiring policies toward disabled people. In companies that have federal contracts, 71% of managers say that they have an established hiring policy for disabled people. Only 21% of managers in companies without federal contracts have such a policy or program.

Awareness of these policies appears to be significantly lower among department heads and line managers. About one-third of this group says that their company has a hiring policy toward disabled people. The corresponding figures for top managers and EEO officers are 47% and 53%, respectively.

In companies that have a hiring policy for disabled people, 88% of top managers state that they play an active role in disseminating this policy to managers (Table 3-2).

Half of these companies also have awareness programs or distribute literature to help managers learn to work with disabled people (Table 3-3).

Observation:

Top managers report a remarkably high level of participation in educating middle managers about these hiring policies. The big dropoff in awareness of these policies among line managers suggests that neither their efforts nor awareness programs have succeeded fully as of yet.

Almost half (47%) of EEO officers (or managers with those responsibilities) in companies with hiring policies say that a specific person or department oversees the hiring of handicapped people (Table 3-4). The existence of such a position or department perhaps suggests a more firmly established policy for employing disabled people.

Q.8a

Table 3-1

PREVALENCE OF HIRING POLICIES OR PROGRAMS FOR DISABLED PEOPLE

Q.: Does your company have an established policy or program for the hiring of handicapped people, or not?

	Base		Has a Policy or Program	Does Not Have	Not Sure
Total	921	%	37	55	8
All Managers By Size of Company					
10,000 or more employees	240	%	62	30	8
1,000-9,999 employees	242	%	51	36	13
50-999 employees	239	%	24	69	7
10-49 employees	200	%	7	92	2
Type of Manager					
Top Management	210	%	47	52	1
EEO Officer	301	%	53	41	7
Department Head/Line Manager	210	%	35	44	21
Small Business Managers	200	%	7	92	2
Company Has Federal Contracts					
Yes	273	%	71	25	4
No	570	%	21	72	7

Q.7

Table 3-2

TOP MANAGEMENT'S ROLE IN DISSEMINATING HIRING POLICIES

Base: Top Managers in companies that have a hiring policy for disabled people

Q.: Does top management in your company play an active role in the dissemination of this policy to your managers, or not?

	Base		Plays an Active Role	Does Not Play a Role	Not Sure	Refused
Top Managers	98	%	88	11	1	-

Q.8d

Table 3-3

PREVALENCE OF AWARENESS PROGRAMS OR LITERATURE

Base: Managers in companies that have a hiring policy for disabled people

Q.: Does your company have any program or distribute any literature that helps your managers and employees learn to work with handicapped people, or not?

	Base		Company Has Awareness Program or Literature	Does Not Have	Not Sure
Type of Manager					
Top Managers	98	%	46	52	2
EEO Officers	159	%	53	43	4
Department Heads/ Line Managers	73	%	47	47	7
All Managers By Size of Company					
10,000 or more employees	149	%	62	34	4
1,000-9,999 employees	123	%	45	52	3
1,000 or fewer	72	%	24	72	4

Q.8b

Table 3-4

PREVALENCE OF DEPARTMENTS THAT OVERSEE HIRING OF DISABLED PEOPLE

Base: EEO Officers and Line Managers in companies that have a hiring policy for disabled people

Q.: Does your company have a specific person or department that oversees the hiring of handicapped people, or not?

	Base		Has a Specific Person\ Department	Does Not Have	Not Sure
EEO Officers	159	%	47	50	3
Department Heads/Line Managers	73	%	36	55	10

Prevalence of Hiring Quotas for Disabled People

A small minority of EEO officers say that their company's hiring policy toward disabled people amounts to a specific quota. Nine percent say that their company policy requires employment of a certain number of disabled people, or a certain proportion of disabled employees (Table 3-5).

Screening Job Candidates for Disability

Forty-four percent of EEO officers say that their company screens job candidates for disabilities that could limit their ability to do the job. This information is used in making hiring decisions by 91% of companies that screen for functional limitations (Table 3-6).

Self-Identification by Disabled Job Candidates and Employees

A 53% majority of EEO officers encourage job candidates and employees to self-identify as being disabled or having a specific disability (Table 3-7).

Observation:

Encouragement to self-identify is considered an important step in the integration of disabled employees into a work environment. Self-identification, as recommended by Berkeley Planning Associates for the Department of Labor (1982) places the special needs of disabled employees in the same status as other work situations and potential problems that managers regularly address.

A large increase in the majority of companies that encourage self-identification would be beneficial to managers, current employees, and job candidates. Then, necessary accommodations could be made.

The survey does not provide information on how companies use screening for disability, or whether this helps or hinders the matching of disabled job applicants with appropriate jobs.

Q.8c

Table 3-5

PREVALENCE OF HIRING QUOTAS FOR DISABLED PEOPLE

Base: EEO Officers in companies that have a hiring policy for disabled people

Q.: Does your company policy require that you employ a certain number of handicapped people, or have a certain proportion of handicapped employees in your work force, or not?

	Base		Policy Requires a Certain Number of Disabled Employees	Does Not Require	Not Sure
EEO Officers	159	%	9	86	5

Q.11a, 11b

Table 3-6

PERCENTAGE OF COMPANIES THAT SCREEN FOR DISABILITY, AND USE INFORMATION IN HIRING DECISIONS

Base: EEO Officers

Q.: Does your company screen job candidates for functional limitations for doing the job, or not?

	Base		Screens	Does Not Screen	Not Sure
EEO Officers	301	%	44	52	4

Q.: Is this information used in making hiring decisions, or not?

	Base		Use Information	Do Not Use	Not Sure	Refused
EEO Officers in companies that screen for disability	132	%	91	6	2	1

Q.11c

Table 3-7

PERCENTAGE OF COMPANIES THAT ENCOURAGE JOB CANDIDATES AND EMPLOYEES TO SELF-IDENTIFY AS DISABLED

Base: EEO Officers

Q.: Does your company encourage job candidates and employees to self-identify themselves as handicapped or as having a specific disability, or not?

	Base		Encouraged to Self-Identify	Not Encouraged	Not Sure	Refused
EEO Officers	301	%	53	44	2	2

CHAPTER 4: RECENT HIRING OF DISABLED PEOPLE

Percentage of Companies That Have Hired Disabled People in the Three Past Years and Past Year

Sixty-five percent of EEO officers say that their company has hired disabled people in the past three years. Managers who said yes to this question then were asked if their company had hired any disabled people in the past 12 months. The percentage of EEO officers who claim to have done this drops sharply to 43% (Table 4-1). A 57% majority of companies, especially smaller companies, have not hired disabled people in the past year.

Observation:

This line of questioning was employed in order to achieve a "harder" measure of the percentage of companies that have hired disabled people in the past year. The idea behind this kind of test is to focus on progressively more recent time periods. The series could have started farther back in time, at five or ten years ago, and continued until only 6 months or 3 months back from the date of the interview. In theory, the percentage should always grow smaller as the time frame is tightened.

All manager groups were asked these questions, even though top managers and line managers could have less direct knowledge of recent hirings than EEO officers and other personnel officers who have these responsibilities. Combining the samples allows for analysis across some broad measures, such as differences by size of company or the possible effects of federal contracts on company policies and actions. It should be understood that the combined sample of all managers is not projectable to any exact universe of managers. Only the individual samples of managers or companies by size, or both, are representative of a particular universe of companies.

The results for all managers reveal a powerful trend toward greater hiring of disabled people in larger companies. Fifty-two percent of companies with at least 10,000 employees have hired disabled people in the past year. The percentage drops to 27% for companies with 50-999 employees and 16% for companies with 10-49 employees (Table 4-1). These differences reflect at least in part the obvious fact that large employers hire more people of all kinds. This survey does not provide information on whether the proportion of disabled employees hired is greater among large, medium-sized or small companies.

The presence of a hiring policy for disabled people greatly increases the likelihood that disabled people will be hired. A two-thirds majority (67%) of companies with a hiring policy for disabled people have hired them in the past year, compared to only 42% of companies that do not have such a policy.

Companies that have federal contracts are also more likely to hire disabled people than are companies without federal contracts. Sixty-five percent of companies with federal contracts have hired disabled people in the past year; 48% of companies without federal contracts have hired disabled people in the past year.

Q.9a

Table 4-1

PERCENTAGE OF COMPANIES THAT HAVE HIRED DISABLED PEOPLE RECENTLY

Q.: Has your company hired any handicapped people in the past 3 years, or not? (NOTE: RESPONDENT MAY ASK IF QUESTION REFERS TO THEIR LOCATION OR THE WHOLE COMPANY. TELL THEM TO ANSWER FOR THE LOCATIONS THEY FEEL QUALIFIED TO SPEAK ABOUT.)

Q.: Has your company hired any handicapped people in the past year, since (DATE) 1985, or not?

	Base	Q8e Hired Disabled People in the Past 3 Years	Q9a Hired Disabled People in the Past Year
EEO Officers	301	65%	43%
All Managers By Size of Company			
10,000 or more employees	240	69%	52%
1,000-9,999 employees	242	63%	42%
50-999 employees	239	54%	27%
10-49 employees	200	45%	16%
Company Has a Hiring Policy for Disabled People			
Yes	344	80%	67%
No	506	49%	42%
Have Federal Contracts			
Yes	273	75%	65%
No	570	52%	48%
Company Participation in Various Programs			
Targeted jobs tax credit program (Association with) state vocational rehabilitation agency	277	74%	51%
	319	79%	56%
Type of Industry			
Manufacturing	279	65%	37%
Wholesale/Retail	253	54%	31%
Financial services	159	62%	42%
Other services	164	54%	32%
Other	88	52%	28%

How Disabled Employees Came to Their Companies

EEO officers whose companies had hired disabled people in the past year were asked how those people were referred to their company. A 68% majority of these people reportedly came of their own initiative, or through friends or word-of-mouth (Table 4-2).

Other disabled employees were referred through: private vocational rehabilitation agencies (15%), state employment services (14%), agencies that place disabled people (12%), government vocational rehabilitation agencies (11%), private employment agencies (11%), current employees of the companies (9%), company recruiters (7%), colleges and schools (3%), and independent recruiters (1%).

Observation:

These findings send a clear message to disabled people: the best way to find a job is through personal initiative and perseverance. The message to public and private rehabilitation agencies is to do a far better job of introducing qualified disabled clients to prospective employers. Chapter 10 will confirm that employers would be likely to respond positively.

Q.9b

Table 4-2

HOW DISABLED EMPLOYEES CAME TO THEIR COMPANIES

Base: Managers whose companies have hired disabled people in the past year

Q.: How were those handicapped people referred to your company? Anything else?

	Hired Disabled People in the Past Year
	197
	%
Came of their own initiative	55
Private vocational rehabilitation agency	15
State employment service	14
Friends or word-of-mouth	13
Agency that places handicapped people	12
Government vocational rehabilitation agency	11
Private employment agency	11
Current employees	9
Company recruiters	7
Colleges and schools	3
Independent recruiters/headhunters	1
Other	8
Not sure	7
Refused	-

Note: Multiple responses were given by some respondents to this question.

Reasons Why Disabled People Have Not Been Hired

Managers whose companies have not hired disabled people in the past three years cited various reasons why they may not have done so (Table 4-3). Two reasons emerged as major barriers to the employment of disabled people:

-- Sixty-six percent of managers say that a lack of qualified applicants is an important reason why they have not hired disabled people in the past three years.

-- Fifty-two percent called an absence of job openings or a hiring freeze an important reason for not hiring disabled people in this time period.

No more than one in five managers said that any of the other factors tested was an important reason why they had not hired disabled people recently. These factors include: disabled people being a safety risk to themselves and others (19%); architectural barriers or a lack of special equipment in the workplace (17%); an inability to train disabled people (12%); and a lack of support from top management (5%).

Those managers whose companies had hired disabled people in the past three years, but not in the past 12 months, also assessed the importance of these reasons. Once again, the two major reasons were an absence of jobs (65%) and a lack of qualified applicants (61%), only the order switched. The rank ordering of the other four reasons was the same (Table 4-4).

Observation:

Society must increase the pool of qualified disabled applicants through increased education and appropriate job training. A new generation of young disabled people are being educated under the 1975 Education for All Handicapped Children Act. Employers, public and private agencies and disabled people must insure that they receive all necessary training to enter the profession of their choice.

But millions of other unemployed disabled people finished their education long ago. Many of these people want to work, and are capable of working, but lack the necessary training to get jobs. Employers could acquire many valuable employees (as Chapter 5 will show) and help disabled people become productive members of society.

Q.3f

Table 4-3

REASONS WHY DISABLED PEOPLE HAVE NOT BEEN HIRED IN THE PAST 3 YEARS

Base: Managers whose companies have not hired disabled people in the past 3 years

Q.: Is/Are (READ EACH ITEM) an important reason why you haven't hired handicapped people in the past three years, or not?

base: 319		Important Reason	Not an Important Reason	Depends	Not Sure	Refused
A lack of qualified applicants	%	66	32	1	1	*
An absence of job openings or a hiring freeze	%	52	47	1	1	-
They're being a safety risk to themselves or others	%	19	78	3	*	-
Architectural barriers or a lack of special equipment	%	17	80	2	2	-
The fact that you are unable to train handicapped people	%	12	85	1	2	-
Not Asked of Top Managers						
A lack of support from top management	%	5	90	1	4	-

*Less than 0.5%.

Q.9c

Table 4-4

REASONS WHY DISABLED PEOPLE HAVE NOT BEEN HIRED IN THE PAST YEAR

Base: Managers whose companies have not hired disabled people in the past year but which had hired them in the two preceding years

Q.: Is/Are (READ EACH ITEM) an important reason why you haven't hired handicapped people in the past year, or not?

Base: 187		Important Reason	Not an Important Reason	Depends	Not Sure	Refused
An absence of job openings or a hiring freeze	%	65	32	1	3	-
A lack of qualified applicants	%	61	36	1	2	-
They're being a safety risk to themselves or others	%	16	81	2	2	-
Architectural barriers or a lack of special equipment	%	12	84	1	2	-
The fact that you are unable to train handicapped people	%	7	89	2	2	-
Not Asked of Top Managers						
A lack of support from top management	%	4	94	-	2	-

CHAPTER 5: MANAGERS RATE THE JOB PERFORMANCE OF DISABLED EMPLOYEES

The Overall Performance of Disabled Employees

Overwhelming majorities of top managers, EEO officers, department heads/line managers, and small business managers give disabled employees a good or excellent rating on their overall performance. Only one in twenty managers say that disabled employees' job performance is only fair, and virtually no one says that they do their jobs poorly (Table 5-1).

Eighty-eight percent of top managers give disabled employees an excellent or good rating, (24% call their job performance excellent, 64 % good, 5% call it only fair, and 1% call it poor.)

Ninety one percent of EEO officers say that disabled employees do an excellent or good job, (20% say that they do an excellent job, 71% a good job, 4% say only fair, and none call their performance poor.)

Line managers give a similar rating: 91% rate disabled employees excellent or good, (27% rate them excellent, 64% good, 3% rate them only fair, and none said that disabled employees do a poor job.)

Observation:

This strong endorsement of disabled employees is the first of several findings to show that disabled employees do a fine job, and perform as well or better than most other employees in similar jobs. Employers who may still harbor fears that disabled people won't measure up to performance standards should be reassured by the findings in this chapter.

Q.11d

Table 5-1

MANAGERS RATE THE JOB PERFORMANCE OF DISABLED EMPLOYEES

Base: Managers in companies with disabled employees

Q.: Now let's talk about your company's experiences with handicapped employees, past and present. In general, how would you rate the job performance of handicapped employees who work for your company -- excellent, good, only fair, or poor?

	Top Managers	EEO Officers	Department Heads/Line Managers	Small Business Managers
Base	198	253	162	118
	%	%	%	%
Excellent	24	20	27	23
Good	64	71	64	59
Only fair	5	4	3	11
Poor	1	-	-	3
Not sure	7	4	7	3
Refused	-	1	-	-

Disabled and Non-Disabled Employees Compared on Key Job Criteria

Top managers, EEO officers, line managers, and small business managers compared disabled and non-disabled employees on key criteria for job performance. The overwhelming majority of disabled employees perform either on a par with non-disabled employees in similar jobs, or often above them (Table 5-2).

The comparisons made by line managers for six key criteria are as follows:

-- On willingness to work hard: 46% rate disabled employees better than non-disabled employees, and 33% rate them about the same.

-- On reliability: 39% rate disabled employees better than non-disabled employees, and 42% rate them about the same.

-- On attendance and punctuality on the job: 39% rate disabled employees better than non-disabled employees, and 40% rate them about the same.

-- On productivity: 20% rate them better than non-disabled employees, and 57% rate them about the same.

-- On desire for promotion: 23% rate them better than non-disabled employees, and 55% rate them about the same.

-- On leadership ability: 10% rate them better than non-disabled employees, and 62% rate them about the same. Six percent of line managers rated disabled employees worse than non-disabled employees on leadership potential.

Observation:

The data shown in Table 5-2 are remarkable both in their content and consistency between the manager groups. Managers are convinced that disabled employees almost always perform their jobs as well or better than other employees in similar jobs.

Disabled employees work hard, and are reliable and punctual. They produce as well or better than non-disabled employees, and demonstrate average or better than average leadership ability and ambition. In other words, disabled employees are an asset to any employer. The challenge posed by these evaluations is how society can find ways to bring many more disabled people into the workplace as productive members of society.

Q.12

Table 5-2

MANAGERS COMPARE DISABLED AND NON-DISABLED EMPLOYEES
ON KEY JOB CRITERIA

Q.: I'm going to read some criteria used to evaluate employees. How would you rate handicapped employees on their (READ EACH ITEM) -- are they better, worse, or about the same as non-handicapped employees in similar jobs?

		Top Managers' Evaluation					
Base: 210		Better	Worse	About the Same	Not Sure	Refused	Not Applicable
Willingness to work hard	%	50	-	40	4	*	6
Reliability	%	42	-	46	5	1	6
Attendance and punctuality on the job	%	43	1	44	4	1	6
Productivity	%	18	6	66	4	1	6
Desire for promotion	%	13	4	69	7	1	6
Leadership ability	%	7	13	60	12	1	7

		EEO Officers' Evaluation					
Base: 301		Better	Worse	About the Same	Not Sure	Refused	Not Applicable
Willingness to work hard	%	49	*	44	2	3	1
Reliability	%	47	*	47	3	3	1
Attendance and punctuality on the job	%	43	1	50	3	3	1
Productivity	%	21	2	68	4	3	1
Desire for promotion	%	18	4	70	5	3	1
Leadership ability	%	7	11	69	8	3	1

		Department Head/Line Managers' Evaluation					
Base: [illegible]		Better	Worse	About the Same	Not Sure	Refused	Not Applicable
Willingness to work hard	%	46	*	33	5	-	15
Reliability	%	39	*	42	4	-	15
Attendance and punctuality on the job	%	39	1	40	5	-	15
Productivity	%	20	2	57	5	-	15
Desire for promotion	%	23	1	55	5	-	16
Leadership ability	%	10	6	62	6	-	16

		Small Business Managers' Evaluation					
Base: 200		Better	Worse	About the Same	Not Sure	Refused	Not Applicable
Willingness to work hard	%	37	1	30	3	-	30
Reliability	%	33	1	34	3	-	30
Attendance and punctuality on the job	%	32	1	33	3	1	30
Productivity	%	17	5	45	4	-	31
Desire for promotion	%	15	4	45	5	-	32
Leadership ability	%	7	14	44	4	-	31

*Less than 0.5%.

Promoting Disabled Employees

Tables 5-3 and 5-4 contain what appear to be somewhat contradictory data about the rate at which disabled employees get promoted. Sixty-eight percent of EEO officers say that disabled employees get promoted at about the same rate as most other employees, which would seem to be a strong sign of their full integration into the workforce (Table 5-3). But nearly three-fourths of these same managers say that they have been only somewhat successful (45%) or not successful (27%) in promoting disabled employees (Table 5-4).

Observation:

The meaning of these findings is open to interpretation. The first question, in Table 5-3, was asked very early in the survey, and the second question, in Table 5-4, was asked at about the midpoint in the interview. It could be that these findings are, in fact, consistent because they reflect the availability of promotions at the level where most disabled people are employed. To the extent that promotions are available, which may not be too often, disabled employees may receive them at about the same rate as everyone else.

Q.4

Table 5-3

RATE OF PROMOTION:
A COMPARISON OF DISABLED AND NON-DISABLED EMPLOYEES

Q.: Would you say that your handicapped employees usually get promoted at about the same rate as most other employees, at a slower rate, or at a faster rate?

	EEO Officers	Department Heads/ Line Managers	Small Business Managers
	391	210	200
	%	%	%
Get promoted at same rate	68	58	45
At a slower rate	15	17	11
At a faster rate	*	1	2
Depends	2	2	4
Not applicable	11	17	37
Not sure	4	4	2
Refused	*	*	1

*Less than 0.5%.

Q.13a

Table 5-4

COMPANIES' SUCCESS AT PROMOTING DISABLED EMPLOYEES

Q.: How would you rate your company's success at promoting handicapped employees -- have you been very successful, somewhat successful, not too successful, or not successful at all?

	Top Management	EEO Managers	Line Managers	Small Business Managers
Base	210	301	210	200
	%	%	%	%
Very successful	3	3	6	4
Somewhat successful	40	45	31	23
Not too successful	29	21	13	11
Not successful at all	7	6	9	12
Not sure	9	8	5	1
Refused	-	1	-	-
Not applicable	12	17	36	51

Supervision of Disabled Employees

A majority of line managers (54%) have supervised disabled employees at some point in their career (Table 5-5).

The overwhelming majority (82%) of both those who have and have not supervised disabled employees feel that disabled employees are not more difficult to supervise (Table 5-6). Half (50%) consider it necessary to brief other employees about working with a disabled person when one is hired (Table 5-7).

Q.31

Table 5-5

PERCENTAGE OF DEPARTMENT HEADS WHO HAVE SUPERVISED A DISABLED EMPLOYEE

Base: Department Heads/Line Managers

Q.: Do you now supervise, or have you ever supervised, any handicapped employees, or not?

	Base		Supervised	Has Not	Not Sure	Refused
Total	210	%	54	45	1	-
Size of Company						
10,000 or more employees	70	%	57	41	1	-
1,000-9,999 employees	70	%	46	54	-	-
50-999 employees	70	%	59	39	3	-

Q.31

Table 5-6

WHETHER OR NOT IT'S HARDER TO SUPERVISE DISABLED EMPLOYEES

Base: Department Heads/Line Managers

Q.: Do you feel that it is more difficult to supervise a handicapped employee than a non-handicapped employee, or not?

	Base		More Difficult	Not More Difficult	Not Sure	Refused
Total	210	%	10	82	7	-
Have Supervised a Disabled Employee						
Yes	113	%	13	84	3	-
No	94	%	7	80	13	-

Q.16c

Table 5-7

WHETHER IT'S NECESSARY TO BRIEF CO-WORKERS WHEN A DISABLED EMPLOYEE IS HIRED

Base: Department Heads/Line Managers

Q.: If you hire a handicapped person, do you think it is necessary to talk with other employees whom you supervise about working with, and reacting to, a handicapped person, or not?

	Base		Necessary	Not Necessary	Not Sure	Refused
Total	210	%	50	47	3	-
Have Supervised a Disabled Employee						
Yes	113	%	49	47	4	-
No	94	%	52	47	1	-

Firing Disabled Employees

Managers in all groups are divided about whether it is more difficult to fire a disabled employee than a non-disabled employee (Table 5-8).

Forty-four percent of top managers believe that it is more difficult to fire a disabled employee, and 46% believe it is not more difficult.

By a two-to-one majority, EEO officers think that it is not more difficult to fire disabled employees. Sixty-two percent think that it is not more difficult, and 30% think that it is more difficult.

A 57% majority of line managers also believe that it is not more difficult to fire disabled employees than non-disabled employees; however a sizable 37% feel that it is.

Small business managers are more equally divided; 44% believing it is more difficult, and 47% that it is not more diffiuclt, to fire disabled employees.

Observation

So long as managers feel that it is difficult to fire employees, if they are disabled, this will tend to be a barrier to the hiring and integration of disabled people.

Some Perceptions Relating to the Employment of Disabled People

One significant barrier to the employment of disabled persons is that almost half of all managers (46%) believe that special privileges must usually be made for them (Table 5-9). On the other hand a plurality (47%) of employers believe that disabled employees have fewer accidents on the job, and a massive 93% majority reject the argument that handicapped employees don't fit in.

Q.17

Table 5-8

WHETHER OR NOT DISABLED EMPLOYEES ARE MORE DIFFICULT TO FIRE

Q.: Do you think that it is more difficult to fire a handicapped employee than a non-handicapped employee, or not?

	Top Management	EEO Officers	Department Heads/ Line Managers	Small Business Managers
Base	210	301	210	200
	%	%	%	%
More difficult	44	30	37	44
Not more difficult	46	62	57	47
Not sure	10	7	6	9
Refused	-	1	-	1

Q.5

Table 5-9

EMPLOYING HANDICAPPED PEOPLE: SOME PERCEPTIONS

Q.: Let me read you some statements that people have made about employing handicapped people. Please say if you agree strongly, agree somewhat, disagree somewhat, or disagree strongly.

Base: 921		Agree	Disagree	Not Sure
Special privileges must usually be made for handicapped employees	%	46	49	6
Handicapped employees have fewer accidents on the job than do non-handicapped employees	%	47	28	25
Handicapped people just don't fit in with most non-handicapped employees	%	4	93	2

Note: On the table the answer for the total sample is shown because the differences between top managers, EEO officers, line managers and small business managers are small.

CHAPTER 6: THE COST OF EMPLOYING AND ACCOMMODATING DISABLED EMPLOYEES

The Average Cost of Employing Disabled People

Overwhelming majorities of top managers (81%), EEO officers (79%), department heads/line managers (75%), and small business managers (64%) say that the average cost of employing a disabled person is about the same as the cost of employing a non-disabled person. Only 13% to 17% of these managers say that the average cost of employment is greater for disabled employees (Table 6-1).

Observations:

1. For many years, it has been alleged that high costs are a major barrier to large-scale employment of disabled people. These findings disprove that theory. Eight out of ten managers say that the costs of employing both disabled and non-disabled people are about the same.

2. Disabled employees meet the standards of large majorities of managers on job performance, ease of supervision, desire for promotion and, now, cost of employment.

Q.16

Table 6-1

AVERAGE COST OF EMPLOYMENT: DISABLED VERSUS NON-DISABLED EMPLOYEES

Q.: Would you say that the average cost of employing a handicapped person is greater than, less than, or about the same as the cost of employing a non-handicapped person in a similar job?

	Top Management	EEO Officers	Department Heads/ Line Managers	Small Business Managers
Base	210	301	210	200
	%	%	%	%
Greater than	13	13	17	14
Less than	*	2	2	4
About the same	81	79	75	64
Depends (vol.)	2	2	1	7
Not sure	3	3	4	11
Refused	-	1	-	1

*Less than 0.5%.

Accommodations in the Workplace

About half (48%) of EEO officers say that their company has made accommodations in the workplace or changed its practices in order to help disabled employees do their jobs. However, only one-third (35%) of line managers say their company has made accommodations. Top managers seem to overestimate with what actually has been done: 70% of them say that accommodations have been made. Small business managers are less likely to have made accommodations (Table 6-2).

The nature of accommodations and their prevalence varies greatly. EEO officers whose companies have made accommodations answered questions about the kinds of steps that have been taken (Table 6-3).

-- Ninety percent of these companies have removed architectural barriers or changed furniture to give disabled employees full access to the workplace.

-- Fifty percent of these companies have purchased special equipment to help disabled employees.

-- Fifty percent of these companies have adjusted work hours or restructured jobs to accommodate disabled employees.

-- Twenty-three percent of these companies have provided readers or interpreters to help blind or speech and hearing-impaired employees do their jobs.

-- Ten percent of these companies have made other accommodations for disabled employees.

A few companies (6%) also employ a disability professional who works with disabled employees and their supervisors (Table 6-4). However, this figure may underrepresent the proportion of companies that subcontract disability professionals on an as needed basis.

Observation:

Federal and private studies have emphasized the importance of making accommodations as a crucial step in the full integration of disabled employees in the workplace. Not all disabled employees require accommodations. But for those who do, these studies urge that accommodations be made at the earliest possible stage in their employment. The sooner that accommodations are made, the sooner that an employee's disability ceases to be an issue or potential problem.

Seeking the advice or services of a disability professional is also encouraged. Many disability professionals are trained to choose the most effective types of accommodations at the cheapest cost to employers.

Q.14a

Table 6-2

PREVALENCE OF ACCOMMODATIONS IN THE WORKPLACE

Q.: Has your company made any accommodations in the work place or changes in its practices in order to help handicapped employees do their jobs, or not?

	Base		Accommodations Made	None Made	Not Sure	Refused
Type of Manager						
Top Management	210	%	70	30	*	-
EEO Officers	301	%	48	45	7	*
Department Heads/Line Managers	210	%	35	50	14	*
Small Business Managers	200	%	18	79	3	1
Size of Company						
10,000 employees	240	%	65	28	7	*
1,000-9,999	242	%	54	37	9	*
50-999 employees	239	%	33	62	5	-
10-49 employees	200	%	18	79	3	1
Have Federal Contracts						
Yes	273	%	74	22	4	*
No	570	%	30	65	4	1

Q.14b

Table 6-3

TYPES OF ACCOMMODATIONS

Base: EEO Officers whose companies have made accommodations

Q.: Has your company (READ EACH ITEM)?

Base: 145		Have	Have Not	Not Sure	Refused	Not Applicable
Removed architectural barriers or changed furniture to give handicapped employees full access, or not	%	90	9	1	-	-
Purchased any special telephones or equipment to help handicapped employees, or not	%	50	43	4	3	-
Adjusted work hours or restructured jobs to accommodate handicapped employees, or not	%	50	42	5	3	
Provided readers or interpreters to help blind or speech and hearing-impaired employees, or not	%	23	65	8	3	-
Make any other accommodations for handicapped employees, or not	%	10	79	1	10	-

Q. 13b

Table 6-4

PERCENTAGE OF COMPANIES THAT EMPLOY A DISABILITY PROFESSIONAL

Q.: Does your company employ a disability professional who works with handicapped employees or their supervisors, or not?

	Base		Employs a Professional	Does Not Employ One	Not Sure	Refused
EEO Officers	301	%	6	88	6	*

*Less than 0.5%.

The Cost of Accommodations

Large majorities of managers in companies that have made accommodations say that the cost of making accommodations has not been expensive. Seventy-four percent of top managers, 72% of EEO officers, and 80% of line managers in these companies consider the cost of accommodations not too expensive or not expensive at all. Less than one-quarter consider the cost of accommodations somewhat expensive, and virtually no one considers them very expensive (Table 6-5).

Thirty-two percent of department heads and line managers say that the cost of accommodating a disabled employee is charged to their departmental budget (Table 6-6).

Observation:

The Berkeley study also shows that most accommodations (81%), cost less than $500 and that half cost nothing. Since the average cost of employing a disabled person is in the range of costs for all employees, the average cost of accommodations must not significantly raise the cost of employing disabled people (Table 6-1).

Where department heads and line managers are charged with the costs of accommodations, this may be a disincentive to hiring disabled people -- however modest the cost -- particularly for small companies.

Q.14c

Table 6-5

THE COST OF ACCOMMODATIONS

Base: Have made accommodations or changes in the workplace

Q.: In general, would you say that the cost of the accommodations you've made is very expensive, somewhat expensive, not too expensive, or not expensive at all?

	Top Management	EEO Officers	Department Heads/ Line Managers
Base	146	145	74
	%	%	%
Very expensive	2	1	3
Somewhat expensive	21	23	14
Not too expensive	58	48	58
Not expensive at all	16	24	22
Not sure	3	3	4
Refused	-	-	-

Q.15b

Table 6-6

WHETHER OR NOT THE COST OF ACCOMMODATIONS IS CHARGED TO DEPARTMENTAL BUDGETS

Q.: Is the cost of accommodating a handicapped employee charged to your department's budget, or not?

	Base		Charged	Not Charged	Not Sure	Refused
Department Heads/ Line Managers	180	%	32	48	18	1

Reasons for Not Making Accommodations

More than eight out of ten managers whose companies have not made accommodations say that none were needed or requested (Table 6-7).

Observation:

The survey did not determine the extent to which accommodations were actually needed. Nevertheless, it seems likely that many managers could benefit from further education about the excellent performance record of disabled employees, the generally low cost of making accommodations, and their effectiveness in helping people do their jobs.

Q.15

Table 6-7

WHY NO ACCOMMODATIONS HAVE BEEN MADE

Base: Have not made accommodations or changes in the workplace

Q.: Why have no accommodations in the work place been made? Any other reasons?

	Top Management	EEO Officers	Department Heads/ Line Managers	Small Business Managers
Base	63	135	106	158
	%	%	%	%
None needed	89	80	83	86
None requested	3	4	2	1
Too expensive	-	1	-	1
Changes needed were too extensive	-	3	-	2
Changes needed were not feasible	-	4	3	5
Laws requiring accommodations don't apply to us	2	2	-	-
Other	-	1	2	-
Not sure	5	5	8	1
Refused	-	-	-	1
No handicapped employees	5	3	5	6

CHAPTER 7: COMPANIES' EXPERIENCES WITH TRAINING PROGRAMS FOR DISABLED EMPLOYEES

Job Initiatives and Programs for Disabled People

Corporate participation in the major government and private job initiatives and training programs has been low during the past three years. About four out of ten EEO officers say that their companies participated in the Targeted Jobs Tax Credit Program (40%) or had experience with state vocational rehabilitation agencies (42%) in this period. Twenty-five percent of companies participated in a Job Training Partnership Act Program or Private Industry Council (PIC). Only one in ten companies participated in a Projects with Industry (PWI) program, and a mere 6% had any association with an independent living center (Table 7-1).

Among small businesses, participation is much lower. The great majority of small business managers have had no involvement with any such programs.

Companies that have participated in these programs generally rate their experiences as very successful or somewhat successful. For example, a large majority of EEO officers rate their company's experience with a Projects with Industry Program as very successful (26%) or somewhat successful (58%). Similar majorities gave positive ratings for their experiences with the other major programs mentioned above (Table 7-2). Very few EEO officers rated their company's experience as not too successful, and only 3% to 5% said that the experience had been a failure.

Observation:

Given that most companies do not participate in these programs, and that those which do overwhelmingly find them successful, there is clearly a need and an opportunity to greatly expand their use.

Q.10a

Table 7-1

COMPANIES' PARTICIPATION IN JOB INITIATIVES AND PROGRAMS FOR DISABLED PEOPLE

Base: EEO Officers

Q.: Now I'm going to ask you about specific government programs. In the past three years has your company (READ ITEM), or not?

Base: 301		EEO Officers Participated	Did Not	Not Sure
(Participated in) a Projects with Industry or PWI Program	%	10	68	22
(Participated in) the Targeted Jobs Tax Credit Program	%	40	46	15
(Participated in) a Job Training Partnership Act Program or PIC Council (Private Industry Council)	%	25	60	15
(Had any association with) state vocational rehabilitation agencies	%	42	46	13
(Had any association with) independent living centers	%	6	80	14

Base: Small Business Managers

Base: 301		Participated	Did Not	Not Sure
(Participated in) a Projects with Industry or PWI Program	%	3	94	3
(Participated in) the Targeted Jobs Tax Credit Program	%	15	82	4
(Participated in) a Job Training Partnership Act Program or PIC Council (Private Industry Council)	%	8	89	4
(Had any association with) state vocational rehabilitation agencies	%	17	81	3
(Had any association with) independent living centers	%	3	93	4

Q.10b

Table 7-2

COMPANIES' EXPERIENCES WITH JOB INITIATIVES AND PROGRAMS FOR DISABLED PEOPLE

Base: EEO Officers whose companies have participated in the program in the past 3 years

Q.: Would you rate your company's experience with (READ ITEM) very successful, somewhat successful, not too successful, or not successful at all?

	Base		Very Successful	Somewhat Successful	Not Too Successful	Not Successful at All	Not Sure	Refused
(Participated in) a Projects with Industry or PWI Program	31*	%	26	58	10	3	3	-
(Participated in) the Targeted Jobs Tax Credit Program	120	%	23	53	12	5	8	-
(Participated in) a Job Training Partnership Act Program or PIC Council (Private Industry Council)	75*	%	24	61	9	-	5	-
(Had any association with) state vocational rehabilitation agencies	125	%	15	62	17	3	3	-
(Had any association with) independent living centers	19*	%	16	63	5	5	11	-

* Percentages of small bases should be interpreted with caution.

Training Disabled Employees In-House

The majority of managers say that their company is able to provide in-house training for disabled employees. Sixty percent of top managers and 61% of EEO officers say that they have this capability (Table 7-3). However, only 46% of small business managers say their companies can do so.

Companies that have a policy for hiring disabled people are far more likely to be able to train them (70%) than are companies without a policy (49%).

Some important reasons why companies cannot train disabled people in-house include: a lack of special training for managers; a lack of needed special equipment; and architectural barriers in buildings (Table 7-4).

Observation:

Roughly 40% of companies currently do not have the facilities or personnel to train disabled people in-house, which is presumably a barrier to upward mobility and promotion. Many more corporations could demonstrate a stronger commitment toward employing disabled people by acquiring the capability to train them.

Stronger links between companies and government training programs for disabled people -- i.e., higher participation in the programs discussed above -- could also increase the number of companies capable of training disabled people.

Q.27

Table 7-3

PERCENTAGE OF COMPANIES THAT CAN TRAIN DISABLED EMPLOYEES

Q.: At present, is your company able to provide in-house training for handicapped employees, or not?

	Base		Able to Provide Training	Not Able	Not Sure	Refused
Type of Manager						
Top Management	210	%	60	38	1	*
EEO Officers	301	%	61	34	6	-
Department Heads/ Line Managers	210	%	57	29	13	*
Small Business Managers	200	%	46	49	6	-
Size of Company						
10,000 or more employees	240	%	60	28	12	*
1,000-9,999 employees	242	%	58	37	5	-
50-999 employees	239	%	61	35	3	*
10-49 employees	200	%	46	49	6	-
Has Federal Contracts						
Yes	273	%	62	34	5	-
No	570	%	54	41	5	*
Company Has a Policy for Hiring Disabled People						
Yes	344	%	70	25	5	-
No	506	%	49	46	5	*

Q.28

Table 7-4

REASONS WHY SOME COMPANIES CANNOT TRAIN DISABLED EMPLOYEES

Bases: EEO Officers and small business managers in companies that cannot train disabled employees in-house

Q.: (Is/Are) (READ EACH ITEM) an important reason why you currently cannot train handicapped people in-house, or not?

		EEO Officers		
Base: 101		Important Reason	Not an Important Reason	Not Sure
Architectural barriers in your building	%	21	77	2
A lack of needed special equipment	%	38	59	3
A lack of special training for your managers and supervisors	%	43	53	4

		Small Business Managers		
Base: 97		Important Reason	Not an Important Reason	Not Sure
Architectural barriers in your building	%	19	79	2
A lack of needed special equipment	%	33	64	3
A lack of special training for your managers and supervisors	%	31	68	1

CHAPTER 8: REHABILITATION OF EMPLOYEES WHO BECOME DISABLED

All of the findings in this chapter concern corporate attitudes and policies toward current employees who become disabled, either from injury, illness, or other health conditions.

The Effects of Rehabilitation Efforts

What are the effects of disability management programs? About half of managers report that the majority of disabled employees return to work, compared to 14% to 22% who say that the majority remain disabled or take early retirement. Many employers, particularly small business managers (50%) say this question is not applicable to them (Table 8-1).

Q.19

Table 8-1

WHETHER THE MAJORITY OF DISABLED EMPLOYEES RETURN TO WORK, OR REMAIN DISABLED

Q.: Do the majority of your disabled employees return to work, or do the majority remain disabled or take an early retirement?

	Top Management	EEO Officers	Department Heads/ Line Managers	Small Business Managers
Base	210	301	210	200
	%	%	%	%
Majority return to work	50	52	47	39
Majority remain disabled/take early retirement	14	19	22	8
Equal number do both (vol.)	3	2	3	2
Not sure	15	14	14	3
Refused	1	1	*	-
Not applicable	18	12	13	50

Prevalence of Various Disability Management Programs

Sixty-seven percent of companies begin monitoring the progress of employees who go on sick leave or workers' compensation within the first three months after they stop work (Table 8-2).

Support for rehabilitiation of employees who become sick or injured is reflected by the prevalence of disability management programs. In rank order of prevalence, some programs currently in use are: light duty employment options, or part-time, or flexible hours (72% of EEO officers); a trial work period during which disability benefits are continued (38% of EEO officers); consultation from private rehabilitation vendors (36%); and medical case management (35%). The most common program is long-term disability benefits (82%). Small businesses are substantially less likely to offer any of the programs (Table 8-3).

Observation:

Studies of the rehabilitation of disabled employees strongly recommend intervention at the earliest possible date after employees begin sick leave or workers' compensation. Monitoring of their progress should begin almost immediately, followed by rehabilitation at the first opportunity. The results of early intervention and disability management are a significant increase in the proportion of disabled employees who fully return to their jobs.

Q.23

Table 8-2

WHEN COMPANIES BEGIN MONITORING DISABLED EMPLOYEES' PROGRESS

Q.: When employees go on sick leave or on workers compensation, after filing claims do you begin monitoring their progress within the first month they're out, or after one to three months, or after four to six months, or after more than six months?

	EEO Officers
Base	301
	%
Within first month	40
After 1 to 3 months	27
After 4 to 6 months	3
After more than 6 months	5
Depends (vol.)	4
Do not monitor progress (vol.)	4
Not sure	16
Refused	2

Q.22

Table 8-3

PREVALENCE OF VARIOUS DISABILITY MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS

Bases: EEO Officers and Small Business Managers

Q.: Does your company have (READ EACH ITEM) for any disabled employees, or not?

Base: 301		EEO Officers Has	Not Have	Not Sure	Refused
Long-term disability benefits	%	82	14	4	-
Light duty employment options, or part-time, or flexible hours	%	72	22	6	*
A trial work period during which disability benefits are continued	%	38	40	21	1
Consultation from private rehabilitation vendors	%	36	54	10	*
Medical case management	%	35	41	24	1

Base: 200		Small Business Managers Has	Does Not Have	Not Sure	Refused
Long-term disability benefits	%	38	59	4	1
Light duty employment options, or part-time, or flexible hours	%	55	44	1	1
A trial work period during which disability benefits are continued	%	21	74	5	1
Consultation from private rehabilitation vendors	%	8	90	2	1
Medical case management	%	16	79	5	1

*Less than 0.5%.

Potential Problems When Employees Return to Work

It has, on occasion, been suggested that disabled employees, encounter resistance from labor unions or supervisors and co-workers when they seek to return to work. Unions, it has been alleged, sometimes resist job modifications or reassignments. In reality those problems occur only very rarely. Overwhelmingly employers have not encountered them.

Q.24

Table 8-4

PROBLEMS FOR EMPLOYERS OF PEOPLE RETURNING TO WORK

		Major Problems	Minor Problems	Not a Problem	Not Sure
Union regulations preventing job reassigments or modifications for returning employees	EEO Officers Base: 301 %	3	6	84	7
	Line Managers Base: 210 %	1	5	87	7
Resistance from Supervisors or co-workers toward disabled employees returning to work	EEO Officers Base: 301 %	1	16	79	5
	Line Managers Base: 210 %	-	7	86	6

Managers' Attitudes Toward Rehabilitation

A three-fourths majority of top managers (73%), EEO officers (74%), and department heads/line managers (78%) think that employers have a responsibility to rehabilitate their employees who become disabled. An additional 8% to 10% believe that employers have this responsibility only when employees become injured on the job (Table 8-5).

A majority (57%), albeit a smaller one, of small employers agree that companies have this responsiblity.

Equally large majorities of managers believe that it is more cost-effective to rehabilitate disabled employees and return them to work than to pay them disability benefits and replace them (Table 8-6).

However seven out of ten managers also believe that their companies should not make a greater effort to rehabilitate disabled employees because they are doing enough now (Table 8-7)

Observation:

These findings suggest some complacency and that rehabilitation is not a high priority. Large majorities of managers are supportive of rehabilitation, at least in theory, and say that it is their responsibility. However, the great majority feel that they're trying hard enough now to accomplish this.

Q.18

Table 8-5

WHETHER OR NOT EMPLOYERS HAVE A RESPONSIBILITY TO REHABILITATE DISABLED EMPLOYEES

Q.: Now let's talk about current employees who become disabled, either from injury, illness, or some other health condition. Do you think that employers have a responsibility to rehabilitate their employees who become disabled, or not?

	Top Management	EEO Officers	Department Heads/ Line Managers	Small Business Managers
Base	210	301	210	200
	%	%	%	%
Employers have a responsibility	73	74	78	57
Do not have a responsibility	13	11	9	17
Have a responsibility only if injured on the job (vol.)	10	9	8	16
Not sure	4	5	6	10
Refused	-	1	-	1

Q. 20

Table 8-6

WHETHER IT'S MORE COST-EFFECTIVE TO REHABILITATE DISABLED EMPLOYEES, OR PAY DISABILITY PAYMENTS

Q.: In most cases do you think that it is more cost-effective to rehabilitate disabled employees and return them to work, or more cost-effective to pay them disability payments and replace them?

Base	Top Management 210 %	EEO Officers 301 %	Department Heads/ Line Managers 210 %	Small Business Managers 200 %
More cost-effective to rehabilitate	75	76	75	57
More cost-effective to pay disability payments	6	6	5	13
Depends (vol.)	6	5	5	14
Not sure	12	12	15	16
Refused	1	1	-	1

Q.21

Table 8-7

WHETHER OR NOT COMPANIES SHOULD RETURN MORE DISABLED EMPLOYEES TO WORK

Q.: Do you think that your company should make a greater effort than it makes now to return more disabled employees to their former jobs or place them elsewhere in your company, or is it doing enough now?

	Top Management	EEO Officers	Department Heads/ Line Managers	Small Business Managers
Base	210	301	210	200
	%	%	%	%
Should make a greater effort	16	9	8	7
Doing enough now	70	75	74	69
Not sure	2	7	9	4
Refused	-	1	*	1
Not applicable	12	9	9	20

CHAPTER 9: THE LIKELIHOOD THAT COMPANIES WILL INCREASE EFFORTS TO HIRE DISABLED PEOPLE

Whether Companies Should Do More to Employ Disabled People

Most managers think that their companies should not make greater efforts to employ disabled people because they are already doing enough. Sixty-seven percent of top managers, 71% of EEO officers, 70% of department heads/line managers, and 76% of small business managers think that their companies are doing enough now to employ disabled people (Table 9-1).

But majorities of all management groups surveyed think it is somewhat likely or very likely that in the next three years their companies will make greater efforts to employ disabled people. Fifty-seven percent of top managers, 58% of EEO officers, and 63% of line managers think it is likely that their companies will make greater efforts to employ disabled people in the near future. Among small business managers the figure is somewhat lower (46%) (Table 9-2).

Observation:

Employers repeat a theme that appeared earlier in the findings. They are willing to try harder to employ more disabled people, and may do so, but they expect disabled people and employment agencies to take the lead in increasing the pool of qualified job applicants.

Q.25

Table 9-1

WHETHER OR NOT COMPANIES SHOULD DO MORE TO EMPLOY DISABLED PEOPLE

Q.: Do you think that your company should make a greater effort than it makes now to employ handicapped people, or is it doing enough now?

	Top Management	EEO Officers	Department Heads/ Line Managers	Small Business Managers
Base	210	301	210	200
	%	%	%	%
Should do more now	30	26	19	17
Doing enough now	67	71	70	76
Not sure	2	3	10	7
Refused	1	-	1	1

Q.26

Table 9-2

LIKELIHOOD OF INCREASED EFFORTS TO HIRE DISABLED PEOPLE IN THE NEXT 3 YEARS

Q.: In the next 3 years, how likely do you think it is that your company actually will make greater efforts than it makes now, to employ more handicapped people -- is it very likely, somewhat likely, not too likely, or not likely at all?

	Top Management	EEO Officers	Department Heads/ Line Managers	Small Business Managers
Base	210	301	210	200
	%	%	%	%
Very likely	9	18	12	9
Somewhat likely	48	40	51	37
Not too likely	27	24	22	22
Not likely at all	11	9	6	30
Not sure	4	7	8	3
Refused	*	1	1	1

Top Management's Commitment to Employing Disabled People

Top managers are divided about whether they could demonstrate a stronger commitment to employing disabled people than they do now. Half (49%) believe that they could, and half don't (46%) (Table 9-3).

Among those who feel that a greater effort could be made, most feel that the way to do this would be to encourage or order personnel departments and supervisors to hire more disabled people. Other approaches suggested would be to increase awareness that disabled employees do as well as other employees, and increase contact with agencies that place disabled people in jobs (Table 9-4).

Q.24

Table 9-3

WHETHER TOP MANAGEMENT COULD DEMONSTRATE A STRONGER COMMITMENT TO EMPLOYING DISABLED PEOPLE

Base: Top Managers

Q.: What about the role played by top management in your company -- do you think that top management could demonstrate a stronger commitment to increased employment of handicapped people than you do now, or not?

	Base		Could Demonstrate a Stronger Commitment	Could Not	Not Sure	Refused
Top Managers	210	%	49	46	4	1

Q.25

Table 9-4

HOW TOP MANAGERS CAN DEMONSTRATE A STRONGER COMMITMENT TO EMPLOYING DISABLED PEOPLE

Base: Top Managers who say they could demonstrate a stronger commitment to employing disabled people

Q.: What do you think is the most important thing that top managers like yourself can do to demonstrate a stronger commitment to employing handicapped people?

	Top Managers
	102
	%
Hire handicapped	25
Instruct/encourage personnel/supervisors to hire handicapped	22
Reinforce/establish company policy	13
More involvement in the process	12
Increase awareness that handicapped are equal to/ as good as other employees	12
More active recruitment/actively seek out handicapped	10
Contact agency/meet with agency	9
Training for handicapped	3
All other mentions	12
Don't know	9

CHAPTER 10: STEPS AND POLICY CHANGES TO INCREASE EMPLOYMENT OF DISABLED PEOPLE

Steps for Public and Private Agencies to Take

EEO officers named the most important steps that public and private agencies should take that they are not taking now, to help companies employ disabled people (Table 10-1).

The most common responses are the obvious ones -- an increased flow of information to employers about available applicants, and increased and appropriate job training for disabled people, training programs, and placement agencies. Employers would also like to know what specific skills candidates have that would be compatible with available jobs. They would even like agencies to provide specific training for particular positions.

Employers see a need for disabled applicants to be more aggressive about marketing themselves. That message translates into more intense coaching by agencies, to accustom disabled applicants to discussing their job skills and attributes. Agencies should also do a better job of informing their clients about job opportunities, according to employers.

Observation:

These responses outline a plan-of-action for rehabilitation and placement agencies to follow as they work with disabled people and employers to match candidates with positions.

Q.10c

Table 10-1

MOST IMPORTANT STEPS FOR PUBLIC AND PRIVATE AGENCIES
TO INCREASE EMPLOYMENT OF DISABLED PEOPLE

Q.: What is the most important step that public or private agencies should take that they are not taking now, to help companies like yours employ handicapped people? Anything else?

	EEO Officers 301 %
Job training/programs for disabled people	16
Information on availability of applicants	10
Make employers aware of programs/agencies	9
Identify/target specific skills compatible with available jobs	6
Encourage disabled people to apply/send applicants	5
More aggressive approach/marketing	5
Eliminate prejudice/fear/misconceptions of disabled people	3
Specific training for specific jobs available	3
Job referral service	2
Make disabled people aware of job opportunities	2
Eliminate government involvement	1
Too many barriers for disabled people in our industry	1
Vocational training	*
Focus on applicant's ability, not disability	*
All other mentions	28
None/no steps	2
Don't know	12

*Less than 0.5%.

The Perceived Effect of Increased Tax Deductions

Some tax deductions currently are available to companies that participate in certain government training programs for disabled people, such as the Targeted Jobs Tax Credit Program. Managers were asked if increased tax deductions and financial incentives would induce employers to train and employ more disabled people.

All four manager groups, as well as managers in different size companies, are divided in their responses. Roughly half believe that increased tax deductions and financial incentives would induce greater employment of disabled people, while the other half believe that tax incentives would have no effect (Table 10-2).

Observation:

Tax incentives would undoubtedly induce some companies to employ more disabled people. How many companies would be persuaded to act? That would depend on the size of the deductions. In considering the impact of tax deductions one should note that factors such as the paperwork involved and the type of deduction are also relevant.

Q.29

Table 10-2

WHETHER INCREASED TAX DEDUCTIONS WOULD HELP EMPLOY MORE DISABLED PEOPLE

Q.: Do you think that increased tax deductions and financial incentives would induce employers like yourself to train and employ more handicapped people, or not?

	Base		Would Induce Greater Employment	Would Not Induce	Depends (Vol.)	Not Sure	Refused
Type of Manager							
Top Management	210	%	46	50	2	1	*
EEO Officers	301	%	56	39	2	3	-
Department Heads/ Line Managers	210	%	57	32	4	7	*
Small Business Managers	200	%	47	47	3	3	1
Number of Employees							
10,000 or more employees	240	%	56	36	3	5	*
1,000-9,999 employees	242	%	49	45	4	2	-
50-999 employees	239	%	54	39	2	4	*
10-49 employees	200	%	47	47	3	3	1
Company has a Policy for Hiring Disabled People							
Yes	344	%	50	43	3	4	*
No	506	%	52	42	3	3	*

*Less than 0.5%.

Managers Rate the Effectiveness of Proposed Policy Changes

The final section of the survey sought managers' reactions to 13 different initiatives and policy changes that have been proposed to help increase the employment of disabled people. It is a richly diverse list designed to meet the varying employment needs of employers in large, medium, and small companies, and in different industries. The list also reflects the important roles played by our entire society in this effort, including employers, federal and state agencies, legislators at both the state and federal level, private rehabilitation agencies and placement services, and foundations.

For each item on the list, managers were asked whether it would be very effective, somewhat effective, not too effective, or not effective at all in helping them to hire handicapped people, or retain handicapped employees.

What emerges is a strong and fairly uniform level of endorsement for ten of the 13 proposals. Only one proposal ranks far above the others by receiving majority endorsement as a very effective change.

The rank ordering of the perceived effectiveness of these proposals is as follows (Table 10-3):

Establishing direct training and recruiting programs with schools and vocational rehabilitation agencies: 54% of managers rate this step as very effective, and 38% rate it somewhat effective.

Having more companies provide internships or part-time jobs to disabled persons as an introduction to full-time jobs: 35% of managers rate this very effective, and 53% rate it somewhat effective.

Having employers explain specific functional requirements as part of job descriptions for open positions: 35% rate this very effective, and 45% rate it somewhat effective.

Having the government provide additional tax deductions for expensive accommodations, or share in their cost: 27% consider this very effective, and 47% consider it somewhat effective.

Having the government subsidize salaries for severely disabled employees for a trial period: 26% rate this very effective, and 42% rate it somewhat effective.

Having disability professionals give technical assistance or counsel to employers for accommodations or problems with specific employees: 24% rate this very effective, and 57% rate it somewhat effective.

Having chief executive officers establish voluntary employment targets for disabled people: 24% rate this very effective, and 48% rate it somewhat effective.

Having foundations and trusts pay some costs for on-the-job training for disabled employees: 23% rate this very effective, and 56% rate it somewhat effective.

Broadening federal affirmative action requirements so that disabled people get the same coverage as other minority groups: 23% rate this very effective, and 42% rate is somewhat effective.

Having outside rehabilitation vendors provide job coaches to companies to help disabled employees learn their jobs: 22% rate this very effective, and 48% rate it somewhat effective.

Having companies provide awareness training to employees about the special needs of disabled employees and company policies towards them: 21% consider this very effective, and 52% consider it somewhat effective.

Only top managers were asked the next two proposals:

Having a group of chief executive officers in major companies appeal to business and government to employ more handicapped people: 13% of top managers rate this very effective, and 46% rate it somewhat effective.

Increasing the recognition for companies with exemplary records for employing disabled people: 12% of top managers rate this very effective, and 63% rate it somewhat effective.

Q.30

Table 10-3

MANAGERS REACT TO PROPOSED POLICY CHANGES THAT MIGHT INCREASE EMPLOYMENT OF DISABLED PEOPLE

Base: All managers

Q.: And finally, I'm going to read some proposed initiatives and policy changes which might help to employ more handicapped people. Please say if you think each one would be very effective, somewhat effective, not too effective, or not effective at all in helping employers to hire handicapped people, or retain disabled employees.

Base: 921		Very Effective	Somewhat Effective	Not Too Effective	Not Effective at All	Not Sure	Refused
Establishing direct training and recruiting programs with schools and vocational rehabilitation agencies so that employers meet more qualified handicapped applicants	%	54	38	5	2	1	*
Having more companies provide internships or part-time jobs as a way of opening the door to full-time jobs for handicapped people	%	35	53	8	3	1	*
Having employers explain specific functional requirements as part of job descriptions for openings	%	35	45	12	6	1	*
Having the government provide additional tax deductions for, or share in the cost of, expensive accommodations	%	27	47	16	9	1	*
Having the government subsidize salaries for severely handicapped employees for a trial period	%	26	42	17	12	2	*
Having disability professionals give technical assistance or counsel to employers for accommodations or problems with specific handicapped employees	%	24	57	12	5	2	*

(Continued)

Q.30

Table 10-3 (Continued)

MANAGERS REACT TO PROPOSED POLICY CHANGES THAT MIGHT INCREASE EMPLOYMENT OF DISABLED PEOPLE

Base: All managers

Base: 921		Very Effective	Somewhat Effective	Not Too Effective	Not Effective at All	Not Sure	Refused
Having the CEO in companies like yours establish voluntary employment targets for handicapped people	%	24	48	15	10	3	*
Having foundations and trusts pay some costs for on-the-job training for handicapped employees	%	23	56	13	5	2	*
Broadening current federal affirmative action requirements so that handicapped people get the same coverage as other minority groups	%	23	42	19	13	2	1
Having outside rehabilitation vendors provide job coaches to companies to help handicapped employees learn their jobs	%	22	48	18	10	2	*
Having companies like yours provide awareness training to your employees about the special needs of handicapped workers and the company's employment policies for them	%	21	52	17	8	1	1
ASKED ONLY OF TOP MANAGEMENT							
Having a group of CEO's in major companies appeal to businesses and government to employ more handicapped people	%	13	46	25	13	2	1
Increase the recognition from public and private sector leaders which is given to companies with exemplary records for employing handicapped people	%	12	63	16	7	1	*

*Less than 0.5%.

APPENDIX A: SURVEY METHOD

Sample Design

For this study, ten systematic samples were drawn from the Dun & Bradstreet universe of corporations in the United States:

- Three separate samples of corporations with 10,000 or more employees generated interviews with 70 top managers, 100 equal employment opportunity (EEO) officers, and 70 department heads or line managers. The sample of top managers was drawn only from corporate headquarters. The other two samples were drawn from branch or single locations.

- Three separate samples of corporations with 1,000 to 9,999 employees generated interviews with 71 top managers, 101 EEO officers, and 70 department heads or line managers. As in the samples of larger companies, top managers were drawn from headquarters locations, and the other two samples were drawn from branch or single locations.

- Three separate samples of corporations with 50-999 employees generated interviews with 69 top managers, 100 EEO officers, and 70 department heads or line managers. Once again, top managers were drawn from headquarters locations, and the other two samples were drawn from branch or single locations.

- A sample of corporations with 10-49 employees generated 200 interviews with principals or ranking officers.

In all, 921 interviews were conducted in 921 companies. Factual profiles of the companies are displayed in Table A-2.

Interviewing

All interviews were conducted by telephone from the New York offices of Louis Harris & Associates during September and October, 1986. Interviews were conducted on weekdays from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. When necessary, appointments were made to interview the relevant officers in a company.

Up to three callback attempts were made to reach all selected respondents in the three separate groups.

Questionnaires

Four questionnaires were developed for the study: one for top managers, one for EEO officers, one for department heads and line managers, and one for top managers in very small companies. All four questionnaires are nearly identical, but each contains some unique questions. Appendix B contains a copy of the questionnaire used for EEO officers. Copies of the other questionnaires can be obtained from I.C.D.

Data Processing

The editing, coding, and data processing of all questionnaires were conducted by Louis Harris & Associates.

Codes were developed for responses to open-ended questions, with only those responses given by less than 0.2% of the respondents being coded as "other" responses.

Sampling Error

Table A-3 indicates the sampling error associated with various sample sizes and the reported sample percentages, at the 95% confidence level.

Table A-1

SAMPLE DISPOSITION

Total number called	1926	
Ineligible		
-- No reply after 4 calls	204	
-- Duplicate number	14	
-- Wrong number (not company listed)	17	
-- Respondent away for duration of survey	101	
-- Not in service	65	
	401	
Total Eligible	1525	100%
Not interviewed because		
-- Respondent terminated during interview	39	3%
-- Respondent refused	547	36%
-- Respondent busy	18	1%
Interviewed	921	60%

Table A-2

THE SAMPLES

	Total	Top Managers	EEO Officers	Line Managers	Managers of Small Companies
Base	921	210	301	210	200
	%	%	%	%	%
Size of Company					
10,000 or more employees	26	33	33	33	--
1,000-9,999 employees	26	34	33	33	--
50-999 employees	26	33	33	33	--
10-49 employees	22	--	--	--	100
Region					
East	26	38	21	21	26
Midwest	24	23	23	24	26
South	31	25	32	37	31
West	19	14	25	18	19
Type of Business					
Manufacturing	30	41	28	28	26
Wholesale or retail	29	17	32	34	29
Financial services	17	15	21	20	11
Other services	18	16	17	17	21
Other	10	12	10	5	12
% in Blue Collar or Skilled Labor					
(Median)	52	54	50	49	49
Unionized or Not					
Has union members	34	51	35	36	12
Does not	65	49	63	62	88
Federal Government Contracts					
Has	30	42	36	28	9
Does not have	62	55	51	57	91
Type of Disability Insurance					
Outside	57	52	53	50	76
Self-insured	30	32	34	36	15
Both	5	11	7	4	3

Table A-3

SAMPLE ERROR

This table shows the sampling tolerance, at 95% confidence level, to use in evaluating any individual percentage result.

Result Is Based	REPORTED SAMPLE PERCENTAGE				
	10% or 90%	20% or 80%	30% or 70%	40% or 60%	Result at 50%
900	2	3	3	3	3
800	2	3	3	3	3
700	2	3	3	4	4
600	2	3	4	4	4
500	3	4	4	4	4
400	3	4	4	5	5
300	3	5	5	6	6
200	4	6	6	7	7
100	6	8	9	10	10
50	8	11	13	14	14

APPENDIX B: QUESTIONNAIRE

Note: In the interest of keeping down the length of this report, only one of the four questionnaires is included. The other three questionnaires were similar but shorter. Copies can be obtained on request from I.C.D.

LOUIS HARRIS AND ASSOCIATES, INC.
630 Fifth Avenue
New York, New York 10111

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Questionnaire No.:_____

5-6-7-8

Study No. 864009

August 28, 1986 (EEO Officers)

Sample Point No.: / / / / / / /
10-11-12-13-14-15

Time Started:_____A.M./P.M.

Interviewer:_____ I.D. No.:_____ Date:_____

Area Code: _____ Telephone No.: _____
(16-25)

Respondent's Name:_____

Title:_____

Organization:_____

Address:_____

City/Town:_____State:_____Zip:_____

SWITCHBOARD INTRODUCTION:

Hello, I'm _____ calling from Louis Harris and Associates, the opinion polling firm in New York. I am trying to identify the senior manager responsible for equal employment opportunity in your company. Could you give me that person's name and telephone extension please? RECORD NAME ABOVE.

RESPONDENT INTRODUCTION:

Hello, I'm _____ calling from Louis Harris and Associates, the opinion polling firm in New York. I would like to confirm that you are (RESPONDENT NAME), the manager responsible for equal employment opportunity.

(IF NAME AND RESPONSIBILITIES CONFIRMED, CONTINUE. IF NOT, ASK: Could you please tell me who is the equal employment opportunity manager? RECORD NAME AND REPEAT INTRODUCTION WITH PROPER RESPONDENT.)

We are conducting a survey on the employment of people with disabilities, (and are interested in your opinions and your organization's policies).

OPTIONAL:
As in all our surveys, neither your name nor your organizational affiliation will ever be released, and the results of this study will be reported in aggregate form only.

OPTIONAL:
The interview will take about 15-20 minutes. When the survey is finished we will send you a copy of the full report, which will be designed to help employers with the employment of handicapped people.

1. Would you say that a strong emphasis on social and communal responsibility is an important part of your corporate culture, or not?

Yes, an important part.....(26(____-1
No, not important.....____-2
Not sure.....____-3
Refused.....____-4

2. Does your company currently make a special effort to recruit (READ EACH ITEM), or not?

DO NOT ROTATE	Currently Makes	Does Not Make	Not Sure	Refused
a. People from minority groups.....(27(	____-1	____-2	____-3	____-4
b. Handicapped persons. By "handicapped" we mean to include people with physical, seeing, hearing and speech disabilities, or emotional or mental disabilities, or long-term health problems.....(28(	____-1	____-2	____-3	____-4

3. In general, how would you compare handicapped job applicants to most non-handicapped applicants on their (READ ITEM) -- are handicapped applicants better, worse, or about the same as most non-handicapped applicants?

ROTATE -- START AT "X"	Better	Worse	About the Same	Doesn't Apply (Vol.)	Depends (Vol.)	Not Sure	Refused
( ) 1. Formal education....(29(	____-1	____-2	____-3	____-4	____-5	____-6	____-7
( ) 2. Job skills.....(30(	____-1	____-2	____-3	____-4	____-5	____-6	____-7
( ) 3. Ability to sell themselves.....(31(	____-1	____-2	____-3	____-4	____-5	____-6	____-7
( ) 4. Leadership potential(32(	____-1	____-2	____-3	____-4	____-5	____-6	____-7
( ) 5. Communication skills(33(	____-1	____-2	____-3	____-4	____-5	____-6	____-7
( ) 6. Past experience.....(34(	____-1	____-2	____-3	____-4	____-5	____-6	____-7

4. Would you say that your handicapped employees usually get promoted at about the same rate as most other employees, at a slower rate, or at a faster rate?

Get promoted at same rate.....(35(____-1
At a slower rate.....____-2
At a faster rate.....____-3
Depends (vol.).....____-4
Not applicable (vol.).....____-5
Not sure.....____-6
Refused.....____-7

5. Let me read you some statements that people have made about employing handicapped people. For each, please say if you agree strongly, agree somewhat, disagree somewhat, or disagree strongly? READ EACH STATEMENT

ROTATE -- START AT "X"	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly	Not Applicable (Vol.)	Not Sure	No Answer/ Refused
( ) a. Special privileges usually must be made for handicapped employees..... (36(	-1	-2	-3	-4	-5	-6	-7
( ) b. Handicapped employees have fewer accidents on the job than do non-handicapped employees..... (37(	-1	-2	-3	-4	-5	-6	-7
( ) c. Handicapped people just don't fit in with most non-handicapped employees..... (38(	-1	-2	-3	-4	-5	-6	-7

6. Do you think that the civil rights laws that cover minorities against discrimination should also cover handicapped persons, or not? (IF RESPONDENT SAYS THAT LAWS ALREADY COVER THEM, PROBE WITH: Do you think that civil rights laws should or should not ....?)

Yes, should cover..... (39(-1
No, should not cover..... -2
Not sure..... -3
Refused..... -4

7. Do you feel that handicapped people often encounter job discrimination from employers, or not?

Yes, encounter discrimination.... (40(-1
No, do not encounter..... -2
Not sure..... -3
Refused..... -4

8a. Does your company have an established policy or program for the hiring of handicapped people, or not?

Yes, has a policy or program.. (41(-1 (ASK Q.8b)

No, has no policy or program..... -2
Not sure..... -3
Refused..... -4
} (SKIP TO Q.8e)

8b. Does your company have a specific person or department that oversees the hiring of handicapped people, or not?

Yes, has specific person/department..... (42(-1
No, does not have specific person/department..... -2
Not sure..... -3
Refused..... -4

8c. Does your company policy require that you employ a certain number of handicapped people, or have a certain proportion of handicapped employees in your work force, or not?

Yes, policy requires a certain number of handicapped employees.....(43(____-1
No, policy does not require this.....____-2
Not sure.....____-3
Refused.....____-4

8d. Does your company have any program or distribute any literature that helps your managers and employees learn to work with handicapped people, or not?

Yes, has program or literature.....(44(____-1
No, does not have program or literature.....____-2
Not sure.....____-3
Refused.....____-4

8e. Has your company hired any handicapped people in the past 3 years, or not? (NOTE: RESPONDENT MAY ASK IF QUESTION REFERS TO THEIR LOCATION OR THE WHOLE COMPANY. TELL THEM TO ANSWER FOR THE LOCATIONS THEY FEEL QUALIFIED TO SPEAK ABOUT.)

Yes, have hired.....(45(____-1 (SKIP TO Q.9a)

No, have not hired.....____-2 (ASK Q.8f)

Not sure.....____-3 } (SKIP TO Q.9a)
Refused.....____-4 }

8f. Is/Are (READ EACH ITEM) an important reason why you haven't hired handicapped people in the past three years, or not?

ROTATE -- START AT "X"	Important Reason	Not an Important Reason	Depends (Vol.)	Not Sure	Refused
( ) 1. A lack of qualified applicants.....(46(	____-1	____-2	____-3	____-4	____-5
( ) 2. Architectural barriers or a lack special equipment.....(47(	____-1	____-2	____-3	____-4	____-5
( ) 3. An absence of job openings or a hiring freeze.....(48(	____-1	____-2	____-3	____-4	____-5
( ) 4. The fact that you are unable to train handicapped people.....(49(	____-1	____-2	____-3	____-4	____-5
( ) 5. Their being a safety risk to themselves or others.....(50(	____-1	____-2	____-3	____-4	____-5
ASK LAST -- DO NOT ASK OF TOP MANAGEMENT					
6. A lack of support from top management.....(51(	____-1	____-2	____-3	____-4	____-5

(SKIP TO Q.10a)

9a. Has your company hired any handicapped people in the past year, since (DATE) 1985, or not?

(NOTE: RESPONDENT MAY ASK IF QUESTION REFERS TO THEIR LOCATION OR THE WHOLE COMPANY. TELL THEM TO ANSWER FOR THE LOCATIONS THEY FEEL QUALIFIED TO SPEAK ABOUT.)

Yes, has hired.....(52(____-1 (SKIP TO Q.9b)

No, has not hired.....____-2 (ASK Q.9c)

Not sure.....____-3 } (SKIP TO Q.10a)
Refused.....____-4 }

9b. How were those handicapped people referred to your company? Anything else?
DO NOT READ LIST -- MULTIPLE RECORD

Government vocational rehabilitation agency.....(53(____-1
Private vocational rehabilitation agency.....____-2
State employment service.....____-3
Private employment agency.....____-4
Agency which places handicapped people.....____-5
Company recruiters.....____-6
Independent recruiters/headhunters.....____-7
Came of their own initiative.....____-8
Colleges and schools.....____-9
Current employees.....(54(____-1
Friends or word-of-mouth.....____-2
Other (SPECIFY):

_____.....____-3
Not sure.....____-4
Refused.....____-5

(SKIP TO Q.10a)

9c. Is/Are (READ EACH ITEM) an important reason why you haven't hired handicapped people in the past year, or not?

ROTATE -- START AT "X"	Important Reason	Not an Important Reason	Depends (Vol.)	Not Sure	Refused
( ) 1. A lack of qualified applicants.....(55(	-1	-2	-3	-4	-5
( ) 2. Architectural barriers or a lack special equipment.....(56(	-1	-2	-3	-4	-5
( ) 3. An absence of job openings or a hiring freeze.....(57(	-1	-2	-3	-4	-5
( ) 4. The fact that you are unable to train handicapped people.....(58(	-1	-2	-3	-4	-5
( ) 5. Their being a safety risk to themselves or others.....(59(	-1	-2	-3	-4	-5
ASK LAST -- DO NOT ASK OF TOP MANAGEMENT					
6. A lack of support from top management.....(60(	-1	-2	-3	-4	-5

ASK EVERYONE

IF "PARTICIPATED" IN Q.10a ITEM, IMMEDIATELY ASK Q.10b. THEN ASK NEXT Q.10a ITEM.

10a. Now I'm going to ask you about specific government programs. In the past three years has your company (READ ITEM), or not?

10b. Would you rate your company's experience with (READ ITEM) very successful, somewhat successful, not too successful, or not successful at all?

DO NOT ROTATE	Q.10a				Q.10b					
	Participated	Did Not	Not Sure	Refused	Very Successful	Somewhat Successful	Not Too Successful	Not Successful at All	Not Sure	Refused
1. (Participated in) a Projects with Industry or PWI Program.....	(61(-1	-2	-3	-4	(66(-1	-2	-3	-4	-5	-6
2. (Participated in) the Targeted Jobs Tax Credit Program.....	(62(-1	-2	-3	-4	(67(-1	-2	-3	-4	-5	-6
3. (Participated in) a Job Training Partnership Act Program or PIC Council (Private Industry Council).....	(63(-1	-2	-3	-4	(68(-1	-2	-3	-4	-5	-6
4. (Had any association with) state vocational rehabilitation agencies.....	(64(-1	-2	-3	-4	(69(-1	-2	-3	-4	-5	-6
5. (Had any association with) independent living centers.....	(65(-1	-2	-3	-4	(70(-1	-2	-3	-4	-5	-6

10c. What is the most important step that public or private agencies should take that they are not taking now, to help companies like yours employ handicapped people? Anything else?

_____ (72-72)

_____ (73-74)

_____ (75-76)

11a. Does your company screen job candidates for functional limitations for doing the job, or not?

Yes, screens.....(77(____-1 (ASK Q.11b)

No, do not screen.....____-2
Not sure.....____-3
Refused.....____-4
(SKIP TO Q.11c)

11b. Is this information used in making hiring decisions, or not?

Used.....(78(____-1
Not used.....____-2
Not sure.....____-3
Refused.....____-4

11c. Does your company encourage job candidates and employees to self-identify themselves as handicapped or as having a specific disability, or not?

Yes, candidates/employees encouraged to self-identify.....(79(____-1
No, not asked.....____-2
Not applicable (vol.).....____-3
Not sure.....____-4
Refused.....____-5

11d. Now let's talk about your company's experiences with handicapped employees, past and present. In general, how would you rate the job performance of handicapped employees who work for your company -- excellent, good, only fair, or poor?

Excellent.....(80(____-1
Good.....____-2
Only fair.....____-3
Poor.....____-4
Not applicable (vol.)....____-5
Not sure.....____-6
Refused.....____-7

12. I'm going to read some criteria used to evaluate employees. How would you rate handicapped employees on their (READ EACH ITEM) -- are they better, worse, or about the same as non-handicapped employees in similar jobs?

ROTATE -- START AT "X"	Better	Worse	About the Same	Not Sure	Refused
( ) a. Leadership ability.....(2*10(	____-1	____-2	____-3	____-4	____-5
( ) b. Desire for promotion.....(11(	____-1	____-2	____-3	____-4	____-5
( ) c. Attendance and punctuality on the job.(12(	____-1	____-2	____-3	____-4	____-5
( ) d. Willingness to work hard.....(13(	____-1	____-2	____-3	____-4	____-5
( ) e. Reliability.....(14(	____-1	____-2	____-3	____-4	____-5
( ) f. Productivity.....(15(	____-1	____-2	____-3	____-4	____-5

13a. How would you rate your company's success at promoting handicapped employees -- have you been very successful, somewhat successful, not too successful, or not successful at all?

Very successful.....(16(____-1
Somewhat successful.....____-2
Not too successful.....____-3
Not successful at all.....____-4
Not applicable (vol.).....____-5
Not sure.....____-6
Refused.....____-7

13b. Does your company employ a disability professional who works with handicapped employees or their supervisors, or not?

Employs a disability professional.(17(____-1
Does not employ one.....____-2
Not sure.....____-3
Refused.....____-4

14a. Has your company made any accommodations in the workplace or changes in its practices in order to help handicapped employees do their jobs, or not?

Yes, accommodations or changes made...(18(____-1 (ASK Q.14b)

No, accommodations or changes not made....____-2 (SKIP TO Q.15)

Not sure.....____-3
Refused.....____-4 } (SKIP TO Q.16)

14b. Has your company (READ EACH ITEM)?

(NOTE: RESPONDENT MAY ASK IF QUESTION REFERS TO THEIR LOCATION OR THE WHOLE COMPANY. TELL THEM TO ANSWER FOR THE LOCATIONS THEY FEEL QUALIFIED TO SPEAK ABOUT.)

DO NOT ROTATE	Have	Have Not	Not Applicable (Vol.)	Not Sure	Refused
1. Removed architectural barriers or changed changed furniture to give handicapped employees full access, or not.....(19(	____-1	____-2	____-3	____-4	____-5
2. Purchased any special telephones or equipment to help handicapped employees, or not.(20(	____-1	____-2	____-3	____-4	____-5
3. Adjusted work hours or restructured jobs to accommodate handicapped employees, or not..(21(	____-1	____-2	____-3	____-4	____-5
4. Provided readers or interpreters to help blind or speech and hearing-impaired employees, or not.....(22(	____-1	____-2	____-3	____-4	____-5
5. Make any other accommodations for handicapped employees, or not (SPECIFY): _____ _____..(23(	____-1	____-2	____-3	____-4	____-5

14c. In general, would you say that the cost of the accommodations you've made is very expensive, somewhat expensive, not too expensive, or not expensive at all?

Very expensive.....(24(	-1
Somewhat expensive.....	-2
Not too expensive.....	-3
Not expensive at all.....	-4
Not sure.....	-5
Refused.....	6

(SKIP TO Q.16)

15. Why have no accommodations in the workplace been made? Any other reasons?
MULTIPLE RECORD

None needed.....(25(	-1
None requested.....	-2
Too expensive.....	-3
Changes needed were too extensive..	-4
Changes needed were not feasible...	-5
Laws requiring accomodations don't apply to us.....	-6
Other (SPECIFY): _____	
_____	-7
Not sure.....	-8
Refused.....	-9

ASK EVERYONE

16. Would you say that the average cost of employing a handicapped person is greater than, less than, or about the same as the cost of employing a non-handicapped person in a similar job?

Greater than.....(26(	-1
Less than.....	-2
About the same.....	-3
Depends (vol.).....	-4
Not sure.....	-5
Refused.....	-6

17. Do you think that it is more difficult to fire a handicapped employee than a non-handicapped employee, or not?

Yes, more difficult	(27(	-1
No, not more difficult		-2
Not sure		-3
Refused		-4

18. Now let's talk about current employees who become disabled, either from injury, illness, or some other health condition. Do you think that employers have a responsibility to rehabilitate their employees who become disabled, or not?

Yes, have responsibility	(28(	-1
No, do not have		-2
Have a responsibility only if they're injured on the job (vol.)		-3
Not sure		-4
Refused		-5

19. Do the majority of your disabled employees return to work, or do the majority remain disabled or take an early retirement?

Majority return to work	(29(	-1
Majority remain disabled/take early retirement		-2
Equal number do both (vol.)		-3
Not applicable (vol.)		-4
Not sure		-5
Refused		-6

20. In most cases do you think that it is more cost-effective to rehabilitate disabled employees and return them to work, or more cost-effective to pay them disability payments and replace them?

More cost-effective to rehabilitate	(30(	-1
More cost-effective to pay disability payments		-2
Depends (vol.)		-3
Not sure		-4
Refused		-5

21. Do you think that your company should make a greater effort than it makes now to return more disabled employees to their former jobs or place them elsewhere in your company, or is it doing enough now?

Yes, should make greater effort	(31(	-1
Doing enough now		-2
Not applicable (vol.)		-3
Not sure		-4
Refused		-5

22. Does your company have (READ EACH ITEM) for any disabled employees, or not?

DO NOT ROTATE	Have	Does Not Have	Not Sure	Refused
1. Consultation from private rehabilitation vendors	(32(-1	-2	-3	-4
2. Light duty employment options, or part-time, or flexible hours	(33(-1	-2	-3	-4
3. Medical case management	(34(-1	-2	-3	-4
4. Long-term disability benefits	(35(-1	-2	-3	-4
5. A trial work period during which disability benefits are continued	(36(-1	-2	-3	-4

23. When employees go on sick leave or on workers compensation, after filing claims do you begin monitoring their progress within the first month they're out, or after one to three months, or after four to six months, or after more than six months?

Within first month.....(37(-1
After 1 to 3 months..... -2
After 4 to 6 months..... -3
After more than 6 months..... -4
Depends (vol.)..... -5
Do not monitor progress (vol.).. -6
Not sure..... -7
Refused..... -8

24. (Has/have) (READ EACH ITEM) been a major problem, minor problem, or not a problem at all for your company?

DO NOT ROTATE	Major Problem	Minor Problem	Not a Problem at All	Not Sure	Refused
a. Resistance from supervisors or co-workers toward disabled employees returning to work	(38(-1	-2	-3	-4	-5
b. Union regulations preventing job re-assignments or job modification for returning employees	(39(-1	-2	-3	-4	-5

25. Do you think that your company should make a greater effort than it makes now to employ handicapped people, or is it doing enough now?

Yes, should do more.....(40(-1
Doing enough now..... -2
Not sure..... -3
Refused..... -4

26. In the next 3 years, how likely do you think it is that your company actually will make greater efforts than it makes now, to employ more handicapped people -- is it very likely, somewhat likely, not too likely, or not likely at all?

Very likely.....(41(____-1
Somewhat likely.....____-2
Not too likely.....____-3
Not likely at all.....____-4
Not sure.....____-5
Refused.....____-6

27. At present, is your company able to provide in-house training for handicapped employees, or not?

Yes, able to provide.....(42(____-1 (SKIP TO Q.29)

No, not able.....____-2 (ASK Q.28)

Not sure.....____-3 } (SKIP TO Q.29)
Refused.....____-4 }

28. (Is/Are) (READ EACH ITEM) an important reason why you currently cannot train handicapped people in-house, or not?

DO NOT ROTATE	Important Reason	Not Important	Not Sure	Refused
1. Architectural barriers in your building.....	(43(____-1	____-2	____-3	____-4
2. A lack of needed special equipment.....	(44(____-1	____-2	____-3	____-4
3. A lack of special training for your managers and supervisors	(45(____-1	____-2	____-3	____-4

29. Do you think that increased tax deductions and financial incentives would induce employers like yourself to train and employ more handicapped people, or not?

Yes, would induce employers.(46(____-1
No, would not induce.....____-2
Depends (vol.).....____-3
Not sure.....____-4
Refused.....____-5

30. And finally, I'm going to read some proposed initiatives and policy changes which might help to employ more handicapped people. Please say if you think each one would be very effective, somewhat effective, not too effective, or not effective at all in helping employers to hire handicapped people, or retain disabled employees.
READ EACH ITEM AND PROMPT WITH CATEGORIES AS OFTEN AS NEEDED

ROTATE -- START AT "X"	Very Effective	Somewhat Effective	Not Too Effective	Not Effective at All	Not Sure	Refused
( ) a. Having the government provide additional tax deductions for, or share in the cost of, expensive accommodations.....(47(	-1	-2	-3	-4	-5	-6
( ) b. Having more companies provide internships or part-time jobs as a way of opening the door to full-time jobs for handicapped people.....(48(	-1	-2	-3	-4	-5	-6
( ) c. Having foundations and trusts pay some costs for on-the-job training for handicapped employees....(49(	-1	-2	-3	-4	-5	-6
( ) d. Having outside rehabilitation vendors provide job coaches to companies to help handicapped employees learn their jobs.....(50(	-1	-2	-3	-4	-5	-6
( ) e. Broadening current federal affirmative action requirements so that handicapped people get the same coverage as other minority groups.....(51(	-1	-2	-3	-4	-5	-6
( ) f. Having employers explain specific functional requirements as part of job descriptions for openings.....(52(	-1	-2	-3	-4	-5	-6
( ) g. Establishing direct training and recruiting programs with schools and vocational rehabilitation agencies so that employers meet more qualified handicapped applicants...(53(	-1	-2	-3	-4	-5	-6

(Continued)

30. (Continued)

ROTATE -- START AT "X"	Very Effective	Somewhat Effective	Not Too Effective	Not Effective at All	Not Sure	Refused
( ) h. Having the CEO in companies like yours establish voluntary employment targets for handicapped people.....(54(	-1	-2	-3	-4	-5	-6
( ) i. Having disability professionals give technical assistance or counsel to employers for accommodations or problems with specific handicapped employees.....(55(	-1	-2	-3	-4	-5	-6
( ) j. Having companies like yours provide awareness training to your employees about the special needs of handicapped workers and the company's employment policies for them.....(56(	-1	-2	-3	-4	-5	-6
( ) k. Having the government subsidize salaries for severely handicapped employees for a trial period.....(57(	-1	-2	-3	-4	-5	-6

F1. Approximately how many people does your company employ in the United States?

Less than 50	(58(-1
51-100	-2
101-250	-3
251-500	-4
501-750	-5
751-1,000	-6
1,001-3,000	-7
3,001-5,000	-8
5,001-7,500	-9
7,501-10,000	-0
10,001-15,000	(59(-1
15,001-20,000	-2
20,001 or more	-3
Not sure	-4
Refused	-5

F2. Approximately what percentage of your employees are in blue-collar or skilled labor jobs?

/ / / / %
(60-62)

Not sure	(63(-1
Refused	-2

F3a. Are any of your employees union members, or not?

Yes, has union members	(64(-1
No unionized employees	-2
Not sure	-3
Refused	-4

F3b. Does your firm currently have any contracts with the federal government, or not?

Yes, has contracts	(65(-1
No, has no contracts	-2
Not sure	-3
Refused	-4

F4a. What is the main business or businesses of your corporation?
PROBE TO BE ABLE TO CLASSIFY

a. Manufacturing -- agribusiness.....(66(____-1
b. Manufacturing -- airlines/aerospace.....____-2
c. Manufacturing -- chemicals/pharmaceuticals.....____-3
d. Manufacturing -- energy.....____-4
e. Manufacturing -- high technology.....____-5
f. Manufacturing -- mining and minerals.....____-6
g. Other manufacturing.....____-7
h. Construction.....____-8
i. Transportation.....____-9
j. Public utility.....____-0
k. Wholesale.....(67(____-1
L. Retail.....____-2
m. Financial, insurance, real estate.....____-3
n. Services.....____-4
Other type of company (SPECIFY):

_____....____-5
Not sure.....____-6

F4b. Does your company have outside insurance for disability, or are you self-insured for disability?

Outside insurance.....(68(____-1
Self-insured.....____-2
Both (vol.).....____-3
Not sure.....____-4
Refused.....____-5

F5. What is your title?

_____ (69-70)

71-80Z

That completes the interview. Thank you very much for your cooperation!

TIME ENDED:_____A.M./P.M.