

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

UMI

**A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600**

Implementation of the American's With Disabilities Act:
Employer Commitment to Title I and Implications for Hiring
in Northeastern Pennsylvania

by

Lori A. Bruch

A Dissertation Submitted to
The Faculty of
The Graduate School of Education and Human Development
of The George Washington University
in partial satisfaction of
the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Education

September 30, 1997

Dissertation directed by
Donald C. Linkowski, Ph.D
Chair of the Department of Counseling/Human and Organizational
Studies
Professor of Counseling

UMI Number: 9806390

**Copyright 1998 by
Bruch, Lori Ann**

All rights reserved.

**UMI Microform 9806390
Copyright 1997, by UMI Company. All rights reserved.**

**This microform edition is protected against unauthorized
copying under Title 17, United States Code.**

UMI
300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, MI 48103

Table of Contents

Dedication.....	I
Acknowledgements.....	II
List of Tables.....	III
Abstract.....	2
Chapter I.....	3
Statement of the Problem.....	8
Purpose.....	8
Significance of the Study.....	9
Research Questions.....	10
Definition and Terms.....	15
Assumptions.....	16
Limitations.....	17
Methodology.....	18
Overview.....	18
Subjects.....	19
Instrumentation.....	20
Data Collection Procedures.....	21
Data Analysis.....	22
Summary.....	23
Chapter II.....	24
Discrimination of Persons with Disabilities.....	25
Work and Persons with Disabilities.....	28
Factors Affecting Employment.....	33
Employer Concerns.....	36
Employer Policy.....	38

External Hiring Factors.....	39
Employer Predictor Variables.....	40
The Americans with Disabilities Act.....	44
Title I of the Americans with Disabilities Act.....	46
Approaches to the Americans with Disabilities Act.....	50
Training and Awareness.....	57
Summary.....	59
Chapter III.....	61
Methodology.....	61
Participants.....	61
Instruments.....	62
Reliability and Validity.....	64
Data Collection Procedures.....	65
Participation Rate.....	68
Descriptive Statistics of Sample.....	68
Data Collection Period.....	72
Data Analysis.....	72
Ethical Considerations.....	74
Limitations of the Design.....	74
Summary.....	75
Chapter IV.....	76
Results.....	76
Research Question 1.....	77
Research Question 2.....	86
Research Question 3.....	94
Research Question 4.....	100
Research Question 5.....	101

Research Question 6.....	105
Research Question 7.....	106
Research Question 8.....	107
Research Question 9.....	109
Summary.....	110
Chapter V.....	112
Summary of the Study.....	112
Study Design.....	115
Study Results.....	117
Discussion.....	117
Conclusions.....	128
Implications for Rehabilitation Professionals.....	130
Recommendations for Further Research.....	132
Summary.....	134
References.....	135
Appendix A Instruments.....	150
Appendix B Letter of Procedures.....	158
Appendix C Description of Job Applicants.....	160
Appendix D Types of Jobs.....	163
Appendix E Factors Facilitating the ADA.....	165
Appendix F Factors Inhibiting the ADA.....	168
Appendix G Training.....	171

Dedication

To my Grandmother, Anna H. Weiss

To my Mother, Norma E. Evans

and

To my Daughter, Kristin L. Bruch

It is wonderful to be a part of four generations of women
committed to helping others

Acknowledgements

There are many people that I would like to thank as I complete my doctoral studies. First, to the many people I have had the opportunity to work and learn with who taught me important lessons about myself and rehabilitation while the list spans twenty years, I am most grateful to Sandy, Loretta, Martha, Stanley, Robert, Susan, Heidi, Rodney, and last but not least Warren.

I would like to thank my dissertation committee. The guidance, insight, and critical evaluation of Drs. Donald Linkowski, Donald Dew and Pamela LeConte helped me to further develop the skills necessary to complete this work. A special thanks to Dr. Dew for encouraging me to pursue this doctoral degree.

I appreciate the technical support of Dr. James Grana, who provided outstanding assistance with the analysis of data and my brother, Rich Evans, for his on-call computer support.

A special thank-you to Dr. Stanley Irzinski and my friends at United Rehabilitation Services, Inc. for encouragement, support, technical assistance, and at times much needed distraction.

My colleagues at the University of Scranton are acknowledged for their faith and trust that I would complete this project. They provided an environment filled with support and encouragement. A big motivating factor for me was the rehabilitation counseling students, Beth, Connie, and Beth who provided me with encouragement through watching their own hard work and determination.

An extra special thank you for Dorsey who provided a place to stay, friendship, and tea. I am also appreciative of the friendship and support from Cully who was always ready to discuss an idea or debate a fine point on APA style.

I am very fortunate to have had the support and love of my family. A special thanks to my husband, Larry, who kept life as orderly as could be with long commutes and busy schedules. I appreciate the prayers of my Grandmother for my safe travels and good works. I could not have completed this program without my mother's assistance, encouragement and love.

Finally, I thank my daughter, Kristin, for helping me to enjoy life while completing this doctoral program.

List of Tables

Table A	Company Characteristics.....	69
Table B	Unionization of Companies.....	69
Table C	Public Transportation to Company.....	70
Table D	Company Size.....	70
Table E	Company Years in Existence.....	70
Table F	Survey Respondent.....	70
Table G	Years Experience with Company.....	71
Table H	Education.....	71
Table I	Previous Contact.....	71
Table J	Self-reported Knowledge of the ADA.....	71
Table 1	Policy Information.....	78
Table 1.1A	Policy Coordinator.....	79
Table 1.1B	Self-reported knowledge of the ADA.....	79
Table 1.1C	ADA Training.....	80
Table 1.1D	Policy Development.....	81
Table 1.1E	ADA Policy Changes.....	81
Table 1.1F	Roles of Consultants.....	82
Table 1.2	Written ADA Policy.....	82
Table 1.3	Contractual Agreements.....	82
Table 1.4	Accessible Workforce.....	83
Table 1.5	Pre-employment Process.....	83
Table 1.6	Reasonable Accommodation.....	83
Table 1.7	Review of the Hiring Process.....	84
Table 1.8	Visibility of the ADA Policies.....	84
Table 1.9	Company Approach to the ADA.....	84

List of Tables (cont.)

Table 1.9A	Chi-Square Analysis of Hiring by Employer..	85
Table 2.1	ADA Implementation.....	87
Table 2.2	Accessible Workplace.....	87
Table 2.3	The ADA Policy Distribution.....	88
Table 2.4	Disability Awareness Training.....	88
Table 2.5A	Recruitment Practices.....	89
Table 2.5B	Partnerships with Rehabilitation Agencies..	90
Table 2.6	Reasonable Accommodation Request Process...	92
Table 2.7	Application Process.....	92
Table 2.8A	Job Requirements.....	92
Table 2.8B	Interviewer ADA Training.....	93
Table 2.9	Job Descriptions.....	93
Table 2.11	Interactive Review Process.....	94
Table 3	Chi-Square Analysis of Hiring by Policy....	94
Table 3A	Post-ADA Hiring Practices.....	95
Table 3.1A	Post-ADA Hiring Practices.....	96
Table 3.2	Job Hours and Benefits.....	97
Table 3.4B	Description of Persons Hired.....	98
Table 3.4C	Job Evaluation Based on Disability.....	99
Table 5A	Interview Respondent Training Needs.....	102
Table 5B	Interview Respondent ADA Visibility.....	103
Table 6	Chi-Square Analysis of Pre and Post ADA....	105
Table 7	Chi-Square Analysis of Hiring by Company...	106
Table 8	Chi-Square Analysis of Hiring.....	108
Table 9	Summary of Significant Findings.....	117

Please Note

**Page(s) missing in number only; text follows.
Filmed as received.**

Page 1

UMI

Abstract

This study investigated employer awareness and knowledge of Title I, the employment provisions, of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). The development and implementation of the ADA company policies were examined to determine if there has been an impact on reported hiring practices of persons with disabilities. This study identified specific factors that were perceived to facilitate the implementation of the ADA, as well as factors that were seen as barriers. A comparison was made between hiring practices of persons with disabilities prior to the ADA enactment and after the ADA mandates to determine any changes in hiring. Employer ADA Title I training needs were also explored.

This study targeted 85 employers from Northeastern Pennsylvania with a 65% participation rate achieved. Employers responded to a survey on their ADA company policies and hiring practices. Nineteen employers completed an interview on the ADA Title I implementation. While 80% of the employers had the ADA policies in place, there were no associations found between policies and hiring practices of persons with disabilities.

This study focused the findings on suggestions for rehabilitation professionals to further understand employer approaches to the ADA and implications for developing employer partnerships. Information is presented on the importance of keeping the ADA highly visible with employers.

Chapter I

Implementation of the American's with Disabilities Act:
Employer Commitment and Implications for Hiring
in Northeastern Pennsylvania

"Without opportunity, ability is meaningless"

Napoleon Bonaparte

Work is a substantive part of a person's life. It is more than the means to economic self-sufficiency, since an occupation defines a person's social status, as well as self-concept (Hershenson & Szymanski, 1992). Having a job that offers security and satisfaction is part of the American dream. The pursuit of the dream is a basic right of each and every American. It is through the 1990 Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) that this right is now protected for persons with disabilities. This study explored the impact Title I of the ADA, the employment provisions, has had on employer ADA policies and reported hiring patterns of persons with disabilities.

People with disabilities remain the largest, most disadvantaged minority group in the United States (Hablutzel & McMahon, 1992). According to the 1991-1992 U.S. Bureau of census, 48.9 million Americans were identified as having a disability (McNeil, 1993). The employment status of people with disabilities is of critical concern. For instance, census data showed that having a disability had a profound impact on a person's ability to enter employment. Further

statistics, from a 1994 National Organization on Disability report, indicated that although the majority of Americans with disabilities aged 16 to 64 would like to work, only 31% are employed, whereas the employment rate for nondisabled Americans was 80.5% (Harris, 1994). The percentage of persons with disabilities who are working (31%) is even lower than the percentage found prior to the passage of the ADA (33%) (Harris, 1986). The reasons for high unemployment are numerous. This study focuses on external barriers to employment that may include employer attitudes, inaccessibility, and high unemployment rates. Despite the many reasons people with disabilities experience high unemployment, the literature is referenced with many stories of persons with disabilities who, when given the opportunity, have repeatedly shown they can be successfully employed (Wehman, 1993).

The high unemployment rate of persons with disabilities is also a concern for the national economy. Unless employability is greatly improved, the federal government estimated that the cost of maintaining persons under the age of 35 on income supports will reach 1 trillion dollars by the year 2005 (Bender & Gray, 1991). Harris (1986) stated that "Not working is perhaps the truest definition of what it means to be disabled" (p. 4). Harris (1986) revealed that persons with disabilities perceived significant barriers to employment, including 47% who felt employers did

not recognize their capability, 40% noted a shortage of available jobs, and 23% lacked the necessary devices or technology to assist them to work easier or communicate more effectively. Implications from Harris (1986) suggest these "barriers to work could be addressed by policymakers and employers" (p. 7).

Historically, the implication of a work disability was that the only factor affecting the ability to work was the condition of the person. More recently, however, McNeil (1993) explored the "ambiguity of work disability" (p. 12) and broadened the concepts to encompass environmental factors linked to accessibility and/or attitudinal barriers that are often associated with work place culture and company policies.

In the past 35 years, there have been limited and sporadic efforts to identify factors that employers feel are important when considering hiring people with disabilities (Greenwood & Johnson, 1985). Greenwood and Johnson compiled a comprehensive review of the literature on employer concerns and found the concept of employment to be complex, with the implications of positive and/or negative hiring practices not being clearly delineated. However, there appears to be a positive link between companies that had policies on employment of people with disabilities and increased hiring practices. A follow-up study completed by Harris (1987) on employment of Americans with disabilities

found that employers ranked persons with disabilities as equal to or better than their nondisabled co-workers on performance factors, and that maintaining their employment required little or no extra cost. In addition, for over 35 years, the E. I. duPont de Nemours and Company has studied the performance of employees with disabilities and have found them to be equal in performance, safety, and attendance to other non-disabled employees. However, these positive perceptions have not increased opportunities in the workplace for people with disabilities. Perhaps this contradiction may be understood in light of research on employer attitudes which indicated that outward attitudes are often ranked positive or neutral while covert attitudes are often negative or hostile (Hablutzel & McMahon, 1992).

Comprehensive Civil Rights Legislation

On July 26, 1990, the American's with Disabilities Act (ADA) was signed into law. The ADA is a comprehensive civil rights legislation that was enacted to help integrate persons with disabilities into every segment of society, including the workplace. Title I of the ADA specifically prohibited discrimination in any condition of employment for qualified individuals with disabilities. Several technical manuals are available which describe in detail the important components of employer implementation of the ADA (Henry, 1994; Jackson, 1993; Pati & Bailey (1995); Schneid, 1992). The importance of a comprehensive employer policy on the ADA

implementation has been repeatedly emphasized. While the ADA does not guarantee a job for every person with a disability, it can be instrumental in providing "a framework for improved employer attitudes, reduced discriminatory practices, and overall increased awareness and communication among employers concerning the vocational capabilities of people with disabilities" (Wehman, 1993, p. 57).

While the legislation clearly stated that qualified persons with disabilities will have full access to employment opportunities, it may not be enough to bring about the removal of subtle barriers to employment for person's with disabilities. A report of the ADA complaints filed with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) from July 26, 1992 to September 30, 1996 indicated that 72,687 claims were received. Of these claims, 9.8% (7095) were related to the hiring process. In light of these figures, how an employer views the ADA appears to be of great importance in making the ADA work for persons with disabilities, as well as for the company.

Pimentel, Bissonette, and Lotito (1992) looked at employer approaches to the ADA and identified three ways of dealing with the ADA. The first approach was conservative in nature and represented by employers who were concerned with doing no more than the "legal minimum with the sole purpose of limiting their losses" (p.43). The second approach was termed insightful and involved the employer

looking at "how can I save or make money while simultaneously being in compliance with ADA" (p. 43). The third approach was considered visionary, in that the employer looked at the ADA compliance in terms of "financial, professional, and personal profit and benefits to my organization and to my employees" (p. 44). Pimentel et al. (1992) cautioned that depending on the approach that employers took to the ADA, opportunities for employment would either increase or decrease. At this point, an employer's views on the ADA appear to be linked to hiring patterns of persons with disabilities.

Statement of the Problem

The impact of Title I of the ADA, employment provisions, on company policies and hiring practices for persons with disabilities is still unknown. If implemented in the true spirit of the law, Title I should be a mechanism for people with disabilities to increase their participation in the workforce. This study explored the influence that Title I of ADA has had on changes in employer nondiscrimination policies, the inclusiveness of these policies, the extent these policies have been implemented, and how these changes have affected the hiring of persons with disabilities.

Purpose

By utilizing a sample of employers in Northeastern Pennsylvania, the purpose of this study was to determine the

extent to which Title I of the ADA has affected company nondiscrimination policies. The study reviewed employers' awareness and knowledge of the ADA and implementation of company ADA policies to determine if there has been an impact on reported hiring practices. In addition, the study identified specific factors that were perceived to be barriers. A comparison was made between reports of employer hiring practices of persons with disabilities prior to ADA implementation and after ADA mandates to determine any changes in hiring patterns. The study also addressed employers' perceived need of overall training with regards to Title I of the ADA.

Significance of the Study

This investigation examined how and if Title I of the ADA has influenced employment policies and practices. In addition, the subsequent impact on hiring practices of persons with disabilities are explored. While the literature specific to Title I of the ADA is expanding, only a few research studies were found that addressed policy and implementation (Berkeley, 1982; Harris, 1987, 1995). Several studies were reviewed based on the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and employer policies regarding hiring of persons with disabilities (Berkeley, 1982; Greenwood & Johnson, 1985; Harris, 1987; Pati & Bailey, 1995). Several technical manuals suggested strategies to ensure compliance (Frierson, 1992; Henry, 1994; Jackson, 1993;

Schneid, 1992). Due to the local nature of the study, generalizability will be limited. However, "it is particularly important to have information on employer patterns of hiring and attitudes in the local and regional labor markets because the evidence is that there are wide variations in job availability and types by region and local area" (Levy, Jessop, Rimmerman, Francis, & Levy, 1995, p. 53).

This study provides practical information that will be valuable to the rehabilitation community in both understanding employer experiences and perceptions of the ADA and hiring practices of persons with disabilities. Additionally, it provides the necessary information to evaluate and plan employment and training strategies. To date, there have not been any systematic studies of the ADA in this region.

In addition, this research study provides a model that may be useful to evaluate other local or regional trends. The outcomes are helpful in generating more understanding about employers and hiring people with disabilities, as well as identifying future areas for exploration.

Research Questions

The purpose of this study was addressed by the following research questions:

1. How have employers changed their company policies on nondiscrimination to meet the requirements of Title I

of the ADA?

- 1.1 (a) Who coordinated the company policies? (b) How do they rate their awareness and knowledge? (c) What types of training did they receive? (d) How was the policy developed? (e) Is the policy different from what was originally in place? (f) To what extent were consultants utilized in the process and describe their backgrounds?
- 1.2 Do employers have a written policy of nondiscrimination on the basis of disability as defined under the ADA?
- 1.3 Do policies address the ADA compliance with all contractual agreements (collective bargaining agreements, employment agencies, training centers)?
- 1.4 To what extent does the policy make a commitment to an accessible workplace?
- 1.5 To what extent does the company policy cover all aspects of the pre-employment process: advertising positions, applications, job descriptions, interviewing procedures, pre-employment physical, hiring decisions?
- 1.6 Does the policy address the process for reasonable accommodation?
- 1.7 Is there a component which addresses the process for filing and resolution of complaints?
- 1.8 To what extent are the ADA postings and the

nondiscrimination policy visible in the company operations?

- 1.9 Is there an association between how an employer approaches the ADA and the hiring practices of persons with disabilities?
2. To what extent are employer nondiscrimination policies on Title I of ADA being implemented in the workplace?
 - 2.1 Who is responsible for the ongoing implementation of the ADA nondiscrimination policy?
 - 2.2 To what extent has implementation of a physically accessible workplace been achieved? (parking, outdoor route, entrance, interior route, restrooms, and meeting rooms).
 - 2.3 How has the nondiscrimination ADA policy been disseminated. Who received a copy? Was it posted?
 - 2.4 Has disability awareness training taken place within the company?
 - 2.5 To what extent do employers practice recruitment that allows a qualified applicant with a disability to have an equal opportunity to learn about and apply for a position?
 - 2.6 Do employers offer reasonable accommodations at the pre-employment stage (alternate formats for applications and related materials)?
 - 2.7 Is the application format free from disability or health related questions?

- 2.8 (a) To what extent are interviews focused on job requirements and the person's qualifications for the job? (b) Have interviewers received training on the ADA requirements? (c) Are all applicants asked the same questions?
- 2.9 Are job descriptions reflective of both essential and marginal job duties?
- 2.10 Are all positions open to qualified persons with disabilities?
- 2.11 Is there an interactive process for Human Resources and Managers in charge of hiring to review hiring practices involving persons with disabilities?
3. To what extent have the employer ADA nondiscrimination policies and their implementation in the workplace resulted in any changes in the number of persons with disabilities hired since 1992?
- 3.1 (a) To what extent has the employer hired since 1992? (b) Are there any emerging patterns apparent by occupation and industry for future exploration?
- 3.2 For persons with disabilities hired, were the jobs part-time? Do part-time jobs include benefits?
- 3.3 For persons with disabilities hired, were the jobs full-time? Did full-time jobs include benefits?
- 3.4 (a) How do employers describe the persons with disabilities who apply for jobs? (b) How do they describe the persons with disabilities they hire? (c)

Do employers have preconceived ideas about what persons with disabilities can do in their companies?

(d) Are employers evaluating ability or disability?

4. What factors are identified by employers as either facilitating or inhibiting the development and implementation of Title I ADA nondiscrimination policies?
5. Do employers perceive the need for any training with regards to Title I of the Americans with Disabilities Act?
6. Is there an association between the Pre-ADA and the Post-ADA hiring patterns of people with disabilities?
7. Is there an association between company characteristics (union, accessible transportation route, years in existence, hiring practices for all persons, company type, and disability awareness training) and hiring patterns of people with disabilities?
8. Is there an association between respondents' characteristics (respondents' education, respondents' contact with people with disabilities, self-reported knowledge of the ADA by respondent, and the respondents' recruitment efforts) and hiring patterns of people with disabilities?
9. What do employers see as the barriers to employment for persons with disabilities and what would

facilitate more successful job opportunities for persons with disabilities?

Definitions and Terms

The Americans with Disabilities Act: The ADA is defined by the EEOC (1990) as the world's first comprehensive rights law for people with disabilities.

Title I of the ADA: Equal Employment Opportunity for Individuals with Disabilities. Title I is a federal statute designed to remove barriers which prevent qualified individuals with disabilities from enjoying the same employment opportunities that are available to persons without disabilities (EEOC, 1990).

Employer: A person engaged in an industry affecting commerce who has 15 or more employees, except that, from July 26, 1992 through 1994, an employer means a person engaged in industry affecting commerce who has 25 or more employees (EEOC, 1990). This study focused on the latter group. This study also targeted human resource specialists and human resource managers as the respondents for the study.

Qualified Person with a Disability: A person who meets the essential duties of the job, with or without reasonable accommodation and (1) has a physical or mental impairment which substantially limits one or more of the person's major life activities, (2) has a record or history of impairment, or (3) is regarded as having such an impairment (EEOC,

1990).

Ambiguity of Work Disability: Expands the factors affecting persons with disabilities ability to access work by including environmental factors linked to accessibility and/or attitudinal barriers (McNeil, 1993).

Tri-Level Classification System: A categorization of employer approaches to ADA. Approach one was defined as conservative with doing no more than the legal minimum. The second approach was considered insightful with the employer looking at ways to cost effectively prepare the workplace for the ADA compliance. The third approach was considered visionary and looked at the needs of both the employer and employees. Pimental, Bissonette, and Lotito (1992) felt that depending on the approach opportunities for employment for people with disabilities would either increase or decrease.

Rehabilitation Professional: The term rehabilitation professional is used to refer to employees of the state vocational rehabilitation system, nonprofit rehabilitation facilities, or other nonprofit community-based programs which provide vocational rehabilitation services to persons with disabilities.

Assumptions

1. People with disabilities want to work and are qualified for the jobs they apply for.
2. The focus is on Title I, the employment provisions of

the ADA. However, the importance and interdependence on the other titles of the ADA for supporting people with disabilities in having full access to community and work was recognized.

3. Employers are a diverse, heterogeneous group.
4. Employers who primarily hire entry level positions in food service and maintenance employ people with disabilities on a regular basis. This group of employers was not included in this study.

Limitations

This was a nonrandom sample and limited in generalizability to the characteristics of the participating employers. The generalizability was further limited by the complexities of regional economy and unique factors of each employer and respondent. However, the study provides a model that can be replicated in other geographic areas and could be useful in beginning to understand implementation factors related to Title I of the ADA and its' implications for hiring persons with disabilities.

The greatest concern with threat to the subject selection process was an insufficient return rate. There was also concern due to the sensitivity of the ADA and employer policy development that some participants might respond with a false presentation. Hablutzel and McMahon (1992) cautioned that research on employer attitudes may be outwardly positive or neutral while covert attitudes are

often negative. Steps were taken to ensure the employer of confidentiality of response.

Methodology

Overview

This study utilized both descriptive and analytic measures to determine the extent to which Title I of the ADA has resulted in changed company nondiscrimination policies. The study reviewed the implementation of company policies to determine if there has been an impact on reported hiring practices of persons with disabilities. In addition, the study identified specific factors that were perceived to be barriers. A comparison was made between reports of employer hiring practices of persons with disabilities prior to the ADA mandates and after the ADA implementation to determine any changes in hiring patterns. The study addressed what employers identified as overall training needs with regards to the ADA.

A nonrandom sample of employers in Northeastern Pennsylvania was targeted to participate in a mailed survey. The surveys were sorted according to employers who reported hiring one or more persons with disabilities and employers who have not hired persons with disabilities both prior to the ADA and since the implementation of Title I of the ADA. Twenty respondents were identified for follow-up interviews.

Data was analyzed using descriptive statistics and nonparametric procedures, specifically, chi-square,

Subjects

The sample for this study was taken from employer members of the Tri-County Personnel Organization in Northeastern Pennsylvania. The purpose of this organization is to advance the understanding of the principles, policies, and methods of creating and maintaining satisfactory human relations with commerce and industry. This group consisted of 95 employer members in Northeastern Pennsylvania and is typically represented by the human resource manager. The sample group included only employers who had 25 or more employees who have been covered by the ADA since July 26, 1992. Eighty-five employers met this criteria, as identified through the local Job Center.

This group was selected because of their commitment to cooperative research and exchange of information among members. It was thought that this group would respond positively to a questionnaire and request for an interview.

In recent years, the development of a diverse industrial base has strengthened the economic stability of the Scranton-Wilkes-Barre Labor Market (Bureau of Research and Statistics, 1992). According to the 1991-1992 U.S. Bureau of Census, the Scranton-Wilkes-Barre area has a population of 547,288. The Pennsylvania Department of Labor lists the unemployment rate as 6.4% for this region (Bureau of Research and Statistics, 1996). This rate is 2.2 percentage points lower than 1995. The 1996 state rate was

4.5% as compared to the national rate of 5%.

While this study focuses on employers response to the ADA, the intended audience for utilizing the results are rehabilitation professionals. The Scranton-Wilkes-Barre Area has 20 rehabilitation counselors and 2 job developers who work for the state Office of Vocational Rehabilitation. In addition, the Blindness and Visual Services Office has 2 rehabilitation counselors. There are 12 agencies who specialize in employment of people with disabilities who employ a number of rehabilitation professionals including vocational evaluators, job development specialists, job coaches, and rehabilitation counselors.

Instrumentation

The survey and interview questionnaire were developed by the researcher based on information from the literature and individuals knowledgeable about the ADA and employer policy development. The survey questions were developed on primarily objective events "that could in principle be observed and reported by parties in addition to the respondent" (Turner & Martin, 1984, p. 408). Turner and Martin (1984) have found greater consensus and stability for self-report items that are objective in nature, even when records may not be accessible.

Experts from the Counseling and Human Resources Departments of The George Washington University and the University of Scranton reviewed the instruments to determine

if they were representative of the research hypothesis and to evaluate format clarity. A pilot test was completed using three human resource specialists with over 50 years of combined experience. Revisions of the instruments were made to clarify any questions.

The survey consisted of closed questions with open ended elements. Every effort was made to insure clarity of the survey instrument to minimize errors. Confidentiality was stressed so errors would be minimized from missing data and answers that were inadvertently or intentionally wrong.

The interview further explored responses to the survey to gain an indepth understanding of the development and implementation of Title I of the ADA policies, as well as to check for consistency between the survey and interview responses. The interview format was semistructured to allow for further exploration of the human resource specialist's experiences. The initial interview was pretested on two human resource specialists to determine accuracy of transcription from brief written notes. In both cases, the researcher was able to adequately capture the respondents' answers.

Data Collection Procedures

A two step process was utilized in collecting data from employers. Data collection consisted of a survey being sent to all employers of Tri-County Personnel who met the criteria of 25 or more employees and follow-up interviews

with 20 targeted employers.

Upon completion of the survey, data was coded and categorized and initially sorted into 10 possible categories. To determine follow-up interviews, four categories were chosen. These categories included surveys with complete pre and post ADA hiring data. The categories were: no hiring pre or post ADA, no hiring pre, 1-5 hired post ADA, 1-5 hired pre and post ADA, and 1-5 hired pre ADA and increased hired post ADA. Follow-up interviews were completed on at least four employers in each category.

Data Analysis

The data was analyzed using both descriptive and nonparametric measures. For each variable a choice of possible categories was developed. Chi-square was utilized to determine the associations between variables in particular categories. Variables were analyzed to determine if any associations existed with hiring practices of persons with disabilities.

Summary

Understanding the multidimensional process of the employment of persons with disabilities is a critical role for the rehabilitation professional. While each person can be best understood within the individual context of their experiences, it is important to also understand the business community and perceptions and practices that exist. The ADA, Title I, employment provisions provided a mechanism for

employers to actively consider qualified persons with disabilities for employment. How an employer chooses to embrace and implement the ADA has serious consequences on hiring practices. This investigation studied the way the employer community has approached the ADA and reviews what if any changes have resulted in policies, practices, and hiring.

The promise of the ADA rests with an employer's philosophical understanding, as well as implementation. President Bush, at the signing ceremony of the ADA, stated "I also want to say a special word to our friends in the business community. You have in your hands the key to the success of this Act. For you can unlock a splendid resource of untapped human potential that, when freed, will enrich us all" (Bush, 1990, p. 11). This study focused on understanding how employers accepted the challenge of the ADA.

Chapter II reviews the constructs and existing literature that provided the framework for this investigation. Chapter III describes the methodology and explains the research design. Chapter IV provides a detailed presentation of the results of the study. While Chapter V concludes with a summary of the study, conclusions and discussion based on the findings and implications for rehabilitation professionals, as well as recommendations for future research.

Chapter II

Literature Review

"Far and away the best prize in life is the chance to work hard at work worth doing" President Theodore Roosevelt

The literature review for this study addresses research regarding persons with disabilities, employment, and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Specifically, the review provides a framework for investigating the impact of the employment provisions, Title I, of the ADA on company policies and hiring practices applicable to persons with disabilities.

This chapter is divided into seven sections. Each section addresses a distinct aspect of the variable being studied. The first section reviews demographic data relevant to persons with disabilities and addresses the historic discrimination they have faced, as well as the resultant passage of the ADA. The second section explores the importance of work in our society to persons with and without disabilities. Section three examines factors affecting the employment of persons with disabilities. Section four provides an overview of the ADA, while section five specifically targets Title I, the employment provisions. Section six reviews research on employer approaches to the ADA and ADA policy implementation. The last segment presents strategies extracted from the literature that deal with employer training and awareness activities designed to promote employment of persons with

disabilities. A summary concludes this chapter.

Sources for the review of the research were obtained through an electronic search of PsycLit, Social Sci, ERIC, CATS, Dissertation Abstracts, and NewsBank database systems.

Discrimination of Persons with Disabilities

In addition to being the largest minority group in the United States, people with disabilities represent a diverse group with multidimensional characteristics (Pati & Bailey, 1995). According to the 1991-1992 U.S. Bureau of Census, 48.9 million persons were identified as having a disability (McNeil, 1993). Each disability is unique and implications vary according to the individual and opportunities and experiences they have had. Disabilities can be apparent or non-apparent; static or progressive; congenital or acquired; and impact severely or minimally on the individual's life. Disability crosses gender, race, ethnicity, age, and socio-economic status. Each person brings different skills and abilities along with varying needs for support. Frierson (1992) emphasizes "As it is true in the general population disabled people vary greatly in personality, intelligence, ability, work performance, and skill" (p.27). As West (1991) reminds us, "the world of disability is dynamic: it can differ from one day to the next and varies according to the person and the situation" (p. 55). Nagler (1993) concurs that disability is often best understood in the context of the person's life circumstances and experiences.

Dart (1996) stated "We are a magnificent majority of over 49 million. We are neither tragic nor irrelevant" (p. 22).

Person's with disabilities have been perceived as second-class citizens who have had to settle for second-class opportunities (West, 1991). They have suffered from discrimination, stereotyping, labeling, reduced role expectations, limited opportunities, and negative attitudes (Altman, 1981). This perception is best reflected in a quote from Kilbury, Benshoff, and Rubin (1992)

In a world where all individuals have equal access to opportunities, there would be no structural or attitudinal barriers that unfairly limit an individual's capacity for activity or development.

However, significant barriers to full participation

still prevail for Americans with disabilities. (p. 6)

While people with disabilities have been disadvantaged in all areas of life, this study focuses on employment. Parry (1991) recognized employment as the key to independence. With this concept in mind, many people with disabilities feel the largest barrier to employment are "the myths and false information that most people have about disabilities and disabled individuals" (Frierson, 1992, p. 24). Frierson also identifies some of these employment myths as people with disabilities being viewed as less productive, having higher absenteeism, higher turnover rates, greater safety risks, and difficulty getting along with co-workers.

Throughout history, discrimination against people with disabilities is well documented (Giordano & D'Alonzo, 1995). One response to this inequity was to legislate responsibilities as demonstrated by the passage of the 1920 Smith-Fess Act to provide rehabilitation to civilians with disabilities. In 1973, the Rehabilitation Act made great strides by providing physical accessibility and employment in the Federal government and with private federal contractors but did not cover the private employment community (Nagler, 1993). While numerous pieces of disability legislation exist on a state and federal level, such as the PA Human Relations Act, 1958 which prohibits discrimination in employment based on disability, Roessler (1987) cautions that people with disabilities will not enjoy economic prosperity unless there are changes in public policy.

The 1990 Americans with Disabilities Act has been by far the most encompassing change in civil rights for persons with disabilities and lays the groundwork for equal opportunities and access. While the act provides a foundation for change, it is important to note that it is not static and will be subject to amendments and developing case law. Under Title I of the ADA, employers can not discriminate against a "qualified individual with a disability" (U.S. Congress, 1990). The ADA uses a three prong definition of disability. Specifically, the term

references disability as (1) a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more of the major life activities; (2) having a record of impairment; or (3) being regarded as having an impairment (EEOC, 1991). In light of this definition, the impact of the ADA covers far more than the original 49 million Americans and has wide reaching implications (Frierson, 1992).

Although people with disabilities are viewing their lives more positively (Harris, 1986, 1994), they still are finding themselves victimized, as laws do not immediately translate into reality and policy (Nagler, 1993). This view was earlier supported by Mithaug (1979) who felt disability legislation alone was not enough to change attitudes towards persons with disabilities. As Marcelli and Vieceli (1988) indicate, understanding employers is critical to the rehabilitation profession in enhancing the employment of persons with disabilities.

Work and Persons with Disabilities

"Not working is perhaps the truest definition of what it means to be disabled: two-thirds of all disabled Americans between the ages of 16 and 64 are not working" (Harris, 1986, p. 4). A more recent Harris study (1994) found that despite the ADA, "the gap in working between people with and without disabilities remains profound" (p. 9). In order for persons with disabilities to be in the mainstream of life, Justin Dart proposes a revolution, to

complete the dreams of Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln. "A revolution of productivity, to create a society in which Americans with disabilities have not only a theoretical right to pursue happiness, but a real opportunity to be employed in producing components of happy lives" (Dart, 1990, p. 19).

"Work is a central aspect of human existence" (Szymanski, Ryan, Merz, Trevino, & Johnston-Rodriguez, 1996). The meaning of work is profoundly influenced by the set of cultural values and norms in a society (Schneider & Ferritor, 1982; Szymanski et al., 1996). It is therefore not surprising that Justin Dart calls upon the dreams of our early American forefathers to emphasize the importance of equality and opportunity for every American citizen. Throughout American history, work was highly regarded and linked to community prestige and individual self-worth (Schneider & Ferritor, 1982). Work is a significant part of our perceived status (McCarthy, 1988). Even today upon initially meeting a person it is a common greeting to ask "What do you do for a living?"

Work is a complex concept that can be viewed from several different lenses (Schneider & Ferritor, 1982). The authors define these lenses as psychological, sociological, and economic. Psychologically, work plays a critical role in the development of self-identity. For all of us, regardless of ability or need, a major part of our identity

is found in the work we do. Schneider and Ferritor (1982) found work has been equated with self-respect, independence, autonomy, and a vehicle by which persons from all walks of life can achieve goals. In this light, the work atmosphere becomes a mechanism for personal evaluation, a foundation for shaping a sense of identity.

Schneider and Ferritor (1982) further explored the sociological importance of work. Work is associated with community prestige and a sense of pride in contributing to community and society. Work provides a setting in which to develop friends and a place to socialize.

The authors emphasize the economic importance of work. Work provides a means for gaining the necessities, as well as the niceties of life. Work is an "easily recognizable, often quantifiable, public indicator of the result's of an individual's life" (Schneider & Ferritor, 1982, P. 33).

Similarly, work can be viewed from a developmental perspective. "Employment represents the most widely accepted barometer of adulthood and success in American culture" (White & Bond, 1992, p. 17). From adolescence to old age, work plays an important role in the developmental process of resolving each psychosocial crisis (Newman & Newman, 1991). In adolescence, work provides a means for developing interpersonal relationships, personal responsibilities, an expression of values, and a means for developing both immediate and long term goals. At the

opposite end of the spectrum, old age is evaluated in terms of generativity verses stagnation, it is a time of personal reflection in coming to grips with the meaning of one's life.

Donahue (1990) studied the phenomenon of work from three perspectives: sociological, organizational, and individual. By utilizing this focused approach, Donahue felt rehabilitation professionals would be better able to assist the match of person and job. From a sociological view, "the work place is part of the greater society and to a great extent, is governed by the norms of that society" (Donahue, 1990, p. 7). He goes on to state that "work role and identity has a social as well as an individual significance" (p. 7). From an organizational perspective, he emphasizes the importance of "person-environment fit" (p. 8) while looking at conditions and how they relate to job satisfaction. From an individual perspective, a job is "satisfying if the worker feels a sense of achievement, accomplishment, and responsibility" (p. 14). "Disability complicates the interaction of people and work. It impacts work performance and affects the way others react to the individual" (Szymanski et al., 1996, p. 9). Consequently, understanding work and its many meanings will contribute to a rehabilitation professionals' effectiveness in assisting employers and people with disabilities in achieving positive employment outcomes.

Wehman (1993) states

Employment is a major aspect in the lives of people with and without disabilities. Types of employment, amount of money earned, advancement opportunities directly affect a person's self-perception, society's evaluation of a person, and a person's financial and social freedom. Meaningful work, which pays a fair wage, plays a pervasive part in the quality of life a person enjoys. (p. 48)

Additionally, without work, government will expend over 200 billion dollars a year in benefits to persons with disabilities and lose a 100 billion dollars in wages and taxes (Douglas, 1992). In a similar light, Dart (1996) reminds us that it costs 200 billion annually to keep people out of work. Wehman (1993) agrees that the economic benefit of people with disabilities working is considerable for both government and the general economy.

West (1991) concludes that jobs are inextricably woven into the fabric of our identities and provide personal, social, and economic benefits that shape the quality of our life experiences. Work has been found to be a critical variable in the way we feel and think about ourselves (Rusch, 1986). To a large degree, the lack of work and those who do not work reflect vast qualitative differences in the quality of life. For persons with disabilities who work, it can be noted that they are better educated, have

more money, and are generally more satisfied with life. They are less likely to consider themselves disabled and more likely to strive towards their full potential (Harris, 1986).

Factors Affecting Employment of Persons with Disabilities

Persons with disabilities, between the ages of 16 and 64, historically and today, are the least employed demographic group in the United States (Bowe, 1983; Harris, 1986; McNeil, 1993). Even with the passage of the ADA more than six years ago, the employment rate for persons with disabilities has decreased from 33% to 31% (Harris, 1986, 1994).

The issues associated with employment of people with disabilities are complex. A Harris (1987) study of employers revealed the primary reason employers cited for not hiring people with disabilities is that they lacked qualified applicants. In 1995, a similar Harris study found that managers from large corporations are more likely to cite "an absence of job openings (61%) than a lack of qualified applicants (39%)" (p. 15). In comparison, companies with fewer than 1000 employees still cite the primary reason for not hiring as "lack of qualified applicants (73%)" (p. 15). This evidence reinforces the age-old notion that the major implications of a work disability were factors related directly to the individual with a disability. Although there also can be significant

individual factors to address such as economic and benefit disincentives, family beliefs and concerns, lack of transportation, and skill matching (Harris, 1994; Kiernan & Brinkman, 1988; Rusch, Mithaug, & Flexer, 1986). Harris (1994) found despite individual barriers to work "79% of non-employed people with disabilities between the ages of 16 and 64-including 84% of those between 16 and 44-say they want to work" (p. 12). This study assumes that people with disabilities are qualified for the jobs they apply for and explores further the concept of the "ambiguity of work disability" (McNeil, 1993, p. 12). McNeil used this term to describe the environmental factors linked to accessibility and/or attitudinal barriers that are associated with work place culture and company policies. This is similar to Hahn's (1993) concept of disability as fitting a minority group model. In this model, discrimination is seen as the product of a disabling environment and stigmatizing attitudes. Mello (1995) stresses that discrimination in employment is rooted in ignorance not hostility. Along similar lines, Parette and Hourcade (1995) found discrimination against persons with disabilities to be unintentional and rooted in a lack of awareness.

Greenwood and Johnson (1985) compiled a thorough review of the existing literature on employer concerns regarding employment of persons with disabilities. In general, they found employers to be a diverse group, representative of the

general public. Employers "have had and continue to have reservations about workers with disabilities, even with available evidence that they make valuable, competent workers" (p. xi). While employer attitudes and stereotypes exist, there are a range of employer concerns and issues that are complex. As Nagler (1993) so aptly states "Employers are a diverse group. As a result, there are few easy solutions to job development" (p. xi).

Greenwood and Johnson (1985) reviewed the internal decision-making process which is influenced by all the usual factors involved in employing new workers:

productivity in the entry position, advancement, dependability, ability to relate effectively with supervisors and co-workers, and maximize the return on investment through the recruitment and employment of effective employees, be they able-bodied or disabled in some way. (p. 37)

The decision to hire is therefore influenced by the employers' perception of how each candidate meets these criteria.

As found in the Harris (1987) survey of employers, persons with disabilities are often found to lack qualifications. Casper (1993) cautions that the business community is often unaware of their own underlying attitudes. Nathanson and Lambert (1981) found no matter how well-trained or educated, the employer is not immune from

holding biases, beliefs, or prejudices. Discriminatory attitudes by employers and the general population has largely contributed to the lack of employment. A 1991 Electronics Industries Foundation study found 50% of employers polled had not hired due to lack of qualified applicants. In addition, 75% of the respondents made no special efforts to recruit and had no association with state or community rehabilitation agencies (Mannon, 1992). Harris (1987) found that managers generally display a low level of consciousness towards people with disabilities. The survey found only one in ten top managers display a strong attitude towards persons with disabilities as a source of applicants. Therefore, it is important to understand whether the hiring process is driven by disability or ability and what the person can do verses can not do (West, 1991).

Employer concerns.

Benshoff and Souheaver (1991) found the initial reaction of many employers in the hiring process with persons with disabilities is based on fear, skepticism, and concern. They are concerned that changes in the workplace would not come easily. Fabian, Luecking, and Tilson (1995) utilized a focus group process with employers who have hired persons with disabilities and found they perceived barriers to hiring include: (a) employer fears and prejudices, (b) lack of information, and (c) no vision or company policies. Fuqua (1983) cites employer issues with regard to

productivity, accident rates, and workers compensation. Similarly, Kiernan and Brinkman (1988) found employers to fall into two categories: (a) those who do not believe persons with disabilities should work in competitive employment and (b) those who require assistance to work. Of these, many are concerned about productivity, appropriate behavior, insurance rates, worker's compensation, adjustment over time, job flexibility, and lack of knowledge about persons with disabilities that reinforce Frierson's (1992) list of employer myths.

Recently, Casper (1993) evaluated employers responses to persons with disabilities as not being qualified and found employer concerns fell in primarily three areas: attitudes and prejudice, lack of information, and concerns associated with cost. Parette and Hourcade (1995) discovered three major areas of employer concern: physical barriers, policy and procedures, and attitudinal barriers; based on myths, fears, stereotypes, and ignorance. Shafer, Parent, and Everson (1988) found that information is not enough, employers need support.

Positive experiences with employees with disabilities is noted as a powerful strategy in opening further opportunities (Kiernan & Brinkman, 1988). The literature strongly supports the notion that the more contact individuals have with the rest of society the more attitudes will improve (Kilbury, Benshoff, & Rubin, 1992). Frierson

(1992) highlighted several successful companies that have integrated people with disabilities into the workforce: Alcoa, Weyerhaeuser, Polaroid, and others. In fact, Kennedy (1993) found Fortune 500 companies show inclusion to be "no big deal" with companies routinely hiring because people with disabilities make good employees.

Employer policy on hiring persons with disabilities.

Greenwood and Johnson (1985) suggest "such factors as company policies may override the attitudes of individuals who are responsible for hiring" (p. 37). A Department of Labor survey (Berkeley Planning Associates, 1982) found that external influences have a significant influence on the employment of people with disabilities. As a result of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, which requires Affirmative Action on the part of federal contractors and the federal government, there appears to be a positive link between strong company policies and increased hiring practices. Harris (1987) found a key barrier to employment is that few employers have a specific policy on hiring applicants with disabilities. The study suggests that of the 37% of managers that had a policy, 67% of the companies with a hiring policy hired at least one person with a disability in the last year, as compared to 42% that did not have a policy. The 1995 Harris study of corporate America found increased policy development; however, hiring remained the same. Specifically, "Companies are changing their policies,

programs, and practices without necessarily hiring more people with disabilities" (Harris, p. 15). The study goes on to state "Corporate America is laying the groundwork for the future" (p. 15). Pati and Bailey (1995) found "Laws can only change behavior, not attitude" (p. 68). While early studies showed a link between company policies and hiring of persons with disabilities, policies alone do not appear to be the answer to increased opportunities for employment for persons with disabilities. Therefore, policies may be put into place to avoid liability for discrimination under ADA without having the intended impact.

External Hiring Factors.

Boerlijst and Meihboom (1989) describe how the employment selection process is influenced by economic, social-cultural, and technical factors. These external factors are equally important to consider. Yelin (1991) noted the discrepancy between the ADA essential job functions concept and matrix management which looks at increased numbers of job tasks within each job. Yelin (1991) described the ADA as being based on an outdated industrial model. For instance, one manufacturing company interviewed has moved to matrix management where rotating teams do all job tasks. Each team member is responsible for doing all job duties within the operation. The employment selection process is the gateway to the working world for persons with disabilities. It is important for the

rehabilitation professional to understand how advancing business concepts impact the ADA and hiring of persons with disabilities.

Millington, Szymanski, and Johnston-Rodriguez (1995) viewed the complexities of this process and caution that employment opportunities may be affected by external business factors such as the economic health of the region. They further state that opportunities will be greatest for persons with disabilities in times of low unemployment and high demand. Hearne (1991) also site the health of the economy as a critical factor. Yelin and Katz (1994) found with part-time employment "Persons with disabilities tend to be hired in good times-even more so than those without disabilities-and displaced in bad times-again, even more so than those without disabilities" (p. 42). West (1991) has found examples where the business community has both supported and hindered persons with disabilities in their quest for employment. Determining the economic reality of a region is an important factor in understanding local hiring patterns.

Employer predictor variables.

Several studies have been done to assist in determining predictor variables for employers with regards to hiring persons with disabilities. Long (1994) examined characteristics of employers who were either likely or unlikely to hire. The study suggests "no true profile

exists" (p. 24). Greenwood and Johnson (1985) concluded no clear pattern exists but the studies provide useful information for contextually understanding employers. Some of the studies focused on company size, type of business, gender, education, unions, and age.

Employer size has been considered in several studies. Bowe (1988) projected that most new jobs would be found in employers with less than 500 employees. Hansen and Perlman (1990) suggested most new job opportunities would be located with employers with less than 100 employees. Smith (1992) determined that hiring will occur more so with employers with 30 or more employees while Levy, Jones-Jessop, Rimmerman, Francis, and Levy (1993) found employers to have more accepting attitudes in large companies. The above data is also supported by Harris (1995). If these predictions hold true then most jobs will be found in small to midsize employers where attitudes may not be the same as with larger employers in hiring people with disabilities.

Contact with persons with disabilities has been cited as a variable in employer hiring. Eigenbrood and Retish (1988) suggest that the quality of the contact is a factor in the hiring process. In their study, employer experience of participating in a work-study program with students with disabilities was seen as a positive contact. Levy et al. (1993) found 59% of employers who hire had a positive relationship with persons with disabilities. As previously

cited, positive experience with employees with disabilities is a powerful strategy in furthering employment opportunities (Kiernan & Brinkman, 1988).

In reviewing the literature on specific employer characteristics, such as gender, education, and age, no clear consensus could be identified (Greenwood & Johnson, 1985). A more recent study by Long (1994), while limited in size, suggests finding a profile of employers that hire may be a futile endeavor. Therefore, it may be useful to explore other characteristics of the employment setting that appear to be associated with hiring of persons with disabilities.

Another area identified as a barrier is what Bradford (1990) called another employment myth, that is "the employer says the union won't let me do it" (p. 38). While the literature on organized labor is sparse, there appears to be both positive and negative hiring perspectives represented (Greenwood & Johnson, 1985). Surveys conducted in the early 1980's report that employers rate union support of recruiting and hiring applicants with disabilities as passive and poor (Berkeley, 1982; Ellner & Bender, 1980). On the other hand, two national unions, the AFL-CIO and IAMCARES, support employment of people with disabilities in conjunction with the Projects with Industry (PWI) Program (Greenwood & Johnson, 1985). PWI was established by Congress in 1968 to promote partnerships with business and

industry with the goal of placement in competitive employment for persons with disabilities. Chamot (1986), Associate Director for the AFL-CIO, Department of Professional Employees recognized that employment problems exist for all people with and without disabilities and therefore, people with disabilities may need increased assistance in order to fully participate in employment.

Although there are differing views on the roles unions play, Bradford (1990) identifies labor union support as an underutilized resource in assisting people with disabilities to access employment. Bradford (1990) further states this attitude exists because "many people including employers, really do not understand labor unions or how they work" and that therefore employment decisions are "guided by hypotheses based on myths, half-truths, and misinformation" (p. 38). This article provides a wealth of information that could be useful to rehabilitation professionals in establishing productive partnerships with employers and labor unions. Additionally, there are signs that when labor and management work together, it is a win-win partnership for all involved. In the report of the Department of Labor, Workplace of the Future report (1993), communication is cited as important to breaking down the traditional barriers between management and labor. The key element is seen as a union-management partnership with union involvement in all decision making points within the company. Esposito (1991)

further stresses the importance of involving union representatives in jointly working together to understand the ADA and states that "because of the various issues that will surface over the ADA's impact on collective bargaining, this may be an opportune time for employers to educate their union representatives on such issues so that a consensus can be reached before problems arise" (p. 12). Bruyere (1993) suggests a partnership of unions, employers, and the rehabilitation community to address "effective labor relations and the Americans with Disabilities Act" (p. 126).
The Americans with Disabilities Act

In response to the discrimination faced by persons with disabilities, the Americans with Disabilities Act was signed into law on July 26, 1990 by President George Bush. West (1991) states:

The ADA represents the culmination of years of progressive and proactive efforts of people with disabilities, the disability rights movement, dedicated professionals, committed legislators and government leaders, service providers whose programs have demonstrated outcomes of independence for people with disabilities, and visionaries in the private sector who have seen beyond disabilities to abilities. (p. xi)

The ADA is intended to provide civil rights protection to persons with disabilities. The EEOC ADA Handbook introduction (1991) states:

The enactment of the ADA reflects deeply held American ideals which treasure the contributions which individuals can make when free from arbitrary, unjust, or outmoded societal attitudes and practices that prevent realization of their potential. The ADA reflects a recognition that the surest path to America's continued vitality, strength and vibrancy is through the full realization of the contributions of all of its citizens. (p. 1)

The act is composed of five titles. Title I, the Equal Employment Opportunities for Individuals with Disabilities prohibits discrimination in any terms of employment for qualified persons with disabilities. Title II, Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Disability in state or local government services, requires the services offered by public entities to be accessible to persons with disabilities such as the state Job Centers where people with disabilities might register for work. It also covers public transportation requirements, which often enable people with disabilities to get to work. Title III, Nondiscrimination on the basis of disability by Public Accommodations and in Commercial Facilities requires access to places open to the general public. This title creates equal opportunities to shop, dine, and enjoy a community life free of obstacles. Title IV, Telecommunications, insures that people will be able to communicate electronically. People will be able to

schedule a job interview over the phone or arrange for references. Title V, Miscellaneous, provides provisions to protect persons with disabilities who file claims from retaliation. It also addresses drug and alcohol issues (U.S. Congress, 1990).

Feldblum (1991) addresses the comprehensiveness of the ADA noting:

The decision to pursue a comprehensive law was a very deliberate one on the part of its sponsors. Each of these areas is interdependent. In order for people with disabilities to enter the mainstream of America, they must have meaningful opportunities to obtain employment; access to public services and to goods and services offered by private businesses; accessible transportation to reach these jobs, goods, and services; and a means of communicating with employers, businesses, and others. (p. 105)

While these titles are closely interrelated, the focus of this study will be on the employment provisions in Title I and the areas of hiring and policy development and implementation.

Title I of the Americans with Disabilities Act

Title I of the ADA prohibits discrimination in any terms or conditions of employment for qualified individuals with disabilities. All aspects of the employment relationship are covered including "job application

procedures, the hiring, advancement, or discharge of employees, employee compensation, job training, and other terms, conditions, and privileges of employment" (EEOC, 1991, p. I-51). Pimentel, Bissonnette, and Lotito (1992) note that both intentional and unintentional discrimination is prohibited and that companies are liable for actions that result in discrimination.

Under Title I, employer "means a person engages in an industry affecting commerce who has 15 or more employees" (EEOC, 1991, p. 3). Covered entities also include employment agencies, labor organizations, and joint labor-management committees. A two-tier level of compliance dates was established. Employers with 25 or more employees were expected to be in compliance by July 26, 1992. For small employers with 15 to 24 employees the effective date for compliance was July 26, 1996. For the purpose of consistency in implementation dates, only employers with 25 or more employees will be included in this study.

The intent of the ADA is to enable people with disabilities "to compete in the workplace based on the same performance standards and requirements that employers expect of persons who are not disabled" (EEOC, 1991, p. I-1).

The ADA "does not guarantee equal results, establish quotas, or require preferences favoring individuals with disabilities over those without disabilities" (EEOC, 1991, p. I-1). The basic tenet of the ADA is that an employer

cannot discriminate against a qualified person with a disability who can perform the essential functions of the job, with or without a reasonable accommodation (EEOC, 1991). This definition provides the basic components an employer must address. In order to comply, it is necessary to understand what the law means by who is a qualified individual with a disability, what are essential job functions, and what is meant by reasonable accommodation.

First, a qualified individual with a disability uses a three prong definition. Briefly stated by the EEOC (1991)

An individual is considered to have a disability if that individual either (1) has a physical or mental impairment which substantially limits one or more of the person's major life activities, (2) has a record of impairment, or, (3) is regarded by the covered entity as having such an impairment. (p. I-25)

This definition also includes persons who have a relationship with a person with a known disability, for instance, a job applicant who has a child with a disability. Based on the known fact of the child's disability, an employer may think the applicant will need excess time of for child care and therefore not hire. An important note for employers is that they have the right to set qualification standards or prerequisite skills for the position which may include education level, background,

experiences, certifications, licenses, and technical knowledge.

Second, the employer needs to determine if the person can perform the essential functions of the job with or without a reasonable accommodation. In general the essential functions mean the necessary job duties of a position and does not include the marginal functions of the position (EEOC, 1991). Pimentel et al. (1992) identify essential functions to be crucial to the development of accurate job descriptions, the development of appropriate interview questions in order to determine if an applicant can perform each job function and to what degree, and determining whether job accommodations are necessary.

Next, an employer must consider making a reasonable accommodation. "An accommodation is any change in the work environment or the way things are customarily done that enables an individuals with a disability to enjoy equal employment opportunities" (EEOC, 1991, p. I-41). The three categories of accommodations include accommodations in the application process, accommodations with essential functions, and accommodations that enable a person to enjoy the equal benefits and conditions of employment (EEOC, 1991, p. I-41). Berkeley Planning Associates (1982) conducted a study on the cost of accommodations in employment and found that about 50% of accommodations cost nothing, 30% cost less than \$500, 10% cost between \$500 and \$2,000, and 10% cost in

excess of \$2,000. The Department of Labor concluded from this study that the cost of reasonable accommodation is reasonable. Pimentel et al. (1992) discuss the "accommodation equation" (p. 13). Factors to consider include the person's needs and wishes, the person's capabilities and difficulties with essential functions, the nature of the job and company, employer resources, options, and any undue hardship.

Finally, it is important to understand the concept of undue hardship. In general, "undue hardship means significant difficulty or expense in, or resulting from, the provision of the accommodation" (EEOC, 1991, p. I-44). Employers do not have to consider an accommodation if it will result in undue hardship. Undue hardship is decided on a case by case basis.

Approaches to ADA

Pati and Bailey (1995) describe the challenge of the ADA to employers and what this means for applicants with disabilities:

The ADA opened windows of opportunity, and it challenged leaders of organizations to stretch their vision, and to place this group of people on their strategic human resource agenda by creating caring, flexible organizational cultures dedicated to meeting global competitive challenge. (p. 52)

The process of establishing a diverse workforce has

typically focused on culture, race, and gender. The ADA has emphasized the importance of including persons with disabilities as employers develop their recruitment plans (Gerber, 1992). By expanding the potential of human resources, companies stay competitive. This translates into a win-win situation for both the employer and the person with a disability. Alvarez (1988) notes some employers develop the "ability to seize opportunity and diminish risk, and we call that talent vision" (p. vii). Employment settings with vision are recognized as dynamic. Leonard (1991) emphasizes the importance for commitment from top leadership for a diversity program to work.

Gerber (1992) makes a distinguishing point about the ADA as law, which states what must be done and the spirit of the ADA, that looks at all that can be done. Compliance with the ADA is an ongoing process. Gerber (1992) points out that "change takes time as people and systems become oriented to new ways of thinking and patterns of behavior" (p. 232). Pati and Bailey (1995) state "Laws can only change behavior, not attitude" (p. 68). To avoid liability for discrimination many employers will have to change and update policies, practices, and physical facilities. Pati and Bailey (1995) found employer ADA implementation strategies ranged from "nonexistent to informal to highly developed practical approaches" (p. 60). For the ADA to be successful in opening employment opportunities for persons

with disabilities it has to go beyond just implementing a policy. Pati and Bailey (1995) suggest two important areas for implementation of the ADA to be successful. These activities include maintenance-oriented tasks such as updating job descriptions and application forms and enrichment oriented tasks which include aggressive outreach, partnerships with unions and rehabilitation agencies, flexibility, and a team approach, as well as a continuous process of training and attitude management.

Similar to Pati and Bailey (1995), Kotter (1996) described the inherent problems associated with change. Some of the barriers include costs that are too high, bureaucracy, lack of teamwork, lack of middle management, and human fear of the unknown. Kotter (1996) describes the difference between management which includes planning, budgeting, staffing, and problem solving and leadership which describes a vision and provides inspiration to make it occur.

Laabs (1996) found the reason why components of changed policies weren't successful is that there was a lack of sufficient attention paid to a particular aspect or issue of the proposed change. Koonce (1996) states for change to be successful it must occur at two levels which are "transformational (the level of leadership and culture) and transactional (the level at which day to day work gets done)" (p. 23). The literature supports the notion that for

the ADA to be successful in opening employment opportunities for people with disabilities it must go beyond a basic policy into a day to day process with commitment and vision.

Gerber (1992) cautions that as employers are becoming savvy about the ADA, they are also guarded about hiring as the law has so many implications. The potential to have a backlash, where employers avoid people with disabilities, is significant. Nagler (1993) warns if employers do not agree with the ADA, then compliance will be at a minimal level.

The literature highlights different employer views of the ADA ranging from optimism to frustration and cynicism. Satcher and Hendren (1992) in a study of employer acceptance of ADA found employers agree significantly less with the employment provisions as compared to other titles. The reasons for disagreement are similar to those found by Moore and Crimando (1995) which include the cost is seen as unfair, business resents government intervention, the potential for endless litigation, and the ambiguity in the ADA itself. In addition, 71% of companies polled set no funds aside for the ADA compliance efforts (Nagler, 1993). A study by Newman and Dinwoodie (1996) found 90% of employers anticipated no change as a result of the ADA. Smith (1992) found 50% of employers anticipated no changes with regards to the ADA and business operation, while 18% said it would hurt business and 10% thought it would help. Overall, it appears that the majority of employers are not

anticipating any major changes as a result of ADA.

Smith (1992) reviewed employer responses to hiring persons with disabilities and found 22% of employers do not get applications from people with disabilities, 26% indicated low turnover as a reason not for hiring, another 21% said their companies were too small, 6% said they hired persons with mild disabilities whereas 2% stated they avoided hiring persons with disabilities. Smith found generalized concerns with safety, productivity, insurance costs, attendance, and co-worker attitudes. According to Harris (1995) 98% of companies surveyed indicated they were aware of the ADA. Overall, it appears that the business community is well aware of the ADA and caution is suggested as employers who do not agree with the ADA may only minimally comply (Smith, 1992).

In line with employer ADA policy implementation and change strategies are employer approaches to the ADA. Pimentel et al. (1992) describe three possible responses to the ADA. The first is described as "the conservative approach is which employers decide to do no more than the "legal minimum" with the sole purpose of limiting their losses" (p. 43). The next approach is regarded as insightful "where the employer considers how can I save money while preparing for ADA compliance" (p. 43). An example of this approach would be coordinating the ADA policies with worker's compensation policies and developing

strategies which assist the person to an early return to work and save the company money. The third approach is viewed as visionary. The visionary approach entails the employer asking "How can I be in compliance with the ADA, make or save in the interim, and bring financial, professional, and personal profit and benefit to my organization and to my employer?" (p. 44).

Pimentel et al. (1992) also reviewed some strategies that visionary employers incorporate which include outreach activities to persons with disabilities, training for interviewing staff to not only be in compliance with the ADA but to better interview all applicants, establishing functional, accurate job descriptions that improve overall hiring, promotion, and supervision, and recruitment strategies to incorporate persons with disabilities into business.

The approach an employer takes may have far-reaching implications. A visionary approach will view the true spirit of the ADA and hopefully create equal employment opportunities for persons with disabilities based solely on their ability. At the opposite end of the spectrum, opportunities will continue to elude persons with disabilities if employers do not look beyond the disability. A study by Soloman (1993) found that employers are misinformed about the ADA and do not necessarily believe it pertains to them. This misperception was especially true

with small employers. Pimentel et al. (1992) forecast that small employers may take a wait and see attitude which may inhibit opportunities for persons with disabilities under the ADA. Frierson (1992) comments that "effective hiring and retention of employees with disabilities, as well as avoiding law suits requires not only the development of company policies and procedures but the consistent implementation" (p. 172). Douglas (1992) stated "Simply put ADA is really about two things. It's about opening your minds and opening your premises" (p.36). In other words, the ADA is about attitude and access.

Given the broad scope of the ADA, Israel and Scott (1992) suggested the importance for employers to reevaluate their practices. Mello (1995) found that the ADA is not a cookbook. The federal government tells what must be accomplished but not how. Thus, employers who have guidelines and policies will reduce the chances for violations of the act.

Several books are available that provide the technical "how to" with regard to the ADA implementation (Frierson, 1992; Henry, 1994; Schneid, 1992; West, 1991). Some key points from these authors include (a) acquire and read the law, (b) educate and communicate the company's ADA philosophy, (c) designate a company ADA expert, (d) establish relationships with rehabilitation agencies, (e) complete a detailed analysis of the company's operations

including physical accessibility, (f) develop and implement an ADA policy, (g) review job descriptions, (h) review applications and interview questions, (i) conduct attitude and awareness training.

A Harris (1995) survey of employers found 56% of corporations have policies for hiring persons with disabilities and 64% of the employers with policies have hired people with disabilities. An overwhelming 89% of employers indicated they would support policies to increase the number of people with disabilities in their employ. Optimistically, 75% of this same employer group said they would most likely make great efforts to hire people in the next three years. The results of the Harris (1995) survey point to increases in both policies and hiring practices of persons with disabilities over the next three years.

Training and Awareness

While the most recent Harris (1995) study of employers is positive and planful in its response to hiring people with disabilities, the literature is mixed in terms of employer commitment to the ADA. Nagler (1993) looks at the importance of continuing efforts to promote strategies for dissemination of information on the ADA and people with disabilities in the employer community. Levy, Jones-Jessop, Rimmerman, Francis, and Levy (1993) note it is important "to identify the types of employers who are more or less favorable in order to be able to target employer education

programs and to be able to make more effective use of job development efforts" (p. 50). Hansen and Perlman (1990) state the rehabilitation community needs to do "a better job at educating the business community" (p. 9). Pimentel, Bell, and Lotito (1993) cite the importance of providing training to employers to overcome one of the greatest sources of hiring resistance "an employer's lack of confidence in his or her ability to evaluate, supervise, and manage the individual once on the job" (p. 28). Scherich (1996) notes that employers are often not knowledgeable about resources that can assist them in hiring people with disabilities.

While training needs can be met in a variety of ways, Geber (1990) suggests that the process of integrating persons with disabilities into the workplace can be done as part of a larger process of managing diversity. However, Pati and Bailey (1995) caution that "diversity training as commonly practiced often addresses issues related to ethnicity and gender, but may totally ignore persons with disabilities as a minority group" (p. 57). As employers look to incorporate diversity and to consider approaches to meeting Title I of the ADA compliance, opportunities exist for the rehabilitation community to establish partnerships. Fabian, et al. (1994) sees rehabilitation professionals as "valuable technical advisors to employers as they respond to workforce challenges of the 21st century" (p. 23). Satcher

(1992) views the rehabilitation counselor as "having the training and expertise to help employers better understand the potential of persons with disabilities to succeed in employment" (p. 40). He cites some areas where the rehabilitation counselor could be effective including dispelling myths about people with disabilities, assisting with employer awareness and developing resources, and providing specific information on the ADA. Gilbride, Stensrud, and Connolly (1992) stress the need to develop and strengthen relationships between employers and the rehabilitation community. While opportunities are available for rehabilitation professionals to provide consultation services to the business community, these consultation services must be "viewed as a proactive approach that utilize a new labor market" (Gilbride, et al., 1992, p. 46). In other employers are looking for diversity programs based on business and economic realities, not just social programs (Overman, 1991).

Summary

Although the literature has shown a range of employer responses to the Americans with Disabilities Act, the most recent survey of corporate America (Harris, 1995) predicts increased opportunities for persons with disabilities in the workforce. As a result, the rehabilitation community needs to be prepared to offer consultative services that can effectively provide the necessary linkage between applicants

with disabilities and the business community. These services conceivably could be the key to opportunity and independence for persons with disabilities.

Chapter III

Methodology

This chapter provides a detailed review of the research methodology utilized in this study. Included is a description of the subjects who participated in the study, the development and utilization of instruments and the procedures followed in data collection and the statistical procedures used in data analysis.

The research conducted was exploratory and utilized quantitative methods which included a mail survey and a semi-structured interview. The study utilized descriptive and nonparametric measures, as well as narrative to determine and describe the extent that Title I of the Americans with Disabilities Act has had on employer hiring practices of applicants with disabilities.

Specifically, the investigation focused on the extent that company nondiscrimination policies changed to address the ADA, the impact on the hiring of persons with disabilities, factors that were identified as facilitating the ADA implementation, factors that were perceived as barriers to the implementation of the ADA, and overall training needs in the area of the ADA. A comparison was made on the reports of hiring of persons with disabilities prior to the ADA and post ADA to determine any changes in hiring patterns.

Participants

The sample for this study was taken from employer members of the Tri-County Personnel Organization in Northeastern

Pennsylvania. The purpose of this organization is to advance the understanding of the principles, policies, and methods of creating and maintaining satisfactory human relations with Commerce and Industry (Tri-County Membership Book, 1995). This group consisted of 95 employer members in Northeastern Pennsylvania and is typically represented by the Human Resource Manager. The sample group included only employers with 25 or more employees who have been covered by ADA since July 26, 1992. Eighty-five employers met this criteria. Fifty-five employers participated in the study.

This group was selected because of its' commitment to cooperative research and exchange of information among members. It was believed that this group would respond positively to a survey and request for an interview. Specifically, the group was targeted to Northeastern Pennsylvania employers to gain a better understanding of employer needs with regards to the ADA and hiring persons with disabilities so as to be able to better plan employment and training strategies. As Levy et al. (1995) pointed out "it is particularly important to have information on employer patterns of hiring and attitudes in the local and regional labor markets because the evidence is that there are wide variations in job availability and types by region and local area" (p. 53). This group was also targeted as it is mainly represented by well-established employers with 94.5% of respondent employers being in business over 10 years.

Instruments

Two instruments were developed and utilized (see Appendix A). A review of the literature was completed to determine possible resources for collecting data. As the ADA is relatively recent, no instruments were found which could be adapted to the purpose of this study.

The survey and interview questionnaire were developed based on information available from the literature and individuals knowledgeable about the ADA and employer policy development.

Experts from the Graduate School of Education and Human Development (GSEHD) of the George Washington University reviewed the instruments to determine if they were representative of the research hypothesis and to evaluate format clarity. A pilot test was conducted utilizing three experts from the Human Resource field. Revisions were minor and included recommendations to gather information unions, public transportation, and reasonable accommodation. Other revisions were for clarity of questions and layout.

The survey consisted of 41 closed questions with 6 open ended elements and was 5 pages in length. Attention was paid to ensuring confidentiality so errors could be minimized from either missing data or answers that were inadvertently or intentionally wrong.

The interview was designed to further explore responses to the survey and to gain an indepth understanding of the development and implementation of Title I of the ADA policies.

The interview process was pre-tested by the investigator's

brief note taking of two trial interviews. The researcher asked each employer for permission to take abbreviated notes during the interview. After the data was transcribed, each person was asked to review the written analysis and provide feedback as to accuracy and clarity. Immediately following each interview the interviewer critically reviewed nature of probes and level of leading responses.

The interview format was semi-structured to allow for the unique experiences of individual employer representatives. The following principles were adhered to (a) the interview was standardized with identical questions being asked across all interviews, (b) the probes used were nondirective, (c) answers were recorded immediately after the interview to minimize interviewer bias (Fowler & Mangione, 1990).

Reliability and Validity

Reliability was considered in the development of the instruments. The information in both the survey and interview instruments is considered to be relatively straight forward. Schumacher and McMillan (1993) looked at demographic data and basic information as relatively simple in nature to respond to. "For this type of data, statistical estimates of reliability are generally not needed" (p. 231). The survey questions were developed on primarily objective events "that could in principle be observed and reported by parties in addition to the respondent" (Turner & Martin, 1984, p. 408). Turner and Martin (1984) have found greater consensus and stability for self-report

items that are objective in nature, even when records may not be accessible. However, reliability was cross checked with 34% of the surveys through conducting a follow-up interview.

Consistency was found with all responses.

The validity of the instruments was based on the relevant literature, expert review, and pre-testing. Of greatest threat to the validity of the study is the sensitive nature of the questions in reference to the ADA policy, implementation, and hiring practices. The confidential nature of each individual response and the anonymity of the employer was emphasized in the initial telephone calls and transmittal letters, as well as at the start of each interview. Cozby (1993) reports that people are less likely to lie or distort answers if the researcher "openly and honestly communicates the purposes and uses of research, promises that there will be feedback about the results, and assures anonymity, then there is every reason to believe that subjects will provide honest responses" (p. 65).

The survey and interview were found by human resource specialists knowledgeable about the ADA and implementation to have content validity.

Data Collection Procedures

All of the identified employer groups (85) were initially contacted by telephone and received general information as to the intent of the study. The researcher identified herself as a faculty member of The University of Scranton in the Human Resources and Counseling Department who was completing this

research study as part of her doctoral dissertation requirements at The George Washington University. Two people indicated during the telephone contact that they were too busy to participate but said they would at least look at the survey. Each identified person agreed to have the survey mailed to them and to take a further look to determine their interest in participating. All participation was voluntary and the confidential nature of response was emphasized. A mailing list was compiled including the names and addresses of all of the subjects that agreed to receive the information. Employers were coded according to their position on the list. Each identified employer representative received a packet by mail which contained a personalized letter of transmittal, a coded survey, and a self-addressed stamped envelope. The letter explained the importance of the respondent's participation, the purpose and importance of the study, the background of the investigator, the confidentiality of the response, timelines, and the opportunity to receive results (see Appendix B). Attention was given to the professional appearance of each packet. All information was typed and grammatically correct. A two line handwritten note was written on the bottom of each survey that personally thanked them for assisting. For example: "I really appreciate your consideration in participating in this survey. Your individual response is valued. Thanks, Lori." All participating employers received a final thank-you note for their participation in December of 1996.

A follow-up call was placed to employers who did not

respond. The information was communicated either directly, by leaving a message, or via voice mail. Each person was asked if they received the survey, did they have any questions, and if for some reason they would be unable to participate the reason why.

For all non-participants who did not respond the data was reviewed to determine any patterns.

Upon receipt of the completed surveys, they were sorted according to the following responses:

Pre ADA Data Not Available	- Post ADA Data Same	(n = 2)
Pre ADA Data not available	- Post ADA No Hire	(n = 3)
Pre ADA No Hire	- Post ADA No Hire	(n = 9)
Pre ADA Data Not Available	- Post ADA Hire 1-5	(n = 11)
Pre ADA No Hire	- Post ADA Hire 1-5	(n = 5)
Pre ADA Hire 1-5	- Post ADA No Hire	(n = 3)
Pre ADA Hire 1-5	- Post ADA Hire 1-5	(n = 16)
Pre ADA Hire 5-10	- Post ADA Hire 1-5	(n = 1)
Pre ADA Hired 1-5	- Post ADA Increased	(n = 5)

The next step of the data collection process included identifying employers to participate in a semi-structured interview. Employers were selected from the following categories:

Pre ADA No Hire	- Post ADA No Hire	(n = 9)
Pre ADA No Hire	- Post ADA 1-5 Hired	(n = 5)
Pre ADA 1-5 Hired	- Post ADA 1-5 Hired	(n = 16)
Pre ADA 1-5 Hired	- Post ADA Increased	(n = 5)

Twenty employers were targeted for follow-up interviews and

were called by phone. They were thanked for their participation in the survey and asked if they would participate in an in person interview to be arranged at their convenience.

Twenty agreed to participate.

The interviewer was also the researcher and every effort was taken to establish rapport and to ensure the comfort of the participants. This included a professional appearance and demeanor, initial rapport, re-explaining the purpose of the interview, and determining if the person has any questions or concerns. While tape recording during the interview would have ensured accuracy and ease of data transcription, due to the sensitivity of the subject and the desire to get the most accurate information from employers, abbreviated note taking was utilized along with immediate data transcription after the interview was complete.

Participation Rate

Of the 85 employers targeted, 50 completed the survey and 5 responded after a follow-up call for a response rate of 55 or 65%. Of 30 follow-up calls to those not responding, 11 responded. Five persons returned the surveys, 2 were too busy, 1 stated the information was confidential and could not be released, 2 passed the survey along and the other persons did not follow-up, and 1 could not find anyone who possessed the information. Nineteen employer representatives did not respond.

Descriptive Statistics of the Sample

The demographic data that was collected on each of the

employer respondents elicited information which was useful in describing the sample used for this study. Tables 1 through 5 describe the sample in terms of company characteristics: type, unionization, accessibility to public transportation, size, and years in existence. Where as tables 6 through 10 describe the individual employer representative respondent in terms of position, years experience with the company, education level, previous contact with persons with disabilities, and current level of perceived ADA knowledge.

Table A

Company Characteristics

Bank/Finance/or Information Service Center	12.7%	n = 7
School/College/or University	7.3%	n = 4
Retail/Department Store/ Grocery Chain	3.6%	n = 2
Hospital/Health Care	14.5%	n = 8
Manufacturing	43.6%	n = 24
Service Industry/Janitorial/ Food/Hotel	1.8%	n = 1
Social Services	1.8%	n = 1
Utilities	3.6%	n = 2
Warehousing and Distribution	3.6%	n = 2
Other	7.3%	n = 4

Table B

Unionization of Companies

YES	41.8%	n = 23	NO	58.2%	n = 32
-----	-------	--------	----	-------	--------

Table C

Public Transportation to Company

YES	70.9%	n = 39	NO	29.1%	n = 16
-----	-------	--------	----	-------	--------

Table D

Company Size

25 to 49 Employees	0	
50 to 74 Employees	1.8%	n = 1
75 to 99 Employees	5.5%	n = 3
over 100 Employees	92.7%	n = 51

Table E

Company Years in Existence

Under 5 Years	1.8%	n = 1
6 to 10 Years	3.6%	n = 2
Over 10 Years	94.5%	n = 52

Table F

Survey Respondent

Owner/President	0	
Human Resource Assistant	0	
Human Resource Specialist/ Manager	61.8%	n = 34
Manager	36.4%	n = 20
Other	1.8%	n = 1

Table G

Respondents' Years Experience with the Company

1 Year	7.3%	n = 4
1-5 Years	29.1%	n = 16
6-10 Years	16.4%	n = 9
over 10 Years	47.3%	n = 26

Table H

Respondents' Education

High School	5.5%	n = 3
Bachelor's Degree	40 %	n = 22
Master's Degree	41.8%	n = 23
Other	12.7%	n = 7

Table I

Respondents' Previous Contact with Persons with Disabilities

Yes	85.5%	n = 47
Yes and also have a disability	5.5%	n = 3
None	9.1%	n = 5

Table J

Respondents' Self-reported Knowledge of ADA

Very Knowledgeable	29.1%	n = 16
Somewhat Knowledgeable	65.5%	n = 36
Minimally Knowledgeable	5.5%	n = 3
No Knowledge		0

Data Collection Period

Step One of the data collection period began with telephone contacts to the identified sample employers on August 1, 1996. The surveys were sent in three stages based on telephone contact. The first group was sent on August 10, 1996 with a return request of August 27, 1996. The second group was sent on August 19, 1996 with a return request of September 4, 1996. The third group was sent on August 26, 1996 with a return request of September 12, 1996. Follow-up calls began on September 16, 1996 and continued until September 30, 1996.

Step Two of the data collection process began with telephone contacts to those employers who completed the survey to identify who would be willing to complete a follow-up interview. Telephone calls began on October 15, 1996 and were completed on December 20, 1996 with 20 employers agreeing to interviews. One employer cancelled three times and declined to reschedule due to time restraints. A total of 19 employers were interviewed.

Data Analysis

The purpose of the research study is to determine the extent to which Title I of the Americans with Disabilities Act has resulted in changed company nondiscrimination policies and to determine if there has been an impact on reported hiring practices. The ADA Survey and the Interview utilized enabled the researcher to gain a comprehensive view of how employers developed and implemented the ADA nondiscrimination policies. The survey data was compiled and analyzed using SPSS. "SPSS is a

comprehensive and flexible statistical analysis and data management system" (Norusis, 1993, p. iii). The researcher entered all data and then carefully rechecked each survey to look for mistakes and insure that the information was correctly coded. Descriptive data characterized the survey results.

In addition, chi-square was utilized to look at specific associations among survey data. Specifically, Pearson chi-square was chosen to "test the hypothesis that the row and column variables are independent" (Norusis, 1993, p. 207). The criterion variable was defined as positive or negative hiring practices of persons with disabilities. The predictor variables were company policies, employer approach to the ADA, company characteristics (union, on transportation route, company years in existence, hiring patterns for all applicants, disability awareness training, and type of company), and respondent characteristics (years of experience with company, educational level, contact with persons with disabilities, knowledge of the ADA, and relationships with rehabilitation agencies). Addressed were the associations between the following variables (a) companies with policies and hiring practices and those companies without policies and hiring practice, (b) the effects of how an employer categorized their approach to the ADA (Tri-level classification system) and hiring practices, and (c) the associations between pre-ADA hiring practices and post-ADA hiring practices. Also reviewed for associations with hiring were company characteristics and respondent characteristics.

Several of the research questions were analyzed utilizing narrative summaries from both the survey and interview questionnaire. Information was elicited to describe factors that facilitated the implementation of the ADA, as well as those that inhibited the implementation of the ADA. A description of employer training needs was provided in narrative. The data also characterized how employers described the typical person with a disability who applied to their companies, as well as the persons with disabilities who they hire. Employers were asked to comment on what barriers people with disabilities faced in the hiring process and strategies to promote more opportunities.

Ethical Consideration

All employers selected for the study were informed of the purpose and the process to be utilized to ensure confidentiality. This was shared in the initial phone contact and in the letter of transmittal. It was also reviewed prior to beginning the second step interview process. The employers responding will not be identified by name or company in this dissertation or any subsequent research publication.

Limitations of the Design

The research study was exploratory in nature. The study utilized a non-random sample of employers and generalizability will be limited to the characteristics of the participating employers. The generalizability was further limited by the complexities of regional economy and unique factors of each employer and respondent as described in previous sections.

Concern is also noted that the sensitivity involved in developing and implementing the ADA policy could have caused employers to respond with positive self-presentation. Steps were taken to ensure employers of the confidential nature of each response so that employers would respond with accuracy neither exaggerating their accomplishments or falsifying information.

Initially, the greatest concern was with threat to the subject selection process and sufficient return rate. The 65% rate needs to be taken into consideration when weighing the results. Schumacher and McMillan (1993) advise cautious conclusions drawn from survey return rates of less than 70%.

Summary

The design and methodology reviewed in this chapter were selected to address the research questions that guided the investigation in the area of ADA policy development and implementation and the subsequent effects on hiring of persons with disabilities. The results of this investigation are described in Chapter 4.

Chapter IV

Results

The primary purpose of this exploratory study was to determine the extent to which Title I of the Americans with Disabilities Act has resulted in changed company nondiscrimination policies. The study was designed to determine employer awareness and knowledge of the Americans with Disabilities Act. The development and implementation of the company ADA policies was examined to determine if there has been an impact on reported hiring practices. A comparison was made to determine any statistically significant associations in hiring people with disabilities between employers with ADA policies and those without. In addition, the study identified specific factors that were perceived to facilitate the implementation of the ADA, as well as factors that were perceived to be barriers. A comparison was made between reports of employer hiring practices of persons with disabilities prior to the ADA implementation and after the ADA mandates to determine any statistically significant associations in changes in hiring patterns. A comparison was made between company characteristics and hiring practices to determine any statistically significant associations. In addition, the study also looked at respondent characteristics and hiring practices to determine any statistically significant associations in hiring practices. This study addressed employer's perceived need of overall training with regards to Title I of the ADA. Employers were also asked to

comment on barriers to employment of persons with disabilities, as well as what would facilitate more successful job opportunities.

The following format is used to present the data analysis and results of the statistical tests of the study's research questions (a) statement of the research question, (b) presentation of the descriptive data for each question and sub-question, and (c) reporting of the statistical findings for predetermined questions. The .05 level of significance was required to establish significance for all of the tested research questions. The findings are summarized and presented at the end of the chapter.

Descriptive Data and Analysis for Each Research Question

Research Question 1

How have employers changed their company policies on nondiscrimination to meet the requirements of Title I of the Americans with Disabilities Act?

The information presented in each of the following Tables describes employer responses to research questions regarding the ADA and policy development. Eighty percent of employers reported having an ADA policy in place. Of these 45.5% indicated it was different than what was in place prior to the ADA. In Pennsylvania, employers may have had disability nondiscrimination policies in place due to the 1973 Rehabilitation Act or the 1958 Pennsylvania Human Relations Act. Policies were described by 63.6% of employers as general and 14.5% as specific. The ADA

ADA: Policy Implementation 78

policies were developed by the Human Resource department (81.8%) with assistance from legal consultants (52.7%) and other management staff (47.3%). Executives were involved with policy development 36.4%. Rehabilitation consultants were utilized 10.9% and unions were involved with the ADA policy development at 3.6%. The Human Resources department (67%) and management staff (13%) had primary responsibility for coordinating the policies. Policies were posted 36.4% and distributed at 18.2%. An employer's approach to the ADA was found to have a statistically significant association with hiring practices of persons with disabilities.

Table 1

Policy Information

Is an ADA nondiscrimination policy in place?	Survey Respondents	n=
Yes	80%	44
No	20%	11
Is the policy different?	Survey Respondents	
Yes	45.5%	25
No	40%	22
No answer	14.5%	8
Describe the policy?	Survey Respondents	
General	63.6%	35
Specific	14.5%	8
No answer	21.8%	12

Table 1.1A

Policy Coordinator

Who coordinated the policy?	Survey Respondents	n=
Human Resource Department	67%	37
Management	13%	7
No answer	20%	11

Table 1.1B

Self-reported Knowledge of ADA

Self-reported knowledge and awareness of ADA? (check one)	Survey Respondents	n=
Very knowledgeable	29.1%	16
Somewhat knowledgeable	65.5%	36
Minimally knowledgeable	5.5%	3
No knowledge		0

Table 1.1C

ADA Training

How was ADA knowledge acquired? (circle all that apply)	Survey Respondents	n=
College Course for Credit	10.9%	6
Formal Training by Legal Consultants	63.6%	35
Formal Training by Rehabilitation Consultants	18.2%	10
Acquired and Read the Law	56.4%	31
Acquired and Read Interpretive EEOC Guidelines	56.4%	31
Follow Developing Case Law	41.8%	23
Inservice by Company Staff	27.3%	15
Inservice by Legal Consultants	25.5%	14
Inservice by Rehab Consultants	5.5%	3
Other		0

Table 1.1D

Policy Development

Who was involved with ADA Policy Development? (circle all that apply)	Survey Respondents	n=
Owner/CEO	36.4%	20
Human Resource Department	81.8%	45
Management Staff	47.3%	26
Union	3.6%	2
Contractual Agencies	3.6%	2
Employees	9.1%	5
Persons with Disabilities	5.5%	3
Legal Consultants	52.7%	29
Rehabilitation Consultants	10.9%	6
Other Consultants	3.6%	2

Table 1.1E

ADA Policy Changes

Is the ADA policy different from what was in place?	Survey Respondents	n=
Yes	45.5%	25
No	40%	22
No answer	14.5%	8

Table 1.1F

Utilization and Roles of Consultants

What was the Utilization and Background of Consultants in ADA Policy Development? (circle all that apply)	Survey Respondents	n=
Legal Consultants	52.7%	29
Rehabilitation Consultants	10.9%	6
Other Consultants	3.6%	2

Table 1.2

Written ADA Policy

Do Employers have a written ADA Nondiscrimination Policy?	Survey Respondents	n=
Yes	80%	44
No	20%	11

Table 1.3

Contractual Agreements

Do ADA policies address Contractual Agreements? (circle all that apply)	Survey Respondents	n=
Collective Bargaining Agreements	29.1%	16
Employment Agencies	23.6%	13
Training and Meeting Sites	34.5%	19
Other	16.4%	9

Table 1.4

Accessible Workforce

Do ADA policies address an accessible workplace? (circle all that apply)	Survey Respondents	n=
Accessible parking spaces	65.5%	36
Accessible entrance	63.6%	35
Accessible interior routes	43.6%	24
Accessible meeting rooms	29.1%	16
Accessible work place	54.5%	30
Accessible human resource dept	40.0%	22
Accessible restrooms	54.5%	30

Table 1.5

Pre-employment Process

Do ADA policies address the pre-employment process? (circle all that apply)	Survey Respondents	n=
Advertising for positions	50.9%	28
Job descriptions	52.7%	29
Interviewing procedures	45.5%	25
Pre-employment physical	40.0%	22

Table 1.6

Reasonable Accommodation

Do ADA policies address reasonable accommodations?	Survey Respondents	n=
Yes	74.5%	41

Table 1.7

Review of the Hiring Process

Is there a process for reviewing hiring decisions regarding persons with disabilities?	Survey Respondents	n=
Yes	49.1%	27
No	49.1%	27
No answer	1.8%	1

Table 1.8

Visibility of the ADA Policies

To what extent are ADA policies visible in the company operation?	Survey Respondents	n=
Policy posted	36.4%	20
Policy Distributed	18.2%	10
Both	18.2%	10
No response	27.3%	15

Table 1.9

Company Approach to the ADA

Company approach to ADA (select only one)	Survey Respondents	n=
Business as usual, wait and see what happens	10.9%	6
Legal/cost effective approach	61.8%	34
Looked at benefits to both employees and company	27.3%	15

Is there an association between how an employer approaches the ADA and hiring practices of persons with disabilities? The employer approaches for this question were based on self-report from the survey data.

Table 1.9A

Chi-Square Analysis of Post-ADA Hiring (Row) by Employer Approach (Column)

*See summary for numerical code	Business as Usual	Benefits to Company and Employee Visionary	Legal and Cost Effective	Row Total
None Hired	4 1.5 66.7%	3 3.3 23.1%	6 8.2 18.8%	13 25.5%
One or more Hired	2 4.4 33.3%	10 9.6 76.9%	26 23.84 81.3%	38 74.5%
Column Total	6 11.8%	13 25.5%	32 62.7%	51 100.0%

*count
expectancy value
column percent

Value 6.16
DF 2
Significance p= .04

As presented in Table 1.9A, the results of the research question 1.9 are depicted. There is a statistically significant association (p= .04) in the employer self-described approach to ADA and hiring practices of persons with disabilities. For those who took a business as usual, wait and see attitude, there is a 33.3% tendency to hire as compared to employers who took a cost effective, legal approach the

tendency to hire was 81.3%. For those employers who looked at the benefits to both the company and employees, the tendency to hire was 76.9%.

Research Question 2

To what extent are employer nondiscrimination policies on Title I of the ADA being implemented in the workplace?

Research question 2 addresses the extent employer nondiscrimination policies on Title I of the ADA are being implemented in the workplace. Policy implementation of the ADA was handled by the Human Resource Department (67%) and other management staff (13%). While 80% of the employers indicated having a policy, only 36.4% indicated posting the policy, with 18.2% actually distributing it to employees. Having an ADA policy did not appear to give high visibility to the ADA in the workplace.

Pati and Bailey (1995) indicated for an ADA policy to promote change in the work place there needed to be both maintenance and enrichment tasks present. Employers have addressed the maintenance tasks of the ADA with updated job descriptions (52.7%), applications free from health/disability related questions (94.5%), and reasonable accommodations (67.3%). Employer enrichment tasks included training interviewing staff (31%), recruitment practices and outreach (OVR contacted 30.9%, Rehabilitation agencies contacted 23.6%, Centers for Independent Living contacted at 5.5%, and College Office of Disability Services contacted, 5.5%) and disability awareness training

(52.7%).

Accessibility was addressed most (over 50%) with parking, restrooms, entrances, and main routes and least (under 50%) with interior routes and meeting rooms. The following Tables provide detailed data.

Table 2.1

ADA Implementation

Who is responsible for the ongoing ADA implementation?	Survey Respondents	n=
Human Resource Department	67%	37
Management	13%	7
Other	20%	11

Table 2.2

Accessible Workplace

To what extent has implementation of a physically accessible workplace been achieved? (Circle all that apply)	Survey Respondents	n=
Parking	65.5%	36
Outdoor route	no response	0
Entrance	63.6%	35
Interior route	43.6%	24
Restrooms	54.5%	30
Meeting rooms	29.1%	16

Table 2.3

The ADA Policy Distribution

How has the ADA policy been distributed?	Survey Respondents	n=
Posted	36.4%	20
Distributed	18.2%	10
Both	18.2%	10
No Response	27.3%	15

Table 2.4

Disability Awareness Training

Was disability awareness training conducted?	Survey Respondents	n=
Yes	52.7%	29
No	43.6%	24
No response	3.6%	2

Table 2.5A

Recruitment Practices

To what extent do employers practice recruitment that allows a qualified applicant with a disability to have equal opportunity to access a job (circle all that apply)	Survey Respondents	n=
Newspaper adds state ADA employer	54.5%	30
Utilize State Office of Vocational Rehabilitation	30.9%	17
Utilize rehabilitation agencies	23.6%	13
Utilize Centers for Independent Living	5.5%	3
Utilize Campus Office of Disability	5.5%	3
Other	7.3%	4

Employers were also asked during the interview process (n = 19) to describe their relationships with rehabilitation agencies and how they might become good partners? Of the 19 employers interviewed, only 4 indicated involvement with the state or community rehabilitation agencies, with 2 indicating the current partnership worked well. Eight indicated having contact with private insurance rehabilitation counselors working with the injured workers compensation system. Most others indicated the need for more information, more communication and follow through, and the importance of understanding employer needs.

Overall, the employer interview responses to rehabilitation

agenices are categorized by hiring patterns of persons with disabilities and were summarized as follows:

Table 2.5B

Partnerships with Rehabilitation Agencies

<p>Pre-ADA/No Hire Post-ADA/No Hire (n = 6)</p>
<p>On a board of a rehabilitation agency; no involvement with state agencies or other rehabilitation agencies; and rehabilitation needs to understand our business operation and skills we need.</p>
<p>We see worker's compensation counselors; no involvement with the state agencies or other rehabilitation agencies; and not sure about partnerships, need more information on what they do.</p>
<p>We have not had follow-through with agencies that bring people for employment; no involvement with state agencies or other rehabilitation agencies; and rehabilitation agencies must have follow-through and consistency.</p>
<p>We see worker's compensation agencies; no involvement with state agencies or other rehabilitation agencies; and agencies need more visibility, maybe put a flyer out so we know what they do.</p>
<p>Do not know anything about these rehabilitation agencies, tell me what they do.</p>
<p>Very aware, however, employers work for the bottom line not for humanitarian reasons.</p>
<p>Pre-ADA/No Hire Post-ADA/1-5 Hired (n = 4)</p>
<p>We see people from worker's compensation and rehabilitation hardening; no involvement with the state agencies or other rehabilitation agencies; and no response to partnerships.</p>
<p>Not real aware of the state or other rehabilitation agencies; somebody came once but never came back; and there needs to be more communication.</p>

We saw some agencies in the past but no one now including the state agencies. We write letters but get no response.

No experience at all it would be good to know what they did.

Pre-ADA/1-5 Hired
Post-ADA/1-5 Hired (n = 5)

We have had "vigilante groups" from worker's compensation agencies and someone from the state blindness agency, but no others. More communication would help

We have worked with OVR. It's important to understand that business has a narrow concern, understand our needs.

Good relations with rehabilitation agencies, state and non-profit. Works well.

I know of these agencies, but none come to my door. Communicate more.

I have worked with worker compensation counselors. I have heard of the other agencies but do not know what they do. Need more information.

Pre-ADA/1-5 Hired
Post-ADA/ Over 5+ hired (n = 4)

No longer see them as I once did ten years ago. OVR once helped me, provided "service and encouragement". I see worker's compensation agencies but they're not the same. I do not have time to seek them out but would be open to them.

We seen workers compensation counselors, this has not worked well. They do not understand us; we do not see anyone from the state agencies or other rehabilitation agencies; and we would be open if they wanted to understand our needs.

We occasionally work with rehabilitation agencies, we have used job coaches, counselors need to understand market needs and basic requirements.

We see worker's compensation counselors, and no others. Our applicants with disabilities are walk-ins off the street.

Table 2.6

Reasonable Accommodation Request Process

Is there a process for requesting reasonable accommodations?	Survey Respondents	n=
Yes	67.3%	37
No	30.9%	17
No response	1.8%	1

Table 2.7

Application Process

Is the application process free from disability or health related questions?	Survey Respondents	n=
Yes	94.5%	52
No	5.5%	3
No Response	0	

Table 2.8A

Job Requirements

Are certain jobs in your company more suitable for persons with disabilities?	Survey Respondents	n=
Yes	54.5%	30
No	34.5%	19
No Response	10.9%	6

Table 2.8B

Interviewer ADA Training

Have interviewers received training on ADA?	Survey Respondents	n=
Yes	31%	17
No	69%	38

2.8C Are all applicants asked the same questions?

Based on interview data (n = 19), 3 respondents indicated a structured interview, 1 stated the interview was hands-on demonstrating essential functions, 14 utilized a multiple interviewer process, and 1 indicated singular authority to hire.

Table 2.9

Job Descriptions

Are job descriptions reflective of both essential and marginal job duties?	Survey Respondents	n=
Yes	52.7%	29
No	47.3%	26

2.10 Are all positions open to qualified individuals with disabilities?

Based on interview data (n = 19), 13 stated yes, 1 stated yes but must do 100% of the job without modifications, 4 discussed the nature of the job and that certain disabilities would not be able to be accommodated, and 1 stated they were not hiring.

Table 2.11

Interactive Review Process

Is there a process to review hiring practices of persons with disabilities?	Survey Respondents	n=
Yes	49.1%	27
No	49.1%	27
No Response	1.8%	1

Research Question 3

To what extent have employer ADA nondiscrimination policies and their implementation in the workplace resulted in any changes in the number of persons hired since 1992?

Table 3

Chi-Square Analysis of Post-ADA Hiring (Row) by Policy (Column)

*See summary for numerical code	Policy Yes	Policy No	Row Total
Post-ADA None Hired	12 10.2 30.0%	1 2.8 9.1%	13 25.5%
Post-ADA Yes Hired	28 29.8 70.0%	10 8.2 90.9%	38 74.5%
Column Total	40 78.4%	11 21.6%	51 100.

*Count	Value	DF	Significance
Expectancy Value	1.98	1	p= .15 N.S.
Column Percent			

As presented in Table 3, the results of the research question 3 are depicted. There are no statistically significant associations (p= .15) in the hiring practices of persons with

disabilities in relationship to whether a company has an ADA non-discrimination policy. While not significant, there was a tendency for those with a policy to hire at (70.0%) and those employers without a policy were likely to hire persons with disabilities at (90%).

Table 3A

Post-ADA Hiring Practices for Persons with Disabilities

Hiring practices of persons with disabilities since July 1992?	Survey Respondents	n=
None hired	23.6%	13
1-5 hired	58.2%	32
5-10 hired	7.3%	4
over 10 hired	3.6%	2
data not available	7.3%	4

Of the 55 employers surveyed, 23.6% (13) did not hire and 76.4% (42) indicated hiring at least one person with a disability.

Table 3.1A

Post-ADA Hiring Practices

To what extent have employers hired since 1992 for persons with or without disabilities?	Survey Respondents	n=
Active hiring	47.3%	26
Sporadic hiring	40%	22
Little, if any hiring	12.7%	7

3.1B Any emerging patterns by occupation?

No significance was found with Chi-square (p=.35372) looking for associations between company type and hiring practices of persons with disabilities. It should also be noted that some categories had low values. Of the eight health care employers responding to the survey, (87.5%) had a tendency to hire people with disabilities. Based on interview data, hospitals expressed that it made good sense to hire persons with disabilities and that they did this prior to the ADA as well.

Table 3.2/3.3

Job Hours and Benefits

Were jobs part-time, full-time, did they include benefits or both?	Survey Respondents	n=
No hiring	3.6%	2
Full-time	1.8%	1
Full-time with benefits	32.7%	18
Part-time	1.8%	1
Part-time with benefits	0	0
Both	60%	33

3.4A How do persons describe the persons with disabilities who apply for jobs?

Employers described the persons with disabilities who apply for employment in a variety of ways. For some, there were too few, if any applicants with disabilities to describe a pattern. An equal number of employers described the persons who apply for jobs as varied and others described more specific experiences such as people who are deaf, visually impaired, or those with slight mental disabilities and low skill level. Some described referrals from rehabilitation agencies. While one employer was very specific in his response that most applicants with disabilities are walk-ins and few have had any "credible rehabilitation consultants."

For verbatim responses from 33 of 55 (60%) survey respondents see (Appendix C).

Table 3.4B

Description of Persons with Disabilities Hired

Verbatim responses from 19 interview respondents.

<p>Pre-ADA/No Hire Post-ADA/No Hire (n = 6)</p>
<p>No description as no one was hired with a disability.</p>
<p>Pre-ADA/No Hire Post-ADA/1-5 Hired (n = 4)</p>
<p>Hearing impairment, if it were an equal decision between two applicants, we would probably choose the applicant with a disability.</p>
<p>Visual impairment, blind in one eye.</p>
<p>We have worked with a state institution and developed a food service program for persons with mental retardation and have also hired in our regular work force, it's been positive and works well.</p>
<p>We have hired persons with hidden disabilities.</p>
<p>Pre-ADA/1-5 Hired Post-ADA/1-5 Hired (n = 5)</p>
<p>People with disabilities strive harder, it is sometime hard to tell whether a person considers themselves disabled or not such as a person with a heart condition.</p>
<p>People were qualified and have done good work for us.</p>
<p>We hire the most qualified, for the most part it has worked well. If the original job does not work, we try something else. We have lots of resources.</p>
<p>Hiring has been positive, stereotypes are not true. People with disabilities have strong work ethics.</p>
<p>Excellent experience, no negatives.</p>
<p>Pre-ADA/1-5 Hired Post-ADA/over 5+ Hired (n = 4)</p>
<p>Positive, accommodation process also positive.</p>

One person uses a wheelchair, overall positive, some disabilities aren't noticeable unless the person needs an accommodation.
It has worked pretty well, straight forward.
Positive, we lose sight that the person has a disability.

Table 3.4C
Job Evaluation Based on Disability

Are certain jobs in your company more suitable for person's with disabilities?	Survey Respondents	n=
Yes	54.5%	30
No	34.5%	19
No response	10.9%	6

3.4D Are employers evaluating ability or disability? As represented in Table 3.4C, 54.5% of the respondents indicated that there were jobs within their companies that seemed more suitable for person's with disabilities. Without any information on the person, 42% of the respondents listed specific occupations, giving an indication that there are preconceived ideas based on disability not ability.

For some employers jobs were defined by the perception of what a person with a disability could not do, for instance non-clinical, non-production, and non-maintenance. A few stated it depends on the disability. Twelve employers listed jobs in clerical areas, while 2 stated sedentary. Food service and assembly positions were also mentioned as jobs that persons with disabilities could do. See (Appendix D) for verbatim responses.

Research Question 4

What factors are identified by employers as either facilitating or inhibiting the development and implementation of Title I of the ADA nondiscrimination policies?

Overall, four themes emerged from the responses. Fourteen persons reported that the act itself or the desire to be in compliance was the motivating force. Eight responses indicated educational materials from government regulations to brochures, publications, videos, and seminars. Five indicated the policy was developed externally and passed along from either the corporate office or legal department. Three indicated it was good business that they always hired and wanted to be proactive.

Verbatim responses for factors identified as facilitating the development and implementation of the company's ADA policy based on 34 of 55 (62%) survey responses are located in (Appendix E).

The patterns for barriers were varied. Four persons indicated the demands of the jobs themselves were barriers to developing and implementing the ADA policy. One person indicated that "patience is not a characteristic of a front line manager". Another four felt the act was vague and lacked understanding. Cost and time were seen as barriers to four respondents. Also noted by three employers were no exposure to persons with disabilities and employees were fearful. Two had no one assigned to coordinate the ADA activities and one indicated the union

contract modifications. Six indicated no difficulties what so ever.

Verbatim responses for factors identified as inhibiting the development and implementation of the company's ADA policy based on 25 of 55 (45%) survey responses are located in (Appendix F).

Research Question 5

Do employers perceive the need for any training with regards to Title I of the Americans with Disabilities Act?

Employers were asked to identify their training needs with regards to ADA in the survey as well as during the follow-up interviews. A lesser number of survey respondents (20 of 55) (36%) answered this question.

There were varying ranges of responses. Thirteen employers indicated no needs or not appropriate at this time. One indicated training was sufficient. Six respondents indicated educating various components of the workforce and one indicated training on policy development. One employer said some refresher materials and an update would be helpful.

Verbatim responses for identified training needs based on 20 of 55 (36%) survey responses are located in (Appendix G).

This area was further explored with interview respondents (n = 19) were asked to respond to the following question: Do you have any current needs with regards to the Americans with Disabilities Act?

Their responses were categorized by their hiring patterns of people with disabilities and were as follows:

Table 5A

Interview Respondents Training Needs

Pre ADA/No Hire Post ADA/No Hire (n = 6)
No needs
Recently had training on all major laws
Not at this time
Not at this time
No, we do yearly training. Maybe an annual ADA update.
No, we have good resources to address our own needs.
Pre ADA/No Hire Post ADA/1-5 Hired (n = 4)
No needs, initial training was done.
No needs, things are slow with acquisitions and downsizing.
Set with needs
Many needs, ADA committee is in the process of determining.
Pre ADA/1-5 Hired Post ADA/1-5 Hired (n = 5)
Sensitivity and awareness for supervisors and managers. How to communicate?
Not really, perhaps focus on successful companies. Large companies appear to be accepting, small companies are worried.
We do yearly training and orient new employees.
A refresher course, see what's happening now.
Regrouping and update.
Pre ADA/1-5 Hired Post ADA/Over 5 Hired (n = 4)

Front line supervisors could benefit from training.
Supervisors could use some training.
An annual update would be helpful.
We have lots of inservice and utilize community resources.

Interview respondents (n = 19) were asked to respond to the following question: How visible is the ADA in your day to day operation and how does it effect your operation?

The responses were categorized by their hiring patterns of people with disabilities and were as follows:

Table 5B

Interview Respondent ADA Visibility

Pre-ADA/No Hire Post-ADA/No Hire (n = 6)
Not visible, may see an update with worker's compensation information.
Not visible, assimilated into the daily fabric.
Not visible
Not visible
Not visible, HR and nursing are very aware.
Not visible, but aware.

(Table 5B cont.)

<p>Pre-ADA/No Hire Post-ADA/1-5 Hired (n = 4)</p>
<p>Not much information, went the way of the macarena, keenly aware.</p>
<p>Not visible, day to day we deal with the complexities and coordination.</p>
<p>Initially, alot of information, incorporated into the day to day routine.</p>
<p>Not seen alot, the ADA committee helps us focus.</p>
<p>Pre-ADA/1-5 Hired Post-ADA/1-5 Hired (n = 5)</p>
<p>Have not seen as much as I would like, ADA is like putting your shoes on in the morning.</p>
<p>Every week I receive alot of information.</p>
<p>Interaction with other laws is what is visible, very conscious of ADA.</p>
<p>Hardly see anything, ADA is easily incorporated.</p>
<p>Initially, big blitz, now on a scale of 1-10, it is a 2. We did what we could and made it part of our daily routine. It is still not black and white.</p>
<p>Pre-ADA/1-5 Hired Post-ADA/Over 5 hired (n = 4)</p>
<p>Not real visible, all are aware.</p>
<p>Not a lot of outside information, but we are very aware.</p>
<p>Do not see or hear alot, ingrained in our thinking.</p>

Not visible, but incorporated into our daily practices.

Research Question 6 Is there an association between Pre-ADA and Post-ADA hiring patterns of people with disabilities?

Table 6

Chi-Square Analysis of Pre-ADA Hiring Patterns for Persons with Disabilities (Row) by Post-ADA Hiring Patterns for Persons with Disabilities (Column)

*See summary for numerical code	Hiring Pattern Pre-ADA None	Hiring Pattern Pre-ADA Yes	Row Total
Hiring Pattern Post-ADA No	9 4.3 64.3%	3 7.7 12.0%	12 30.8
Hiring Pattern Post-ADA Yes	5 9.7 35.7%	22 17.3 88.0%	27 69.2%
Column Total	14 35.9%	25 64.1%	39 100.0%

*Count Value DF Significance
 Expectancy Value 11.517 1 p=.00069
 Column Percent

As presented in Table A, the results of question 6 are depicted. There is a statistically significant association (p=.00069) between employer hiring practices of persons with disabilities pre-ADA and post-ADA. Employers who did not hire persons with disabilities pre-ADA are not likely to hire post-ADA (64.3%) and employers who hired persons with disabilities pre-ADA

are likely to hire post-ADA (88.0%).

Research Question 7 Is there a statistically significant association between company characteristics (union, accessible transportation route, years in existence, hiring patterns for all persons, company type, and disability awareness training) and hiring patterns of people with disabilities?

Table 7

Chi-Square Analysis of Company Characteristics by Hiring Patterns

Relationship between company characteristics and Post-ADA hiring for persons with disabilities.	Significance Level Chi-square Value DF
Union (yes or no) by Post-ADA Hiring (yes or no)	p=.04* Value 4.10 DF 1
On public transportation route (yes or no) by Post-ADA hiring for persons with disabilities.	p=.19 Value 1.65354 DF 1
Company years in existence by Post-ADA hiring for persons with disabilities.	p=.57 Value 1.09046 DF 2
Hiring patterns for all persons by Post-ADA hiring for persons with disabilities.	p=.00172* Value 12.73341 DF 2
Company disability awareness training by Post-ADA hiring for persons with disabilities.	p=.06 Value 3.29232 DF 1
Type of Company by Post-ADA hiring for persons with disabilities.	p=.35 Value 9.96019 DF 9

* P<.05

As presented in Table 7, the results of question 7 are depicted. A statistically significant association was found

between employers with and without unions and post-ADA hiring practices of persons with disabilities ($p=.04278$).

Employers with unions had a tendency to hire persons with disabilities at 60.9% as compared to employers without unions hiring at a tendency of 85.7%.

A statistically significant association was found between the post-ADA hiring patterns for all persons and the post-ADA hiring practices for persons with disabilities ($p=.00172$). Employers with active hiring had a tendency to hire at 87.5%, those with sporadic hiring had a tendency to hire persons with disabilities at 76.2%, and those employers with little to no hiring, hired persons with disabilities with a tendency of 16.7%.

No associations were found with companies on an accessible transportation route, years company was in existence, type of company, or whether disability awareness training was offered.

Research Question 8 Is there an association between respondents characteristics (respondents experience, respondents education, respondents contact with persons with disabilities, self-reported knowledge of the ADA by respondent, and respondent's recruitment efforts) and hiring patterns of people with disabilities?

Table 8

Chi-Square Analysis of Company Respondent Characteristics
and Post-ADA Hiring Practices for Persons with Disabilities

Relationship between company respondent characteristics and post-ADA hiring for persons with disabilities.	Significance Level Chi-square Value DF
Respondents years of experience with the company by post-ADA hiring for persons with disabilities.	p=.94 Value .35229 DF 3
Respondents education level by post-ADA hiring for persons with disabilities.	p=.68 Value 1.48222 DF 3
Respondents contact with persons with disabilities by post-ADA hiring for persons with disabilities.	p=.94 Value .10324 DF 2
Respondents knowledge of ADA by post-ADA hiring for persons with disabilities.	p=.05289 Value 5.87898 DF 2
Respondents on-going relationship with rehabilitation agencies by post-ADA hiring for persons with disabilities.	p=.15 Value 1.98050 DF 1

*p<.05

As presented in Table 8, the results of question 8 are depicted. There were no statistically significant associations found between respondent characteristics and post-ADA hiring practices of persons with disabilities.

While not significant (p=.05289), there was a tendency for respondents who rated their knowledge of ADA as very knowledgeable to hire at 93.3%, while those who rated themselves as somewhat knowledgeable hired at 69.7%, and finally those who

rated themselves minimally knowledgeable had a tendency to hire at 33.3%.

Research Question 9 During the interview process (n = 19), employers were asked to describe the barriers to employment that people with disabilities face, as well as what would facilitate more successful job opportunities for persons with disabilities.

While responses were varied, several themes emerged. The most frequently barrier mentioned were concerns associated with employer fears, misperceptions, and stereotypes which were consistent with Frierson's myths (1992). Another pattern were concerns about the individuals disability including lack of experience, low productivity, and the attitudes of persons with disabilities described as bitter. Finally, areas of accessibility, mobility, and no hiring were noted. Some employers stated they lacked any applicants with disabilities.

Employers had several strategies to increase employment opportunities for persons with disabilities. First, they felt they needed more information about hiring persons with disabilities and available resources. More visibility, education, and positive promotion was suggested. Rehabilitation professionals should get more involved in shared community networks such as the Chamber of Commerce and the Job Center Employer Advisory Council. Also mentioned was the need for better skill development and training for persons with disabilities. In other words, discrimination makes little sense if you have the skills to do the job. Another area noted was the

need for more work incentives. Finally, the ADA Act itself was viewed as a help.

Summary

This study examines employer responses to the development and implementation of the ADA policies and the impact this has had on hiring persons with disabilities. The data for this present study were analyzed with descriptive statistics and Chi-square.

A Chi-square statistical analysis for Research Question 1.9 A resulted in statistical significance for associations between the approach an employer takes to the ADA and Post-ADA hiring practices. Employer approaches included business as usual, benefits to the company and employee which is characterized as visionary, and a legal and cost effective approach.

A Chi-square statistical analysis for Research Question 3 yielded no statistically significant associations between Post-ADA hiring practices and whether the company had an ADA nondiscrimination policy.

A Chi-square statistical analysis for Research Question 3.1B yielded no statistically significant associations between Post-ADA hiring and type of company. Companies included (a) bank and service information centers, (b) colleges, universities, and schools, (c) retail, (d) health care, (e) manufacturing, (f) service industry, (g) social services, (h) utilities, (i) warehousing, and (j) other.

A Chi-square statistical analysis for Research Question 6 resulted in significance. There was a statistically significant

association between pre-ADA hiring of persons with disabilities and post-ADA hiring of persons with disabilities. Employers who did not hire pre-ADA were not likely to hire post-ADA and employers who hired pre-ADA were more likely to hire post-ADA.

A Chi-square statistical analysis for Question 7 resulted in partial significance. No associations were found between ADA-post hiring practices of persons with disabilities and company being on a public transportation route, company years in existence, whether disability awareness training was provided, and for type of company. A statistically significant association was found between post-ADA hiring practices and company union status, as well as post-ADA hiring practices and post-ADA hiring practices for all persons with or without disabilities.

A Chi-square analysis for Question 8 resulted in no significance. No associations were found between post-ADA hiring practices and company respondent characteristics including: years experience with the company; education; contact with people with disabilities; respondents self-reported knowledge of ADA; and ongoing relationships with rehabilitation agencies.

The results do not support the main research question with that increased company ADA policies would result in increased hiring of persons with disabilities but provides valuable information for better understanding ADA from an employers perspective. Further discussion and interpretation of the findings in addition to implications for application and future research is presented in Chapter V.

Chapter V

Summary, Conclusions, Discussion, and Recommendations

This chapter is organized in three sections. The first section presents a summary of the study, while the second section presents discussion and conclusions based on the findings of the study. The final section presents implications of this research for rehabilitation professionals, as well as recommendations for future research.

Summary of the Study

The present study was conducted to determine the impact of Title I of the ADA on changes in employer nondiscrimination policies, the inclusiveness of these policies, the extent to which these policies have been implemented, and how these changes have affected the hiring of persons with disabilities. The study examined employers self-reported approach to the ADA to determine any associations with hiring practices of persons with disabilities. In addition, the study identified specific factors that were perceived to facilitate the implementation of the ADA, as well as factors that were perceived to be barriers. A comparison was made between reports of employer hiring practices of persons with disabilities prior to ADA implementation and after ADA mandates to determine any changes in hiring patterns. The study also addressed employer's perceived needs of overall training with regards to Title I of the ADA. The study reviewed post-ADA hiring to determine any associations with company characteristics or respondent characteristics. Finally, the

study addressed employer perceptions with regard to the employment issues faced by persons with disabilities.

The literature review addressed research regarding persons with disabilities, employment, and the Americans with Disabilities Act. The majority of the research studies reviewed were conducted on small samples, with the exception of the four major Lou Harris and Associate studies (1986; 1987; 1994; 1995).

Nonetheless, several key factors stand out from the literature search. First, Wehman (1993) states "Employment is a major aspect in the lives of people with and without disabilities" (p. 48) and people want to work. Second, the issues associated with employment of persons with disabilities are complex and interrelated (Greenwood & Johnson, 1985). In addition, several authors emphasize the importance of understanding the effects of external factors (attitudes, accessibility and, unemployment rates) on hiring practices of persons with disabilities (Millington, Szymanski, & Johnston-Rodriguez, 1995; Hearne, 1991; Yelin & Katz, 1994; West, 1991).

The overall study focused on ADA policy development and implementation. The literature in this area was sparse. Berkeley Planning and Associates (1982) found a link between companies that had a strong policy based on Affirmative Action on the part of federal contractors and the federal government, as a result of the 1973 Rehabilitation Act and increased hiring of persons with disabilities. The Harris (1987) study found that of the 37% of companies that had a policy, 67% hired a person with a disability

in the previous year, as compared to 42% that did not have a policy. Harris (1995) also found in response to ADA, companies are developing policies (56%), but hiring has not necessarily increased for persons with disabilities. This may be as employers state that they are planning to hire in the next three years (Harris, 1995). It may also be the result of employers wanting to avoid liability for discrimination under the ADA so they institute a policy without taking steps to actively implement the policy.

The literature on employer concerns and hiring persons with disabilities was also reviewed. The studies represented a patchwork of related areas of research. Greenwood and Johnson (1985) compiled a thorough review of existing literature on employer concerns and concluded no clear patterns exist. Long (1994) examined characteristics of employers who were either likely or unlikely to hire and suggests "no true profile exists" (p. 24).

The Americans with Disabilities Act and related literature was also examined, with particular emphasis on Title I provisions on employment of people with disabilities. The literature in this area tended to focus on the importance of how an employer viewed and approached ADA. The approach taken in development and implementation was especially viewed as possibly associated with the employers proclivity to hire people with disabilities. Pimentel, Bissonnette, and Lotito (1992) described three approaches to the ADA, and this study attempted to determine

associations between self-described approach and hiring patterns of people with disabilities.

There are also several technical manuals which outline key steps to being in compliance with Title I of ADA (Frierson, 1992; Schneid, 1992; Jackson, 1993; Henry, 1994). This study addressed key areas noted in these resource manuals as important for policy development and implementation and developed instruments to determine how employers evolved and implemented their ADA policies.

Finally, the literature also addressed how rehabilitation agencies and rehabilitation professionals could provide consultant services to employers on the ADA and employment issues of persons with disabilities. This study further sought to understand the training needs of employers pertaining to the ADA, as well as how companies interfaced with the rehabilitation community, and employer opinions on developing partnerships.

Study Design

The study targeted 85 employers in Northeastern Pennsylvania who were members of the Tri-County Personnel Association. The employers who participated represented 10 different types of companies of 41.8% that were unionized and 70.9% that were accessible by public transportation. All companies had over 25 employees and 92.7% had over 100 employees. Most companies (94.5%) were in business for more than 10 years. The majority of respondents to the survey were Human Resource Specialists (61.8%) or Managers (36.4%). Only 7.3% had less than 1 year of

experience with the company. The group was well educated with 40% with a Bachelor's degree and 41.8% reporting a Master's degree. An overwhelming 90.9% have had previous contact with a person with a disability and 5.5% indicated they themselves have a disability. The employers were asked to rate their knowledge of ADA and all (100%) were aware of ADA. Only 5.5% rated themselves as minimally knowledgeable, with 65.5% indicating somewhat knowledgeable, while 29.1% felt they were very knowledgeable.

Each employer was contacted by phone by the researcher to explain the study and ask for a commitment to participate. The first phase of the study included sending the survey and cover letter explaining study details. Follow-up by phone calls occurred with all who did not respond. Fifty-five employers completed the survey for a response rate of 65%. Phase two consisted of sorting the surveys by pre-ADA and post-ADA reported hiring patterns and identifying 20 employers to participate in a personal interview. Nineteen of 20 completed the interview process. Confidentiality of individual responses by company and name of respondent was emphasized throughout all steps of the study.

Data was analyzed with the software package SPSSX and descriptive data characterized the survey results. Chi-Square was utilized to look for specific associations between policies, approaches, employer characteristics, respondent characteristics and hiring patterns for persons with disabilities.

The significance level was set at 0.05.

Study Results

Table 9

Summary of Significant Findings

Research Question	Finding
Question 1.9 Post-ADA Hiring by employer approach	An association was found between Post-ADA hiring practices of persons with disabilities and employer approaches to ADA.
Question 6 Is there an association between pre-ADA and post-ADA hiring patterns of people with disabilities?	Pre-ADA hiring patterns, both positive and negative, have a relationship to Post-ADA hiring patterns
Question 7 Is there an association between company characteristics and hiring patterns of people with disabilities? Sub-question Union	A relationship was found between Post-ADA hiring patterns and companies with and without unions.
Question 7 Sub-question Hiring patterns for both persons with and without disabilities post-ADA	A relationship was found between overall employer hiring patterns and Post-ADA hiring of persons with disabilities.

Discussion

The primary purpose of this study was to determine the changes Title I of the ADA has had on employer policies and the subsequent impact on hiring of persons with disabilities. This section of the discussion will review the research questions and report on the findings.

Findings on how employers have changed their company policies on nondiscrimination to meet the requirements of Title I of the

Americans with Disabilities Act

The study suggests that employers have increased their policy development with regards to the ADA Title I and nondiscrimination towards hiring persons with disabilities. The majority of employers (80%) indicated they have a policy. Of those employers with policies, 45.5% indicated it was different from what was in place prior to the ADA. When describing the policy 63.6% indicated it was general in nature, with 14.5% stating it was specific. Policy development was coordinated most often by the Human Resource Department (67%) or management (13%).

Leonard (1991) and Pimentel, Bissonnette, & Lotito (1992) emphasize the importance of executive commitment and visionary leadership in helping diversity in the workplace to be successful. In the ADA policy development, it is interesting to note that owners and CEO's were involved with policy development only 36.4% of the time, while legal consultants involvement was at 52.7% and human resource departments leading the way at 81.8%. Other noteworthy findings included the relatively low level of union involvement at 3.6%, and rehabilitation consultants at 10.9%.

Policies varied widely in the areas they addressed. Reasonable accommodation was the highest mentioned at 74.5%, followed by accessible workplace with parking spaces at 65.5%, entrances at 63.6% and restrooms at 54.5%. Policy emphasis on accessible Human Resource Departments, accessible interior routes and meeting rooms were mentioned less than 50% of the time, while

policies addressing the preemployment process were around 50%. While not always addressed in policies, 94.5% of the respondents indicated their applications were free of any health or disability related questions.

Although 80% of employers indicated having a written policy, only 36.4% indicated these policies were posted. Policies that were both distributed to employees and posted were noted 18.2% of the time.

Findings on how survey respondents rate their knowledge of ADA and where they received their training

All survey respondents (100%) indicated that they were knowledgeable of the ADA. While there was no statistical significance found between employer knowledge of the ADA and post-ADA hiring patterns, there did appear to be a tendency for respondents who rated their knowledge of the ADA as very knowledgeable to hire at 93.3%, while those who rated themselves as somewhat knowledgeable hired at 69.7%, and finally those who rated their knowledge as minimal had a tendency to hire at 33.3%.

Survey respondents were asked how they acquired their knowledge of the ADA. Over half stated they received training by legal consultants. While approximately 50% were those who acquired the law and interpretive EEOC guidelines. Only 5.5% indicated that rehabilitation consultants were involved in their training. This finding is particularly important since it reflects the level of involvement between employers and the rehabilitation community in implementing and understanding ADA.

Findings on the application of a Tri-level classification system to determine employer commitment to ADA and the impact on hiring of persons with disabilities.

The literature highlights different employer views of the ADA, ranging from optimism to frustration and cynicism. Similarly, Pimentel, Bissonnette, and Lotito (1992) consider three possible employer approaches to the ADA. These three approaches were analyzed to determine possible impact on hiring practices of persons with disabilities. A statistically significant association was found between the self-reported approach an employer took to the ADA and hiring practices of persons with disabilities. For employers who took a wait and see, business as usual approach, only 33.3% reported hiring persons with disabilities. For employers who reported a legal and cost effective approach, 81.3% had a tendency to hire. For employers who took a visionary approach that looked at how the ADA could benefit both employees and the company, 76.9% were likely to hire. This finding is consistent with the literature which suggests how an employer approaches the ADA will have a definite impact on hiring practices.

Findings on the extent employers are implementing Title I of the ADA nondiscrimination policies in the workplace

Implementation of the ADA was difficult to discern by the survey and interview process. The majority of the information was self-report with the exception of the observations made during the interview process. While 80% of the employers

ADA: Policy Implementation 121

indicated having a policy, only 36.4% indicated posting the policy, with 18.2% actually distributing it to employees. Consequently, having an ADA policy did not appear to give high visibility to the ADA in the workplace.

Policy implementation was handled by the Human Resources Department in the majority of cases, although in some companies it was handled by other management staff. It was interesting to note that over 50% indicated specific attention being given to parking, entrances, and restrooms, while under 50% noted interior routes and meeting rooms. Higher access routes such as parking areas and entrance ways received the most attention for accessibility.

A majority of employers (94.5%), with or without a policy indicated that their application process was free from disability or health related questions. A process for reasonable accommodation was in place with 67.3% of the respondents, while job descriptions utilizing the ADA language of essential or marginal functions occurred with 52.7% of the employers responding.

Disability awareness training was conducted by 52.7% of the respondents, however only 31% of employment interviewers received training. While 54.5% indicated they are an ADA employer in newspaper ads, less than 30.9% had any relationships with state and community vocational rehabilitation facilities.

Overall, it appears the ADA implementation is difficult to discern and is not occurring in a consistent manner. The

literature on implementation and change indicates the importance of taking both maintenance tasks such as policy development and enrichment tasks such as recruitment and outreach. While most companies report having a policy (80%), the enrichment activities are lacking in the majority of companies.

Findings on the extent that employers ADA nondiscrimination policies and their implementation in the workplace have resulted in any changes in the number of persons hired since 1992

A hopeful pattern was established after the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 with employers who established policies and affirmative action plans being more likely to hire persons with disabilities (Berkeley, 1982; Harris, 1987).

However, this study shows no significant results between employer ADA policies and hiring patterns of persons with disabilities. This finding is consistent with the recent Harris (1995) results which showed corporate America increasing their ADA nondiscrimination policies with the employment rate of people with disabilities decreasing to 31%. There were no statistically significant associations with employment across company types.

Findings on factors identified by employers as facilitating the development and implementation of the ADA Title I policies

The findings suggest four themes emerging from the results of this question. For many, the act itself and the desire to be in compliance was the main motivating factor. Several respondents indicated the available educational materials from government regulations to brochures, publications, videos, and

seminars was helpful. Some respondents had the policy developed at the corporate level or legal department so it was simply a matter of putting it in place. A few employers indicated it just made good sense, that they hired pre-ADA and wanted to continue this practice.

Findings on factors identified by employers as barriers to development and implementation of the ADA Title I policies

The findings suggest that the barriers encountered by employers were varied. Accessibility issues, cost and time were noted by some, while others pointed to the vagueness of the law and difficulty understanding the law. The demands of the job were also seen by some as causing difficulty with one employer referencing "patience is not always a characteristic of a front line manager". Additionally noted were "no exposure to people with disabilities and employees are fearful". One person mentioned union contract modifications. Two employers indicated no one was responsible for coordinating the ADA efforts, and finally, six indicated no barriers whatsoever.

Findings on employers perceived needs for training with regards to Title I of the ADA

There were fewer responses to this question on the survey than the other open ended questions (20 of 55) at a response rate of 36%. Over half of the respondents indicated no training needs and two were not sure of their needs. Other responses indicated training for various members of the workforce, especially front-line supervisors, training on policy development, and one person

indicated a refresher course would be helpful.

Training needs were further explored during the interview process (n = 19). The pattern of response while similar indicated an interesting trend. Employers who have not hired persons with disabilities were more likely to indicate no training needs (5 of 6), while those who have been hiring see needs for awareness and sensitivity training across the workforce (9 of 9).

The literature addresses the critical role of the rehabilitation professional in providing ADA consultation and training (Nagler, 1993; Levy et al. 1993; Hansen & Perlman, 1990; Satcher, 1992) This study found employers barely (5.5%) utilizing rehabilitation professionals in training efforts.

Findings on comparisons between pre-ADA and post-ADA hiring patterns

A statistically significant association (p= .00069) was found in this area. The findings suggest there is a pattern between pre and post hiring practices of persons with disabilities. Employers who did not hire people with disabilities pre-ADA are less likely to hire post-ADA while employers who did hire people with disabilities pre-ADA are likely to continue to hire people with disabilities post-ADA.

Leonard (1991) states that in order for a diversity program to work, there must be a commitment from the top with leadership involvement and vision. Pati and Bailey (1995) state "laws can only change behavior, not attitude" (p. 68). Kotter (1996)

emphasized the difference between management which includes planning, budgeting, staffing, and problem solving and leadership which describes a vision and provides inspiration to make it happen. Overall, a lack of commitment or vision seems consistent with employers who have not made efforts to hire either pre or post ADA.

Findings on comparisons between post-ADA hiring and company characteristics.

Company characteristics were analyzed to determine any associations with post-ADA hiring patterns of persons with disabilities. Of the characteristics included in the survey, both union involvement and hiring patterns for all employees were found to be statistically significant.

No associations were found with companies on an accessible transportation route, years company was in existence, type of company, or whether disability awareness was offered.

The significant findings are consistent with the literature review. For companies with unions, a relationship was found wherein unionized companies were less likely to hire persons with disabilities. While the literature is sparse, both Ellner and Bender (1980) and Berkeley Planning Associates (1982) found union support in hiring persons with disabilities as passive and poor. One employer who was interviewed stated he required each person hired to do 100% of the job and did not offer accommodation because he did not want grievances from the union. He knew he was in violation of the ADA, but felt the union tied his hands.

However, it is important to note that the literature also provided examples of national approaches that demonstrated union support for hiring persons with disabilities. Bradford (1990) outlined a wealth of information to help understand unions and facilitate the development of effective partnerships. During the interview process, one employer in particular stands out because of their win-win approach to partnerships with their union. This was also an employer that actively hired persons with disabilities. In this company, the union was included as an integral partner in policy development, planning, and implementation.

Although Bruyere (1993) highlighted the importance of labor management committees in developing ADA policies, this study found labor involvement in ADA policy development at 3.6%.

The study suggests that overall hiring patterns for all applicants are related to hiring patterns of applicants with disabilities. This was found to be statistically significant and consistent with Hearne (1991) and Yelin and Katz (1994) who looked at the health of the economy as a critical external factor in hiring of persons with disabilities.

Findings on comparisons between post-ADA hiring and respondent characteristics

There were no associations found between respondent characteristics (respondent experience, respondent education, respondents' contact with persons with disabilities, self-reported knowledge of ADA by respondent, and respondents'

recruitment efforts) and hiring patterns of persons with disabilities. This is consistent with the literature which suggests no true profile exists (Long, 1994; Greenwood & Johnson, 1985).

Findings on employer involvement with rehabilitation agencies

Overall, there was a low level of awareness of the state (39.9%) and community vocational rehabilitation programs (23.6). However, several respondents indicated that they are contacted on a regular basis by private, workers compensation rehabilitation counselors, and some employers were open to exploring rehabilitation partnerships. Some survey participants felt they needed more information to understand what these rehabilitation agencies do. Most others indicated the need for more information, more communication, follow-through, and the importance of focusing on understanding business needs.

Findings on employer perceptions of employment issues faced by persons with disabilities

Employers described the barriers to employment for persons with disabilities as attitudinal, lack of experience and skill, accessibility, and no employment openings. These are consistent with the literature on employer concerns (Greenwood & Johnson, 1985; Benshoff & Souheaver, 1991; Parette & Hourcade, 1995; Fabian, Luecking, & Tilson, 1995).

Strategies to increase opportunities included providing employers with more information and linkages to resources, better skill development, more visibility, and for rehabilitation

professionals to get more involved in the business world through participation in Chamber of Commerce and Job Center Employer Advisory activities. These employer recommendations were also consistent with the literature review (Satcher, 1992; Gilbride, Stensrud, & Connolly, 1992).

Conclusions

There are several general conclusions drawn within the bounds of the limitations of this study.

1. Employers have increased their ADA nondiscrimination policies with no significant impact on hiring practices of persons with disabilities.
2. Employers reported that they were knowledgeable of Title I of the ADA. Only 10.9% indicated that Rehabilitation consultants were involved in the acquisition of their ADA knowledge.
3. A statistically significant association exists between employer self-described approach to ADA and hiring practices of persons with disabilities. Employers who take a wait-and-see attitude are less likely to hire, whereas, those who have made an effort to understand and implement the ADA are more likely to hire. While there was an initial blitz of ADA materials, information, and seminars most employers stated that the ADA does not have a high visibility within their day to day operations.
4. It is difficult to ascertain the implementation of employer ADA nondiscrimination policies in the

workplace.

5. There are statistically significant relationships between pre-ADA hiring patterns of persons with disabilities and post-ADA hiring patterns of persons with disabilities. With pre-ADA hiring patterns being indicative of post-ADA hiring patterns.
6. Employers found both the Act itself and educational materials to be helpful in facilitating the development and implementation of the ADA policies. Barriers to policy development and implementation were varied but included time and money, accessibility of buildings, the nature of the work performed, and the vagueness of the Act itself.
7. For employers who have not hired, the majority identified no ADA training needs while those who have hired both pre and post ADA placed an emphasis on developing the training needs of the entire workforce, especially frontline managers and co-workers.
8. There is a lack of awareness and utilization of the state and community rehabilitation resources available for assisting with the ADA efforts and as a source of qualified job applicants.
9. There is a statistically significant association between unionized companies and hiring patterns of persons with disabilities. Companies with unions are less likely to hire persons with disabilities.

10. The overall hiring patterns for all applicants are related to the hiring patterns of applicants with disabilities.
11. There were no identifiable profiles of respondent characteristics that were likely to hire persons with disabilities.
12. Employers identified employer myths, perceptions, and misinformation as barriers to employment for persons with disabilities. Strategies to increase employment opportunities included providing more information on hiring people with disabilities, promoting available resources, more visibility, education, and positive promotion. Most important to note was the employers request to understand their business needs. Some employers noted rather than just asking about available openings it would be helpful to ask about the entire business operation. All indicate increased communication as important in improving the process.

Implications for Rehabilitation Professionals

The results of this study build on a growing body of knowledge on Title I of the ADA which may be useful to the rehabilitation professional who is interested in promoting employment opportunities for persons with disabilities.

Specifically, the study supports the following recommendations for rehabilitation professionals:

1. Employers have laid a foundation for the ADA with over 80% having policies on hiring persons with disabilities. Even those employers that did not have policies indicated a

tendency to hire persons with disabilities. Despite the groundwork, there are still significant gaps in the opportunities that exist for persons with disabilities. An association was found between employers who have taken a positive approach to the ADA and increased hiring of persons with disabilities. The ADA was surrounded by a tremendous amount of media attention. It was not uncommon to find daily flyers, seminars, and journal information coming across the desks of Human Resource Specialists. Today, HR Specialists report little, if any, visual information coming across on the ADA. The rehabilitation professional has a continuing opportunity to keep employer awareness heightened to the importance of Title I of the ADA; thereby increasing the likelihood of employment opportunities for persons with disabilities.

2. Rehabilitation professionals have an opportunity to take a leadership role in increasing employer awareness and resource utilization for promoting employment opportunities for persons with disabilities. Employers have urged rehabilitation professionals to get to know their business needs. Rehabilitation professionals are in a natural position to expand employer perspectives on the abilities of persons with disabilities.
3. Rehabilitation professionals are in a unique and strategic position to develop active partnerships on a community level with employer advisory groups, labor councils, economic

development groups, coalitions of persons with disabilities, state and community vocational rehabilitation agencies, and other related groups to formulate local strategies for increasing awareness and promoting employment opportunities for persons with disabilities.

4. Employers are a heterogeneous group. Both the findings and the literature strongly support the rehabilitation professionals need to recognize that each employer is unique and to make a commitment to understanding how the employer views the ADA, current hiring practices of persons with disabilities, and specific labor market needs, in order to develop a partnership that is based on meeting mutual needs.
5. Employer training needs with regards to the ADA were varied. Rehabilitation professionals are in an excellent position to assist the employer in identifying and meeting these needs.
6. The possible role of labor unions in the support of hiring people with disabilities is often significant. It would behoove rehabilitation professionals to become more cognizant of union perspectives and to begin to play a role in the education of union leadership.

Recommendations for Further Research

The results of this study are viewed as contributing to the knowledge base on employment of people with disabilities and Title I of the ADA. Additional research should be conducted to broaden this base. Several areas seem worthy of further exploration. The following recommendations are suggested:

1. Employers on a national level have indicated that they have laid the groundwork by implementing the ADA policies for future hiring of persons with disabilities. On a local level a similar pattern has emerged. Follow-up studies on the hiring of people with disabilities would provide a measure on which to evaluate the effectiveness of Title I of the ADA on hiring persons with disabilities and further identify areas of need for promoting employment opportunities.
2. Research with larger samples should be conducted on the relationship between employer knowledge of the ADA and hiring patterns of persons with disabilities.
3. Research with larger samples should be conducted to determine employer approach to the ADA and impact on hiring persons with disabilities.
4. Research on model employers that have incorporated recruiting and hiring persons with disabilities because it makes good business sense and could help identify strategies that would improve employment opportunities. This information would be useful for replication and dissemination.
5. Research should be conducted to further examine the impact of unions on hiring persons with disabilities and the role of the rehabilitation professional in promoting partnerships.
6. Research investigating the characteristics of model employer/rehabilitation partnerships that effectively promote employment opportunities for persons with disabilities.
7. Awareness and education are key in promoting further

employment opportunities for persons with disabilities.

Exploring the impact of positive promotional campaigns on hiring practices as they relate to persons with disabilities could produce pertinent data.

8. The Tri-level classification system proves to be a useful tool when viewing employer hiring practices. Further research in this area could provide a framework for better understanding employer motivations and perspectives on hiring persons with disabilities.
9. Title I of the ADA has clearly not as yet had the hoped for impact on employment of persons with disabilities. More research is needed to help answer the question: Why?

Summary

Gerber (1992) discusses the difference between the ADA as law, which states what must be done and the spirit of the ADA, that looks at all that can be done. This statement seems to capture the essence of this research study. The results of this study show that just implementing an ADA policy is not enough to bring about change. While more research is needed in this area, it appears in order to increase employment opportunities for persons with disabilities, the ADA needs to be incorporated in to the day to day company operation with a clear philosophy and commitment to hiring persons with disabilities.

References

Album, C. J. (1988). Affirmative action and the handicapped. Employment Relations Today, Summer, 99-106.

Altman, B. (1981). Studies of attitudes toward the handicapped: The need for a new direction. Social Problems, 28, (3), 321-337.

Alvarez, F. W. (1988). Forward. In Hudson Institute, Opportunity 2000 (pp. vii-ix). (Department of Labor Publication NO. 99-6-3370-75-002-02). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Bender, T. J., & Gray, C. D. (1991, December). The New Disability Law and How it Affects You. Paper presented at Allied Services, Scranton, PA.

Benshoff, J. J., & Souheaver, H. G. (1991). Private sector rehabilitation and the Americans with Disabilities Act. Journal of Applied Rehabilitation Counseling, 22, (4), 27-31.

Berkely Planning Associates. (1982, June). A study of accomodations provided to handicapped employees by federal contractors (Summary). Berkeley, CA.

Blanck, P. D., Handley-Anderson, J., Wallach, E. J., & Tenney, J. P. (1994). Mental and Physical Disabilities Law Report, 18, (4), 458-464.

Bleyer, K. (1992). The Americans with Disabilites Act: Enforcement mechanisms. Mental and Physical Disabilities Law Reporter, 16, (3), 347-350.

Boerlijst, G., & Meijboom, G. (1989). Matching the individual and the organization. In P. Herriot (Ed.), Handbook of Assessment in Organizations (pp. 25-44).

Bowe, F. G. (1983). Demography and Disability: A Chartbook for Rehabilitation. Hot Springs, Arkansas: Arkansas Rehabilitation and Research Center.

Bradford, C. E. (1990). Employment and Disability: A point of view from the labor unions. In L. G. Perlman & C. E. Hensen (Eds.). Employment and Disability: Trends and Issues for the 1990's (pp. 38-45). A Report on the 14th Mary E. Switzer Memorial Seminar. Washington, D. C.: NRA.

Bruyere, S. (1993). The implications of the ADA for Labor Relations, Collective Bargaining, and Contract Administration. The Journal of Rehabilitation Administration, 17, (3), 120-126.

Bureau of Research and Statistic. (1992). Annual Planning Information Report: Scranton/Wilkes-Barre MSA. Harrisburg, PA: Department of Labor and Industry.

Bureau of Research and Statistic. (1996). Annual Planning Information Report: Scranton/Wilkes-Barre MSA. Harrisburg, PA: Department of Labor and Industry.

Bush, G. (1990). President Bush: Let the shameful wall of exclusion come tumbling down. Worklife: Vol. 3, Number 3, Fall, 9-11.

Casper, M. W. (1993). Seasons of change the ADA: Implementation in the workplace. Journal of Rehabilitation

Administration, 17, (3), 129-134.

Chalker, M. (1991). Tooling up for ADA. HR Magazine, 61-65.

Chamot, D. (1986). The changing workplace: The union view (Monograph). The future of work for disabled people (pp. 63-72). New York: The American Foundation for the Blind.

Cozby, P. C. (1993). Methods in Behavioral Research (5th ed.). Mountainview, CA: Mayfield Publishing Company.

Crist, P .A. H., & Stoffel, V. C. (1992). The Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 and employees with mental impairments: Personal efficacy and the environment. The American Journal of Occupational Therapy, 46, (5), 434-443.

Dart, J. (1990). Chairman Justin Dart, Jr., Address. Worklife, 3, (2), 19.

Dart, J. (1996). Justin Dart speaks out...The ADA: five years later-Is it working. In Motion, 6, (1), 22-23.

Devience, A., & Convery, J. J. (1992). A primer on the new work force law: The ADA. Journal of Rehabilitation Administration, 16, (2), 40-45.

Donahue, R. E. (1990). Psychology of Work. In C. Schiro-Geist (Ed.), Vocational counseling for special populations (pp. 3-18). Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas Publisher.

Douglas, R. C. (1992). The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)---What it really means for rehabilitation

professionals. Journal of Rehabilitation Administration, 16, (2), 38-39.

Douglas, R. C. (1992). What a small business needs to know about the ADA. American Rehabilitation, Winter, 35-36.

EEOC. (1991). Americans with Disabilities Act Handbook. (EEOC-BK-19). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

EEOC. (July 26, 1992 to March 31, 1995). Cummulative ADA Charge Data Report. Washington, D.C.

Eigenbrood, R., & Retish, P. (1988). Work experience: Employers' attitudes regarding the employability of special education students. Career Development for Exceptional Individuals, 11, 15-25.

E. I. du Pont de Nemours and Company. (1990). Equal to the Task II. Wilmington, DE.

Ellner, J. R., & Bender, H. E. (1980). Hiring the handicapped: An AMA research study. New York: AMACOM.

Esposito, M. D. (1991). Employment Action Steps for the Americans with Disabilities Act. Philadelphia: Ithan Management.

Fabian, E. S., Luecking, R. G., & Tilson, G. P. (1994). A working relationship: The job development specialist's guide to successful partnerships with business. Baltimore: Paul H. Brooks Publishing Company.

Fabian, E. S., Luecking, R. G., & Tilson, G. P. (1995). Employer and rehabilitation personnel perspectives on hiring

persons with disabilities: Implications for job development. Journal of Rehabilitation, 61, (1), 42-49.

Feldblum, C. R. (1992). Employment Protection. In J. West (Ed.), The Americans with Disabilities Act: From policy to practice (pp. 81-110). New York: Milbank Memorial Fund.

Fisher, R. J. (1994). The Americans with Disabilities Act: Implications for measurement. Educational Measurement: Issues and practice, 13, (3), 17-26, 37.

Fowler, F. J., & Mangione, T. W. (1990). Standardized survey interviewing: Minimizing interviewer-related error. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications, Inc.

Fuqua, D. R., Rathbun, M., & Gade, E. M. (1984). A comparison of employer attitudes toward the worker problems of eight types of disabled workers. Journal of Applied Rehabilitation Counseling, 15, (1), 40-43.

Geber, B. (1990). Managing diversity. Training, 27, (7), 23-30.

Gerber, P. J. (1992). At first glance: Employment for people with learning disabilities at the beginning of the Americans-With Disabilities Act era. Learning Disability Quarterly, 15, 330-332.

Gilbride, D. D., Stensrud, R., & Connolly, M. (1992). Employer's concerns about the ADA: Implications and opportunities for Rehabilitation Counselors. Journal of Applied Rehabilitation Counseling, 22, (3), 45-46.

Giordano, G., & D'Aloneo, B. F. (1995). Challenge and progress in rehabilitation: A review of the past 25 years and a preview of the future. American Rehabilitation, 21, (3), 14-21.

Goff, J. L. (1993). The legislative response to alcoholism and drug addiction in the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. The Journal of Psychiatry and Law, 21, (1), 77-107.

Greenwood, R., & Johnson, V. A. (1985). Employer Concerns Regarding Workers with Disabilities. Arkansas Research and Training Center.

Hablutzel, N., & McMahon, B. T. (1992). The Americans with Disabilities Act: Access and Accommodations. Orlando: Paul M. Deutsch Company.

Hahn, H. (1993). Equality and the environment: The interpretation of "Reasonable Accommodation" in the ADA. Journal of Rehabilitation Administration, 17, (3), 101-106.

Hansen, C. E., & Perlman, L. G. (1990). Employment and disability: Issues and solutions for the 1990's. Journal of Rehabilitation, 56, (4), 9-13.

Harris, L. (1986). The ICD Survey of Disabled Americans: Bringing Disabled Americans into the Mainstream. New York: Lou Harris and Associates.

Harris, L. (1987). The ICD Survey II: Employing Disabled Americans. New York: Lou Harris and Associates.

Harris, L. (1994). Closing the Gap: The National

Organization on Disability/Harris Survey of Americans with Disabilities-A Summary. New York: Lou Harris and Associates.

Harris, L. (1995). The National Organization on Disability/Harris Survey on Employment of Persons with Disabilities. New York: Lou Harris and Associates.

Hearne, P. G. (1991). Employment strategies for people with disabilities: A prescription for change. In J. West (Ed.), The Americans with Disabilities Act: From Policy to Practice (pp. 111 to 128). New York: Milbank Memorial Fund.

Henry, K. H. (1994). ADA: 10 Steps to Compliance. California Chamber of Commerce.

Hershenson, D. B., & Szymanski, E. (1992). Career Development of People with Disabilities. In R.M. Parker & E. M. Szymanski (Eds.), Rehabilitation Counseling: Basics and Beyond (pp. 273-304). Austin, Texas: Pro.Ed, Inc.

Israel, D., & Scott, D. (1990). HR Magazine, October, 87-88.

Jackson, G. W. (1993). Don't Let the ADA Disable You. Risk Management, 39-46.

Jolliffe, F. R. (1986). Survey Design and Analysis. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Jones, T. L. (1993). The Americans with Disabilities Act: A Review of Best Practices. New York: AMA Membership Publications Division.

Kennedy, B. (1993). Constricted employment opportunities encountered by people with severe disabilities. Journal of Rehabilitation, 59, (4), 51-54.

Kiernan, W. E., & Brinkman, L. (1988). Disincentives and barriers to employment. In P. Wehman & M. S. Moon (Eds.), Vocational Rehabilitation and Supported Employment, (pp. 221-234). Baltimore: Paul H. Brooks Publishing Co.

Kilbury, R. F., Benschhoff, J. J., & Rubin, S. E. (1992). The interaction of legislation, public attitudes, and access to opportunities for people with disabilities. Journal of Rehabilitation, 58, (4), 6-9.

Koonce, R. (1996). The human face of change. Training and Development, January, 23.

Kotter, J. P. (1996). Leading change. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Laabs, J. J. (1996), Expert advice on how to move forward with change. Personnel Journal, January, 54-62.

Leonard, B. (1991). Ways to make diversity programs work. HR Magazine, April, 37-98.

Levy, J. M., Jones-Jessop, D., Rimmerman, A., Francis, F. & Levy, P.H. (1993). Determinants of attitudes of NY State employers towards the employment of persons with severe handicaps. Journal of Rehabilitation, 59, (1), 49-54.

Long, N. M. (1994). The search for a likely employer: A waste of time? Journal of Job Placement, 10, (1), 19-24.

Mannon, M. M. (1992). Partners for independence: An industry managed job placement model. American Rehabilitation, 18, (4), 2-6.

Martin, T. N., & Vieceli, L. (1988). The business of rehabilitation placement: What to understand about private employers before approaching them. Journal of Rehabilitation, 54, (4), 49-55.

McAdams, T., Moussavi, F., & Klassen, M. (1992). Employee appearance and the Americans with Disabilities Act: An emerging issue. Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 5, (4), 323-337.

McCarthy, H. (1988). Attitudes that affect employment opportunities for persons with disabilities. In H. Yuker (Ed.), Attitudes towards persons with disabilities. New York: Springer Publishing Co.

McNeil, J. M. (1993). Americans with Disabilities: 1991-1992. U.S. Bureau of the Census. Current Population Reports, P70-33. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Mello, J. A. (1995). Employee law and workers with disabilities: Implications for public sector managers and human resource practices. Public Personnel Management, 24, (1), 75-87.

Millington, M. J., Szymanski, E. M., & Johnston-Rodriguez, S. (1995). A contextual stage model for employment selection. Journal of Job Placement, 11, 31-36.

Mithaug, D. E. (1979). Negative attitudes toward hiring the handicapped: Fact or fiction? Journal of Contemporary Business, 8, (4), 19-26.

Moore, T. J., & Crimando, W. (1995). Attitudes toward Title I of the ADA. Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin, 38, (3), 232-247.

Nagler, M. (1993). Perspectives on Disability (2nd ed.). Palo Alto, CA: Health Markets Research.

Nathanson, R. B., & Lambert, J. (1981). Integrating disabled employees into the workplace. Personnel Journal, 60, 2, 109-113.

Newman, J. F., & Dinwoodie, R. E. (1996). Impact of the Americans with Disabilities Act on private sector employers. Journal of Rehabilitation Administration, 20, (1), 3-13.

Newman, B. M., & Newman, P. R. (1991). Development Through Life (5th ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.

Norusis, M. J. (1993). SPSS for Windows Base System User's Guide Release 6.0. Chicago: SPSS, Inc.

Norusis, M. J. (1994). SPSS 6.1 Syntax Reference Guide. Chicago: SPSS, Inc.

Norusis, M. J. (1994). SPSS Advanced Statistics 6.1. Chicago: SPSS, Inc.

Overman, S. (1991). Managing the diverse workplace. HR Magazine, April, 32-26.

Parrette, H. P., & Hourcade, J. J. (1995). Disability etiquette and school counselors: A common sense approach toward compliance with the ADA. The School Counselor, 42, 224-232.

Parry, J. W. (1991). Employment under the ADA: A national perspective. Mental and Physical Disability Law Reporter, 15, (5), 525-536.

Parry, J. W. (1991). State and local government services under the ADA: Nondiscrimination on the basis of disability. Mental and Physical Disability Law Reporter, 15, (6), 615-621.

Parry, J. (1989). 1989 and persons with disabilities: A year of change without real progress overall. Mental and Physical Disability Law Review, 13, (6), 498-501.

Pati, G. C., & Bailey, E. K. (1995). Empowering people with disabilities: Strategies and human resource issues in implementing the Americans with Disabilities Act. Organizational Dynamics, 52-69.

People with Disabilities lag behind. ARC Today, 2. (1994, Fall).

Perry, P. M. (1994). ADA missteps (and how to avoid them). Training, 10, 84-91.

Peters, J. E. (1989). How to bridge the hiring gap. Personnel Administrator, 76-85.

Pimental, R. K., Bell, C. G., & Lotito, M. J. (1993). The Job Placement-ADA Connection. Chatsworth, CA: Milt

Wright & Associates.

Pimental, R., Bissonnette, D., & Lotito, M. J. (1992). What Managers and Supervisors Need to Know About the ADA. Northridge, CA: Milt Wright & Associates.

Ravid, R. (1992). Disclosure of mental illness to employers: Legal resources and ramifications. The Journal of Psychiatry and Law, 20, (1), 85-102.

Roessler, R. T. (1987). Work, disability, and the future: Promoting employment for persons with disabilities. Journal of Counseling and Development, 66, 188-190.

Rusch, F. R., Mithaug, D. E., & Flexer, R. (1986). Obstacles to competitive employment and traditional program options for overcoming them. In F. R. Rusch (Ed.), Competitive employment issues and strategies, (pp. 7-21). Baltimore: Paul H. Brooks Publishing Co.

Satcher, J. (1992). Responding to employer concerns about ADA and job applicants with disabilities. Journal of Applied Rehabilitation Counseling, 23, (3), 37-40.

Satcher, J. F., & Hendren, G. (1991). Acceptance of the ADA of 1990 by persons preparing to enter the business field. Journal of Applied Rehabilitation Counseling, 22, (2), 15-18.

Scherich, D. L. (1996). Job accommodations in the workplace for persons who are deaf or hard of hearing: Current practices and recommendations. Journal of Rehabilitation, 62, (2), 27-35.

Schneid, T. D. (1992). The Americans with Disabilities Guide: A Practical Guide for Managers. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

Schneider, M. J., & Ferritor, D. E. (1982). The meaning of work. In B. Bolton (Ed.), Vocational Adjustment of Disabled People, (pp. 21-37). Baltimore: University Park Press.

Schumacher, S., & McMillan, J. H. (1993). Research in education: A conceptual introduction, 3rd ed. New York: Harper Collins College Publishers.

Shafer, M. S., Parent, W. S., & Everson, J. M. (1988). Responsive marketing by supported employment programs. In P. Wehman & M. S. Moon (Eds.), Vocational Rehabilitation and Supported Employment (pp. 235-252). Baltimore: Paul H. Brooks Publishing Co.

Smith, B. (1992). That was then, this is now. HR Focus, 69, 3-6.

Soloman, M. L. (1993). Is the ADA "Accessible" to people with disabilities. Journal of Rehabilitation Administration, 17, (3), 109-117.

Susser, P. A., & Jett, D. A. (1988). Accomodating handicapped workers: The extent of the employers' obligation. Employment Relations Today, Summer, 113-120.

Szymanski, E. M., Ryan, C., Merz, M. A., Trevino, B., Johnston-Rodriquez, S. (1996). Psychosocial and economic aspects of work: Implications for people with disabilities.

In R. M. Parker & E. M. Szymanski (Eds.), Work and disability: Issues and strategies in career development and job placement (pp. 9-38). Austin, Texas: Pro-Ed, Inc.

Turner, C. F. & Martin, E. (1993). Surveying Subjective Phenomena. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

U. S. Congress (1990). Public Law 101-336: The Americans with Disabilities Act. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

U. S. Department of Congress & U. S. Department of Labor (1993). Workplace of the future. Washington, D.C.: Office of American Workplace & Office of Global Competitiveness.

Walters, S. E., & Baker, C. M. (1996). Title I of the Americans with Disabilities Act: Employer and recruiter attitudes toward individuals with disabilities. Journal of Rehabilitation Administration, 20, (1), 15-23.

Weaver, C. L. (1991). Disability and work: Incentives, rights, and opportunities. Washington, D.C.: The AEI Press.

Wehman, P. (1993). The ADA Mandate for Social Change. Baltimore: Paul H. Brooks Publishing Company.

West, J. (1991). The Americans with Disabilities Act: From Policy to Practice. New York: Milbank Memorial Fund.

White, S., & Bond, M. R. (1992). The role of the entrepreneur in job placement. American Rehabilitation, 17-20, 44.

Yelin, E. H. (1991). Disability and the displaced worker. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press.

Yelin, E. H., & Katz, P. P. (1994). Labor force trends of persons with and without disabilities. Monthly Labor Review, 117, (10), 36-42.

Zuckerman, D. (1993). Reasonable accomodation for persons with mental illness under the ADA. Mental and Physical Disability Law Reporter, 17, (3), 311-320.

Appendix A
Instruments

**THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT
TITLE I
EMPLOYMENT PROVISIONS
SURVEY OF EMPLOYER RESPONSES**

IN AN EFFORT TO FURTHER UNDERSTAND THE IMPACT OF TITLE I OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT ON HIRING PRACTICES OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES YOUR CANDID RESPONSE IS APPRECIATED WITH REGARDS TO YOUR COMPANY'S ADA POLICY AND IMPLEMENTATION. ALL INDIVIDUAL RESPONSES WILL BE KEPT CONFIDENTIAL. THIS SURVEY WILL TAKE APPROXIMATELY 15 MINUTES TO COMPLETE.

PART I

DEMOGRAPHICS: (Please X the best description)

A. TYPE OF COMPANY

- Bank/Finance/or Information Service Center _____
- School/College/or University _____
- Retail/Department Store/Grocery Chain _____
- Hospital/Health Care _____
- Manufacturing _____
- Service Industry/Janitorial/Food/Hotel _____
- Social Services _____
- Utilities _____
- Warehousing and Distribution _____
- Other Please indicate _____

IS YOUR COMPANY UNIONIZED? YES ___ NO ___

IS YOUR COMPANY ACCESSIBLE BY PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION? YES ___ NO ___

B. COMPANY SIZE:

- 25 To 49 Employees _____
- 50 To 74 Employees _____
- 75 To 99 Employees _____
- over 100 Employees _____

C. YEARS IN EXISTENCE:

- Under 05 _____
- 6 - 10 _____
- Over 10 _____

D. HOW MANY PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES WERE HIRED IN THE YEAR PRIOR TO ADA, JULY 26, 1991 TO JULY 25, 1992? IF NECESSARY, PLEASE APPROXIMATE.

- None hired _____
- 1-5 persons hired _____
- 5-10 persons hired _____
- over 10 hired _____
- data not available _____

E. OVERALL HIRING PRACTICES SINCE JULY 26, 1992

Active, Ongoing Hiring _____
Sporadic Hiring _____ Little, if any Hiring _____

WERE JOBS: Full-time _____ Part-time _____ Both _____
Benefits _____ Benefits _____

F. HIRING PRACTICES OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES SINCE JULY 1992

None hired _____
1-5 persons hired _____
5-10 persons hired _____
over 10 hired _____

WERE JOBS: Full-time _____ Part-time _____ Both _____
Benefits _____ Benefits _____

G. PERSON COMPLETING THE SURVEY

Owner/President _____
Human Resource Specialist _____
Manager _____
Other (Please Indicate) _____

H. YEARS EXPERIENCE with the company

1 Year _____
1-5 Years _____
6-10 Years _____
over 10 Years _____

I. EDUCATION OF PERSON COMPLETING THE SURVEY

High School _____
Bachelor's Degree _____
Master's or above _____
Other _____ Please Indicate _____

J. PREVIOUS CONTACT WITH PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

Family Member or Friend _____
Through Civic Organization _____
Through Work _____
Self _____
None _____
Other (Please Indicate) _____

K. PLEASE CIRCLE WHICH NUMBER BEST DESCRIBES YOUR CURRENT UNDERSTANDING OF TITLE I OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT

- 1. Very Knowledgeable
- 2. Somewhat Knowledgeable
- 3. Minimally Knowledgeable
- 4. No Knowledge

L. PLEASE INDICATE HOW YOU ACQUIRED YOUR KNOWLEDGE OF TITLE I OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT, CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY

1. College Course for Credit
2. Attended formal training by legal consultants
3. Attended formal training by rehabilitation consultants
4. Acquired and read the law
5. Acquired and read the interpretive guidelines by EEOC
6. Keep abreast of developing case law
7. Inservice training by company staff
8. Inservice training by legal consultants
9. Inservice training by rehabilitation staff
10. Other Please Indicate _____

M. PLEASE INDICATE BY CIRCLING THE ONE METHOD BEST DESCRIBES YOUR COMPANY'S APPROACH TO THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT

1. Continued business as usual, wait and see what happens
2. Looked at the benefits to both employees and company
3. Took a legal approach to ADA
4. Took a cost effective approach to being in compliance

PART II

POLICY DEVELOPMENT:

IN RESPONSE TO THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT, PLEASE INDICATE YOUR COMPANY'S RESPONSE TO THE FOLLOWING AREAS:

1. Is an ADA policy in place? yes _____ no _____
2. Is policy different from what was in place? yes _____ No _____
3. Describe the policy? General _____ Specific _____
4. Please circle all persons involved in the policy development:
 - A. owner/CEO
 - B. Human resource manager/department
 - C. other management staff
 - D. union
 - E. contractual agencies
 - F. employees
 - G. persons with disabilities
 - H. consultants legal
 - I. consultants rehabilitation
 - J. consultants other
5. Who is responsible for the ongoing implementation of the ADA policy? _____
6. Was an analysis of operations, practices, and policies completed in relationship to ADA? yes _____ no _____
Detailed _____ Partial _____

7. Do you have a written plan of action? yes _____ no _____
8. Please circle if your ADA policy covers:
 A. collective bargaining agreements
 B. employment agencies
 C. training and meeting sites
 D. other
9. Please circle all that the policy specifically addresses:
 A. accessible parking spaces
 B. entrance
 C. interior routes
 D. meeting routes
 E. accessible work place
 F. accessible human resource department
 G. accessible restrooms
 H. advertising for positions
 I. job descriptions state essential and marginal functions
 J. interviewing procedures
 K. pre-employment physicals
 L. reasonable accommodations
10. Please circle all that apply:
 A. Policy was posted
 B. Policy was distributed to all employees
11. Please circle all that apply in your recruitment of persons with disabilities:
 A. Newspaper advertisements state ADA employer
 B. Utilize state Office of Vocational Rehabilitation
 C. Utilize rehabilitation agencies
 D. Utilize Centers for Independent Living
 E. College Campus Office for Disability
 F. Other _____
12. Are certain jobs in your company more suitable for person's with disabilities? yes _____ no _____
 If yes, Please describe jobs: _____
13. Do you have an ongoing relationship with rehabilitation agencies? yes _____ no _____
14. Was Disability Awareness Training conducted: yes _____ no _____
 If yes circle all that apply:
 A. Managers
 B. Human Resource Employees
 C. Interviewers
 D. All staff
 E. Others please indicate _____
15. Is a self-identification program for persons with disabilities in place: yes _____ no _____

16. Does documentation take place on all ADA efforts:
always _____ sometimes _____ never _____
17. Does a written ADA evaluation plan or audit take place:
yes _____ no _____ How often is it utilized? _____
18. Are alternate formats available at the pre-employment phase:
yes _____ no _____ Sometimes _____
19. Is the job application free from disability or health
questions: yes _____ no _____
20. Is there a process for requests for reasonable
accommodations:
yes _____ no _____
21. Is there a process for reviewing hiring decisions regarding
applicants with disabilities: yes _____ no _____
22. Please describe the factors that facilitated your development
and implementation of your company's ADA policy:
23. Please describe the factors that inhibited your development
and implementation of your company's ADA policy:
24. Please identify any training needs with regards to Title I
of the Americans with Disabilities Act:
25. Please describe the typical person with a disability that
applies to your company for employment:

THANK YOU FOR TAKING THE TIME TO FILL THIS SURVEY OUT. THIS PROJECT IS BEING UNDERTAKEN TO BETTER UNDERSTAND EMPLOYER NEEDS IN RELATION TO HIRING PERSON'S WITH DISABILITIES AND AS THE FINAL REQUIREMENT FOR MY DOCTORAL STUDIES AT THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY IN COUNSELING/REHABILITATION LEADERSHIP.

AS ONE SMALL WAY OF SAYING THANK YOU, I WOULD BE VERY OPEN TO OFFERING YOU ASSISTANCE WITH YOUR EFFORTS ON TITLE I OF ADA AND/OR EMPLOYMENT QUESTIONS REGARDING PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES, NOW OR IN THE FUTURE.

**PLEASE RETURN THIS SURVEY TO: LORI BRUCH
P.O.BOX 121
MOUNTAINTOP, PA 18707**

IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS, PLEASE CALL ME AT 474-9202 or 941-4308

All information will be kept confidential with no identification of the company or person completing the survey.

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. I am interested in hearing about your experiences with the ADA to date, would you please give me an overview of your efforts.
2. From 1990 to 1992, ADA was heavily publicized. We saw a lot of media coverage, regular training sessions, and articles in trade journals. Presently, how visible is the ADA in your everyday work life and how does it effect your day to day operation?
- 3a. Your business has reported hiring persons with disabilities, can you describe how this has worked? What if any were the positive aspects? the negative aspects? How would you describe the interview process? Are all jobs in your company open to qualified persons with disabilities?
- 3b. Your business has not reported hiring persons with disabilities, can you share with me the reasons why your company has not hired? How would you describe the interview process? Are all jobs in your company open to qualified persons with disabilities?
4. What do you see as barriers to the employment of persons with disabilities?
5. What would facilitate more successful job opportunities for persons with disabilities?
6. Have you had any experiences with rehabilitation agencies? How might these agencies become good partners with your business?
7. Do you have any current training needs with regards to ADA?
8. Are there any comments you'd like to share regarding the ADA?
9. Are there any other thoughts you'd like to share regarding hiring persons with disabilities?

Appendix B

Letter of Procedures for Completing Survey Questionnaire

August 26, 1996

Mr.
Human Resource Manager
Manufacturing
Street Address
City, PA Zip

Dear Mr. :

I appreciate your consideration to participate in this research project and hope you'll be able to respond. This project is being undertaken to better understand employer needs and concerns in relation to hiring persons with disabilities and the Americans with Disabilities Act. The research generated from this project is the final requirement for my doctoral studies at The George Washington University in Rehabilitation Leadership. Currently, I'm employed with the University of Scranton and teach in both the Counseling and Human Resource Programs. Prior to this, I worked for United Rehabilitation Services in Wilkes-Barre. Our paths may have crossed through our volunteer efforts with the United Way, The Employer Advisory Council of the Job Centers, and other community events.

I realize your schedule is full and sincerely thank you for assisting me as each response is valuable. The information will be beneficial in designing future training programs.

As one small way of saying thank you, I would be open to offering you assistance with your ongoing efforts with Title I of the ADA and/or employment questions regarding persons with disabilities now or in the future.

All information will be kept confidential with no identification of the company or person completing the survey. I'd be pleased to share the results of this survey with you. If possible, please return this survey by September 12, 1996 in the enclosed self-addressed envelope. If you have any questions I can be reached at 474-9202 or 941-4308.

With Appreciation,

Lori A. Bruch

Appendix C
Description of Applicants with Disabilities

Please describe the typical person with a disability that applies to your company for employment:

-data operators-wheel chairs

-Most applying with a disability are really unknown

-Usually a learning disability

-We have not had any to our knowledge

-In need of a job

-We have done no hiring of production workers since 12/90. Our clerical hirings have been limited and we fill these openings with laid off production workers.

-Normally, it is someone with a slight mental disability.

-Varied

-had one apply in past 10+ years

-none have applied

-Have had no applicants

-Again, since I have only been here for a short time I really do not know the answer to this. However, we are a health care organization, and would definitely hire a sec/clerk person with a disability.

-No experience, very little turnover

-Almost everyone that applies could fall under the ADA since the list is so long. Many individuals have deviated septums which is very common. Other individuals have heart disease, diabetes, muscular problems, rheumatoid arthritis, etc. I have had one of each of the following apply: hearing impaired, visually impaired, mentally challenged.

-physically impaired

-n/a

-various: wheelchair bound, blind, partial paralysis, hearing

-usually back problems

-through rehabilitation agencies-people are referred to us

-Most disabled applicants apply for positions with low skill requirements. The typical person with a disability is mentally

challenged, unable to manage several tasks at once, does best with stable, repetitive jobs.

-An applicant with M.S. applies for MHT (nurses aide) position.
An applicant who is wheelchair bound applies for a clerical position.

-Referrals from vocational rehabilitation agencies.

-?

-may be hearing impaired, minor disability

-Mainly our experience has been with employees who have hearing impaired (completely deaf)

-So few to describe a pattern

-Emotional disabilities (including drug rehab. etc), loss of limb but with full mobility, hearing disabled.

-Our only experience has been with the hearing impaired.

-there is no typical person

-A diabetic, epileptic, profound deafness, mental retardation.
In most cases, they are walk-ins actively seeking employment.
Most of them attempt to minimize their disability. Few have had any credible rehabilitation consultants.

-Persons with prostheses, hearing impairments.

-We have had people with bi-polar disorder, cancer, cataracts.

-Ambulatory but has a disability that is covered under ADA

Appendix D

Types of Jobs Best Suited Based on Disability

Please describe the jobs that are best suited in your company for persons with disabilities:

There were 23 of 55 (42%) specific responses to this question.

- non-clinical
- depends on the disability
- clerical support staff
- dietary; telecommunications
- telephone operator; accounts
- clerical, administrative, management
- non-production, occupations in semi-professional categories
sedentary jobs
- depends on disability, maybe telephone receptionist, statement
processing
- non-maintenance
- clerical
- clerical
- clerical/managerial
- various jobs that allow employee to sit
- office, clerical
- highly dependent on type of disability and limitations
- office vs plant
- light clerical
- office workers
- secretary, clerk
- assemblers, packers, inspectors
- depends on disability, each case is worker on individually

Appendix E
Factors that Facilitated ADA Policy

Please describe the factors that facilitated your development and implementation of your company's ADA policy:

- Education videos and documentation and outside consultation agency
- Policy was in place prior to my promotion to Human Resource Department
- Passage of the act
- Corporate rolled out the policy to all subsidiaries.
- Qualifications under the act.
Fairness to the prospective employee/employer.
- n/a
- attended a seminar on ADA, law firm presenting seminar was very helpful
- implementation of ADA
- staff attorney developed and distributed
- n/a
- Plan was originally developed at retail level and extended to other facilities. Compliance with the law
- compliance
- our government contracts require a policy
- written in 1991
- We have ADA policy and procedures that are company policy which we consider in all 6 center sites
- state provided brochures and a ready source of information
- seminars, colleagues, publications, awareness
- compliance with the law by the time it became effective was our primary concern
- federal regulations
- passing of the law
- Took a pro-active approach. Always have hired people with disabilities and accommodated. ADA forced us to take a close look at the physical plant.

- Corporate H.R. and Legal Departments provided training.
Attended video conference when law became effective on a college campus-Bloomsburg, PA
- We have always had a policy re: nondiscrimination. We did not put in a policy dealing with only ADA. We evaluate applicants and make accommodations as we can.
- Unable to determine.
- The act itself
- became law
- law, employee understanding
- To be in full compliance with the regulations.
- Govt. info available
- Government contractor and compliance with the law, programs were in place prior to ADA, history of employing and retaining employees with disabilities.
- We find that hiring persons with disabilities to be good business. People with disabilities are usually very reliable and have less absenteeism, and tardiness, and are more attentive to their work. This is our experience and not just a statistic.
- We have no formal policy-We simply follow the regulations mandated by law. Our public documents state that we do not discriminate based on ADA issues.
- Passage of the laws relating to ADA.
- government regulations.

Appendix F

Factors that Inhibited your ADA Policy

Please describe the factors that inhibited your development and implementation of your company's ADA policy:

- Some cost
- 95 % of jobs require heavy lifting and good movement
- Building structures, regulations, people
- Not assigned to a specific department/person
- No exposure to handicapped applicants
- lack of time, change of personnel
- lack of understanding of ADA
- cost
- The factors that inhibit the company's development and implementation of an ADA policy are policy makers knowledge of Title I of the ADA and desire to gain knowledge
- At this facility, standing for entire shift (8hours) with only two breaks and a lunch period is a requirement. There is no position, except clerical, where a person can sit.
- Accessibility to machines, nature of the work, lifting/moving, type of work/machinist
- none
- none that I am aware of
- none
- Size of regulation, vagueness/grey areas of Act, lack of desire of the need to know act by supervisors and managers, ignorance on their part. Numerous practices already in place that required changes.
- ambiguities in the law, gray areas in guidelines that made us unsure at times of what was required.
- access routes
- employees mostly fearful of the unknown
- none
- Decided we did not need another policy. We've always accommodated

- Title I- very simple to implement, very little change in practices due to good employment practices already in place.
- Title II-facility accommodations-made difficult due to large amount of facilities and properties to accomplish within the time frame, but it was done.
- Very few applicants ever identify themselves.
- Cost considerations (total projected cost in facilities modifications were 250,000) By the end of FY 96 we will have made full investment. Union contract modifications could only be accomplished at the renewal of the contract. Confusion of exactly what, who, and how the law applies and conflicts with other laws.
- Lack of response from corporate office
- The most difficult factor is matching the disability with the proper job description. Attempts to adjust the job to the disability are difficult for some of our frontline supervisors. Unfortunately patience is not always a characteristic of front line management.
- We chose not to create a separate policy because the regulations are clear and frankly not that difficult to follow.
- We review each case individually and work with the staff person involved who is asked for ways to adjust the work site to handle the disability.
- Age of facility.

Appendix G
Training Needs

Please identify any training needs with regards to Title I of

ADA:

- will need to educate supervisors in the Fall (1996) with documentation and videos
- n/a
- Managers need to be made more aware of questions to ask with the proper approach. Job related concerns.
- n/a
- none at this time
- none
- what should be in an ADA policy
- need to train personnel assistant and supervisors
- currently, no training needs because of the above (jobs too demanding)
- ??
- none
- since I have only been at my company for four months, I am looking into this area.
- none
- writing of job descriptions for supervisors and managers
- none
- not right now, maybe in the future
- none
- Varies. We employ both professional types and hourly shop floor craftsmen. Disabilities range from hearing impaired to amputees.
- Training that has been and continues to be provided in this facility are sufficient.
- Always can use refresher materials
- Major program which addresses the awareness and needs of the disabled employee from the practical and realistic applications not socialistic.

-Our primary goal is to educate our supervisors and employees with Title I, II, III.