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Chapter I

Review of Literature

The Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA) was enacted to prevent discrimination on the basis of physical or mental disability. In the workplace, the ADA prohibits discrimination against disabled individuals throughout a range of employment processes including selection, training, compensation, advancement, and discharge. The ADA also requires employers to provide reasonable accommodation for qualified individuals upon request. In order to protect the privacy of disabled individuals in the workplace, the ADA strictly limits employers in the disclosure of information regarding employee disabilities and accommodations (Cascio & Aguinis, 2011). For this reason, coworkers of employees who are receiving accommodations are often without knowledge of the reasons for which the employee is receiving differential treatment. Although maintaining confidentiality holds clear benefits, interpersonal communication theory suggests potential drawbacks of withholding important information.

Specifically, uncertainty reduction theory (Berger & Calabrese, 1975) suggests that interpersonal uncertainty leads to negative consequences such as reduced liking within an interaction. Furthermore, this theory suggests that individuals attempt to predict and explain the behavior of others. Logically, limited information may lead to inaccurate behavioral attributions. Within the context of workplace accommodation, this theory suggests that coworkers who possess limited knowledge of the reasons for a disability accommodation may hold negative perceptions of the accommodated employee and make inaccurate attributions for an employee’s
behavior. The purpose of this study was to utilize uncertainty reduction theory to explore the relationship between information disclosure and coworker acceptance of employees receiving accommodations for disabilities.

**Coworker Reactions to Disability in the Workplace**

Researchers have attempted to understand multiple perceptions of disability accommodation in the workplace. Several of the major research areas include general reactions to accommodation (Cleveland, Barnes-Farrell, & Ratz, 1997), coworker fairness judgments (Colella, 2001; Colella, Paetzold, & Bellivaeau, 2004; Hunzeker & Kottke, 2008), and coworker acceptance of accommodated employees (McLaughlin, Bell, & Stringer, 2004; Novak & Rogan, 2010). Colella (2001) emphasized the importance of understanding coworker reactions to workplace accommodation. She suggested that coworkers are often integral to the success of an accommodation. In addition, fear of coworker backlash may cause employees not to request a needed accommodation. In a qualitative study by Ellsworth (2008), 15% of participants who needed an accommodation for a chronic health illness indicated avoiding an accommodation request or waiting as long as possible to make a request for reasons such as fear of being viewed as incompetent.

Understanding coworker reactions to disability is important for creating a work environment that allows employees with disabilities to reap the benefits of positive social experiences. Jackson, Stone, and Alvare (1993, as cited in McLaughlin et al., 2004) suggested that coworker acceptance is crucial for establishing work satisfaction and commitment through the process of socialization. Research has also demonstrated that perceptions of acceptance and inclusion are highly valued by employees with disabilities. Leufstadius, Eklund, and Erlandsson (2009) conducted interviews with 12 Swedish employees with persistent mental illness in order
warranted. Within the context of workplace accommodation, the needs rule is especially relevant. Unwarranted accommodations are those that coworkers believe have been granted for an illegitimate disability or those that are unrelated to the disability. Illegitimate disabilities are those that are invisible, socially undesirable, and/or perceived as being self-induced. For example, mental disabilities such as depression are less visible and typically viewed as less socially desirable than physical disabilities such as arthritis (Cleveland et al., 1997); therefore, according to the needs rule, an accommodation for depression would be viewed as less warranted and less fair than an accommodation for arthritis. Research has demonstrated that individuals are more likely to employ the needs rule when making fairness judgments about accommodations for physical (as opposed to mental) disabilities (Hunzeker & Kottke, 2008). Additionally, individuals using the needs rule are more likely than those using the equity rule to judge an accommodation as fair.

Information Disclosure and Disability

The ADA strictly limits employers in sharing information regarding an employee’s disability and accommodation. Employers are prohibited from disclosing this information to anyone with the exception of the following: supervisors or managers who need information about the accommodation and necessary restrictions of work duties, first aid and safety personnel who may need information about the disability for medical treatment, and government officials who need information for investigations of ADA compliance. Consequently, coworkers of disabled employees are often unaware of the reasons for which accommodations are granted. In spite of the benefits of maintaining employee confidentiality, research suggests limited knowledge is linked to negative consequences for both coworkers and accommodated employees. For example, Colella et al. (2004) created a framework for understanding coworker procedural
justice judgments involving disability accommodation. Informational justice is an integral component of establishing procedural justice. Within the accommodation context, informational justice would be established by providing coworkers with the reasons for which an accommodation was granted. However, ADA confidentiality regulations greatly limit the extent to which informational justice can be established.

In spite of the limitations enforced by confidentiality regulations, several researchers have studied the benefits of increasing coworkers’ knowledge of accommodation. Seijts and Yip (2008) investigated the relationship between coworker support for a breastfeeding accommodation and knowledge accumulation. Specifically, the researchers found that employees who were aware of the benefits of breastfeeding were more likely to support a breastfeeding accommodation than employees who were unaware of the benefits. The researchers also found a positive relationship between having children and showing support for the accommodation. This relationship was mediated by accumulated knowledge of the benefits of breastfeeding. Results from this study demonstrate the benefits of providing employees with information regarding workplace accommodations.

Other research has focused on the benefits of self-disclosure for persons with disabilities. Jastrowski, Berlin, Sato, and Davies (2007) studied the effect of preventative self-disclosure on socially rejecting attitudes toward individuals displaying symptoms of attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD). Preventative disclosure involves selectively informing and educating others about a disability. Participants included 306 undergraduate students who read vignettes describing a friend, “Jamie,” who commonly displayed symptoms of ADHD. In one condition, Jamie disclosed her disability and indicated that her behaviors were common symptoms of ADHD. In the control condition, Jamie did not disclose information about her
disability. Results indicated that participants in the disclosure condition were significantly less likely to possess socially rejecting attitudes toward Jamie.

Gates (2000) also investigated self-disclosure and education in relation to individuals with disabilities. Specifically, the researchers implemented psychoeducational training, which is a process for training individuals who are living or working in an environment involving functional disability. Participants included 12 employees with mental disabilities returning from short-term disability leave and their workgroup members. Each participant and his or her workgroup received psychoeducational training in the following areas: the general purpose of the ADA, an overview of the disability experienced by the employee, and an explanation for the accommodation. The results of the training were positive. In general, participants who took part in the training indicated that they felt more competent in expressing their accommodation needs and obtaining the assistance required to maintain their level of performance. In addition, workgroup members generally expressed satisfaction with developing a better understanding of the employee’s obstacles and indicated intentions to utilize strategies obtained through the training. The training also addressed workgroup members’ misperceptions and misunderstandings regarding the accommodated employee.

Research on disability and accommodation has also focused on the reasons for and outcomes of disclosure. Oftentimes, employees with disabilities decide not to disclose information regarding their disability for reasons such as fear of being perceived as incompetent (Price, Gerber, & Mulligan, 2003), concerns for job security, and fear of negative coworker and supervisor reaction (Madaus, 2008). Research suggests that employees who do not plan disclosure may encounter unfavorable circumstances that lead to obligatory disclosure. For instance, Ellison, Russinova, MacDonald-Wilson, and Lyass (2003) found that among a sample
of 495 employees with psychiatric disabilities, 50.5% felt obligated to disclose their condition due to circumstances such as experiencing symptoms in front of others or being hospitalized while at work. The researchers found that, in comparison to the 38% of employees who disclosed under comfortable circumstances, those that disclosed under unfavorable circumstances were more likely to experience regrets about their disclosure.

Additionally, researchers have studied the influence of ADA familiarity on disclosure and willingness to request a needed accommodation. In a survey of 500 working graduates with learning disabilities, Madaus (2008) found a significant correlation between the decision not to disclose a disability and knowledge of the ADA. Individuals who were familiar with the ADA were more likely to disclose their condition than individuals who were not aware of the ADA. Similarly, Price et al. (2003) interviewed 25 working individuals with learning disabilities and found that none had made an accommodation request. In addition, 19 of the 25 participants were unaware of the existence of the ADA. Findings such as these suggest that employees with disabilities, in addition to non-disabled coworkers, could benefit from increased knowledge of the ADA.

Even though research has demonstrated the benefits of self-disclosure for individuals with disabilities, it is clear that employees with disabilities are still hesitant to self-disclose for a variety of reasons. One of the major reasons for not disclosing is the fear of being perceived negatively by coworkers (Madaus, 2008). There is a clear need for research to address this concern. Many researchers who have studied disclosure in relation to disability and accommodation have taken a qualitative approach. In addition, research has not addressed the interaction between disability type (mental vs. physical) and disclosure. Employees with disabilities would greatly benefit from knowledge of the impact of disclosure in relation to their
specific disability. Although Jastrowski et al. (2007) empirically manipulated disclosure, the results of the study were limited to individuals with ADHD. In addition, research has not addressed the level of disclosure that is sufficient to alter coworker attitudes regarding disability and accommodation. For example, will coworkers respond differently to general ADA training in comparison to full disclosure of a specific disability and reasons for accommodation? In order to address such questions, it is necessary to investigate disability and disclosure from a different perspective.

Uncertainty Reduction Theory

One of the major goals of workplace accommodation research is to promote positive attitudes and perspectives toward workers with physical and mental disabilities. However, little research has been conducted on practical methods for encouraging positivity toward this group of employees. The majority of the research has focused on understanding attitudes as opposed to changing attitudes. As suggested by Colella et al. (2004), informational justice is one way to achieve perceptions of fairness throughout the accommodation process. However, the ADA limits employers on the information that can be shared with others in the organization. One theory that holds potential for understanding and promoting positive attitudes toward employees with disabilities is the uncertainty reduction theory (URT), which was introduced by interpersonal communication researchers Berger and Calabrese in 1975.

URT is based on the idea that individuals strive to proactively predict and retroactively explain the behavior of both themselves and others within interactions (Berger & Calabrese, 1975). The theory suggests several factors that affect uncertainty and several consequences of uncertainty. URT posits that uncertainty level is affected by the following three factors: verbal communication, nonverbal affiliative expressiveness, and perceived similarity. Level of
would be more likely to accept employees with disabilities when they are provided with information about the ADA, the disability, and the purpose of the accommodation.
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Rationale and Hypotheses

Researchers have investigated individual reactions to disability in a variety of contexts. In general, researchers have focused on reactions such as acceptance (McLaughlin et al., 2004; Novak & Rogan, 2010) and fairness judgments (Colella, 2001; Colella et al., 2004). Past research has not provided a clear operationalization of acceptance. McLaughlin et al. (2004) defined acceptance within the context of accommodation as consisting of three components: attitudes (favorable or unfavorable feelings toward an individual), perceived fairness of the accommodation, and discriminatory employment judgments (decisions that reflect expectations or perceived competencies of the accommodated employee). For the purposes of this study, acceptance will be measured using the acceptance scale developed by McLaughlin et al. (2004).

Research has demonstrated a distinction between reactions to physical and mental disabilities. In general, mental disabilities are perceived less favorably than physical disabilities (An et al., 2001; Cleveland et al., 1997; Stone & Colella, 1996). Coworkers are more likely to react negatively to disabilities that are perceived to be invisible, self-caused, and socially undesirable (Stone & Colella, 1996). In comparison to many physical disabilities, mental disabilities such as depression or bipolar disorder are less socially desirable (Cleveland et al., 1997). In addition, mental disabilities are less visible than many physical disabilities. Therefore, mental disabilities may not be perceived as legitimate disabilities. Research also suggests that individuals are less likely to accept disabilities that are associated with a higher degree of stigma.
(McLaughlin et al., 2004). Highly stigmatized disabilities are those associated with higher degrees of unpredictable behavior, negative social and performance impact, controllability of onset, unattractiveness, and permanence of the condition. In general, mental disabilities are perceived as possessing more of these stigmatizing qualities. For this reason, the following hypotheses were proposed:

**Hypothesis 1a:** In the absence of disclosure, participants will indicate more negative attitudes toward an employee who is receiving an accommodation for a mental as opposed to a physical disability, using the *attitude* subscale of McLaughlin et al.'s (2004) acceptance scale.

**Hypothesis 1b:** In the absence of disclosure, participants will indicate less perceived fairness of an accommodation granted for a mental disability as opposed to an accommodation granted for a physical disability, using the *perceived fairness of accommodation* subscale of McLaughlin et al.'s (2004) acceptance scale.

**Hypothesis 1c:** In the absence of disclosure, participants will indicate more discriminatory employment judgments toward an employee who is receiving an accommodation for a mental disability as opposed to a physical disability, using the *discriminatory employment judgments* subscale of McLaughlin et al.'s (2004) acceptance scale.

Research has indicated that individuals who are provided with more information regarding a disability or accommodation are more likely to react positively in comparison with those provided with less information. For instance, Seijts and Yip (2008) found that employees demonstrated more support for a workplace breastfeeding accommodation as knowledge of the benefits of breastfeeding increased. Additionally, Jastrowski et al. (2007) found that self-disclosure of a disability led to significantly fewer socially-rejecting attitudes toward an individual displaying symptoms of ADHD in comparison to no disclosure. Researchers, however,
have yet to investigate the degree of disclosure necessary for increasing positive reactions within the context of accommodation. In the present study, disclosure will be operationalized in the following manner: no disclosure (the participant receives no information regarding the ADA or the disability/accommodation), medium disclosure (the participant receives information regarding the general purpose of the ADA), and high disclosure (the participant receives information regarding the general purpose of the ADA, the nature of the disability, and the purpose of the accommodation).

According to URT (Berger & Calabrese, 1975), liking increases with reduction of interpersonal uncertainty. Within the context of accommodation, this theory suggests that employees with more information regarding a disability accommodation will perceive an accommodated coworker more favorably than employees with less information. Individuals who feel that they are able to accurately explain the behavior of others tend to perceive higher liking for that person. Based on URT and previous research on disclosure and accommodation, the following hypotheses were proposed:

**Hypothesis 2a:** Participants will report more favorable reactions toward an employee receiving an accommodation for a physical disability (per the *attitude* subscale of McLaughlin et al.'s (2004) acceptance scale) as level of disclosure increases, such that high disclosure will result in the most favorable attitudes and no disclosure will result in the least favorable attitudes.

**Hypothesis 2b:** Participants will report more perceived fairness of an accommodation that has been granted for a physical disability (per the *perceived fairness of accommodation* subscale of McLaughlin et al.'s (2004) acceptance scale) as level of disclosure increases, such that high disclosure will result in the most perceived fairness and no disclosure will result in the least perceived fairness.
Hypothesis 2c: Participants will report less discriminatory employment judgments toward an employee who is receiving an accommodation for a physical disability (per the discriminatory employment judgments subscale of McLaughlin et al.’s (2004) acceptance scale) as level of disclosure increases, such that high disclosure will result in the least discriminatory employment judgments and no disclosure will result in the most discriminatory employment judgments.

Hypothesis 3a: Participants will report more favorable reactions toward an employee receiving an accommodation for a mental disability (per the attitude subscale of McLaughlin et al.’s (2004) acceptance scale) as level of disclosure increases, such that high disclosure will result in the most favorable attitudes and no disclosure will result in the least favorable attitudes.

Hypothesis 3b: Participants will report more perceived fairness of an accommodation that has been granted for a mental disability (per the perceived fairness of accommodation subscale of McLaughlin et al.’s (2004) acceptance scale) as level of disclosure increases, such that high disclosure will result in the most perceived fairness and no disclosure will result in the least perceived fairness.

Hypothesis 3c: Participants will report less discriminatory employment judgments toward an employee who is receiving an accommodation for a mental disability (per the discriminatory employment judgments subscale of McLaughlin et al.’s (2004) acceptance scale) as level of disclosure increases, such that high disclosure will result in the least discriminatory employment judgments and no disclosure will result in the most discriminatory employment judgments.

Past researchers have not compared the effects of disclosure for physical and mental disabilities. Therefore, the potential interaction between disability type and disclosure level has
not been investigated. However, based on research demonstrating that mental disabilities are associated with more negative reactions than physical disabilities (An et al., 2011; Cleveland et al., 1997; Stone & Colella, 1996), the following hypotheses were proposed:

**Hypothesis 4a:** An interaction between disability type and disclosure level exists such that as disclosure level increases, positive attitudes will increase to a greater extent within the physical disability condition in comparison to the mental disability condition, using the *attitude* subscale of McLaughlin et al.'s (2004) acceptance scale.

**Hypothesis 4b:** An interaction between disability type and disclosure level exists such that as disclosure level increases, perceived accommodation fairness will increase to a greater extent within the physical disability condition in comparison to the mental disability condition, using the *perceived fairness of accommodation* subscale of McLaughlin et al.'s (2004) acceptance scale.

**Hypothesis 4c:** An interaction between disability type and disclosure level exists such that as disclosure level increases, discriminatory employment judgments will decrease to a greater extent within the physical disability condition in comparison to the mental disability condition, using the *discriminatory employment judgments* subscale of McLaughlin et al.'s (2004) acceptance scale.
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Method

Participants

Participants for this study were recruited using Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk), through which MTurk workers browse a selection of human intelligence tasks (HITs) posted by requesters. In order to obtain a .80 power and detect a medium effect using an analysis of variance (ANOVA) design, 210 participants were needed (Cohen, 1992). The study was developed and posted through surveygizmo.com such that each vignette would be viewed by approximately 16-17% of participants for a minimum of 35 participants in each condition. The six vignettes were randomly distributed through the branching feature on surveygizmo.com. Because the branch total must equal 100%, it was not possible to assign each condition an equal number of participants. Experimental conditions received between 35 and 41 participants. The specific breakdown is as follows: mental disability, no disclosure, $n = 41$; mental disability, medium disclosure, $n = 41$; mental disability, high disclosure, $n = 35$; physical disability, no disclosure, $n = 35$; physical disability, medium disclosure, $n = 37$; physical disability, high disclosure, $n = 40$. All participants were required to confirm that they were 18 years of age or older. Participant diversity was assessed using a brief demographic survey (see Appendix A).

A total of 377 response sets were collected. Data was removed from 80 participants who responded incorrectly to either one or both of the quality-check items. In addition, another 68 responses were removed due to incomplete survey data, which left a total of 229 usable and
complete sets of data. Of the 229 participants, 59.8% were male. The average participant age was 29.6 years ($SD = 8.10$; range = 18 – 67 years). The majority of the participants identified as Asian (71.2%). White was the second most common self-identified race (18.3%). The remaining participants selected some other race category, and two participants (0.9%) chose not to self-identify race. The majority of participants (90.8%) identified that neither they nor anyone they know had ever received an accommodation through the ADA. A little over half of the participants (52.4%) indicated that they were “somewhat familiar” with the ADA prior to participating in this study, with 38.4% indicating that they were “not at all familiar” and 9.2% indicating that they were “very familiar.” Most of the participants (62.9%) conveyed that they were full-time employees. Of the remaining participants, 26.2% were part-time employees, and 10.9% were not employed.

**Measures**

**Coworker acceptance.** Acceptance was assessed using McLaughlin et al.’s (2004) acceptance scale (see Appendix B). Permission was granted by the original author to use the scale (see Appendix C). This scale assesses coworker acceptance within the context of accommodation using three subscales. The attitude subscale consists of four items assessed through a 7-point, semantic differential scale. Participants indicated their attitudes toward having a hypothetical employee, “John,” as a coworker. Items in the attitude scale were anchored with the words *extremely, quite, and slightly* on each end with *neither* at the midpoint. Each item contained bipolar adjectives at each point on the scale such as *good/bad* and *easy/difficult*. Item responses, ranging from one to seven were summed for each item to compute a total score for the scale.
The perceived fairness of accommodation subscale consists of six items assessed through a 7-point, semantic differential scale. Participants indicated their perceptions of the fairness of John’s accommodation. Items in this scale were also anchored with the words extremely, quite, and slightly on each end with neither as the midpoint. Similarly, each item was anchored with bipolar adjectives such as reasonable/unreasonable and deserved/undeserved. Item responses, ranging from one to seven were summed for each item to compute a total score for the scale.

The final subscale, discriminatory employment judgments, assesses the likelihood that participants will make judgments relating to various aspects of John’s employment such as promotion and layoffs. This scale consists of three items assessed through a 7-point Likert-type scale. Each item was anchored with the words strongly agree and strongly disagree at either end. Again, this scale was scored by summing responses from each item to compute a total score. The discriminatory employment judgments subscale was reverse scored such that a higher score indicated more coworker acceptance.

To assess internal consistency, each subscale was assessed separately using Cronbach’s alpha. The following reliability statistics were obtained for each subscale: $\alpha = .86$ for the attitude scale, $\alpha = .91$ for the perceived fairness of accommodation scale, and $\alpha = .75$ for the discriminatory employment judgments scale.

**Procedure**

Methods from this procedure were adapted from those of Jastrowski et al. (2007). This study involved completion of an electronic survey developed through surveymonkey.com and posted to MTurk in the form of a HIT. Completion of the study was estimated to take approximately 15 mins, although participants received a total of 60 mins to complete the HIT. MTurk workers viewed a description of the HIT including an approximate duration of the study
and compensation for completion. Participants who completed the study and passed the quality check items received compensation in the form of $0.25, which was intended to encourage participation without coercing individuals to participate in the study. Individuals who decided to participate in the study received a link directing them to the electronic survey on surveygizmo.com. To begin, participants reviewed an informed consent form (see Appendix D). Participants who clicked “next” were then randomly assigned to one of six vignettes (see Appendix E), the acceptance measure, and a brief demographic questionnaire.

Each participant read a vignette that described a hypothetical coworker, “John,” who is suspected to have received an accommodation. In all conditions, the vignette conveyed that John is allowed to leave work early when he chooses to do so. In addition, all conditions communicated that John completes all of his work tasks in spite of his schedule. This study involved six experimental conditions. A 2x3 design was employed with two levels of disability type (mental vs. physical) and three levels of information disclosure (no disclosure vs. medium disclosure vs. high disclosure).

In the mental disability condition, John was described as exhibiting common symptoms of bipolar disorder. In the no disclosure condition, participants received information regarding John’s behavior at work (symptoms and suspected accommodation). The participants were told that they were under the impression that John’s suspected accommodation had been granted in response to a mental disability. In the medium disclosure condition, participants received the information received in the no disclosure condition in addition to a memo from the organization describing the general purpose of the ADA. Participants in the medium disclosure condition were informed that the purpose of the ADA is to create equality in the workplace as opposed to providing advantages to accommodated employees. In the high disclosure condition, participants
received the information received in the medium disclosure condition in addition to specific information regarding John’s disability and the purpose of the accommodation. In this condition, John communicated that his behaviors are common symptoms of bipolar disorder. John also communicated the purpose of his accommodation—flexible hours allow him to accommodate treatment and side effects of medication.

In the physical disability condition, John was described as exhibiting symptoms common to multiple sclerosis. In the no disclosure condition, participants received information regarding John’s symptoms and accommodation. The participants were then informed that they are under the impression that John’s suspected accommodation has been granted in response to a physical disability. As in the mental disability condition, participants in the medium disclosure condition received the same information as participants in the low disclosure condition in addition to information regarding the general purpose of the ADA in the form of a memo from the organization. In the high disclosure condition, participants received the information received in the medium disclosure condition. Additionally, in the high disclosure condition, John disclosed that his symptoms are a result of multiple sclerosis and that his accommodation allows him to accommodate treatment and side effects of medication.

After reading the vignette, participants completed the acceptance scale (McLaughlin et al., 2004), followed by the demographic questionnaire. Two quality check items were inserted into the acceptance scale for the purposes of monitoring quality of the data. The quality check items were “Please select ‘Slightly Good’ for this item” and “Please select ‘Moderately Agree’ for this item.” Participants who responded incorrectly to one or both of the quality check items were not compensated for participation in the study, and data from these participants was removed prior to running analyses. All participants received a debriefing form (see Appendix G), which conveyed
the purpose of the study. Specifically, the debriefing form conveyed that the purpose of the study was to assess the effects of information disclosure on coworker acceptance of employees with physical and mental disabilities.
Chapter IV

Results

Descriptive statistics were first derived for each of the six experimental conditions (see Table 1). To test the hypotheses, variable totals were computed by summing participant responses for each of the subscales. Scale correlations were run to determine the appropriateness of a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) design. All scales were correlated at the .01 level (see Table 2). Hypothesis 1 proposed that participants in the no disclosure condition would indicate lower acceptance of a coworker with a mental as opposed to a physical disability. This hypothesis was tested using a MANOVA on data from the no disclosure conditions \( n = 76 \). The MANOVA showed a significant multivariate effect for disability type, \( F(3, 72) = 4.29, p = .01 \); Wilk’s \( \Lambda = 0.85 \), partial \( \eta^2 = 0.15 \). Tests of between-subjects effects were conducted to assess the nature of the observed differences. Hypotheses 1a-c were supported. The main effect for disability type was significant for each scale in the hypothesized direction. For the attitude subscale, the mean for the physical disability condition \( (M = 19.03, SD = 4.14) \) was higher than the mean for the mental disability condition \( (M = 16.76, SD = 5.05) \), \( F(1, 74) = 4.50, p = .04; MS = 97.51 \), partial \( \eta^2 = 0.06 \). Similarly, for the perceived fairness of accommodation subscale, the mean for the physical disability condition \( (M = 31.31, SD = 7.73) \) was higher than the mean for the mental disability condition \( (M = 26.90, SD = 5.90) \), \( F(1, 74) = 7.94, p = .01; MS = 367.52 \), partial \( \eta^2 = 0.10 \). In addition, for the discriminatory employment judgments subscale, the mean
Table 1

*Descriptive Statistics for Experimental Conditions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Disability Type</th>
<th>Disclosure Level</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude Scale</td>
<td>Mental</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>16.76</td>
<td>5.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>17.41</td>
<td>4.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16.63</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19.03</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18.62</td>
<td>4.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18.28</td>
<td>4.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness of Accommodation Scale</td>
<td>Mental</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>26.90</td>
<td>5.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>28.63</td>
<td>6.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28.06</td>
<td>6.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31.31</td>
<td>7.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30.84</td>
<td>7.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31.82</td>
<td>5.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discriminatory Employment Judgment Scale</td>
<td>Mental</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12.22</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>13.22</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13.03</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14.74</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13.86</td>
<td>4.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14.38</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

*Pearson Correlations of Coworker Acceptance Scales*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Attitude Scale</th>
<th>Fairness of Accommodation Scale</th>
<th>Discriminatory Employment Judgments Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude Scale</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness of Accommodation Scale</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discriminatory Employment Judgments Scale</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* **p < .01.*
for the physical disability condition (M = 14.74, SD = 3.02) was higher than the mean for the mental disability condition (M = 12.22, SD = 5.90), \( F(1, 74) = 9.72, p = .01, MS = 120.22 \), partial \( \eta^2 = 0.12 \). The *discriminatory employment judgments* subscale was reverse scored such that higher scores indicated more coworker acceptance toward the accommodated employee.

Hypothesis 2 proposed that higher levels of disclosure would result in more favorable reactions toward an employee receiving an accommodation for a physical disability. This hypothesis was tested using a MANOVA on data from the physical disability conditions (\( n = 112 \)). Hypotheses 2a-c were not supported. Results indicated that, for conditions involving physical disability, higher levels of disclosure were not associated with increased coworker acceptance, \( F(6, 214) = 0.39, p = .89 \); Wilk’s \( \Lambda = 0.98 \), partial \( \eta^2 = 0.01 \). Hypothesis 3 proposed that higher levels of disclosure would result in more favorable reactions toward an employee receiving an accommodation for a mental disability. This hypothesis was tested using a MANOVA on data from the mental disability conditions (\( n = 117 \)). Hypotheses 3a-c were also not supported. Results indicated that, for conditions involving mental disability, higher levels of disclosure were not associated with increased coworker acceptance, \( F(6, 224) = 0.45, p = .85 \); Wilk’s \( \Lambda = 0.98 \), partial \( \eta^2 = 0.01 \). Finally, hypothesis 4 proposed an interaction between disability type and disclosure level such that higher levels of disclosure would result in more favorable reactions toward an employee receiving an accommodation for a physical as opposed to a mental disability. This hypothesis was tested using a MANOVA on data from all conditions (\( n = 229 \)). Hypotheses 4a-c were not supported. Results showed that the proposed interaction was not significant, \( F(6, 442) = 0.47, p = .83 \); Wilk’s \( \Lambda = 0.99 \), partial \( \eta^2 = 0.01 \).
Exploratory Analyses

In several instances, dependent variables yielded significant relationships with the demographic variables. There was a significant positive relationship between participant age and the attitude subscale such that older participants showed a more favorable attitude than younger participants toward an individual receiving a workplace accommodation: $r(229) = .168, p = .011$. Additionally, results of a MANOVA showed that ADA familiarity significantly affected coworker acceptance, $F(6, 448) = 2.22, p = .04$; Wilk’s $\Lambda = 0.94$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.03$. Tests of between-subject effects showed an effect for the discriminatory employment judgments subscale of the acceptance measure, $F(2, 226) = 3.80, p = .02, MS = 52.56$, partial $\eta^2 = .03$. A follow up Tukey’s HSD test showed that familiarity with the ADA was significantly related to discriminatory employment judgments such that participants who were very familiar with the ADA were significantly more likely ($p < .05$) to make discriminatory employment judgments regarding individuals receiving an accommodation ($M = 11.43, SD = 3.20$) than participants who were both somewhat familiar with the ADA ($M = 13.83, SD = 3.63$) and not at all familiar with the ADA ($M = 13.68, SD = 4.00$).

In addition, a MANOVA was conducted to view the potential relationship between employment status and acceptance of workplace accommodation. Results showed that employment status significantly affected acceptance, $F(6, 448) = 2.24, p = .04$; Wilk’s $\Lambda = 0.94$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.03$. Tests of between-subject effects showed that for the discriminatory employment judgments subscale of the acceptance measure, there was a significant relationship between employment status and tendency to make discriminatory employment judgments, $F(2, 226) = 5.41, p = .01, MS = 73.97$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.05$. Results of a follow-up Tukey’s HSD test showed that employment status was significantly related to discriminatory employment judgments such
that participants who were not employed were significantly more likely ($p < .05$) to make discriminatory employment judgments ($M = 11.43$, $SD = 3.20$) than participants who were part-time employees ($M = 13.37$, $SD = 3.82$). Participants who were not employed were also significantly more likely ($p < .01$) to make discriminatory employment judgments ($M = 11.43$, $SD = 3.20$) than participants who were full-time employees ($M = 13.23$, $SD = 3.57$). There were no significant differences between full-time and part-time employees.
Chapter V

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effects of disability type and information disclosure on coworker acceptance of an employee receiving a disability accommodation. Hypothesis 1 is based on previous research showing that mental disability tends to elicit more negative reactions in comparison to physical disability (An et al., 2001; Cleveland et al., 1997; Stone & Colella, 1996). The results of this study lend additional support to this finding. Specifically, participants in this study demonstrated significantly less acceptance toward an accommodated employee when the accommodation was made for a mental as opposed to a physical disability, thus supporting Hypothesis 1. Previous research has also demonstrated positive outcomes associated with information disclosure in circumstances involving disability and accommodation (Gates, 2000; Jastrowski et al., 2007; Seijts & Yip, 2008). In contrast to previous findings, results from this study did not support information disclosure as a means of eliciting more positive reactions toward disability. Participants who received more information did not indicate higher levels of acceptance for an accommodated employee when the accommodation was made for either a physical or mental disability in comparison to participants who received less information, thus failing to support Hypotheses 2 and 3. In addition, results from this study did not support the presence of an interaction between disability type and disclosure level in relation to coworker acceptance of an accommodated employee. Therefore, Hypothesis 4 was also not supported.
In addition to findings surrounding the proposed hypotheses, several exploratory analyses yielded interesting and (in some cases perplexing) results. In this study, older participants reported attitudes that were significantly more favorable than those reported by younger participants in relation to the accommodated employee. This finding was not particularly surprising. Older individuals often have more experience than younger individuals in dealing with interpersonal situations that may elicit negative reactions. In a 2008 study, Charles and Carstensen investigated the effect of age on emotional responses to unpleasant interpersonal situations. In their study, older individuals reported less anger than younger individuals when asked to imagine overhearing negative comments made about them by another person (participants listened to comments on a recording). Older participants also made fewer appraisals and expressed less negativity than younger participants about the person speaking on the recording. Because older individuals tend to have more exposure to situations perceived as upsetting or unfair, older individuals have also had more opportunities than younger individuals to develop a more positive response to these situations.

Two additional exploratory findings are worthy of discussion. In this study, participants who were full-time employees were significantly less likely to make discriminatory employment judgments about the accommodated employee than participants who were either part-time employees or unemployed. A similar logic may be applied to this finding in that full-time employees have likely had more exposure in the workplace to situations that seem ambiguous or unfair. More exposure brings increased opportunities to develop a more positive response to social situations that might elicit negative reactions. However, a third exploratory finding seems to contradict the notion that increased exposure leads to more positive reactions. Specifically, participants who reported being “extremely familiar” with the ADA prior to participating in the
study were significantly more likely to make discriminatory employment judgments toward the accommodated employee compared to participants who were both “somewhat familiar” and “not at all familiar” with the ADA prior to the study. This finding was unexpected and somewhat puzzling. Gates (2000) found that ADA training (in addition to other variables) led to positive outcomes for employees with disabilities and their workgroup members. However, this study was qualitative in nature and did not use experimental manipulations or a control group. It is worth noting that the present study attempted to experimentally manipulate ADA knowledge through the information disclosure variable. Conditions involving medium and high disclosure included information on the general purpose of the ADA, whereas conditions involving no disclosure did not include this information.

Although the disclosure manipulation did not yield significant results, self-reported ADA familiarity did display a significant relationship with acceptance. It is important to note, however, that the number of participants who indicated that they were “very familiar” with the ADA was small ($n = 21$) and the effect size for the relationship between ADA familiarity and tendency to make discriminatory employment judgments was also small ($\eta^2 = .03$). It is possible that these particular individuals have had negative experiences involving workplace accommodation. One explanation is that participants who were “very familiar” with the ADA prior to this study may have been in managerial positions where ADA knowledge was required to make decisions about granting employee accommodations. Employees who make decisions regarding accommodation requests may see the process as burdensome. Another explanation is that employees who have experienced negative reactions to a coworker accommodation have educated themselves on the ADA in order to gain evidence to support their feelings (e.g., evidence that a disability is illegitimate or that an accommodation is unwarranted).
Contributions

This study is the first to examine the potential interaction between disability type and disclosure within the context of workplace accommodation. Whereas past research has separately investigated the effects of disability type (An et al., 2011; Cleveland et al., 1997; McLaughlin et al., 2004) and disclosure (Gates, 2000; Jastrowski et al., 2007; Seijts & Yip, 2008) on reactions to disability and/or accommodation, this study represents the first attempt to investigate both variables simultaneously. In addition, this study is the first to employ the uncertainty reduction theory (Berger & Calabrese, 1975) in the context of employee accommodation.

One of the most important contributions made by this study is the additional evidence to support the finding that mental disabilities are often perceived more negatively than physical disabilities. In this study, results indicated that coworker acceptance of an accommodated employee was significantly lower when the accommodation was made for a mental as opposed to a physical disability. Specifically, in conditions involving mental disability, participants were less likely to hold a positive attitude toward the employee and perceive the accommodation as fair. Additionally, conditions involving mental disability were more likely than those involving physical disability to elicit discriminatory employment judgments in regard to the accommodated employee.

The difference in reactions toward physical and mental disabilities holds many implications within the employment context. For example, negative reactions to mental disability may be associated with unfavorable personnel decisions (e.g., hiring, promotion, selection for training opportunities) for employees accommodated for a mental disability. Most importantly, employees with mental disabilities may have a far less positive and fulfilling experience at work in comparison to employees with physical disabilities. Previous research has shown that feeling
accepted at work can contribute to offsetting feelings of inadequacy in employees with mental illness (Leufstadius et al., 2009). If coworkers of employees with mental disabilities do not convey acceptance, these employees may have negative work experiences. On a related note, the effect of disability type on coworker acceptance emphasizes the importance of reaching a greater understanding of mental disability in the workplace. One of the major differences between mental and physical disability is that mental disability is often less visible than physical disability. In this study, the employee in the physical disability condition was described as sometimes using a wheelchair or a cane to move around the office. In contrast, the employee in the mental disability condition was described as displaying shifts in mood and energy level. Without physical manifestations of a disability (e.g., a wheelchair or cane), it is more difficult to understand why an employee is behaving or being treated differently. According to a theoretical framework by Colella (2001), individuals are more likely to view invisible disabilities (in comparison to visible disabilities) as illegitimate and are more likely to perceive accommodations made for invisible disabilities as unwarranted. Based on previous research on reactions to disabilities (Cleveland et al., 1997; Colella, 2001; McLaughlin et al., 2004) and results of the present study, it may be beneficial for employers to incorporate disability-related information into diversity training. Educating employees on the obstacles of living and working with mental disability may help to lessen the perception that it is illegitimate.

Another contribution made by this study involves the questionable role of ADA familiarity in shaping perceptions of employee accommodation. Previous research has suggested that ADA familiarity is beneficial from the perspective of employee workgroup members (Gates, 2000) and that limited ADA familiarity may be detrimental to employees with disabilities (Maudus, 2008; Price et al., 2003). However, results from this study suggested a negative
relationship between self-reported ADA familiarity and acceptance of an accommodated employee. This finding is particularly relevant for the federal contractor community, which is now required under Section 503 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 to collect hiring data on individuals who are disabled under the ADA. With the implementation of the new regulations, federal contractors must expand their knowledge of the ADA and related disability litigation in order to remain in compliance. The negative relationship observed between ADA familiarity and acceptance in the present study may call into question the implications for reactions to disability in the federal contractor community. However, due to the limitations described next, caution should be employed in drawing major conclusions based on this particular result.

Limitations and Future Research

The most obvious limitation in this study involves the participant demographics. Specifically, participation was not restricted to a US-only sample. Over 70% of the participants self-identified a race of “Asian.” Although country of origin was not included in the demographic questionnaire, recent research on MTurk demographics shows that a significant portion of MTurk workers are from India. In a 2010 study, Ipeirotis found that 34% of 1,000 workers surveyed were from India. This demographic survey was conducted in response to a new Amazon policy introduced to allow payment in the form of Indian rupees. Prior to this policy, MTurk workers without a US bank account could only receive payment in the form of an Amazon gift card. Past research on MTurk demographics in combination with the large percentage of self-reported Asian participants in the present study suggest that a significant portion of the sample likely came from outside of the US. Because the ADA (an American piece of legislation) was a major focus of this study, the likelihood that many participants were not from the US is problematic. Specifically, participants outside of the US may have had difficulty
relating to the vignette, which asked them to imagine being “an employee at a mid-sized, Midwestern company.” Additionally, having a large number of non-US participants might explain why only a small number of the sample (n = 21) reported being “very familiar” with the ADA prior to participating in the study. Future research involving the ADA should ensure that the sample is restricted to participants from within the US, as non-US participants may have limited understanding of the ADA and may be unable to connect with the topic. To gain insight into this possibility, a MANOVA was run on non-Asian participants from all conditions (n = 66) examining the relationship between disclosure level and coworker acceptance. The MANOVA approached significance, F(6, 122) = 1.97, p = .08; Wilk’s Λ = 0.83, partial η² = 0.97. This follow-up analysis suggests that the results of this study may have differed drastically if a US-only sample had been utilized.

Another major limitation of this study involves the manipulation of the variables. Experimental conditions were crafted through the use of vignettes, which limits the generalizability of the findings. The use of actual employees in future research would be preferable to the use of vignettes; however, due to the sensitivity of disability and accommodation-related information (especially in the workplace), it would be difficult to study coworker reactions to actual accommodated employees. It would also be difficult to manipulate disclosure level with real employees because asking accommodated employees to disclose this type of sensitive information would likely result in skepticism and resistance. Regardless, the experimental manipulation of the variables through vignettes could have been improved. The present study did not utilize a manipulation check. Therefore, there is no way of determining whether the participants read the vignettes in their entirety. The length of the vignette increased with information disclosure such that participants assigned to the medium or high disclosure
conditions were required to read more. Because a manipulation check was not employed, there is no way of determining whether or not the participants read the full vignette. For this reason, future research should utilize a manipulation check to ensure participants have fully read and understood the information presented.

A related concern involves the use of MTurk workers as participants. MTurk workers complete tasks in an unproctored setting. Because of the nature of this design, there is no way to determine the amount of effort that participants are actually devoting to the task. It is possible that MTurk workers could be engaging in other activities while participating in the study. It is also possible that MTurk workers could be participating in the study while in a loud or otherwise distracting environment. In the present study, approximately one third of the responses were removed from the data due to incorrect responses on simple quality checks. Responding correctly to the quality checks items only required reading the items, not the vignettes. It is therefore possible that participants who passed the quality check items did not fully or carefully read the vignettes. For this reason, future research should obtain participant data through a proctored setting.

One area in particular is extremely promising for expansion of disability and disclosure research: within the federal contractor community. Even though the ADA and the Americans with Disabilities Act Amendments Act (ADAAA) of 2008 strictly limit employers from inquiring about disability status at the pre-offer stage of employment, a new regulation now requires federal contractors and sub-contractors to solicit this information from applicants both pre-offer and post-offer and from current employees. These new requirements under Section 503 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 went into effect as of March 24, 2014. The Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs (OFCCP) will soon begin enforcing this regulation, which uses a
proscribed form to solicit voluntary disclosure of disability status from applicants and employees of federal contractors. Previous research has found that oftentimes individuals with disabilities choose not to disclose in an employment setting for reasons such as fear of negative coworker perceptions (Maudus, 2008) and fear of being perceived as incompetent (Price, Gerber, & Mulligan, 2003). The present study, along with previous research findings, shows that the decision to disclose involves particular complications for individuals with mental disabilities, who are oftentimes perceived more negatively than individuals with physical disabilities (An et al., 2001; Cleveland et al., 1997; Stone & Colella, 1996). In order to understand the implications of the new regulations for federal contractors, future research should investigate both applicant reactions to the proscribed form and decision to disclose. Future research should investigate the differences in reactions and response rate between applicants with physical and mental disabilities. In addition, future research should examine differences between reactions and response rate at different phases of the employment process: pre-offer, post-offer, and current employee.

Another area that should be pursued further by future research is the role of ADA knowledge and familiarity in influencing reactions to disability and accommodation. Results of this study showed that those who were more familiar with the ADA were less accepting of an accommodated employee, which defies previous research demonstrating the positive outcomes of ADA knowledge for coworkers of employees with disabilities (Gates, 2000). Previous research also demonstrates negatives outcomes for employees with disabilities who are not familiar with the ADA (Madaus, 2008; Price et al., 2003). In light of the present finding that ADA familiarity was associated with negative outcomes within the sample, future research should further investigate the relationship between ADA familiarity and reactions to disability.
and accommodation. Whereas this finding emerged through an exploratory analysis in the present study, future research should conduct a more focused and deliberate study on the relationship between these variables.

**Conclusion**

Understanding disability in the context of employment is critical to establishing a workplace where both individuals with disabilities and organizations at large can achieve their potential. The results of this study indicate that more research is needed to understand how to reduce negative reactions to disability accommodation in an employment setting. Specifically, the results of this study confirm past research showing that individuals display more negative reactions toward accommodations made for mental as opposed to physical disabilities. As more and more studies suggest that mental disability is especially stigmatized in the workplace, I-O psychologists need to continue the search for methods of reducing these negative perceptions.

We cannot achieve a more productive and less discriminatory workplace unless we step back and look at the whole picture. Investigating disability from an I-O perspective (as opposed to the traditional clinical perspective) is a crucial step toward achieving a holistic approach to understanding disability.
likely to be accepted by coworkers. Similarly, Stone and Colella (1996) suggest that negative reactions to disabilities are more likely when the disability is invisible (such as depression), socially undesirable, or perceived to be self-caused. Additionally, An, Roessler, and McMaho (2011) conducted an analysis of employee allegations filed through the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) from 1992 to 2005 and found employees with psychiatric disabilities to be significantly more likely than those with physical disabilities to file allegations on the basis of intimidation and harassment. Previous research indicating a more negative reaction toward mental (compared to physical) disability is the basis for Hypotheses 1a-c.

**Hypothesis 1a:** In the absence of disclosure, participants will indicate more negative attitudes toward an employee who is receiving an accommodation for a mental as opposed to a physical disability.

**Hypothesis 1b:** In the absence of disclosure, participants will indicate less perceived fairness of an accommodation granted for a mental disability as opposed to an accommodation granted for a physical disability.

**Hypothesis 1c:** In the absence of disclosure, participants will indicate more discriminatory employment judgments toward an employee who is receiving an accommodation for a mental disability as opposed to a physical disability.

Research has indicated that individuals who are provided with more information regarding a disability or accommodation are more likely to react positively in comparison with those provided with less information. For instance, Jastrowski, Berlin, Sato, and Davies (2007) found that self-disclosure of a disability led to significantly fewer socially-rejecting attitudes toward an individual displaying symptoms of ADHD in comparison to no disclosure. Researchers, however, have yet to investigate the degree of disclosure necessary for increasing
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Summary

The Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA) was enacted to prevent discrimination on the basis of physical or mental disability. In order to protect the privacy of disabled individuals in the workplace, the ADA strictly limits employers in the disclosure of information regarding employee disabilities and accommodations (Cascio & Aguinis, 2011). For this reason, coworkers of employees who are receiving accommodations are often without knowledge of the reasons for which the employee is receiving differential treatment.

Interpersonal communication theory suggests potential drawbacks of withholding important information such as reasons for workplace accommodation. Specifically, uncertainty reduction theory (Berger & Calabrese, 1975) suggests that interpersonal uncertainty leads to negative consequences such as reduced liking within an interaction. The purpose of this study is to utilize uncertainty reduction theory to explore the relationship between information disclosure and coworker acceptance of employees receiving accommodations for disabilities.

Research has suggested differences in reactions to accommodation based on disability type. Specifically, research has demonstrated a distinction between perceptions of mental and physical disabilities. McLaughlin, Bell and Stringer (2004) studied the influence of disability type and stigma (perceived negative consequences of characteristics of disability) on coworker acceptance. Results indicated that stigma largely mediated the relationship between disability type and acceptance such that accommodations made for highly stigmatized disabilities were less
likely to be accepted by coworkers. Similarly, Stone and Colella (1996) suggest that negative reactions to disabilities are more likely when the disability is invisible (such as depression), socially undesirable, or perceived to be self-caused. Additionally, An, Roessler, and McMaho (2011) conducted an analysis of employee allegations filed through the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) from 1992 to 2005 and found employees with psychiatric disabilities to be significantly more likely than those with physical disabilities to file allegations on the basis of intimidation and harassment. Previous research indicating a more negative reaction toward mental (compared to physical) disability is the basis for Hypotheses 1a-c.

**Hypothesis 1a:** In the absence of disclosure, participants will indicate more negative attitudes toward an employee who is receiving an accommodation for a mental as opposed to a physical disability.

**Hypothesis 1b:** In the absence of disclosure, participants will indicate less perceived fairness of an accommodation granted for a mental disability as opposed to an accommodation granted for a physical disability.

**Hypothesis 1c:** In the absence of disclosure, participants will indicate more discriminatory employment judgments toward an employee who is receiving an accommodation for a mental disability as opposed to a physical disability.

Research has indicated that individuals who are provided with more information regarding a disability or accommodation are more likely to react positively in comparison with those provided with less information. For instance, Jastrowski, Berlin, Sato, and Davies (2007) found that self-disclosure of a disability led to significantly fewer socially-rejecting attitudes toward an individual displaying symptoms of ADHD in comparison to no disclosure. Researchers, however, have yet to investigate the degree of disclosure necessary for increasing
positive reactions within the context of accommodation. Colella, Paetzold, and Bellivaeau (2004) suggested that establishing information justice within the accommodation context by providing coworkers with the reasons for an accommodation may lead to perceptions of procedural justice. However, the ADA greatly limits the extent to which informational justice can be established. The uncertainty reduction theory (Berger & Calabrese, 1975) suggests that information disclosure will enable coworkers to more accurately explain the behavior and treatment of an accommodated employee, therefore perceiving higher liking for that employee. Based on previous research on information disclosure within accommodation and the uncertainty reduction theory, Hypotheses 2a-c and 3a-c are proposed.

**Hypothesis 2a:** Participants will report more favorable reactions toward an employee receiving an accommodation for a physical disability as level of disclosure increases, such that high disclosure will result in the most favorable attitudes and no disclosure will result in the least favorable attitudes.

**Hypothesis 2b:** Participants will report more perceived fairness of an accommodation that has been granted for a physical disability as level of disclosure increases, such that high disclosure will result in the most perceived fairness and no disclosure will result in the least perceived fairness.

**Hypothesis 2c:** Participants will report less discriminatory employment judgments toward an employee who is receiving an accommodation for a physical disability as level of disclosure increases, such that high disclosure will result in the least discriminatory employment judgments and no disclosure will result in the most discriminatory employment judgments.

**Hypothesis 3a:** Participants will report more favorable reactions toward an employee receiving an accommodation for a mental disability as level of disclosure increases, such that
high disclosure will result in the most favorable attitudes and no disclosure will result in the least favorable attitudes.

**Hypothesis 3b:** Participants will report more perceived fairness of an accommodation that has been granted for a mental disability as level of disclosure increases, such that high disclosure will result in the most perceived fairness and no disclosure will result in the least perceived fairness.

**Hypothesis 3c:** Participants will report less discriminatory employment judgments toward an employee who is receiving an accommodation for a mental disability as level of disclosure increases, such that high disclosure will result in the least discriminatory employment judgments and no disclosure will result in the most discriminatory employment judgments.

Past researcher has explored the potential interaction between disability type and disclosure level. However, based on research demonstrating that mental disabilities are associated with more negative reactions than physical disabilities (An et al., 2011; Cleveland, Barnes-Farrell, & Ratz, 1997; Stone & Colella, 1996), the following hypotheses are proposed:

**Hypothesis 4a:** An interaction between disability type and disclosure level exists such that as disclosure level increases, positive attitudes will increase to a greater extent within the physical disability condition in comparison to the mental disability condition.

**Hypothesis 4b:** An interaction between disability type and disclosure level exists such that as disclosure level increases, perceived accommodation fairness will increase to a greater extent within the physical disability condition in comparison to the mental disability condition.

**Hypothesis 4c:** An interaction between disability type and disclosure level exists such that as disclosure level increases, discriminatory employment judgments will decrease to a
greater extent within the physical disability condition in comparison to the mental disability condition.

Method

Participants

Participants included 229 MTurk workers who were compensated $0.25 for completion of an online survey and correct responses to two quality-check items. Of the 229 participants, 59.8% were male. The average participant age was 29.6 years. The majority of the participants identified as Asian (71.2%).

Measures

Coworker acceptance. Acceptance was assessed using McLaughlin et al.'s (2004) acceptance scale. This scale assesses coworker acceptance within the context of accommodation using three subscales. The attitude subscale consists of four items assessed through a 7-point, semantic differential scale. The perceived fairness of accommodation subscale consists of six items assessed through a 7-point, semantic differential scale. The final subscale, discriminatory employment judgments, includes three items and assesses the likelihood that participants will make judgments relating to various aspects of a coworker’s employment such as promotion and layoffs. The following reliability statistics were obtained for each subscale: $\alpha = .86$ for the attitude scale, $\alpha = .91$ for the perceived fairness of accommodation scale, and $\alpha = .75$ for the discriminatory employment judgments scale.

Procedure

Methods from this procedure were adapted from those of Jastrowski et al. (2007). MTurk workers who decided to participate in the study received a link directing them to the electronic survey on surveygizmo.com. To begin, participants reviewed an informed consent form.
Participants who clicked "next" were then directed to one of six vignettes (randomly assigned). Each participant read a vignette that described a hypothetical coworker, "John," who was suspected to have received an accommodation. In all conditions, the vignette conveyed that John was allowed to leave work early when he chose to do so. In addition, all conditions communicated that John completed all of his work tasks in spite of his schedule.

The manipulation included two levels of disability (mental and physical) and three levels of disclosure (no disclosure, medium disclosure, and high disclosure). In conditions involving mental disability, John was described as exhibiting common symptoms of bipolar disorder. In conditions involving physical disability, John was described as exhibiting symptoms common to multiple sclerosis. In the no disclosure conditions, participants received information regarding John's behavior at work (symptoms and suspected accommodation). The participants were told that they were under the impression that John's suspected accommodation had been granted in response to a disability. In the medium disclosure condition, participants received the information received in the no disclosure condition in addition to a memo from the organization describing the general purpose of the ADA. In the high disclosure condition, participants received the information received in the medium disclosure condition in addition to specific information regarding John's disability and the purpose of the accommodation. After reading the vignette, participants completed the acceptance scale, followed by the demographic questionnaire. All participants received a debriefing form stating the purpose of the study: to assess the effects of information disclosure on coworker acceptance of employees with physical and mental disabilities.
Hypotheses 4a-c were not supported. Results showed that the proposed interaction was not significant, $F(6, 442) = 0.47, p = .83$; Wilk's $\Lambda = 0.99$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.01$.

**Exploratory Analyses**

There was a significant positive relationship between participant age and the attitude subscale such that older participants showed a more favorable attitude than younger participants toward an individual receiving a workplace accommodation: $r(229) = .168, p = .011$.

Additionally, results of a MANOVA showed that ADA familiarity significantly affected coworker acceptance, $F(6, 448) = 2.22, p = .04$; Wilk's $\Lambda = 0.94$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.03$. Specifically, the *discriminatory employment judgments* subscale of the acceptance measure showed a significant relationship with ADA familiarity, $F(2, 226) = 3.80, p = .02, MS = 52.56$, partial $\eta^2 = .03$. Familiarity with the ADA was significantly related to discriminatory employment judgments such that participants who were very familiar with the ADA were significantly more likely ($p < .05$) to make discriminatory employment judgments regarding individuals receiving an accommodation ($M = 11.43, SD = 3.20$) than participants who were both somewhat familiar with the ADA ($M = 13.83, SD = 3.63$) and not at all familiar with the ADA ($M = 13.68, SD = 4.00$). In addition, results of a MANOVA showed that employment status significantly affected acceptance, $F(6, 448) = 2.24, p = .04$; Wilk's $\Lambda = 0.94$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.03$. The *discriminatory employment judgments* subscale of the acceptance measure displayed a significant relationship with employment status, $F(2, 226) = 5.41, p = .01, MS = 73.97$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.05$. Participants who were not employed were significantly more likely ($p < .05$) to make discriminatory employment judgments ($M = 11.43, SD = 3.20$) than participants who were part-time employees ($M = 13.37, SD = 3.82$). Participants who were not employed were also significantly more likely
(p < .01) to make discriminatory employment judgments ($M = 11.43, SD = 3.20$) than participants who were full-time employees ($M = 13.23, SD = 3.57$).

**Discussion**

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effects of disability type and information disclosure on coworker acceptance of an employee receiving a disability accommodation. Hypothesis 1 is based on previous research showing that mental disability tends to elicit more negative reactions in comparison to physical disability (An et al., 2001; Cleveland et al., 1997; Stone & Colella, 1996). The results of this study lend additional support to this finding. Specifically, participants in this study demonstrated significantly less acceptance toward an accommodated employee when the accommodation was made for a mental as opposed to a physical disability, thus supporting Hypothesis 1. In contrast to previous findings, results from this study did not support information disclosure as a means of eliciting more positive reactions toward disability. Participants who received more information did not indicate higher levels of acceptance for an accommodated employee when the accommodation was made for either a physical or mental disability in comparison to those who received less information, thus failing to support Hypotheses 2 and 3. In addition, results from this study did not support the presence of an interaction between disability type and disclosure level in relation to coworker acceptance of an accommodated employee. Therefore, Hypothesis 4 was also not supported.

Perhaps the most interesting and unexpected finding was that participants who reported being “extremely familiar” with the ADA prior to participating in the study were significantly more likely to make discriminatory employment judgments toward the accommodated employee compared to participants who were both “somewhat familiar” and “not at all familiar” with the ADA prior to the study. It is possible that these individuals have had negative experiences
involving workplace accommodation. It is important to note, however, that the effect size for this relationship was small ($\eta^2 = .03$).

Contributions

This study is the first to examine the potential interaction between disability type and disclosure within the context of workplace accommodation. Whereas past research has separately investigated the effects of disability type (An et al., 2011; Cleveland et al., 1997; McLaughlin et al., 2004) and disclosure (Gates, 2000; Jastrowski et al., 2007; Seijts & Yip, 2008) on reactions to disability and/or accommodation, this study represents the first attempt to investigate both variables simultaneously. In addition, this study is the first to employ the uncertainty reduction theory (Berger & Calabrese, 1975) in the context of employee accommodation.

One of the most important contributions made by this study is the additional evidence to support the finding that mental disabilities are often perceived more negatively than physical disabilities. The difference in reactions toward physical and mental disabilities holds many implications within the employment context. For example, negative reactions to mental disability may be associated with unfavorable personnel decisions (e.g., hiring, promotion, selection for training opportunities) for employees accommodated for a mental disability. Most importantly, employees with mental disabilities may have a far less positive and fulfilling experience at work in comparison to employees with physical disabilities. Based on previous research on reactions to disability (Cleveland et al., 1997; Colella, 2001; McLaughlin et al., 2004) and results of the present study, it may be beneficial for employers to incorporate disability-related information into diversity training. Educating employees on the obstacles of living and working with mental disability may help to lessen the perception that it is illegitimate.
Another contribution involves the questionable role of ADA familiarity in shaping perceptions of employee accommodation. Results from this study suggested a negative relationship between self-reported ADA familiarity and acceptance of an accommodated employee. This finding is particularly relevant for the federal contractor community, which is now required under Section 503 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 to collect hiring data on individuals who are disabled under the ADA. With the implementation of the new regulations, federal contractors must expand their knowledge of the ADA and related disability litigation in order to remain in compliance. The negative relationship observed between ADA familiarity and acceptance in the present study calls into question the implications for reactions to disability in the federal contractor community.

Limitations and Future Research

The most obvious limitation in this study involves the participant demographics. Specifically, participation was not restricted to a US-only sample. Over 70% of the participants self-identified a race of “Asian.” Although country of origin was not included in the demographic questionnaire, recent research on the MTurk demographics shows that a significant portion of MTurk workers are from India. In a 2010 study, Ipeirotis found that 34% of 1,000 workers surveyed were from India. Because the ADA (an American piece of legislation) was a major focus of this study, the likelihood that many participants were not from the US is problematic. Specifically, participants outside of the US may have had difficulty relating to the vignette, which asked them to imagine being “an employee at a mid-sized, Midwestern company.” Future research involving the ADA should ensure that the sample is restricted to participants from within the US, as non-US participants may have limited understanding of the ADA and may be unable to connect with the topic.
Another major limitations of this study involves the variable manipulation. The experimental manipulation of the variables through vignettes could have been improved. The present study did not utilize a manipulation check. Therefore, there is no way of determining whether the participants read the vignettes in their entirety. The length of the vignette increased with information disclosure such that participants assigned to the medium or high disclosure conditions were required to read more. Future research should utilize a manipulation check to ensure participants have fully read and understood the information presented. In addition, approximately one-third of the responses were removed from the data due to incorrect responses on simple quality checks. Responding correctly to the quality checks items only required reading the items, not the vignettes. It is therefore possible that participants who passed the quality check items did not fully or carefully read the vignettes. For this reason, future research should consider a proctored setting.

One area in particular is extremely promising for expansion of disability and disclosure research: within the federal contractor community. Even though the ADA and ADAAA strictly limit employers from inquiring about disability status at the pre-offer stage of employment, Section 503 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 now requires federal contractors and subcontractors to solicit this information from applicants both pre-offer and post-offer and from current employees. The present study, along with previous research findings, shows that the decision to disclose involves particular complications for individuals with mental disabilities, who are oftentimes perceived more negatively than individuals with physical disabilities (An et al., 2001; Cleveland et al., 1997; Stone & Colella, 1996). Future research should investigate the differences in reactions and response rate between applicants with physical and mental disabilities. In addition, future research should examine differences between reactions and
response rate at different phases of the employment process: pre-offer, post-offer, and current employee.

**Conclusion**

Understanding disability in the context of employment is critical to establishing a workplace where both individuals with disabilities and organizations at large can achieve their potential. The results of this study indicate that more research is needed to understand how to reduce negative reactions to disability accommodation in an employment setting. As more and more studies suggest that mental disability is especially stigmatized in the workplace, I-O psychologists need to continue the search for methods of reducing these negative perceptions.

We cannot achieve a more productive and less discriminatory workplace unless we step back and look at the whole picture. Investigating disability from an I-O perspective (as opposed to the traditional clinical perspective) is a crucial step toward achieving a holistic approach to understanding disability.


Appendix A

Demographic Questionnaire

**Directions:** Please indicate your response to the following demographic items on the lines provided.

**Gender**

Male _____ Female _____ Prefer not to answer _____

**Race (You may select more than one)**

American Indian or Alaskan native _____ Asian _____

Black/African American _____ Hispanic/Latino _____

Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander _____ White _____

Prefer not to answer _____

**Age _____**

Have you or anyone you know ever received an accommodation through the American’s with Disabilities Act (ADA)?

Yes _____ No _____

Please indicate your familiarity with the content of the ADA prior to participating in this study.

Very familiar _____ Somewhat familiar _____ Not at all familiar _____

Which of the following describes your current work situation?

Full time employee _____ Part time employee _____ Not employed _____

Please indicate the number of full time jobs you have held including any current positions.
Appendix B

The Acceptance Scale is not included in the final document in order to protect the copyright of its creator. Permission to utilize the scale is documented in the following appendix.
Hi Rachel,
I hadn't forgotten your request! I've attached the components (attitude toward a coworker who has a disability, perceived fairness of accommodation, and discriminatory employment judgments scales) that comprised the measure of acceptance that we had used.

I've also attached a copy of our paper that was published in Group and Organization Management (which you probably already have) because it provides more detail about the measures.
Good luck with your research; it sounds interesting! Best wishes,
--Mary

On Jun 04, 2012, at 05:37 PM, "Gabbard, Rachel M" <gabbardr@xavier.edu> wrote:
Appendix D

Informed Consent

You are being given the opportunity to participate in a study conducted by Rachel Gabbard through Xavier University.

The purpose of this research is to investigate coworker dynamics in the workplace. Completion of this study involves reading a scenario and completing a brief questionnaire. Please note that some of the items are included for the purpose of checking the quality of the responses. If you do not pass the quality check items, please be aware that your responses will not be included in the study and you will not receive compensation for completing the HIT. For most items, there are no correct or incorrect answers. Therefore, please respond openly and honestly.

This study should last approximately 15 minutes. There are no known or anticipated consequences of participating in this study. Participation is voluntary and you are free to withdraw at any point without penalty. If you withdraw from the study before completion, however, you will not receive compensation for the HIT. If you complete the HIT and pass the quality check items, you will be compensated $0.25. You must be at least 18 years of age or older to participate in this study. Please note that you will have 60 minutes to complete the HIT.

If you have any questions at any time, you may contact Rachel Gabbard (gabbardr@xavier.edu) or the faculty advisor, Dr. Morrie Mullins (mullins@xavier.edu). Questions about your rights as a research participant should be directed to the Xavier University Institutional Review Board at 513-745-2870. Your data will be anonymous in that no names will ever be associated with your responses. No one aside from the principal investigator or faculty advisor will have access to your responses. You will not be asked to provide identifying information (e.g. your full name) at any point in the study. You will be asked to provide your MTurk worker ID at the end of the study to receive compensation. Your worker ID will be removed prior to data analysis.

By clicking the next button, you agree to the following: I understand that my participation in this study is voluntary. I have received information regarding the risks and benefits of this study and have been given the opportunity to ask questions and have my questions answered to my satisfaction. I voluntarily give my informed consent to participate in this study.
Appendix E

Vignettes

No Disclosure/Mental Disability

Directions:

While reviewing the following scenario, imagine that you are an employee at a mid-sized, Midwestern company, and that you and the individual described in the scenario report to the same manager.

Scenario:

During your time at work, you have noticed that one of your coworkers, John, is a little different from your other coworkers. Most noticeably, John’s mood seems to be unstable. During some weeks, John seems to be excessively happy and excited. During these weeks, John brings a lot of energy to work. He becomes more talkative, speaks rapidly, and tends to jump from one idea to another quickly. However, during other weeks, John seems sad and lethargic. During these weeks, John can be irritated easily and seems to lack interest in work.

You know that John recently had a long meeting with a representative from HR and the manager who oversees your department. Although you don’t know what was discussed in the meeting, John no longer has the same schedule as the rest of the department. Occasionally, he is allowed to leave work a few hours early when he chooses to do so. John completes all of his work tasks efficiently. You suspect that John’s schedule change may be due to an accommodation granted for a mental disability. However, John has never confirmed this suspicion explicitly.
Medium Disclosure/Mental Disability

Directions:

While reviewing the following scenario, imagine that you are an employee at a mid-sized, Midwestern company, and that you and the individual described in the scenario report to the same manager.

Scenario:

During your time at work, you have noticed that one of your coworkers, John, is a little different from your other coworkers. Most noticeably, John’s mood seems to be unstable. During some weeks, John seems to be excessively happy and excited. During these weeks, John brings a lot of energy to work. He becomes more talkative, speaks rapidly, and tends to jump from one idea to another quickly. However, during other weeks, John seems sad and lethargic. During these weeks, John can be irritated easily and seems to lack interest in work.

You know that John recently had a long meeting with a representative from HR and the manager who oversees your department. Although you don’t know what was discussed in the meeting, John no longer has the same schedule as the rest of the department. Occasionally, he is allowed to leave work a few hours early when he chooses to do so. John completes all of his work tasks efficiently. You suspect that John’s schedule change may be due to an accommodation granted for a mental disability. However, John has never confirmed this suspicion explicitly.

The week after John receives his accommodation, you receive an email from your direct supervisor with the following information:

The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) was put into place in 1990 to prohibit discrimination on the basis of physical and mental disability. The purpose of the ADA is to provide equal opportunities in the workplace (among other settings) for individuals with disabilities. Under the ADA, employers are legally required to grant reasonable accommodations to employees with documented disabilities. The purpose of the ADA is not to provide unfair advantages to individuals with disabilities. Accommodations granted through the ADA are meant to provide disabled individuals with a work environment that grants them same opportunities as those granted to their nondisabled coworkers.
High Disclosure/Mental Disability

Directions:

While reviewing the following scenario, imagine that you are an employee at a mid-sized, Midwestern company, and that you and the individual described in the scenario report to the same manager.

Scenario:

During your time at work, you have noticed that one of your coworkers, John, is a little different from your other coworkers. Most noticeably, John’s mood seems to be unstable. During some weeks, John seems to be excessively happy and excited. During these weeks, John brings a lot of energy to work. He becomes more talkative, speaks rapidly, and tends to jump from one idea to another quickly. However, during other weeks, John seems sad and lethargic. During these weeks, John can be irritated easily and seems to lack interest in work.

You know that John recently had a long meeting with a representative from HR and the manager who oversees your department. Although you don’t know what was discussed in the meeting, John no longer has the same schedule as the rest of the department. Occasionally, he is allowed to leave work a few hours early when he chooses to do so. John completes all of his work tasks efficiently. You suspect that John’s schedule change may be due to an accommodation granted for a mental disability.

The week after John receives his accommodation, you receive an email from your direct supervisor with the following information:

The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) was put into place in 1990 to prohibit discrimination on the basis of physical and mental disability. The purpose of the ADA is to provide equal opportunities in the workplace (among other settings) for individuals with disabilities. Under the ADA, employers are legally required to grant reasonable accommodations to employees with documented disabilities. The purpose of the ADA is not to provide unfair advantages to individuals with disabilities. Accommodations granted through the ADA are meant to provide disabled individuals with a work environment that grants them same opportunities as those granted to their nondisabled coworkers.

Shortly after you receive the email, John approaches you after work to explain that his odd behaviors are common symptoms of a mental condition known as bipolar disorder. John also explains that his accommodation helps him to attend necessary medical appointments and deal with the side effects of medication.
No Disclosure/Physical Disability

Directions:

While reviewing the following scenario, imagine that you are an employee at a mid-sized, Midwestern company, and that you and the individual described in the scenario report to the same manager.

Scenario:

During your time at work, you have noticed that one of your coworkers, John, is a little different from your other coworkers. Most noticeably, John often uses a wheelchair to get around the office. Sometimes, however, John will use a walker or a cane. Oftentimes, John seems to be low on energy while at work. You have also noticed that John’s hands sometimes shake, which seems to be out of his control.

You know that John recently had a long meeting with a representative from HR and the manager who oversees your department. Although you don’t know what was discussed in the meeting, John no longer has the same schedule as the rest of the department. Occasionally, he is allowed to leave work a few hours early when he chooses to do so. John completes all of his work tasks efficiently. You suspect that John’s schedule change may be due to an accommodation granted for a physical disability. However, John has never confirmed this suspicion explicitly.
Medium Disclosure/Physical Disability

Directions:

While reviewing the following scenario, imagine that you are an employee at a mid-sized, Midwestern company, and that you and the individual described in the scenario report to the same manager.

Scenario:

During your time at work, you have noticed that one of your coworkers, John, is a little different from your other coworkers. Most noticeably, John often uses a wheelchair to get around the office. Sometimes, however, John will use a walker or a cane. Oftentimes, John seems to be low on energy while at work. You have also noticed that John’s hands sometimes shake, which seems to be out of his control.

You know that John recently had a long meeting with a representative from HR and the manager who oversees your department. Although you don’t know what was discussed in the meeting, John no longer has the same schedule as the rest of the department. Occasionally, he is allowed to leave work a few hours early when he chooses to do so. John completes all of his work tasks efficiently. You suspect that John’s schedule change may be due to an accommodation granted for a physical disability. However, John has never confirmed this suspicion explicitly.

The week after John receives his accommodation, you receive an email from your direct supervisor with the following information:

The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) was put into place in 1990 to prohibit discrimination on the basis of physical and mental disability. The purpose of the ADA is to provide equal opportunities in the workplace (among other settings) for individuals with disabilities. Under the ADA, employers are legally required to grant reasonable accommodations to employees with documented disabilities. The purpose of the ADA is not to provide unfair advantages to individuals with disabilities. Accommodations granted through the ADA are meant to provide disabled individuals with a work environment that grants them same opportunities as those granted to their nondisabled coworkers.
High Disclosure/Physical Disability

Directions:

While reviewing the following scenario, imagine that you are an employee at a mid-sized, Midwestern company, and that you and the individual described in the scenario report to the same manager.

Scenario:

During your time at work, you have noticed that one of your coworkers, John, is a little different from your other coworkers. Most noticeably, John often uses a wheelchair to get around the office. Sometimes, however, John will use a walker or a cane. Oftentimes, John seems to be low on energy while at work. You have also noticed that John’s hands sometimes shake, which seems to be out of his control.

You know that John recently had a long meeting with a representative from HR and the manager who oversees your department. Although you don’t know what was discussed in the meeting, John no longer has the same schedule as the rest of the department. Occasionally, he is allowed to leave work a few hours early when he chooses to do so. John completes all of his work tasks efficiently. You suspect that John’s schedule change may be due to an accommodation granted for a physical disability.

The week after John receives his accommodation, you receive an email from your direct supervisor with the following information:

The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) was put into place in 1990 to prohibit discrimination on the basis of physical and mental disability. The purpose of the ADA is to provide equal opportunities in the workplace (among other settings) for individuals with disabilities. Under the ADA, employers are legally required to grant reasonable accommodations to employees with documented disabilities. The purpose of the ADA is not to provide unfair advantages to individuals with disabilities. Accommodations granted through the ADA are meant to provide disabled individuals with a work environment that grants them same opportunities as those granted to their nondisabled coworkers.

Shortly after you receive the email, John approaches you after work to explain that his symptoms are common symptoms of a physical condition known as multiple sclerosis. John also explains that his accommodation helps him to attend necessary medical appointments and deal with the side effects of medication.
Appendix F

Research Materials

Informed Consent

You are being given the opportunity to participate in a study conducted by Rachel Gabbard through Xavier University.

The purpose of this research is to investigate coworker dynamics in the workplace. Completion of this study involves reading a scenario and completing a brief questionnaire. Please note that some of the items are included for the purpose of checking the quality of the responses. If you do not pass the quality check items, please be aware that your responses will not be included in the study and you will not receive compensation for completing the HIT. For most items, there are no correct or incorrect answers. Therefore, please respond openly and honestly.

This study should last approximately 15 minutes. There are no known or anticipated consequences of participating in this study. Participation is voluntary and you are free to withdraw at any point without penalty. If you withdraw from the study before completion, however, you will not receive compensation for the HIT. If you complete the HIT and pass the quality check items, you will be compensated $0.25. You must be at least 18 years of age or older to participate in this study. Please note that you will have 60 minutes to complete the HIT.

If you have any questions at any time, you may contact Rachel Gabbard (gabbardr@xavier.edu) or the faculty advisor, Dr. Morrie Mullins (mullins@xavier.edu). Questions about your rights as a research participant should be directed to the Xavier University Institutional Review Board at 513-745-2870. Your data will be anonymous in that no names will ever be associated with your responses. No one aside from the principal investigator or faculty advisor will have access to your responses. You will not be asked to provide identifying information (e.g. your full name) at any point in the study. You will be asked to provide your MTurk worker ID at the end of the study to receive compensation. Your worker ID will be removed prior to data analysis.

By clicking the next button, you agree to the following: I understand that my participation in this study is voluntary. I have received information regarding the risks and benefits of this study and have been given the opportunity to ask questions and have my questions answered to my satisfaction. I voluntarily give my informed consent to participate in this study.
Vignette

Directions:

While reviewing the following scenario, imagine that you are an employee at a mid-sized, Midwestern company, and that you and the individual described in the scenario report to the same manager.

Scenario:

During your time at work, you have noticed that one of your coworkers, John, is a little different from your other coworkers. Most noticeably, John’s mood seems to be unstable. During some weeks, John seems to be excessively happy and excited. During these weeks, John brings a lot of energy to work. He becomes more talkative, speaks rapidly, and tends to jump from one idea to another quickly. However, during other weeks, John seems sad and lethargic. During these weeks, John can be irritated easily and seems to lack interest in work.

You know that John recently had a long meeting with a representative from HR and the manager who oversees your department. Although you don’t know what was discussed in the meeting, John no longer has the same schedule as the rest of the department. Occasionally, he is allowed to leave work a few hours early when he chooses to do so. John completes all of his work tasks efficiently. You suspect that John’s schedule change may be due to an accommodation granted for a mental disability. However, John has never confirmed this suspicion explicitly.
March 12, 2013

Rachel Gabbard
2915 Robertson Ave. Apt. 1
Cincinnati, OH 45209

Re: Protocol #1268, The Effect of Disability Type and Information Disclosure on Coworker Acceptance of Employees Receiving Disability Accommodations

Dear Ms. Gabbard:

The IRB has reviewed the materials regarding your study, referenced above, and has determined that it meets the criteria for the Exempt from Review category under Federal Regulation 45CFR46. Your protocol is approved as exempt research, and therefore requires no further oversight by the IRB. We appreciate your thorough treatment of the issues raised.

If you wish to modify your study, including the addition of data collection sites, it will be necessary to obtain IRB approval prior to implementing the modification. If any adverse events occur, please notify the IRB immediately.

Please contact our office if you have any questions. We wish you success with your project!

Sincerely,

Kathleen J. Hart, Ph.D., ABPP
Vice Chair, Institutional Review Board
Xavier University

KIH/sb

C: Morell Mullins, Advisor