CHAPTER 6

PRESENTATION OF THE RESULTS FROM THE QUANTITATIVE PHASE (CONFIRMATORY DELPHI PHASE)

6.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the quantitative results from the quantitative phase of the study, which used a two-round Delphi process with expert participants. The chapter begins with the dynamics experienced in the Delphi pilot phase and the lessons learnt from this phase. It proceeds to the results from the first Delphi round, which was intended to clarify, refine and expand on the criteria for workplace-effective mobility identified in the focus group interviews with the participants, as discussed in Chapter 5. The chapter culminates in a presentation of the consensus reached by the expert participants in the second Delphi round.

6.2 PRESENTATION OF RESULTS

The purpose of the Delphi process was to '*clarify, refine and expand the identified indicators in order to ensure their representativeness to the concept of workplace-effective mobility of employees with disabilities (EwDs). Representativeness means the extent to which an indicator approximates or represents the concept of workplace-effective mobility*' (P1: Delphi Round Number One.txt – 1:5, 85:109). The results of the two Delphi rounds with expert participants – industrial and organisational psychologists – in relation to the process purpose indicated above are therefore presented in this section, by round. Originally, three rounds were envisaged for the Delphi process, with a duration of one hour per round: '*It is envisaged that three rounds to Delphi will be undertaken, with a minimum of a week each round on an electronic basis (by e- mail)'*

(P9: FW Invitation to Participate in Delphi rounds Scanned.txt – 9:4, 91:94). However, because of the technical problems experienced, it was decided to regard Round One as a pilot round for the purposes of the quantitative Delphi phase.

6.2.1 Pilot round of the Delphi process

The pilot round was fraught with a number of problems, ranging from problematic access to the Moodle webpage by the expert participants to their queries regarding the content and structure of the questionnaire. These problems are explained below.

6.2.1.1 Problems with access to the Moodle webpage

When participants accessed the Moodle webpage, it indicated that the site was not available, which necessitated that the expert participants click on the URL further down the system window (P2: First Round of Delphi.txt – 2:1, 32:33). Also, once one expert participant had responded to the questionnaire, the others could not access it at all. I became aware of this problem through the e-mail that I received from a participant: '*Kgomotso – It says I have already completed the survey. Is there another username or password?*' (P10: FW Invitation to Participate in Delphi rounds Scanned2.txt – 10:4, 57:58). Another participant indicated that despite typing in the correct details, system access was still unavailable: '*Hi, I typed in the username and password but cannot access your questions, pls let me know*' (P28: RE FW First Round of Delphi Scanned.txt – 28:1, 22:25).

In some cases, participants missed access deadlines, as is evident in the following response: '*I have unfortunately seemed to miss the deadline for your questionnaire. Is there any way I can still participate? I hope I have not created difficulty for you in this regard*' (P25: RE First Round of Delphi Scanned 7.txt – 25:1, 8:10).

These problems persisted regardless of my personal interventions: '*Please make sure that you do not type in delphi7 but delph7. I have just gone through it, and I could access the questionnaire*' (P28: RE FW First Round of Delphi Scanned.txt – 28:2, 8:10). As a result of the failed log-in attempts, I eventually reported this problem to the Information Technology Division of the Vaal University of Technology (my employer). The division advised '*that you* [participants] *may need to use a different PC, with the same login details. Please try that and advise if it is working*' (P10: FW Invitation to Participate in Delphi rounds Scanned2.txt – 10:3, 43:45). I also apologized to participants and provided feedback on the status of the problem to them as follows: '*It is with a deepest sense of regret to advise you that I have experienced some technical problems with the Delphi Round One attempt. Due to a common username and password being provided, I discovered that if one participant completes the questionnaire, the other participants could not participate. My technical colleagues and I have since attended to the problem. You are thus humbly requested to try again using the following:…*' (P10: FW Invitation to Participate in Delphi rounds Scanned2.txt – 10:1, 8:13).

Otherwise, other participants could not participate due to technical problems or work related commitments. One participant said, '*I have had terrible problems with my computer over the last week, so my apologies for not sending this to you sooner*' (P10: FW Invitation to Participate in Delphi rounds Scanned2.txt – 10:6, 144:146). Other invitation e-mails bounced with the following message: '*This message was created automatically by mail delivery software. A message that you sent has not yet been delivered to one or more of its recipients after more than 24 hours on the queue on mailsvr.vut.ac.za*' (P11: FW Warning message 1Ka6BS-000599-UN delayed 24 hours Scanned.txt – 11:1, 17:20). In other cases, participants were away from their offices, for example: '*I am out of office from 23 – 27 February 2008, for urgent matters please contact me on my cellphone*' (P14: Out of Office AutoReply First Round of Delphi Scanned.txt – 14:1, 6:7).

6.2.1.2 Content and structural problems regarding the questionnaire

Participants indicated problems in understanding concepts used in the questionnaire, and complained about the actual duration they spent responding to the Delphi questionnaire. Regarding understanding the concept, one participant mentioned that '*there is not always a clear understanding as to what qualifies as an EwDs* [employees with disabilities] (P49: Research Questionnaire Report.txt – 49:13, 679:680).

Another participant was concerned about the comprehensiveness and complexity of the questionnaire. Regarding the comprehensiveness, the participant indicated that '*the definitions do not always do justice to the concept. You are repeating one question twice. Each one of these concepts should be seen in context. Competence has a context and it means many things to different people. What do you mean by humility? Etc. I think the first part of your process needs significantly more work and clarity*' (P23: Re First Round of Delphi Scanned2.txt – 23:2, 16:21). The person thus proposed the following: '*[M]y suggestion would be that you ask people working in disability to review this: e.g.: S… W… from [the] Cape Town Society for the Blind and Dr C… D… from S…D… in Cape Town to name only two people*' (P23: Re First Round of Delphi Scanned2.txt – 23:3, 23:27). For fear of any influence of a different paradigm on the results, I did not heed this proposal, because the suggested participants were not in the field of industrial and organisational psychology.

Regarding the structure of the questionnaire, a participant indicated having '*looked at …* [the] *questionnaire and found it rather difficult and time consuming as I would have to comment extensively on each concept. I do not have the time to do this at this stage*' (P23: Re First Round of Delphi Scanned2.txt – 23:1, 9:12). In the same vein, a participant indicated the following pertaining to the structure of the questionnaire and proposed a solution: '*You are measuring several variables – access to job opportunities, Perform effectively and developing the capacity to enjoy a good quality life. When answering the questionnaire and the*

indicators, some of the indicators apply to all and some of the indicators apply to one or two of the variables, would it not be more effective to split the questionnaire into three one measuring: – access to job opportunities – Perform effectively – develop capacity to enjoy good quality life. Perhaps looking at the indicators that pertain to most of them' (P49: Research Questionnaire Report.txt – 49:9, 661:669).

One participant was comfortable with the dimensions proposed, but indicated the following: '*[A]ll of the above things should be in place. However we should guard against over-analysis and overprotection of EwD* [employee with disability] *lest we communicate that they are helpless*' (P49: Research Questionnaire Report.txt – 49:4, 640:642). Another participant also felt comfortable with the dimensions identified, but indicated: '[*Y]ou seem to have covered all the areas, I just some of the indicators apply more to some of the variables you want to measure and because you are looking at three variables it may cloud the issue*' (P49: Research Questionnaire Report.txt – 49:7, 651:653).

These problems necessitated a review of the questionnaire '*to make it a bit simpler and time convenient*' (P20: RE Delphi Round Number One Scanned.txt – 20:2, 34:38). Otherwise, there seemed to be a general willingness by expert participants to participate in the study; for example, one replied: '*I just need to confirm that I did not receive your first email, so this is the first time I am receiving anything from you, I will try and answer the survey asap*' (P27: Re FW First Round of Delphi Scanned 3.txt – 27:1, 8:10). In order to address the concerns of the participants, I changed the electronic platform from Moodle to Excel, and refined the questionnaire for greater understandability.

Some responses from participants corroborated the information already obtained from the focus group interview participants in the previous phase. The following indicates how the participants' responses

corroborated the results from the focus group interview phase of the study:

Communication problems

Communication problems were specified as a major inhibitor of workplace-effective mobility for the Deaf employees. In the pilot Delphi phase, an expert supported this finding by citing an example: '*One particular case that comes to mind is a hearing impaired employee – Most managers find it difficult to interact with her. She is then inclined to respond aggressively*' (P49: Research Questionnaire Report.txt – 49:5, 646:648).

Orientation and induction

Orientation and induction was identified by participants in the focus group interviews as an enabler of workplace-effective mobility. This finding was confirmed as follows: '*[T]here must be [an] effective induction programme for disabled people*' (P49: Research Questionnaire Report.txt – 49:10, 671:671).

Positive self-concept

A remark from an expert confirmed a positive self-concept as an enabler of workplace-effective mobility, namely that employees with disabilities must have '*insight into [their] own limitations*' (P49: Research Questionnaire Report.txt – 49:2, 636:636).

Reasonable accommodation

One participant responded: '*Workplace-effective mobility could be enhanced by employers determining specific needs (depending on disability). Clarify expectations, taking disabilities into consideration. Concentrating on individual strengths (instead of limitations')* (P49: Research Questionnaire Report.txt – 49:11, 672:674). I associated this response with the reasonable accommodation measures identified by participants in the focus group interviews.

Sensitization and awareness education

Issues of able-bodied people's training surfaced in expert participants' comments as an enabler of workplace-effective mobility for employees with disabilities too (P49: Research Questionnaire Report.txt – 49:6, 648:649; P49: Research Questionnaire Report.txt – 49:12, 675:677). In particular, a participant mentioned that employers must provide '*training/preparing other team members to work with disabled people. Organisation (example HR) to facilitate clarification of expectations between disabled person and manager*' (P49: Research Questionnaire Report.txt – 49:12, 675:677).

Willingness and ability to communicate one's needs

A response by a participant regarding the willingness by employees with disabilities to ask for help (P49: Research Questionnaire Report.txt – 49:1, 631:635) was related to the willingness and ability to communicate one's needs, as indicated by participants in the focus group interview phase of the study.

I also received encouragement from participants regarding the work I was doing, although the timeline given seemed short to the participant: '*You are doing very well. I am proud of you I will complete the stuff before Friday…. Short notice though…*' (P22: RE First Round of Delphi Scanned.txt – 22:1, 6:7).

6.2.1.3 Conclusion

Because of the technical and conceptual challenges experienced in the pilot phase of the Delphi process, I decided to change the platform from Moodle to Excel and refined the questionnaire for understandability. Therefore, although the results of the pilot phase could not be directly used in the subsequent Delphi rounds, it was necessary to address the problems experienced for the smooth engagement of expert participants in subsequent rounds.

6.2.2 Results from Round One of Delphi

The revised questionnaire was processed on a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet, which allowed frequency analysis of the responses. Also, the Microsoft Excel package proved to be more user-friendly than Moodle, because it required neither a password nor a username. In order to ensure confidentiality of responses, an Information Technology colleague was assigned the responsibility of handling responses and providing a pivot table analysis thereof. As in the pilot phase, instructions were provided regarding the completion and submission of the questionnaire. Unlike in the pilot round, the participants were also requested to rate the definition of workplace-effective mobility for clarity, relevance and representativeness on a five-point Likert scale.

Questionnaires were sent to 18 participants by e-mail. Ten responses were received in this round, a response rate of 55%. The results from this round are discussed below.

6.2.2.1 Consensus regarding the definition of workplace-effective mobility

Table 6.1 presents the extent of consensus reached by the expert participants on the clarity, relevance and representativeness of the concept of workplace-effective mobility of employees with disabilities. As I indicated in Section 4.7.2.4, a 70% rule was adopted to decide whether or not consensus had been reached. According to Table 6.1, therefore, consensus was evidently reached on the clarity (3.9/5 or 78%) and relevance (3.7/5 or 74%) of the definition of workplace-effective mobility.

Table 6.1: Definition of workplace-effective mobility

Expert participant	Five-point Likert-scale score		
	Clarity	**Relevance**	**Representativeness**
1	4	4	3
2	4	4	4
3	4	3	3
4	4	3	3
5	4	4	3
6	4	2	2
7	4	4	4
8	5	5	4
9	4	4	3
10	2	4	3
Total	**39**	**37**	**32**
Mean	**3.9 (78%)**	**3.7 (74%)**	**3.2 (64%)**

Table 6.1 indicates that consensus could not be reached on the representativeness of the concept (3.2/5 or 64%). The reasons for the non-attainment of consensus on representativeness were provided by Participants 6 and 3. Participant 6 indicated that an alternative concept of workplace resilience is more relevant than workplace-effective mobility, which the participant would not have understood as centred on the ability of an employee with disabilities.

Participant 3 commented that mobility refers to movement and the ability to move about, which may be patronizing. According to this participant, the definition of workplace-effective mobility that I provided does not make any reference to movement in the marketplace/between jobs, etc. Consequently, the participant proposed that workplace hardiness or workplace capability or capacity be used, because the latter refers more to skill and ability than the person. These comments were incorporated into the next round as comments for further review by participants, and were thus not dropped.

6.2.2.2 *Dimensions of workplace-effective mobility*

In Chapter 5, the focus group results per disability category culminated in an analysis of the data for the dimensions and indicators of workplace-effective mobility. It became evident from the analysis (see Section 5.4.2, for example) that positive self-concept, self-efficacy, workplace accessibility, sense of coherence and positive sense of independence could be identified as dimensions of workplace-effective mobility. The second question used in Delphi Round One was thus aimed at establishing consensus among expert participants as to whether these are indeed dimensions of workplace-effective mobility. Table 6.2 presents these dimensions together, and shows the level of consensus reached by expert participants on them.

Table 6.2: Dimensions of workplace-effective mobility

Expert participant	Five-point Likert scale score				
	Positive self-concept	Self-efficacy	Workplace accessibility	Sense of coherence	Positive sense of independence
1	3	3	4	4	3
2	4	4	5	4	5
3	4	4	5	4	5
4	4	4	4	4	4
5	4	4	4	4	4
6	4	4	4	4	3
7	4	4	5	4	5
8	2	4	4	3	2
9	4	4	4	3	4
10	4	4	4	4	4
Totals	**37**	**39**	**43**	**39**	**39**
Mean	**3.7 (74%)**	**3.9 (78%)**	**4.3 (86%)**	**3.9 (78%)**	**3.9 (78%)**

From Table 6.2, it was evident that more than the required 70% consensus threshold was achieved in response to the question on the dimensionalization of workplace-effective mobility. This threshold consensus implies that the concept of workplace-effective mobility can be dimensionalized into positive self-concept, self-efficacy, workplace

accessibility, sense of coherence and positive sense of independence. However, Expert Participants 1, 8 and 10 made some additional remarks on these dimensions. Participant 1 agreed with the dimensionalization of the concept, but argued for a causal relationship between motivation and drive as elements of a person's willingness and ability to find work in an open labour market. Therefore, this participant did not regard a willingness and ability to find work in an open labour market as a result of only a positive self-concept. The participant also indicated that in the participant's view, there was a lack of clarity on the concepts of positive sense of independence.

Expert Participant 8 scored positive self-concept and positive sense of independence below the acceptable score (a score of 2 was given to each) because the participant believed that a positive self-concept is only a small part of willingness and ability to find work in the open labour market. The person made the same comment for a positive sense of independence, as indicated by the willingness and ability to enjoy the benefits of an economically active lifestyle.

Expert Participant 10 scored all dimensions as a 4, but suggested that positive self-concept and self-efficacy should be regarded as a form of resilience, that sense of coherence should be seen as learnt coping skills, and that a positive sense of independence should resort under life experiences.

These comments were reflected as feedback to the expert participants in the second round Delphi questionnaire to enable the voting process on these issues to proceed.

6.2.2.3 Categorising indicators into criteria for workplace-effective mobility

As indicated in Section 3.5, because criteria are comprised of indicators, a categorization of various indicators of the workplace-effective mobility dimensions was necessary. Therefore, a question was posed to the expert participants on their views regarding the categorization of the various indicators of workplace-effective mobility dimensions into criteria. The sections below present the results.

(i) Indicators of positive self-concept

Table 6.3 below presents the results from the expert participants pertaining to the categorization of the indicators of a positive self-concept into criteria.

Table 6.3: Indicators of a positive self-concept

Expert participant	Five-point Likert scale score						
	Willingness and ability to –						
	work in a team	assert own human rights	acquire knowledge & experience	communicate one's needs	determine own career path	maintain a positive self-concept	maintain self-confidence
1	4	3	3	4	4	4	4
2	5	4	4	4	4	4	4
3	2	4	4	4	4	4	4
4	4	5	3	5	5	5	5
5	3	4	4	3	5	5	5
6	5	4	4	4	4	4	4
7	4	4	4	4	4	4	1
8	4	5	3	5	5	5	5
9	4	4	3	3	4	5	4
10	2	4	3	3	3	4	4
Total	**37**	**41**	**35**	**39**	**42**	**44**	**40**
Mean	**3.7 (74%)**	**4.1 (82%)**	**3.5 (70%)**	**3.9 (78%)**	**4.2 (84%)**	**4.4 (88%)**	**4 (80%)**

It is clear from Table 6.3 that the expert participants reached consensus (evident in scores of 70% and above) that willingness and the ability to work in a team environment, assert one's human rights, acquire job-related knowledge and experience, communicate one's needs, determine one's own career path, maintain a positive self-concept, and maintain self-confidence can be categorised as indicators a positive self-concept.

However, participants added several comments on some of these indicators. Although Participant 1 scored indicators of a positive self-concept as 3s and 4s, the participant proposed that interpersonal/social skills should be included as a category representing the willingness and ability to work in a team environment, and the willingness and ability to communicate one's needs. Drive and motivation were also added to willingness and the ability to acquire job-related knowledge and experience, as well as to willingness and the ability to determine one's own career path. Participant 7 gave a lower score to willingness and ability to maintain self-confidence because the participant thought that this item could be moved to self-efficacy. The person's reason for this was that someone may have high self-confidence, but may still have a low self-image.

Participant 10 agreed with almost all the indicators except willingness and the ability to work in a team environment. This participant regarded willingness and the ability to work in a team environment as a requirement for performance, but not necessarily as a self-concept indicator. A willingness and the ability to assert one's own rights indicate confidence. This participant also indicated that a willingness and the ability to acquire job-related knowledge and experience is an indicator of one's own belief in workplace-effective mobility and ability to acquire experience. Willingness and the ability to communicate personal needs was also regarded as an essential requirement for performance. Expert Participant 10 also regarded willingness and the ability to develop one's career as an indication of personal maturity. Willingness and the ability to

maintain self-confidence is an indication of personal energy levels. Willingness and the ability to maintain self-confidence indicates a personal ability to cope.

These comments were also reflected in the subsequent questionnaire as feedback to the expert participants, requesting them to evaluate the comments for consensus building. The results are indicated in Round Two, see Section 6.2.3.3 (i).

(ii) Indicators of self-efficacy

Table 6.4 presents the indicators of self-efficacy. Because the descriptors of the various indicators could not fit into the table, they were reflected as acronyms. The acronyms are explained in detail in the legend below the table.

Table 6.4: Indicators of self-efficacy

Expert participant	Five-point Likert scale score									
	OLM	CWE	CCR	AUM	APR	AO	AEC	PSOP	WE	GM
1	1	1	4	3	3	3	4	3	3	3
2	3	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	3
3	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	5	4
4	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	2	2	3
5	5	3	1	5	5	4	4	4	4	5
6	4	3	3	3	4	4	4	3	3	4
7	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	5	4
8	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
9	5	3	1	5	5	4	4	4	4	5
10	3	3	4	4	5	3	5	4	4	3
Totals	**37**	**33**	**32**	**39**	**42**	**38**	**41**	**38**	**36**	**38**
Mean Percentage	**3.7 74**	**3.3 60**	**3.2 64**	**3.9 78**	**4.2 84**	**3.8 76**	**4.1 82**	**3.8 76**	**3.6 72**	**3.8 76**

Legend:

OLM = willingness and ability to find work in the open labour market

CWE = willingness and ability to adjust to changing working environment

CCR = willingness and ability to change cultural responses to disability in order to achieve success

AUM = willingness and ability to achieve upward mobility in the workplace
APR = willingness and ability to assume a productive role
AO = willingness and ability to work hard and maintain achievement orientation in the workplace
AEC = willingness and ability to make an effective contribution
PSOP= willingness and ability to maintain a positive sense of purpose in the community
WE = willingness and ability to maintain a positive work ethic
GM = willingness and ability to transcend constraints and gain membership of an occupational class.

From Table 6.4, it can be observed that, with the exception of the willingness and ability to adjust to a changing working environment (60%) and to change cultural responses to disability in order to achieve success (64%), which are below the threshold of 70%, the rest of indicators were scored above the threshold by the expert participants. Such above-threshold scoring reflected that the expert participants had reached consensus that the indicators related to the dimension of self-efficacy and are thus appropriate as criteria thereof.

However, Participant 1 did not agree that willingness and the ability to find work in the open labour market and to adjust to a changing working environment are comprehensive indicators of self-efficacy. This participant therefore proposed that drive be added to willingness and an ability to find work in the open labour market, and that flexibility or change orientation be added to willingness and ability to adjust to a changing working environment. Although the participant agreed with the rest of the indicators, the person also proposed further additions to them.

For instance, Participant 1 indicated that social responsibility should be added to willingness and ability to change cultural responses to disability in order to achieve success. Because willingness and ability to achieve upward mobility in the workplace depend on drive, commitment, motivation, confidence and competence, these concepts should be added to willingness and ability to achieve upward mobility in the

workplace and also to willingness and ability to work hard and maintain an achievement orientation in the workplace. Participant 1 indicated that in maintaining a positive work ethic, an employee with a disability demonstrates social responsibility, which should be added to willingness and ability to maintain a positive work ethic. Finally, the participant suggested that the willingness and ability to transcend constraints and gain membership of an occupational class depend on individual tenacity, perseverance, drive and confidence, and that these concepts should be added to this indicator.

Participant 10 agreed with the indicators as specified, but proposed several additions. The participant mentioned that willingness and ability to find work in the open labour market does not only indicate self-efficacy, but also that an individual is showing persistence. Also, the willingness and ability to adjust to a changing work environment shows levels of personal flexibility, while willingness and ability to change cultural responses to disability in order to achieve success is an indication of self-confidence. The participant alluded to the fact that a willingness and the ability to achieve upward mobility in the workplace, work hard and maintain an achievement orientation in the workplace and maintain a positive work ethic indicate high levels of organisational commitment. This participant saw willingness and an ability to assume a productive role as reflecting resilience, and thought that willingness and an ability to maintain a positive sense of purpose in the community relates to self-worth. Finally, Participant 10 expressed the view that the willingness and ability to transcend constraints and gain membership of an occupational class indicates not only self-efficacy, but also self-confidence.

Because of the relevance of the above comments to the study, the items were not omitted, but were tested further in Round Two.

(iii) Indicators of sense of coherence

From the focus group interviews, it seems that a sense of coherence was associated with the willingness and ability to cope with work demands, maintain a positive attitude towards life and maintain a productive job fit. These indicators were thus presented to the expert participants for consensus-building. Table 6.5 present the results (again, because the indicators could not fit into the table they are presented as acronyms and explained in a legend).

From Table 6.5, it can be observed that consensus was achieved among almost all the expert participants as reflected in higher scores than the threshold of 70%. However, Participant 10 did not agree with willingness and ability to cope with work demands as an indicator of a sense of coherence because for this participant, it indicates coping skills. The participant also argued that willingness and ability to maintain a positive attitude towards life relates to temperament, and that willingness and ability to maintain a productive job fit indicates levels of energy, to which this participant suggested that technical skills and competence should be added.

Again, these comments were not omitted but were presented as feedback to the expert participants for their assessment and consensus-building.

Table 6.5: Indicators of sense of coherence

Expert participant	Five-point Likert scale score		
	CWD	MPATL	MPJF
1	3	4	3
2	5	4	4
3	4	4	4
4	4	4	4
5	4	4	3
6	5	4	4
7	4	3	4

Expert participant	Five-point Likert scale score		
	CWD	MPATL	MPJF
8	4	4	4
9	4	5	3
10	1	4	3
Totals	**38**	**40**	**36**
Mean	**3.8 (76%)**	**4.0 (80%)**	**3.6 (72%)**

Legend:

CWD = Willingness and ability to cope with work demands

MPATL = Willingness and ability to maintain a positive attitude towards life

MPJF = Willingness and ability to maintain a productive job fit

(iv) Indicators of workplace accessibility

Based on the focus group interviews, workplace accessibility was found to be related to issues of safety and freedom of movement, either in the workplace or between home and the workplace. Because of its centrality to workplace-effective mobility, its indicators were presented to the expert participants for evaluation. Table 6.6 present the results of this evaluation and the extent of consensus reached by the expert participants in categorizing these indicators into criteria for workplace-effective mobility. Again, the indicators are presented in the table as acronyms and explained in the legend after the table.

Table 6.6: Indicators of workplace accessibility

Expert participant	Five-point Likert scale score				
	MFBA	CPR	OCAD	THW	AWSHS
1	3	3	4	4	4
2	5	3	3	4	4
3	4	4	4	4	4
4	5	3	5	5	5
5	5	2	3	5	5
6	4	3	3	3	4
7	4	4	4	4	4
8	4	4	4	4	4
9	5	2	3	5	5
10	5	3	3	5	3
Totals	**44**	**31**	**36**	**43**	**42**
Mean	**4.4 (88%)**	**3.1 (62%)**	**3.6 (72%)**	**4.3 (86%)**	**4.2 (84%)**

Legend:

MFBA = Willingness and ability to move freely and safely in built areas

CPR = Willingness and ability to change places of residence to achieve success

OCAD = Willingness and ability to operate and care for assistive devices

THW = Willingness and ability to travel from home to work

AWSHS = Willingness and ability to adhere to workplace safety and health standards.

It is evident from Table 6.6 that, with the exception of the willingness and ability to change place of residence to achieve success (where the mean is below the threshold, at 62%), consensus was achieved. However, because of the comment from Participant 10 on this indicator, it was retained and was tested further in the second round. Participants 1 and 10 made several comments regarding this dimension. Participant 1 commented that employees may not always have control over access to buildings. Therefore, more dimensions relating to willingness and ability to move freely and safely in built areas were suggested, such as flexibility, drive, perseverance/tenacity or motivation in order to have a complete picture of a suitable and resilient employee. Participant 1 also argued that workplace accessibility is often affected by employers' compliance with regulatory frameworks and that it may therefore be an unfair measure for employees with disabilities. Overall, Participant 1 thinks that upon completion, the study will be a valuable tool and will create more awareness and opportunities for people with disabilities in the workplace.

Participant 10 commented that the willingness and ability to move freely and safely in built areas indicates independence. Participant 10 further contended that willingness and ability to change places of residence to achieve success indicates an ability to cope with work demands and that training is required to enhance the willingness and ability to operate and take care of assistive devices. This participant also mentioned that the willingness and ability to travel from home to work indicates independence and willingness and ability to adhere to workplace safety and health standards indicates knowledge.

The comments made by Participants 1 and 10 were also provided as feedback to the expert participants in the subsequent round.

(v) Indicators of a positive sense of independence

The focus group interview finding that a positive sense of independence was indicated by the willingness and ability to maintain an economically active lifestyle and exercise life choices was tested with expert participants in Delphi Round One. Table 6.7 presents the results and reflects the indicators as acronyms, which are further explained in the legend after the table.

Table 6.7: Indicators of a positive sense of independence

Expert participant	Five-point Likert scale score	
	MEAL	ELC
1	3	4
2	4	5
3	4	4
4	5	5
5	5	5
6	4	4
7	4	4
8	4	4
9	5	5
10	5	4
Total	**43**	**44**
Mean	**4.3 (86%)**	**4.4 (88%)**

Legend:

MEAL= Willingness and ability to maintain an economically active lifestyle

ELC = Willingness and ability to exercise life choices

From Table 6.7, it is clear that consensus was reached on the indicators of a positive sense of independence. Percentages of 86% and 88% respectively were obtained on both indicators of positive sense of independence, which is above the cut-off percentage (70%). Therefore,

the dimension was unconditionally retained for the second round of Delphi.

6.2.3 Results from Round Two

In this round, a rating of 1 was given to YES and 2 to NO. Therefore the five-point scale was not followed, because forced choice responses were required for the round. The following sections report on the levels of consensus reached by the expert participants by question. Only six expert participants continued to this round. As participation was anonymous and voluntary, it was impossible to identify who of the ten expert participants dropped out in this round.

6.2.3.1 Definition of workplace-effective mobility

Table 6.8 below presents the results on the expert participants' agreement on the clarity, relevance and representativeness of the definition of workplace-effective mobility.

Table 6.8: Consensus reached on the definition of workplace-effective mobility

Expert participant	Consensus score		
	Clarity	Relevance	Representativeness
1	1	1	1
2	1	1	1
3	1	1	1
4	1	1	1
5	1	1	1
6	1	1	1
Total	**6**	**6**	**6**
Mean	**1 (100%)**	**1 (100%)**	**1 (100%)**

From Table 6.8, it was observed that consensus was reached with regard to the clarity, relevance and representativeness of the definition of

workplace-effective mobility. Therefore, all six participants indicated complete (100%) confirmation of the definition.

6.2.3.2 Dimensions of workplace-effective mobility

Agreement relating to the expert participants' dimensionalization of workplace-effective mobility into a positive self-concept, self-efficacy, workplace accessibility, sense of coherence and a positive sense of independence is reflected in Table 6.9.

Table 6.9: Consensus reached on the dimensionalization of workplace-effective mobility

Expert participant	Consensus score				
	Positive self-concept	**Self-efficacy**	**Workplace accessibility**	**Sense of Coherence**	**Positive sense of independence**
1	1	1	1	1	1
2	1	1	1	1	1
3	1	1	1	1	1
4	1	1	1	1	1
5	1	1	1	1	1
6	1	1	1	1	1
Totals	**6**	**6**	**6**	**6**	**6**
Mean	**1 (100%)**	**1 (100%)**	**1 (100%)**	**1 (100%)**	**1 (100%)**

In Table 6.9, it can be observed that the expert participants were unanimous (100% consensus) about the dimensionalization of the indicators of workplace-effective mobility. However, Participants 2 and 3 made some qualitative comments. Participant 2 indicated that life experience is a culmination of a positive sense of independence. However, this participant indicated that a positive sense of independence may be left as is because '*one can never achieve 100% on the meaning of concepts and their combinations*'. However, the frame of reference created by concepts on the questionnaire was satisfactory to him/her.

Participant 3 suggested that resilience should be incorporated into positive self-concept, as this person thought that the comment made by other participants regarding the use of coping to define sense of coherence was reactive and negative. Also, Participant 3 regarded the other participants' suggested use of life experience for a positive sense of independence as unscientific.

Given an overwhelming (100%) consensus on the dimensions, there was no need to test these comments in subsequent rounds to determine the views of expert participants on these dimensions.

6.2.3.3 Categorising indicators into criteria for workplace-effective mobility

As already indicated in Section 6.2.2.3, almost all the indicators of workplace-effective mobility attracted comments from the expert participants. The only exception to this observation was a positive sense of independence. As indicated in that section, comments from expert participants were deemed worthy of being presented as feedback in the subsequent round (Delphi Round Two). In this section, the results of this exercise are presented by dimension, indicating whether or not consensus was reached on the identified dimensions and their indicators.

(i) Consensus reached on the indicators of positive self-concept

Table 6.10 illustrates the extent to which consensus was reached by the expert participants on this dimension.

Table 6.10: Consensus reached on the indicators of positive self-concept

Expert parti-cipant	Consensus score						
	Willingness and ability to:						
	Work in a team environ-ment	Assert human rights	Acquire job-related knowledge & experience	Communicate one's needs	Determine own career path	Maintain positive self-concept	Maintain self-confidence
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
4	1	1	2	2	2	1	1
5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
6	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Total	**6**	**6**	**7**	**7**	**7**	**6**	**6**
Mean	**1 (100%)**	**1 (100%)**	**0.85 (85%)**	**0.85 (85%)**	**0.85 (85%)**	**1 (100%)**	**1 (100%)**

From Table 6.10, it was observed that, using the cut-off of 70% for consensus, consensus was reached on this dimension because all the indicators received a score of 85% and higher from the participants. However, some comments were recorded from Participant 4, who did not agree with the indicators of willingness and ability to acquire job-related knowledge and experience, to communicate personal needs and to determine one's own career path. On willingness and ability to communicate personal needs, Participant 4 suggested the use of self-confidence or assertiveness, related the willingness and ability to acquire job-related knowledge and experience to a learning approach or inquisitiveness, and also associated the willingness and ability to determine own career path with self-actualisation. This participant also regarded the willingness and ability to maintain self-confidence as an internal locus of control. These comments should be read in the context of the fact that consensus had been reached and therefore no further need existed to test them in subsequent rounds, as the cut-off percentage had been exceeded.

(ii) Consensus reached on the indicators of self-efficacy

Again, the indicators are presented in Table 6.11 as acronyms, followed by a detailed explanation in the legend. From Table 6.11, it can be observed that consensus was reached on all indicators. However, Participant 3 rejected the previous round's comments by experts that the willingness and ability to adjust to a changing working environment as an indicator should be replaced with change orientation. Instead, Participant 3 proposed that the concept of flexibility should be added to this indicator.

Regarding the willingness and ability to achieve upward mobility in the workplace, Participant 3 observed that the indicator involves a combination of variables, of which self-efficacy is one. The participant agrees with drive being added to the willingness and ability to work hard and maintain achievement orientation in the workplace. To willingness and ability to make an effective contribution, Participant 3 added the concept of commitment, and proposed that willingness and ability to maintain a positive sense of purpose in the community should be considered a form of social responsibility. The participant agreed that a positive self-concept and tenacity should be considered additions to the willingness and ability to transcend constraints and gain membership of an occupational class.

Table 6.11: Consensus reached on the indicators of self-efficacy

Expert participant	Consensus score									
	OLM	CWE	CCR	AUM	APR	AO	AEC	PSOP	WE	GM
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
3	1	2	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	2
4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
6	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7
Totals	**6**	**7**	**6**	**6**	**6**	**7**	**7**	**6**	**6**	**7**
Mean %	**1 100**	**0.85 85**	**1 100**	**1 100**	**1 100**	**0.85 85**	**0.85 85**	**1 100**	**1 100**	**1 100**

Legend:

OLM = willingness and ability to find work in the open labour market
CWE = willingness and ability to adjust to changing working environment
CCR = willingness and ability to change cultural responses to disability in order to achieve success
AUM = willingness and ability to achieve upward mobility in the workplace
APR = willingness and ability to assume a productive role
AO = willingness and ability to work hard and maintain achievement orientation in the workplace
AEC = willingness and ability to make an effective contribution
PSOP= willingness and ability to maintain a positive sense of purpose in the community
WE = willingness and ability to maintain a positive work ethic
GM = willingness and ability to transcend constraints and gain membership of an occupational class.

(iii) Consensus reached on the indicators of a sense of coherence

As indicated in Section 6.2.2.3, Participant 10 suggested that coping skills, temperament, technical skills and competence should be considered for this dimension. Table 6.12 represents the results obtained from expert participants after these suggestions were provided to them as feedback. The various indicators are presented as acronyms and are then explained in the legend after Table 6.12.

From Table 6.12, it was observed that consensus was achieved among the participants, who scored the indicators higher than the cut-off score of 70%. In response to Participant 10's suggestion in the previous round that coping skills should be added to the willingness and ability to cope with work demands, in the second round, Participant 4 rejected the suggestion in favour of resilience, accepting that willingness and ability to maintain a positive attitude towards life should be replaced with resilience, as previously suggested, but thought that the willingness and ability to maintain a productive job fit must be replaced with a sense of coherence. Because of the consensus that had already been achieved, these comments were not reviewed further, but were regarded as constituting avenues for future research on the subject.

Table 6.12: Consensus reached on the indicators of sense of coherence

Expert participant	Consensus score		
	CWD	MPATL	MPJF
1	1	1	1
2	1	1	1
3	1	1	1
4	1	2	1
5	1	1	1
6	1	1	1
Totals	**6**	**7**	**6**
Mean	**1 (100%)**	**0.85 (85%)**	**1 (100%)**

Legend:

CWD = Willingness and ability to cope with work demands

MPATL = Willingness and ability to positive attitude towards life

MPJF = Willingness and ability to maintain a productive job fit

(iv) Consensus reached on the indicators of workplace accessibility

Table 6.13 illustrates consensus reached by participants on whether or not the various indicators identified by the participants in the focus group interviews can be categorised as workplace accessibility. Having reflected on the previous round's comments, the participants achieved complete (100%) consensus on this dimension, as indicated in Table 6.13 below. The various acronyms used for identified indicators are explained in the legend after the table.

Table 6.13: Consensus reached on the indicators of workplace accessibility

Expert participant	Consensus score				
	MFBA	CPR	OCAD	THW	AWSHS
1	1	1	1	1	1
2	1	1	1	1	1
3	1	1	1	1	1
4	1	1	1	1	1
5	1	1	1	1	1
6	1	1	1	1	1
Totals	**6**	**6**	**6**	**6**	**6**
Mean	**1 (100%)**	**1 (100%)**	**1(100%)**	**1(100%)**	**1 (100%)**

Legend:

MFBA = Willingness and ability to move freely and safely in built areas

CPR = Willingness and ability to change places of residence to achieve success

OCAD = Willingness and ability to operate and take care of assistive devices

THW = Willingness and ability to travel from home to work

AWSHS = Willingness and ability to adhere to workplace safety and health standards.

(v) Consensus reached on the indicators of a positive sense of independence

Table 6.14 presents the consensus scores achieved by expert participants on the indicators of a positive sense of independence. As is evident from Table 6.14, complete (100%) consensus was reached by the participants on this dimension. The indicators are again reflected as acronyms in Table 6.14 and are explained in the legend.

Table 6.14: Consensus reached on the indicators of positive sense of independence

Expert participant	Consensus score	
	MEAL	ELC
1	1	1
2	1	1
3	1	1
4	1	1
5	1	1
6	1	1
Total	**6**	**6**
Mean	**1 (100%)**	**1 (100%)**

Legend:

MEAL = Willingness and ability to maintain an economically active lifestyle

ELC = Willingness and ability to exercise life choices

Overall, not only did participants achieve consensus by scoring dimensions above 70% in Round Two, but the Delphi process attained the cut-off regarding stability on both votes between rounds and the dropout rate (Day & Bobeva, 2005), as explained in Section 4.7.2.4. The

change between votes was acceptable at 15% in some dimensions, in other words, where a score of 0.85 consensus was reached. The dropout rate between rounds was 40% (four out of ten judges dropped out), which was also acceptable.

6.3 SUMMARY

This chapter presented the results of the process followed to refine, categorise and confirm criteria for workplace-effective mobility. It pointed to consensus being reached on the definition, dimensions, and categorization of indicators into criteria. A reduction in the response rate of expert participants was also noted, which is attributable to their busy work schedules. However, the reduction in the response rate was still within the minimum required participation rate of 40%.

In the next chapter, both the qualitative results from the focus group interviews and the quantitative results from the Delphi processes are compared with the existing literature; and a theoretical model of workplace-effective mobility of employees with disabilities is presented.

CHAPTER 7

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

7.1 INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, the results of both the qualitative (focus group interviews) and quantitative (Delphi) phases of the study are compared and discussed in relation to previous findings and the views of other authors. Where the authors' views support the findings of this study, they strengthen the trustworthiness of the research. Such support would also emphasise the relevance of the criteria and enablers of workplace-effective mobility of workplace-effective mobility with regard to the application of the findings in organisations. The chapter also highlights some of the contributions the data made to the broader field of knowledge on workplace-effective mobility of employees with disabilities.

7.2 NATURE OF WORKPLACE-EFFECTIVE MOBILITY

As mentioned in Section 5.4.5, the pilot phase of the qualitative study involving focus group interviews generated a useful definition of workplace-effective mobility and several dimensions, and the themes that emerged in that phase were retained in the main study phase. Therefore, the definition of workplace-effective mobility as the willingness and ability to find work in the open labour market, to make an effective contribution and to maintain an economically active lifestyle was used. It was found that participants in the main study emphasised all these elements.

The willingness and ability to find work in the open labour market relates to workplace mobility, which Van Ham (2002) defines as the process by which an employee accepts a job at a greater distance from home. In Sections 5.4.2.1 and 5.5.2.1, the data confirmed the importance of job-related knowledge and experience as indicated by Hofmeister (2006) in

determining the ability of people with disabilities to find work in the open labour market. Such job-related knowledge and experience emerged from the data as a positive self-concept and is further explained in Section 7.6.1. It is evident from Sections 5.4.3.1 and 5.5.3.3 that an inability to find work in the open labour market is partly attributable to the adverse economic conditions (a high unemployment rate) in the country and to a negative self-concept (see Sections 5.4.3.2 and 5.5.3.2). According to Moscarini and Thomsson (2007), unemployment is prevalent in a stagnant economy. Under these conditions, therefore, growth in employment slows down, as also observed by Souza-Poza and Henneberger (2004), and job seekers find it difficult to access jobs that meet their preferences, as Gesthuizen and Dagevos (2005) show.

Making an effective contribution is associated with the ability to deal with one's environment (Sideridis, 2006) and achieve competence (Sullivan & Arthur, 2006). Willingness and an ability to make an effective contribution came across in the data as self-efficacy, which is comprised of an achievement orientation and goal-setting behaviour. Willingness and the ability to make an effective contribution is thus related to willingness and the ability to perform work-related tasks (Chatterton, 2005) and self-motivation, as Chapple (2006) suggests. The details regarding self-efficacy are explained in Section 7.6.2. In the context of career mobility, a willingness to make an effective contribution relates to perceived capacity, as explained by Sullivan and Arthur (2006).

Maintaining an economically active lifestyle emerged from the data as an outcome of workplace-effective mobility. Such outcomes relate to the unleashing of the potential of employees with disabilities (P4: Pilot Focus Group Session – KZN – Physically Disabled 12072006.txt – 4:61, 108:109) and a sense of independence (P2: EXPERIENCES OF GAUTENG PARTICIPANTS – Physically Disabled 122008.txt – 2:38, 142:147). Their unleashed potential and sense of independence have been argued by Beatty *et al.* (1998) to

enable active participation of people with disabilities in their communities and live independently.

Access to job opportunities is central to this definition (Ginzberg & Hiestand, 1968), which is indeed a precondition for the workplace-effective mobility of employees with disabilities. Therefore, targeted recruitment was proposed as a mechanism through which job seekers with disabilities could gain access to information regarding job opportunities (see Sections 5.4.2.6 and 5.5.2.6).

7.3 ENABLERS OF WORKPLACE-EFFECTIVE MOBILITY

Six main enablers of workplace-effective mobility emerged from the focus group interview data, namely a positive self-concept, self-efficacy, a sense of coherence, a positive sense of independence, workplace accessibility and workplace equity. Section 7.6 explains almost all these factors as dimensions of workplace-effective mobility.

Workplace equity emerged from the data as part of the employer's obligation toward ensuring the success of employees with disabilities (see Sections 5.4.2.6 and 5.5.2.6). Workplace equity is thus evident in the measures for ensuring the workplace-effective mobility of employees with disabilities identified in the study. Two of these measures (job readiness training, and sensitivity training and awareness) were confirmed by experts in the Delphi pilot phase. The measures to ensure workplace equity support the argument that employers should equalize the primary resources, implement meritocracy rules in order to equalize opportunities and maintain accountability for employment outcomes (Cogneau, 2005).

7.4 INHIBITORS OF WORKPLACE-EFFECTIVE MOBILITY

The major inhibitors of workplace-effective mobility have been identified as a negative self-concept (see Section 7.2), workplace prejudice (employer ignorance, a lack of social support and unfair discrimination), adverse economic conditions (a high unemployment rate and overuse of disability grants) and accessibility issues.

A key feature of a negative self-concept seems to be communication problems, which the experts in the pilot round of the Delphi process confirmed to be an inhibitor of workplace-effective mobility. From the information provided by the participants with physical disabilities, a negative self-concept manifests in negativity towards able-bodied colleagues, thereby confirming that a negative self-concept is associated with anger (Weiss *et al*., 2003). In the data gleaned from the focus group interviews, a negative self-concept was associated with overprotective families and disability grants as a disincentive (see Sections 5.4.3.1 and 5.4.3.2). The inhibitory nature of overprotective families was evident in families hiding their members with disabilities from society to avoid social disgrace (Dube & Charowa, 2005) and/or protecting them from the potential for what families perceived as leading to inevitable failure (Feldman, 2004).

Ngwena (2004) cites workplace prejudice and discrimination as the main reason for the low number of people with disabilities who are gainfully employed. The high unemployment rate has been associated with the declining economic mobility of employees with disabilities (Souza-Poza & Henneberger, 2004). The high unemployment rate thus makes it difficult for employees with disabilities to make progress in the economic mainstream (Meerman, 2005). This leads to job terminations and reduced earning capacity (Barbezat & Hughes, 2001). It also makes it difficult for them to find a job that meets their preferences (Gesthuizen & Dagevos, 2005).

7.5 DIFFERENTIAL TREATMENT OF EMPLOYEES WITH DISABILITIES

Despite the cautionary response from a Deaf participant to this question, most participants across the focus group interviews indicated that employers favour employees with sensory or physical disabilities over those in other disability categories. This is consistent with the finding by Klimoski and Donahue (1997) that firms tend to be more open to people with physical or sensory disabilities than those with psychological problems.

7.6 DIMENSIONS AND INDICATORS OF WORKPLACE-EFFECTIVE MOBILITY

The definition of workplace-effective mobility presented by participants reflects the dimensions of the concept in this study as finding work, making a contribution and growing in an organisation. These dimensions of workplace-effective mobility relate to the personal, physical, social and economic dimensions of the job mobility of employees with disabilities as identified in the literature.

The willingness and ability to find work in an open labour market depends on economic conditions (the economic dimension), a positive self-concept, a sense of coherence, self-efficacy and a positive sense of independence (the personal dimension), and employment practices (the social dimension). As was mentioned in Section 7.4, high unemployment inhibits the economic mobility of people with disabilities (Meerman, 2005), reduces their earning capacity (Barbezat & Hughes, 2001) and limits their career choices (Gesthuizen & Dagevos, 2005). These experiences explain the economic dimension of the workplace-effective mobility of employees with disabilities, which mediates their ability to find work.

The personal dimension of self-efficacy was confirmed, in line with the findings of Sullivan and Arthur (2006), in their definition of career mobility in terms of motivation and identity, skills and expertise, and relationships. Motivation relates these factors that define career mobility to an individual's sense of coherence (Albrecht & Devlieger, 1999). Identity is associated with positive self-concept (Weiss *et al*., 2003). Skills and expertise are associated with self-efficacy or a belief that one can successfully perform intended behaviours (Kempen *et al*., 1999). The ability to build relationships is viewed from the perspective of independent living (Gignac & Cott, 1998) and is thus associated with a positive sense of independence. These personal factors increase the chances that people with disabilities will find work in the open labour market, make a contribution and achieve career growth in organisations.

The physical dimension is represented by the ability to move safely and freely in built areas or accessibility (Patla & Shumway-Cook, 1999), reasonable accommodation (Kreismann & Palmer, 2001) and assistive devices (Townsend *et al.*, 2007). These factors enable an individual with disabilities to make an effective contribution in the workplace, in spite of the person's disability status. Inherent in these factors is the employment practices applicable in the workplace, which constitute the social dimension of workplace-effective mobility. As indicated in Section 7.3, the employment opportunities and outcomes need to be equalized (Cogneau, 2005) in order to enable people with disabilities to find work in the open labour market, make a contribution and grow in organisations as employees.

Although this was not directly observed, the dimensions of workplace-effective mobility as identified in the literature (in Section 3.3), namely the personal, physical, social and economic dimensions, have thus been confirmed by the study. More specifically, the three aspects of the definition of workplace-effective mobility were dimensionalized into positive self-concept (finding work), self-efficacy, sense of coherence and

workplace accessibility (making an effective contribution) and a positive sense of independence (growing in an organisation). In the following section, indicators for each of these dimensions of workplace-effective mobility are compared with the existing literature.

7.6.1 Positive self-concept

According to Mrug and Wallander (2002), a positive self-concept leads to a positive display of personal resources and thus enables people with disabilities to find work in an open labour market. It is evident from Chapter 5 (on the results from the focus group participants) that a positive self-concept is indicated by several factors. The willingness and ability to acquire a job-related knowledge and experience as indicators of positive self-concept is confirmed by studies that found that good quality education and appropriate on-the-job training to be preconditions for entry into the labour market (Ginzberg & Hiestand, 1968; Meerman, 2001).

The willingness and ability to determine one's own career path relates to the ability of an employee with a disability to assess threats and opportunities that might impinge on his/her career (Nicholson *et al*., 1985) and make the necessary job transition. The ability to make the necessary job transitions is associated with Sullivan and Arthur's (2006) notion of career mobility and the concept of a boundaryless career as proposed by Nas *et al*. (1998). The notion of teamwork is necessary, as an opportunity for employees with disabilities both to garner support and to show their competence. Therefore, the willingness and ability to work in a team environment as an indicator of a positive self-concept confirms the ability of a person with a disability to forge strategic working relationships (Sullivan & Arthur, 2006) in order to attain workplace-effective mobility.

Willingness and an ability to communicate one's needs and to assert one's human rights were found to be indicators of a positive self-concept. With regard to the willingness and ability to communicate one's needs, Anspach's (1979) view that employees with disabilities should play a political activist role in rejecting conventional negative perceptions of disability and changing them is supported. Without communicating their needs, therefore, employees with disabilities may not be able to change the negative perceptions of disability that inhibit their workplace-effective mobility. The need to display such a willingness and ability to assert one's human rights is supported by Albert *et al*.'s (2005:29) view that people with disabilities must 'stand up for their ideals' because their human rights are often neglected in society.

Not only should employees with disabilities have a positive self-concept, but they should also be willing and able to maintain it. This willingness and ability to maintain a positive self-concept has been found to enable the full participation of people with disabilities in the workplace (Klimoski & Donahue, 1997). Therefore, it is confirmed to be an important indicator of the positive self-concept required by employees with disabilities to attain workplace-effective mobility.

Finally, the willingness and ability to maintain positive self-confidence was also identified as an indicator of a positive self-concept. According to Kennedy and Olney (2001), the self-confidence of people with disabilities tends to be lost in situations where they are unemployed. Therefore, when they achieve workplace-effective mobility, employees with disabilities should maintain their positive self-confidence, which will in turn help them to maintain their positive self-concept of themselves as productive human beings.

7.6.2 Self-efficacy

Self-efficacy as an individual's belief in his/her personal capabilities (Mihalko & Wickley, 2003) to perform the intended behaviours successfully was found to be an important dimension of workplace-effective mobility. It was found to be indicated by the willingness and ability of employees with disabilities to work hard. The previous research findings showed that employees with disabilities are able to demonstrable high levels of productivity (Baldwin & Johnson, 2001), which indicates a willingness and the ability to hard work (Mbara & Paradza, n.d.). Therefore, employees with disabilities should be assessed by the extent to which they possess a willingness and ability to assume a productive role.

Employees with disabilities are also required to demonstrate the willingness and ability to make an effective contribution. Wang *et al*. (2004) associate this with coping efficacy, which they define as an individual's appraisal of his/her ability to cope or manage the stressful aspects of a particular life experience. Such aspects of a particular life experience include finding work in the open labour market. Therefore, the willingness and ability of employees with disabilities to find work in the open labour market was identified as an indicator of self-efficacy. This confirms the argument that people with disabilities should optimise their ability to secure and maintain employment (Beatty *et al*., 1998) in order to attain workplace-effective mobility.

While in the workplace, employees with disabilities need to show a willingness and ability to change cultural responses to disability in order to achieve success. This indicator of self-efficacy confirms arguments that employees with disabilities should work actively towards changing cultural responses to disability in order to achieve success (Anspach, 1979; Feldman, 2004; Hahn, 1993). Success may take the form of upward mobility. Therefore, employees with disabilities must also

demonstrate a willingness and ability to achieve upward mobility in the workplace. Keenness for upward mobility is associated with career development, which requires clearer assessment criteria (Ross, 2004) for readiness. Self-efficacy has also been confirmed by Ingledew *et al.* (2004) to be important for employees with disabilities in attaining job mobility.

In some cases, employees with disabilities meet with challenges in the workplace. In order for them to be self-efficacious, they would need to have the willingness and ability to adjust to a changing working environment. Employees with disabilities are required to adapt to new work environments (Van Vianen *et al.*, 2003), and thus this willingness and ability to adjust is critical for their workplace-effective mobility. Such an ability to adjust to a changing working environment engenders a willingness and ability among employees with disabilities to maintain a positive sense of purpose in the community. The literature indicates the value of employees with disabilities' actively participating in their community (Beatty *et al*., 1998) through strong social support networks and community ties (Albrecht & Devlieger, 1999). Without these preconditions for community living, employees with disabilities may not develop a positive sense of purpose.

Blair and Jost (2003) indicate that employees with disabilities should be able to deal with intergenerational mobility by voluntarily changing their group membership to improve their quality of life. Such an ability is reflected in people's willingness and ability to transcend constraints and gain membership of an occupational class as an indicator of self-efficacy. The willingness and ability of employees with disabilities to maintain positive work etiquette represents individual values and preferences (Kopec, 1995) relating to work. Therefore, the higher the value that employees place on their work by displaying and maintaining positive work etiquette, the better the chances that they will attain workplace-effective mobility.

7.6.3 Sense of coherence

A sense of coherence, as defined in Section 2.3.5, implies a willingness and the ability to make an effective contribution in the workplace. It is indicated by the willingness and ability to cope with work demands, maintain a positive attitude towards life and maintain a productive job fit. Regarding the willingness and ability to cope with work demands, Koster *et al*. (2005) indicate that employees with disabilities who have the capacity to handle their workloads despite the severity of their disability and bodily structure tend to achieve greater mobility. Therefore, the willingness and ability to cope with work demands is confirmed as an indicator of workplace-effective mobility. Mrug and Wallander (2002) confirm the importance of a willingness and ability to maintain a positive attitude toward life in their argument that positive experiences result in high self-esteem and a positive outlook on the world. Finally, previous research confirms that a productive job fit is evident in a 'can do' approach to life, a demonstration of spirituality, a sense of inner strength, resilience and a sense of achievement (Albrecht & Devlieger, 1999) among people with disabilities.

7.6.4 Positive sense of independence

A positive sense of independence among employees with disabilities was found to be indicated by their willingness and ability to enjoy the benefits of an economically active lifestyle and exercise their life choices. A positive sense of independence measured through this willingness and ability depends on flourishing economic conditions to yield good quality of life for employees with disabilities (Meerman, 2001) and enhance their sense of citizenship (Kenyon *et al*., 2002) in society. The exercise of life choices is associated with the value of employment in incorporating people with disabilities into mainstream society by increasing their sense of independence (Schur *et al*., 2005). A positive sense of independence

thus means independent living and freedom of choice for employees with disabilities (Bouret *et al*., 2002; Mauro, 1999).

7.6.5 Workplace accessibility

Workplace accessibility relates to the willingness and ability to change place of residence to achieve success, to move freely and safely in built areas, to observe safety and health procedures, to operate assistive devices and to travel from home to work. The willingness and ability to change one's place of residence to achieve success is associated with a tolerance for migration, as mentioned by Townsend *et al*. (2007) and Van Ham (2002). The willingness and ability of employees with disabilities to move freely and safely in built areas is also indicative of workplace accessibility. Chatterton (2005) comments in this regard on the need for intense mobility training as identified by the partially sighted to ensure that they can move safely in unfamiliar surroundings.

Assistive devices are regarded as essential for employees with disabilities to achieve workplace accessibility and to perform effectively. However, I found that they themselves need to demonstrate the willingness and ability to operate assistive devices. This indicator of workplace accessibility is confirmed in arguments that, when it comes to technology use, the majority of employees with disabilities remain uninformed (Kenyon *et al*., 2002; Sheldon, 2003) because of the digital divide they experience in workplaces. Therefore, employers should not only provide assistive devices, but also training on how to use them.

Willingness and an ability to observe safety and health procedures is yet another indicator of workplace accessibility. However, this willingness and ability requires employers to design workplace accessibility for reliability, safety, efficiency, comfort and affordability (Mbara & Paradza, n.d.) for employees with disabilities. In most cases, as Van Ham (2002) observes, employees should develop the ability to harmonise the

conflicting demands of their residential and workplace locations to achieve a spatial match. Such an ability includes a willingness and the ability to travel from home to work. The literature refers to this willingness and ability as tolerance for commuting, and it is evident in employees with disabilities' accepting jobs some distance from their residences in order to advance their careers (Van Ham, 2002).

The participants regarded the implementation of reasonable accommodation measures by employers as another factor enabling workplace accessibility, and this was confirmed by the experts in the Delphi pilot phase. Therefore, workplace accessibility (assistive devices, reasonable accommodation and physical accessibility) was confirmed by the arguments for physical mobility in Section 3.3.2, in line with the findings of Chatterton (2005) and Patla and Shumway-Cook (1999).

7.7 GENERAL COMMENTS MADE BY PARTICIPANTS

In this section, the general comments by the participants are compared with the relevant literature.

7.7.1 Deafness and disability

In the correspondence with DEAFSA, I was told that deafness is not a disability. I then used this response as a negative case; and during a focus group interview with the Deaf participants, I therefore asked whether or not deafness constitutes a disability. All the Deaf participants expressed the view that deafness is not a disability, but a matter of communication difference; for example, one participant said: '*[S]omeone who comes here from China, that person uses a different language. Is he disabled? That person cannot speak a local language; he cannot be understood; he cannot communicate effectively. Is that person disabled? No, he just uses a different language*' (P7: Western Cape – Managerial

Candidates – Deaf 122008.txt – 7:106,486:489). This is consistent with the view that the Deaf employees simply require a different means of communication to audible speech and hearing (Koch, 2000).

7.7.2 Deafness and speech-impairment

In preparation for a focus group interview with speech-impaired people, I asked the following question to determine whether there are differences between them and the Deaf people:

> Interviewer: '*Can we have two last questions; the first is, help me understand, I normally hear about the deaf and people with speech impairment. Is there a difference?*'
>
> Interpreter: '*If you are Deaf, sometimes you have speech problems sometimes you don't. If you have [a] speech impairment but you can hear; it is a huge, gigantic difference.*'
>
> Interviewer: '*Does it add anything to the employment?*'
>
> Interpreter: '*It is like OP4; she is deaf but speaks well; OP5 is deaf but does not speak well. It is all about how you learn language. So, there are significant differences*' (P8: Western Cape – Operational Employees – Deaf 12 2008.txt – 8:136, 593:602).

Hawkridge, Vincent and Hales (1985) indicate that although both speech-impairment and deafness relate to an inability to communicate effectively, they are different conditions. Deafness is associated with receiving messages, which is passive, whereas a speech-impairment is related to expressing oneself, which is an active mode of communication (Hawkridge *et al*., 1985). Given this distinction, I therefore decided also to conduct focus group interviews with participants with speech impairments to compare and contrast the views on workplace-effective mobility between the two groups.

7.7.3 Disability and quality of life

Contrary to the commonly held belief that physical difference results in inferior quality of life for people with disabilities, studies by Koch (2000) and Albrecht and Devlieger (1999) have yielded more positive findings. According to Koch (2000), the quality of life of Deaf people is not necessarily lessened. Therefore, some people with disabilities tend to experience good quality life against all odds (Albrecht & Devlieger, 1999). The literature therefore contradicts a participant's view that '*in the disability sector, quality of life is a very big problem*' (P7: Western Cape – Managerial Candidates – Deaf 122008.txt – 7:52, 219:224).

7.7.4 Disabilities are different in nature and extent

Participants argued that disabilities are different in nature and extent, thereby necessitating differential treatment. This claim confirms Ngwena's (2004) view of the need for employers to recognize the legitimacy of treating employees with disabilities differentially when employers want to implement reasonable accommodation measures in order to address the unique needs of employees with disabilities.

7.7.5 Effect of changing regimes

Some participants with a physical disability lamented the reduction in rehabilitation centres since the new democratic government in South Africa took power. Such lamentations confirm the fact that a change in regime may affect the effective mobility of employees with disabilities (Blair & Jost, 2003). Consequently, the ability of people with disabilities to secure and maintain employment (Beatty *et al*., 1998) is adversely affected, as they may be ill-prepared to assume productive work if they have not been rehabilitated.

7.7.6 Contributions of the data to the broader field of knowledge

The various contributions that the data made to the broader field of knowledge are explained in this section. Various assumptions were made to create a framework for understanding the results; hence, reflections on ontological, epistemological, axiological and methodological contributions are included.

7.7.6.1 Ontology

The data indicate that the view that employees with disabilities are unable to attain workplace-effective mobility is inaccurate and should be critiqued (Guba, 1990). In this regard, one participant mentioned the following: '*It just feels that there is a preconceived notion of what it means to be disabled. Whilst I am regarded as disabled, I can do many things. Maybe we should divide disabilities between what can and cannot be done*' (P23: Western Cape – Managerial Candidates – Deaf 122008.txt – 23:148, 452:454). This also contextualises the need for criteria to distinguish between the dispositions of 'can do' and 'cannot do'. For these reasons, therefore, the data made a contribution by developing criteria and verifying them with expert participants to redress the untenable historical position (Guba & Lincoln, 1994) that employees with disabilities may not attain workplace-effective mobility. Documenting the criteria in this manner – using specific criteria – would enable the validation thereof in future studies with a view to furthering the promotion of optimal workplace equity, thereby emancipating employees with disabilities.

In order to improve an understanding of workplace-effective mobility, a further contribution to the body of knowledge was a theoretical model explaining the concept (see Chapter 8). Therefore, the proposed theoretical model of workplace-effective mobility provides a framework for further research and fills a knowledge gap experienced in the field of disability research. The introduction of the concept of workplace-effective

mobility as a multi-dimensional concept also serves as a further theoretical contribution. As indicated in Section 3.2, the concept has previously always only been inferred from other concepts, including job and career mobility.

7.7.6.2 Epistemology

What Guba and Lincoln (1994) refer to as subjective interpretations and meanings, in this case, of workplace-effective mobility, were identified in the various definitions of workplace-effective mobility. Indeed, the data show that a subjectivist epistemology results in an exchange of values that ultimately mediates the inquiry (Guba, 1990). Initially, I thought that within various disability groupings, there would be homogeneity, and only focused on samples relating to employees with a physical disability, the Deaf, people with a speech-impairment and the blind. In the process of data collection, I was informed that there are differences even within these groups of disabilities. A participant mentioned that, for instance '*among physically disabled people, there are those who have* [a] *muscular disorder as a result of polio. Furthermore, there are those who are paralysed from* [the] *waist down and are commonly known as paraplegics, whereas those who are paralysed from* [the] *neck down are referred to as quad paraplegics*' (P2: EXPERIENCES OF GAUTENG PARTICIPANTS – Physically Disabled, 122008.txt – 2:80, 280:286).

In the Deaf community, also, there are differences. Therefore, a participant suggested that '*it would be interesting for your research to get hold of people who, as the previous speaker said if I heard correctly, are hard of hearing, i.e. those coming from oral and hearing culture or associate themselves with that and also those who have been deafened later in their lives like MP2. I think just to create a balance or get the balance in how people with hearing loss actually experience this type of thing in the workplace*' (P23: Western Cape – Managerial Candidates – Deaf 122008.txt – 23:117, 648:654).

These data contributed to sampling processes by suggesting that when researching disabilities as a non-disabled researcher, one should carefully select the samples for specificity.

7.7.6.3 Axiology

The data confirmed that various orientations came to light as the study progressed, as Creswell (2007) suggests. Because of the exchange of values indicated in the epistemological experiences in this study, my orientations regarding people with disabilities have changed. The data therefore made a personal contribution to me as a non-disabled researcher.

As I indicated in Section 5.5.5, some differences of opinion were recorded, including the point that Deafness is not regarded as a disability by the Deaf. A participant indicated that 'there *must have been a misunderstanding when Ms Goosen referred you to me. Yes, I am Deaf (with capital 'D' meaning I am culturally Deaf) and I have been the chairperson of DeafSA Free State (my term just ended). As your title for your research suggests (workplace-effective mobility among employees living with disabilities), we, Deaf people are not "disabled" and therefore have no "mobility" problems at all. That is why you must have misunderstood Ms Goosen or you don't understand what Deafness is all about*' (P21: RE Request to conduct interviews for Doctoral Studies Scanned2.txt – 21:1, 28:34). As a result of this experience, the interview questions were amended to allow a detailed discussion on this issue with the Deaf participants in the Western Cape Province.

7.7.6.4 Methodology

As I indicated in Section 4.3, the data emerged from a dialectical dialogue with the participants (Zarb, 1997), guided by the evolving data collection and analysis, and the statements from interactions with

participants were recorded through thick descriptions (see Plack, 2005). Such a dialectical dialogue was experienced in the manner in which the data was collected – participants referred me to further sources for data collection, as is evident in the following statement: '*I suggest that you link up with places like MODE to access further information on your research topic. Their numbers are (011) 467 9444*' (P2: EXPERIENCES OF GAUTENG PARTICIPANTS – Physically Disabled 122008.txt – 2:83, 298:300).

In order to ensure effective collection of data, cognitive interviews were used, as indicated in Section 4.7.1.3 (i)(c). Participants were encouraged to respond as follows: '*[T]hink aloud about your understanding of the concept and using your experiences please indicate how you would define workplace-effective mobility of employees with disabilities. As there is no right or wrong answers, I would request that you verbalise any thoughts and opinions you may have on the subject. Anything you may say during these discussions will not be held against you*' (P2: EXPERIENCES OF GAUTENG PARTICIPANTS – Physically Disabled 122008.txt – 2:34, 117:124).

7.7.6.5 Emancipatory research principles

To attain the emancipatory goal, a research process must be collaborative and should be negotiated between the researcher and the researched (Fawcett & Hearn, 2001). As a result of adopting such an approach, the data indicate that disability organisations were involved at various stages of the research process, as suggested by Zarb (1997). They were involved in the shaping of the research topic (P4: Pilot Focus Group Session – KZN – Physically Disabled 12072006.txt – 4:4, 26:28), in the identification of research assistants (P12: Scanned.txt – 12:2, 15:18) and the sampling and data collection (P5: FW Request to conduct interviews for a Doctoral Study Scanned 8.txt – 5:1, 129:136).

Although I am a non-disabled researcher whom the participants perceived as lacking personal experience of the various disabling

barriers (Barnes & Mercer, 1997), rather than being criticised, I was educated on issues of disability. I admitted my limitations by way of showing reflexivity (Oliver, 1997). By this admission, I provided research feedback that would ensure that the research practice is appropriate by saying: '*I must admit my own limitations; when I chose the topic, of course, I did not know the different manifestations of physical disabilities until I interviewed participants with physical disabilities. They were saying that some are disabled from neck to waist; others are disabled from waist downwards. So, that is the one distinction I have picked up and some are multiply disabled. Also, within the deaf community I noted that there are differentiations in terms of being born deaf and hearing loss or late life deafness*' (P23: Western Cape – Managerial Candidates – Deaf 122008.txt – 23:121, 670:677).

The data also suggest that I placed my skills and knowledge at the disposal of the participants (Barnes & Mercer, 1997) and provided them with an opportunity to comment on and change working drafts (Oliver, 1997). My skills and knowledge contribution were acknowledged in participants' remarks, for example: '*We are excited about your research, and we are of* [the] *opinion that the said research will add value to the lives of people with disabilities'* (P12: Scanned.txt – 12:1, 10:11) and '*We also see this as a development opportunity for the people involved..*.' (P12: Scanned.txt – 12:4, 27:28). These participants' experiences are in line with what Barnes (2001) says, namely that any knowledge that is generated should provide power to disabled people themselves. While the research experience was empowering to participants in this manner, they also shared their appreciation for the study. Comments include expressions of gratitude for involving them in the study (P8: Gauteng – Speech Impaired experiences.txt – 8:34, 188:189), for sensitising them to their right to litigate in terms of the consent agreements (P9: KZN – APD – Physically Disabled.txt – 9:53, 351:356), for showing an interest in them (P22: RE Research Project – people with disabilities in the workplaceScanned.txt – 22:1, 10:10), and for informing them of their right to association (P24: Western Cape – Operational Employees – Deaf 12 2008.txt – 24:129, 700:701).

7.7.6.6 Theoretical models of disability

The data suggest that the social model is valuable in understanding the problems of unaccommodating attitudes (Jette, 2006) and disabling environments (Pinder, 1996) for employees with disabilities. The participants mentioned unaccommodating attitudes such as non-acceptance and negative attitudes from managers and colleagues. With regard to non-acceptance, a participant commented: '*As employees with disabilities, colleagues do not always accept us. We also tend to show negativity towards able-bodied colleagues. They perceive us as being proud, self-centred individuals and as closed books*' (P2: EXPERIENCES OF GAUTENG PARTICIPANTS – Physically Disabled 122008.txt – 2:58, 216:219). Regarding negative attitudes, they said that this is the latest problem they are experiencing in the workplace (P10: KZN – QuadParaAssociation – Physically Disabled.txt – 10:83, 93:95).

7.7.6.7 The biopsychosocial model

From the data, the concepts of self-efficacy, a positive self-concept and social support emerged as enablers of workplace-effective mobility, among others. These concepts are related to the biopsychosocial model of disability. The model has been mainly used in the area of enhancing the performance of people with disabilities in society. Therefore, a particular contribution of the data was to highlight the importance of the biopsychosocial model in the area of criteria development for Human Resources purposes. The data further confirm the importance of introducing a psychological model to understand the performance (Johnston, 1997) or self-efficacy behaviour of employees with disabilities. Regarding social support as a resource deficit (Gignac & Cott, 1998), the inhibiting nature of over-protective and overly supportive families is emphasised by the data. Therefore, the data show that employees with disabilities must be allowed to develop a positive sense of independence.

7.7.6.8 Salutogenesis

Although salutogenesis has primarily been used in the areas of stress management, the data indicate that it is also a valuable model that can be used to enhance the self-efficacy of employees with disabilities in the workplace. In this regard, the participants highlighted the notion of a sense of coherence (Albrecht & Devlieger, 1999) as an enabler of workplace-effective mobility. Another contribution of the data in support of a salutogenesis approach was the identification of a positive self-concept as an enabler of workplace-effective mobility. These concepts account for a deep sense of achievement (Albrecht & Devlieger, 1999) felt by participants in the study. It is thus no wonder that an expert participant suggested the concept of resilience for the study because it is associated with problem-solving skills, social competence, a sense of purpose and autonomy (Morgan *et al*., n.d.).

7.7.6.9 Welfare-to-work strategies

The data support the argument that welfare-to-work strategies are of value to people with disabilities (Bambra *et al*., 2005). Therefore, the effectiveness of these strategies has been confirmed by data from this study. Although South Africa does not have an active welfare-to-work programme, the underlying philosophy is implied in various pieces of legislation aimed at prohibiting discrimination on the basis of disability. In this regard, participants mentioned that '*workplace-effective mobility and equal access to job opportunities provide a better quality of life than relying on disability grants. It creates a sense of independence because one would use the salary to buy things like a house, a car and also be able to pay accounts, as well as have a family*' (P2: EXPERIENCES OF GAUTENG PARTICIPANTS – Physically Disabled 122008.txt – 2:38, 142:147). Furthermore, they mentioned that workplace-effective mobility supports the relationship-building process (P24: Western Cape – Operational Employees – Deaf 12 2008.txt – 24:67, 351:353).

7.7.6.10 Sensitivity training and awareness programmes

Sensitivity training and awareness programmes address disability discrimination and ensure the retention of employees with disabilities (Kennedy & Olney, 2001). The data confirm the value of sensitivity training and awareness programmes for employees with disabilities. Participants regarded sensitivity training and awareness programmes as important for creating a greater understanding of the specific needs of employees with disabilities (P4: Free State – Physically Disabled.txt – 4:129, 405:407).

7.7.6.11 Sign language appreciation

Sign language as a means of communication (Barnes & Mercer, 1997) has been supported by the data to a point that participants felt that it must be recognised as the first language of the Deaf (P24: Western Cape – Operational Employees – Deaf 122008.txt – 24:38, 216:217). In South Africa, this has far-reaching consequences with our eleven official languages – sign language should thus be the twelfth official language.

7.7.6.12 Contribution to practice

From a policy viewpoint, one participant mentioned the following as a potential value addition by the study: '*I think the study will be an eye-opener to employers and it will definitely assist in finding mechanisms to improve our career prospects. We also wish that government considers the issues we have discussed in order to ensure effectiveness in the employment equity processes in this country*' (P3: EXPERIENCES OF GAUTENG PARTICIPANTS – Physically Disabled 122008.txt – 3:82, 289:297).

7.7.6.13 Contributions of the data to the international literature

Section 3.2 reflected on the origins of the concept of workplace-effective mobility and indicated that it relates to other concepts such as to

workplace and job mobility, which focus on accessibility or the job search behaviour of candidates in general, and to career mobility, which focuses on the internal and external factors enhancing such mobility. However, in that section it became evident that the study makes a unique contribution by advocating for an integration of workplace, job and career mobility into what may be called the workplace-effective mobility of employees with disabilities.

The study thus makes a contribution to the field of career psychology and organisational commitment from the perspective of a disabled employee. It may be that the concept of workplace-effective mobility applies to able-bodied employees as well, but because of the dearth of literature on how workplace-effective mobility applies to employees with disabilities, the emphasis in this study was placed on employees with disabilities. The model presented in Figure 8.1 also makes a contribution to knowledge on how workplace-effective mobility manifests among employees with disabilities. However, the model would need to be validated by future studies to make it possible to apply it practically in the workplace and to make its implementation effective.

The discussion of the model also suggests that the concept of workplace-effective mobility contributes to the Human Resources field by implying the importance of workplace equity for the productivity and quality of work life for employees with disabilities.

7.8 SUMMARY

The chapter indicated that the evidence on the nature of workplace-effective mobility, together with its enablers, inhibitors, dimensions and indicators found in this study have some support in the literature. Such support thus strengthens the trustworthiness of the study and demonstrates the relevance of the concepts of disability management in organisations. The various comments that participants made on the

phenomenon in general are also in line with findings reported in the literature, thereby paving the way for integrated future research efforts aimed at emancipating people with disabilities. However, some unique contributions of the data to the broader field of knowledge were presented.

The alignment of the findings in the current study with the findings reported in the prior literature implies that theoretical saturation has been achieved, making possible the compilation of a theoretical framework. In the next chapter, the process followed in compiling such a theoretical framework on workplace-effective mobility and its various dimensions is presented.