

## CHAPTER 9

### RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

“Every man is born with the ability to do something well. This is what the Lord intended him to do. using that ability – what life is all about.” Gracie Allen

#### 9.1 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this chapter is to present, interpret and discuss the research findings of the study. The research problems were captured in a questionnaire which had as its main objective the identification and understanding of the constraints to the employment of persons with disabilities. The questionnaire was completed by a purposive sample of 38 disabled persons and 46 not disabled managers and human resource management practitioners. The quantitative research design and the qualitative method of Content Analysis (ATLAS.ti) were also applied to further identify categories and subcategories of constraints and to provide greater understanding of the most significant constraints that inhibit the employment of persons with disabilities.

The identified constraints are interpreted and discussed. As part of the discussion, strategic outputs are suggested to mitigate these constraints. The strategic outputs will form the basis on which the strategy to employ persons with disabilities is developed in the next chapter. Further research topics were also identified.

#### 9.2 PRESENTATION OF THE RESEARCH FINDINGS

The presentation and discussion of the research findings follow the same order as the questions in the questionnaire. In order to ensure maximum clarity the question as stated in the questionnaire is presented whereafter the research results are presented and discussed for the said question.

This will be repeated for each question in a particular section of the questionnaire. The means for each question in the section is then presented followed by a conclusion whether a constraint has been identified or not using the interpretation

key presented in Table 50 in Chapter 8. This pattern is followed consistently throughout this chapter.

As discussed in Chapter 8 the purpose of the research is amongst others, to identify the constraints to the employment of persons with disabilities. The response categories were therefore divided into two categories, namely response category “5 to 7” reflected the level of agreement and response category “1 to 3” reflected the level of disagreement. Where relevant, this approach was followed consistently. The quantitative statistics for each section of the questionnaire are presented at the end of each section, for that specific section.

The research findings in respect of sections 2 to 9 of the questionnaire are discussed below. The research findings and the discussion of section 1 of the questionnaire (biographical information) were presented in Chapter 8.

### 9.2.1 SECTION 2: DEFINING DISABILITY - QUESTIONS 11 TO 14

The section of the questionnaire relating to the definition of disability was divided into 4 questions (questions 11 to 14). Questions 11 to 13 were quantitative questions while question 14 was an open-ended question that was analysed by using a qualitative technique by means of the ATLAS.ti software.

Questions 11 to 13 and the response categories are presented in Table 51 below:

**Table 51: The questions and response categories related to the definition of disability**

The Employment Equity Act, 1998, defines “People with Disability” as follows: “... people who have a long-term or recurring physical or mental impairment which substantially limits their prospects of entry into, or advancement in, employment;”								
NO	QUESTION/STATEMENT	RESPONSE						
11.	Indicate the extent to which you agree with this definition.	1 Indi- cates strong dis- agree-	2	3	4	5	6	7 Indi- cates strong agree- ment.

		ment.						
12.	Indicate the extent to which this definition covers all types of disability.	1 Indicates not at all.	2	3	4	5	6	7 Indicates completely / fully.
13.	Indicate the extent to which this definition assists in dealing with issues of disability.	1 Indicates not at all.	2	3	4	5	6	7 Indicates completely / fully.
14.	How do you propose this definition should be amended? (Open text)							

### Question 11 (Extent to which the definition of disability is agreed with)

The results are presented in Table 52 below:

**Table 52: Frequencies of question 11 indicating the extent to which the definition of disability is agreed with**

<sup>1</sup> RESP CAT	DISABLED		NOT DISABLED		COMBINED	
	<sup>2</sup> FREQUENCY	<sup>3</sup> %	FREQUENCY	%	FREQUENCY	%
<sup>4</sup> 1	1	3	0	0	1	1
2	3	8	3	7	6	7
3	2	5	1	2	3	4
<sup>5</sup> 4	3	8	6	13	9	11
<sup>6</sup> 5	7	19	13	28	20	24
6	9	24	18	39	27	33
7	12	32	5	11	17	20

<sup>1</sup> RESP CAT refers to the options available to the respondents on the seven point Likert scale.

<sup>2</sup> FREQUENCY refers to the number of respondents whom selected the relevant response category.

<sup>3</sup> % refers to the number of respondents who chose a specific response category relative to the total responses overall or in a specific group of either disabled or not disabled.

<sup>4</sup> Red refers to the respondents' "disagreement" with the statement.

<sup>5</sup> Orange refers to the respondents' "neutral" position in respect of the statement.

<sup>6</sup> Green refers to respondents' "agreement" with the statement.

Emanating from Table 52 it is evident that 12 (32%) and 9 (24%) disabled respondents indicated strong agreement and somewhat strong agreement respectively with the definition. To establish whether the definition of disability could be regarded as a constraint to the employment of persons with disabilities, the response categories were divided into two categories as discussed in par. 8.5.6.1 above. Response category “5 to 7” reflected the level of agreement and response category “1 to 3”, the level of disagreement. A total of 28 (76%) disabled respondents selected the “agreement” category while only 6 (16%) selected the “disagreement” category. One (1) disabled respondent did not complete this question.

Eighteen (18 - 39%) not disabled respondents indicated “somewhat strong agreement” with the definition while 5 (11%) indicated strong agreement. Should the categories be collapsed as indicated above, 35 (78%) respondents selected the “agreement” category, while only 4 (9%) selected the “disagreement” category. The “agreement” with this definition by both groups of respondents was indicative that, from a quantitative data point of view, this definition was agreed with. This dispelled the possible notion reflected in the research questions that the abovementioned definition was not adequate. The quantitative results contradict the views of some authors that the definition of disability as discussed in Chapter 2 (par 2.3) is inadequate. This could also be interpreted that the respondents still hold a medical model perspective on disability management.

### **Question 12 (Extent to which this definition covers all types of disability)**

The results are presented in Table 53 below:

**Table 53: Frequencies question 12 indicating the extent to which this definition covers all types of disability**

RESP CAT	DISABLED		NOT DISABLED		COMBINED	
	FREQUENCY	%	FREQUENCY	%	FREQUENCY	%
1	1	2,7	1	2,17	2	2,41
2	1	2,7	1	2,17	2	2,41
3	6	16,22	6	13,04	12	14,46
4	5	13,51	3	6,52	8	9,64
5	9	24,32	14	30,43	23	27,71

RESP CAT	DISABLED		NOT DISABLED		COMBINED	
	FREQUENCY	%	FREQUENCY	%	FREQUENCY	%
6	12	32,43	17	36,96	29	34,94
7	3	8,11	4	8,70	7	8,43

From Table 53 above it was evident that 12 (32%) disabled respondents indicated that the definition “almost completely” covers all types of disabilities. Should the categories be divided into the “agreement” or “disagreement” categories, 24 (65%) respondents selected the “agreement” category.

Seventeen (17 - 37%) not disabled respondents indicated that the definition “almost completely” covers all types of disabilities. Should the categories be divided, 34 (76%) respondents selected the “agreement” category while 8 (17%) respondents selected the “disagreement” category.

The results in Table 53 dispel the possibility that the abovementioned definition does not cover all types of disability.

### **Question 13 (Extent to which this definition assists in dealing with issues of disability)**

The results are presented in Table 54 below.

**Table 54: Frequencies question 13 indicating the extent to which this definition assists in dealing with issues of disability**

RESP CAT	DISABLED		NOT DISABLED		COMBINED	
	FREQUENCY	%	FREQUENCY	%	FREQUENCY	%
1	5	14	3	7	8	10
2	3	8	2	5	5	6
3	6	16	8	18	14	17
4	10	27	9	20	19	23
5	5	14	13	29	18	22
6	7	19	10	22	17	21
7	1	3	0	0	1	1

From Table 54 above it is evident that 10 (27%) disabled respondents indicated “uncertainty” as to whether this definition assisted in managing disability. Should the

response categories be divided 14 (38%) respondents selected the “disagreement” category while 13 (35%) respondents selected the “agreement” category. Ten (10) (27%) respondents expressed uncertainty. Due to the rather even distribution of the responses to this question it was not conclusive whether the definition of persons with disabilities assisted disability management or not. The responses by the not disabled respondents followed a similar pattern namely 23 (51%) indicated that the definition assisted in managing disability, while 13 (29%) indicated that it did not assist. In this instance, 9 (20%) expressed uncertainty.

The mean for each question in Section 2 of the questionnaire are presented in Table 55 below:

**Table 55: Means of questions 11, 12 and 13 related to the formal definition of disability**

QUESTION	N	Mean
11	82	5,29268
12	82	4,96341
13	82	4,08537

Table 55 thus indicates that the mean for question 11 is 5,29268 (maximum possible value is “7”) which was indicative that there was a convincing level of “agreement” with the definition of “persons with disabilities” as set out in section 1 of the EEA. The responses of the disabled respondents and the not disabled respondents were similar, with 76% of disabled respondents and 78% of the not disabled respondents respectively, agreeing with the definition.

The mean for question 12 is 4,96341, indicating the view of respondents that the definition covers all types of disability to some extent. The responses of disabled respondents and not disabled respondents were similar with 65% of the disabled respondents and 76% of the not disabled respondents respectively, indicating that the definition covers all types of disabilities.

The mean for question 13 is 4.08537 indicating that the definition assisted to some extent with disability management. Fewer persons with disabilities (35%) indicated that the definition assisted while half (51%) of the not disabled respondents, indicated that the definition of disability assisted in managing disability.

The research questions related to the definition of disability were posed because of the perceived uncertainty around the definition of “persons with disabilities” as set out in section 1 of the EEA. The mean outlined above indicated that the respondents were actually of the view that the definition was applicable, that it covered all types of disability and that it assisted to a limited extent in dealing with issues of disability management.

However, the responses to questions 12 and 13 were below the mean value of “5” which was set as the criteria for acceptance as discussed in par. 8.5.6.1. The lower mean than the mean required for acceptance in the responses to question 12 and 13 is indicative that this aspect was a constraint and it should be included in a strategy to employ persons with disabilities.

#### **Question 14 (Open ended question to obtain proposals on how the definition of disability should be amended)**

The qualitative analysis of the responses to question 14 was analysed with the use of ATLAS.ti. The process of open coding was followed and the following three thematic themes, which are discussed below, were identified:

- Accessibility and reasonable accommodation was identified as the major disabler to persons with disability and the reasons for identifying this constraint were as follows:
  - Persons with disabilities operate in inaccessible environments which creates disabling conditions.
  - The laws which exist to govern accessibility were not enforced.
- The definition and various terms used in the definition were unclear and required either clarification or change. The following motivation and suggestions were provided:
  - Respondents indicated that the definition should be simplified.

- The terms “impairment”, “substantially”, “long term” and “recurring” were indicated by a number of respondents as being unclear.
- It was also suggested that the word “substantially” should be omitted.
- Clarity was not provided concerning chronic ailments, specifically HIV.
- Perception needs to be included because disability is perceived and not dependant on actual limitations which result in society disabling the person with disabilities.
- The definition was presently not aligned to the UN definition and it should be aligned.
- The definition must provide for different levels of disability within the various categories.
- Emotional disorders and psychiatric conditions must also be included.
- It was also pointed out that it is necessary to draw a distinction between mental and physical disabilities.
- It was advised that all disabilities should not be lumped together.
- The definition must provide for levels of disability within the various categories. A rating system similar to the BBBEE scorecard was suggested to identify more or less disabling types of disability.
- The impact of disability on the performance of a person with disabilities was not clarified in the definition. This comment was reasonable considering that the definition was intended to be related to employment.
- Examples of the different categories of disabilities could be provided.
- The following alternative definitions were suggested by respondents, namely:
  - People who have a long-term or recurring physical or mental impairment that substantially limits their normal functioning and limits their prospects of entry into or advancement in employment.
  - People who have a long-term or recurring physical, intellectual, sensory or psychiatric impairment which, without the necessary human assistance and guidance, assistive devices or adaptation to the activity itself, substantially limit their participation in activities of daily living e.g. work, personal care, mobility, communication, finances and leisure activities.
  - People who have a long-term or recurring physical or mental impairment which substantially limits their prospects of entry into performance and/or advancement in employment.



- People who have permanent or recurring physical or mental impairment which, through discrimination in employment, may limit their prospects of securing employment or career advancement.
- Disability is the loss or elimination of opportunities to take part in community life equitably with others. This is encountered by persons with physical, sensory, psychological, developmental, learning, neurological or other impairments, which may be permanent, temporary or episodic in nature, resulting in activity limitations and participation restrictions with the mainstream society. These barriers may be due to economic, physical, social, attitudinal and/or cultural factors.

In summary, the nature of the comments made by respondents was indicative that the definition of persons with disabilities as set out in section 1 of the EEA was not clear, as the terms used in the definition were not understood. The definition was also not inclusive of all categories of disability. This conclusion contradicts the results of the quantitative questions in this section of the questionnaire (questions 11, 12 and 13). The challenges of accessibility and reasonable accommodation were also raised by a number of disabled respondents as the critical disabler in the work environment. Although this was, strictly speaking, not related to the definition, it became clear that it was a matter of significant importance, and therefore it was also included in this analysis.

In response to question 14, the not disabled respondents largely made comments related to the seeking of clarity and requiring more information, whereas the disabled respondents raised more pertinent shortcomings of the definition.

The suggestions made by respondents to change the definition of persons with disabilities will be consolidated into a single definition as part of the strategy which will be developed and the suggestion made in relation to the inclusion of disability in the BBBEE scorecard will also be considered.

This confirmed the views of Jahiel, 2007 and Albrecht and DeVlieger, 1999 that disability is mostly discussed in terms of function and social labelling but seldom in terms of its relationship to the quality of life of persons with disabilities.

The comments respondents made to question 14 confirmed the conclusion of the abovementioned authors. The raising of the challenges of accessibility and reasonable accommodation relates to the core of the social model of disability (Kaplan date unknown and Olivier 1990)

In considering the abovementioned research results, the constraints to the employment of persons with disabilities which require to be addressed in terms of the strategy to employ persons with disabilities are set out in Table 56 below. The suggested strategic outputs required to mitigate these constraints will be discussed in more detail in the following chapter.

**Table 56: Summary of the constraints identified in relation to the definition of disability**

CONSTRAINT NUMBER	DESCRIPTION OF CONSTRAINTS IDENTIFIED
1.	The definition of “people/ persons with disabilities” for employment purposes is a constraint because it is vague and words used in the definition are unclear.
2.	Accessibility and reasonable accommodation are serious constraints for persons with disability as it prevents them from participating on a more equal footing in the workplace.
3.	Disability is viewed in terms of function and social labelling rather than in terms of its relationship to the quality of life of persons with disability.

### 9.2.2 SECTION 3: USEFULNESS OF THE SOUTH AFRICAN LEGAL AND POLICY FRAMEWORK - QUESTIONS 15 AND 16

The part of the questionnaire relating to the usefulness of the legal and policy framework was divided into two questions (questions 15 and 16). Question 15 consisted of four subquestions of a quantitative nature. Question 16 was an open-ended question which was analysed by using qualitative techniques by means of ATLAS.ti software.

Questions 15 and 16 and its response categories are presented in Table 57 below:

**Table 57: The questions and response categories related to the usefulness of the legal and policy framework**

15	Please indicate to what extent you use the following legislation or policy frameworks to assist you to manage disability in the workplace:							
NO	QUESTION/STATEMENT	RESPONSE						
15.1.	The Constitution.	1 Indicates never.	2	3	4	5	6	7 Indicates always.
15.2.	The Employment Equity Act, 1998 (EEA).	1 Indicates never.	2	3	4	5	6	7 Indicates always.
15.3.	The Integrated National Disability Strategy (INDS).	1 Indicates never.	2	3	4	5	6	7 Indicates always.
15.4.	The Technical Assistance Guidelines (TAG).	1 Indicates never.	2	3	4	5	6	7 Indicates always.
16.	Please indicate which areas you would want to see amended or extended in the legislation and policies? (Open text)							

The results are presented in Table 58 below:

**Table 58: Responses to question 15 grouped into three categories indicating disagreement, neutrality and agreement with each statement**

Question	DISABLED			NOT DISABLED			COMBINED		
	Not at all	Neutral	Fully	Not at all	Neutral	Fully	Not at all	Neutral	Fully
15.1.	12 36%	8 24%	13 39%	11 24%	10 22%	24 53%	23 29%	18 23%	37 47%
15.2.	9 27%	9 27%	15 45%	4 9%	5 11%	36 80%	13 17%	14 18%	51 65%
15.3.	14 42%	9 27%	10 30%	21 47%	9 20%	15 33%	35 45%	18 23%	25 32%
15.4.	14 42%	10 30%	9 27%	20 44%	7 16%	18 40%	34 44%	17 22%	27 35%

**Question 15.1 (Extent to which the Constitution is used to assist to manage disability in the workplace)**

The responses of the disabled group of respondents varied to a large extent and 12 (36%) of the disabled respondents indicated that the Constitution, 1996 did not assist in dealing with disability management issues while 13 (39%) indicated that the Constitution, 1996 assisted to manage disability in the workplace. Furthermore 8 (24%) disabled respondents indicated a neutral response.

The not disabled response group had 24 (53%) respondents indicating that the Constitution, 1996 assisted while 11 (24%) indicated that the Constitution, 1996 did not assist. A total of 10 (22%) not disabled respondents stated that it sometimes assisted to manage disability in the workplace.

A number of 6 (8%) respondents did not complete this question.

**Question 15.2 (Extent to which the EEA is used to assist to manage disability in the workplace)**

Persons with disabilities responded in a similar manner in respect of the EEA as they responded in respect of the Constitution, 1996 in question 15.1 above. Of the not disabled respondents however, 36 (80%) responded that the EEA was helpful while only 4 (9%) stated that the EEA was not helpful in dealing with disability management issues.

A number of 5 (6%) respondents did not complete this question.

**Question 15.3 (Extent to which the INDS is used to assist to manage disability in the workplace)**

Eleven (11 - 33%) disabled respondents indicated that the INDS (1997) was “never” used, followed by 9 (27%) who responded that they used it “sometimes”. From the not disabled group, 10 (22%) respondents indicated that the INDS (1997) was “almost always” used followed by 9 (20%) respondents who indicated that it was

used “sometimes”. In combining the disabled and not disabled groups of respondents it was determined that 19 (24%) respondents indicated that it was “never” used followed by 18 (23%) indicating that it was “sometimes” used.

A number of 6 (8%) respondents did not complete this question.

#### **Question 15.4 (Extent to which the TAG is used to assist to manage disability in the workplace)**

According to the responses of 12 (36%) disabled respondents the TAG “never” assisted in dealing with disability management in the workplace, followed by 10 (30%) respondents who indicated that it “sometimes” assisted in dealing with disability management in the workplace. The grouping of the response categories indicated that 9 (27%) not disabled respondents used the TAG to different degrees while 14 (42%) respondents did not use it.

The responses of not disabled respondents were fairly evenly distributed in terms of having used the TAG or not. The grouping of respondents indicated that 20 (44%) respondents did not find the TAG useful while 18 (40%) found it useful and 7 (16%) not disabled respondents submitted a neutral response.

The combining of the disabled and not disabled response groups confirmed that most respondents, namely 34 (44%) indicated that the TAG was never used, 17 (22%) indicated that it was sometimes used and 27 (35%) indicated that it was helpful in managing disability in the workplace.

A number of 6 (7%) respondents did not complete this question.

The means for the relevant questions are presented in Table 59 below:

**Table 59: Means of questions 15.1 to 15.4 related to respondents' views concerning the usefulness of the legal and policy framework**

QUESTION	N	MEAN
15.1.	78	4,47436
15.2.	78	4,87179
15.3.	78	3,66667
15.4.	78	3,60256

It is observed from Table 59 above that the mean of the responses to questions 15.1 to 15.4 were below 5 which indicated that the Constitution, 1996 and other policy documents were not regarded as being sufficiently useful to assist in managing disability in the workplace.

The Constitution, 1996 is the foundation on which disability management is built. It provides the reasons why disability management must be prioritised as a basic right of persons with disabilities, why discrimination against persons with disabilities must be prevented and why previously disadvantaged individuals (including persons with disabilities) must be affirmed. The lack of usefulness of these important documents is, therefore, regarded as a constraint which should be included in the strategy to employ persons with disabilities.

**Question 16 (Indication of the areas respondents would like to have amended or extended in the legislation and policies)**

The qualitative analysis of the responses to question 16 (utilising ATLAS.ti) identified six constraints. These constraints and the reasons why they are seen as constraints by respondents are discussed below:

- Reasonable accommodation and environmental accessibility is a constraint in the employment of persons with disabilities for the following reasons:
  - A national guideline/policy on reasonable accommodation especially assistive devices and environmental accessibility is required to demystify the matter.

- The definitions of "reasonable accommodation" and "unjustifiable hardship" as stated in the "Code of Good Practice: Key Aspects on the Employment of People with Disabilities" are vague and allow employers to avoid this responsibility. Steps must also be taken to ensure that all new buildings and existing buildings are accessible to persons with disabilities at the point of considering the approval of building plans.
- Strict enforcement of the NBR must take place accompanied by the issuing of fines and withdrawal of approval if access is not provided.
- Reasonable accommodation and easy access to venues should be provided when interviews for employment are conducted with persons with disabilities.
- Lack of enforcement of legislation and policies.
- Policies are unclear, not user friendly and require improvement and the reason for identifying this constraint is the lack of clarity of the definition of persons with disabilities and the various categories of disability.
- The focus is more on legislation and policy development rather than on actual implementation and this constrains the employment of persons with disabilities.
- Clear targets for employment of persons with disabilities have not been set and is identified as a constraint for the following reasons:
  - Black people are "historically disadvantaged individuals" but people with disabilities have on-going struggles with thoughtlessness and discrimination and should be regarded as "continuously disadvantaged".
  - There should be no upper limit targets to employing persons with disabilities.
  - The targets set should be enforced.
- Human resource management practitioners lack knowledge of disability management and this was identified as a constraint for the following reasons:
  - Human resource management practitioners were not trained on disability management.
  - A number of respondents also stated that they have limited knowledge of the legislation and policy framework.
  - Clarity on the responsibility of an employee to assist a disabled co-worker was raised as information that was required.
  - Guidelines should assist to clarify matters of reasonable accommodation.

In summary, environmental accessibility and reasonable accommodation were again raised as paramount issues when considering the legislative and policy framework. It was indicated that the legislation and policies were not clear, not appropriate or not enforced. The need for comprehensive legislation has also been raised. The purposive sample of persons who have knowledge and experience of disability management has also brought the need for training on the legislative and policy framework to the attention. It was also raised that focus should be on implementation and enforcement of existing policies and laws rather than on developing new policies and legislation.

South Africa has signed the ICRPD as discussed in Chapter 4 (par 4.4). Article 27 of the ICRPD calls on state parties to recognise the rights of persons with disabilities to work with others on an equal basis. The ICRPD requires state parties to safeguard and promote the realisation of the right to work by prohibiting discrimination, protect the rights of persons with disabilities and ensure that they are able to exercise their labour and trade union rights, amongst others. The discussion of the South African disability management framework in Chapter 5 concluded that South Africa is largely compliant with the ICRPD. The South African Government continues to improve the implementation of the disability management framework. However, it is further concluded that persons with disabilities, managers and human resource management practitioners do not utilise the disability management framework. This conclusion exposes two areas, namely lack of knowledge by critical role players and poor enforcement by top management.

In considering the abovementioned research results, the constraints to the employment of persons with disabilities which need to be addressed in terms of the strategy to employ persons with disabilities, are presented in Table 60 below. The strategic outputs suggested to mitigate these constraints, will be discussed in more detail in the following chapter.



**Table 60: Summary of the constraints identified in relation to the usefulness of the legal and policy framework**

CONSTRAINT NUMBER	DESCRIPTION OF CONSTRAINTS IDENTIFIED
4.	The Constitution, 1996, EEA, INDS and TAG are not sufficiently useful to manage disability in the workplace.
5.	The South African legislative and policy framework were hardly ever used to assist with disability management.
6.	Reasonable accommodation and environmental accessibility not clearly described in policy guidelines.
7.	Lack of focus on the employment of persons with disabilities.
8.	Unfair targets to employ persons with disabilities as they are continuously disabled.

### 9.2.3 SECTION 4: GENERAL PERCEPTIONS - QUESTIONS 17 TO 27

The section of the questionnaire relating to general perceptions concerning persons with disabilities was divided into 11 quantitative questions.

Questions 17 to 27 and their response categories read as follows:

**Table 61: The question and response categories related to general perceptions.**

NO	QUESTION/STATEMENT	RESPONSE						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17.	Employees with disabilities generally are able to work as well as any other employee.	Indicates strong disagreement.						Indicates strong agreement.
18.	Employees with disabilities are able to do physically strenuous work.	Indicates strong disagreement.						Indicates strong agreement.

19.	Employees with disabilities are difficult to manage.	1 Indicates strong disagreement.	2	3	4	5	6	7 Indicates strong agreement.
20.	Employees with disabilities require special attention from their supervisors.	1 Indicates strong disagreement.	2	3	4	5	6	7 Indicates strong agreement.
21.	It is more expensive to employ employees with disabilities than any other employee.	1 Indicates strong disagreement.	2	3	4	5	6	7 Indicates strong agreement.
22.	Employees with disabilities are absent from work due to illness more often than other employees.	1 Indicates strong disagreement.	2	3	4	5	6	7 Indicates strong agreement.
23.	Employers are not willing to employ persons with disabilities.	1 Indicates strong disagreement.	2	3	4	5	6	7 Indicates strong agreement.
24.	Workplaces are not friendly towards disabled persons.	1 Indicates strong dis-	2	3	4	5	6	7 Indicates strong agree-

		agree- ment.							ment.
25.	A CV indicating that a job applicant is disabled is not properly considered.	1 Indi- cates strong dis- agree- ment.	2	3	4	5	6	7 Indi- cates strong agree- ment.	
26.	Organisations ignore disability management issues because it conflicts with business objectives.	1 Indi- cates strong dis- agree- ment.	2	3	4	5	6	7 Indi- cates strong agree- ment.	
27.	Organisations encourage managers to ignore disability issues because it conflicts with business objectives.	1 Indi- cates strong dis- agree- ment.	2	3	4	5	6	7 Indi- cates strong agree- ment.	

The results are presented in Table 62 below:

**Table 62: Responses to questions 17 to 27 grouped into three categories indicating disagreement, neutrality and agreement with each statement**

Question	DISABLED			NOT DISABLED			COMBINED		
	Disagree- ment	Neutral	Agree- ment	Disagree- ment	Neutral	Agree- ment	Disagree- ment	Neutral	Agree- ment
17.	34 89%	1 2%	3 8%	37 80%	1 2%	8 17%	71 85%	2 2%	11 13%

Question	DISABLED			NOT DISABLED			COMBINED		
18.	14 37%	10 26%	14 37%	10 22%	13 28%	23 50%	24 29%	23 27%	37 44%
19.	34 89%	1 3%	3 8%	35 76%	5 11%	6 13%	69 82%	6 7%	9 11%
20.	20 53%	3 8%	15 39%	23 50%	6 13%	17 37%	43 51%	9 11%	32 38%
21.	28 74%	4 11%	6 16%	18 39%	8 17%	20 43%	46 55%	12 14%	26 31%
22.	24 63%	6 16%	8 21%	32 70%	7 15%	7 15%	56 67%	13 15%	15 18%
23.	2 5%	5 13%	31 82%	7 15%	7 15%	32 70%	9 11%	12 14%	63 75%
24.	2 5%	1 3%	35 92%	2 4%	8 17%	36 78%	4 5%	9 11%	71 85%
25.	3 8%	5 13%	30 79%	16 35%	13 28%	17 37%	19 23%	18 21%	47 56%
26.	2 5%	7 18%	29 76%	13 18%	12 26%	21 46%	15 18%	19 23%	50 60%
27.	7 18%	14 37%	17 45%	26 57%	8 17%	12 26%	33 39%	22 26%	29 35%

**Question 17 (Employees with disabilities generally are able to work as well as any other employee)**

It is observed from Table 62 that a total of 19 (50%) disabled respondents indicated strong agreement with the statement that employees with disabilities were able to work as well as any other employee. Should the categories be divided into the “agreement” and “disagreement” categories it is observed that of all respondents, 34 (89%) agreed while 3 (8%) disagreed.

A total of 18 (39%) not disabled respondents indicated a lesser “agreement” with the statement. Should the categories be divided as indicated above, 37 (80%) respondents disagreed while 8 (17%) fell into the agreement category.

Most respondents, (29 – 35%) indicated “strong agreement” with the statement. Should the categories be divided as indicated above, 71 (85%) respondents agreed while 11 (13%) disagreed.

### **Question 18 (Employees with disabilities are able to do physically strenuous work)**

From Table 62 it is observed that 10 (26%) disabled respondents submitted a neutral response. A total of 14 (37%) disabled respondents agreed while 14 (37%) disagreed.

Of the not disabled respondents, 13 (28%) indicated a neutral response, while 10 (22%) respondents agreed and 23 (50%) disagreed that employees with disabilities are able to do physically strenuous work.

Overall, a total of 23 (27%) respondents submitted a neutral response, and 24 (29%) respondents agreed while 37 (44%) disagreed.

### **Question 19 (Employees with disabilities are difficult to manage)**

From Table 62 it is observed that 3 (8%) disabled respondents agreed while 34 (89%) disagreed with the statement.

It is also observed that 6 (13%) not disabled respondents disagreed while 35 (76%) agreed.

Overall, the most respondents (69 – 82%) disagreed with the statement that employees with disabilities are difficult to manage.

**Question 20 (Employees with disabilities require special attention from their supervisors)**

From Table 62 it is observed that the responses of disabled and not disabled respondents are spread fairly evenly amongst the seven response categories. Overall, the most respondents (43 – 51%) disagreed with the statement that employees with disabilities require special attention from their supervisors while 32 (38%) respondents agreed with the statement that they do require special attention from their supervisors.

**Question 21 (It is more expensive to employ employees with disabilities than any other employee)**

From Table 62 it is observed that 6 (16%) disabled respondents agreed while 28 (74%) disagreed.

It is further observed that 20 (43%) not disabled respondents agreed while 18 (39%) disagreed.

Overall, the majority of respondents (46 – 55%) indicated their disagreement with the statement while 26 (31%) respondents agreed.

**Question 22 (Employees with disabilities are absent from work due to illness more often than other employees)**

It is observed from Table 62 that 8 (21%) disabled respondents agreed while 24 (63%) disagreed with the statement.

It was further observed that 7 (15%) not disabled respondents agreed while 32 (70%) disagreed.

Overall, 15 (18%) respondents agreed, while 56 (67%) disagreed that employees with disabilities are absent from work more often than other employees.

### **Question 23 (Employers are not willing to employ persons with disabilities)**

From Table 62 it is observed that a total of 31 (82%) disabled respondents agreed while 2 (5%) disagreed with the statement that employers are not willing to employ persons with disabilities.

It was also observed that 32 (70%) not disabled respondents agreed while 7 (15%) disagreed.

Overall, 63 (75%) respondents agreed that employers are not willing to employ persons with disabilities.

### **Question 24 (Workplaces are not friendly towards persons with disabilities)**

It was observed from Table 62 that 35 (92%) disabled respondents agreed while 2 (5%) disagreed with the statement that workplaces are not friendly towards persons with disabilities.

Thirty six (36 - 78%) not disabled respondents agreed, while 2 (4%) disagreed.

Overall, 71 (85%) respondents agreed with the statement that workplaces are not friendly towards persons with disabilities.

### **Question 25 (A CV indicating that a job applicant is disabled, is not properly considered)**

In this case it is observed from Table 62 that a total of 30 (79%) disabled respondents agreed while 3 (8%) disagreed with the statement that a CV indicating that a job applicant is disabled is not properly considered.

Almost one-third (13 – 28%) not disabled respondents indicated a neutral response while 17 (37%) not disabled respondents agreed while 16 (35%) disagreed.

Overall the majority of respondents (47 – 56%) indicated “agreement” while 19 (23%) disagreed with the statement that a CV of a disabled job applicant is not properly considered.

**Question 26 (Organisations ignore disability management issues because it conflicts with business objectives)**

From Table 62 it is observed that 29 (76%) disabled respondents agreed with the statement that organisations ignore disability management issues because it conflicts with business objectives while 2 (5%) disagreed.

It is further observed that 21 (46%) not disabled respondents agreed, while 13 (28%) disagreed with the statement.

Overall, the majority (50 - 60%) of respondents agreed while 15 (18%) disagreed that organisations ignore disability issues because it conflicts with business objectives. Nineteen (19 - 23%) of the overall responses indicated a neutral response.

**Question 27 (Organisations encourage managers to ignore disability issues because it conflicts with business objectives)**

From Table 62 it is observed that 14 (37%) disabled respondents indicated a neutral response. It is further observed that 17 (45%) respondents agreed while 7 (18%) disagreed. Fourteen (14 - 37%) disabled respondents indicated a neutral response.

In the instance of not disabled respondents, 12 (26%) agreed, while 26 (57%) disagreed.

Overall, 29 (35%) respondents agreed while 33 (39%) disagreed that organisations encourage managers to ignore disability issues because it conflicts with business objectives. A total of 22 (26%) respondents indicated a neutral response.

The means for section 4 of the questionnaire are presented in Table 63 below.



**Table 63: Means of questions 17 to 27 related to respondents' views regarding general perceptions**

QUESTION	N	MEAN
17.	84	5,57143*
18.	84	3,84524*
19.	84	2,36905
20.	84	3,55952
21.	84	3,27381
22.	84	2,79762
23.	84	5,28571
24.	84	5,55952
25.	84	4,69048
26.	84	4,80952
27.	84	3,88095

From Table 63 it is observed that the mean of the scores to question 17 (5,57143) is above 5. A positive perception therefore exists that employees with disabilities work as well as any other employee. This perception was therefore not identified as a constraint.

The mean of the scores to question 18 (3,84524) is below 5 and indicates that a perception exists that employees with disabilities are not able to do physically strenuous work. This perception was therefore identified as a constraint to the employment of persons with disabilities. It is interesting to note that both groups of respondents responded similarly to this question, leading to a conclusion that both response groups have a perception that persons with disabilities are not able to do physically strenuous work. A perception like this is likely to cause persons with disabilities not to apply for work which is physically strenuous and for employers not to consider the CV of a person with disabilities. A proper job match should rather be performed before it is decided whether a person with disabilities can perform the work or not. Considering the high percentage of persons with disabilities in the “unschooled” category of the South African labour market as discussed in Chapter 6, this perception is a constraint in the employment of persons with disabilities.

Responses to questions 19 to 27 required careful interpretation since the questions were phrased differently (negatively) from the positively stated questions so far. The nature of these questions was also complicated. The negatively stated questions (questions 19 to 27) had to be interpreted inversely from the positively stated questions. A mean score higher than 3 in respect of any of these questions would, therefore, indicate that the perception is a constraint and should be included in the strategy to employ persons with disabilities.

The mean for question 19 is below 3 (2,36905) which, when interpreted inversely, indicates that the perception that employees with disabilities are difficult to manage, was not identified as a constraint to the employment of persons with disabilities.

The mean for question 20 is above 3 (3,55952) which, when interpreted inversely, indicates that the perception that employees with disabilities require special attention from their supervisors was identified by respondents as a constraint to the employment of persons with disabilities.

The mean for question 21 is above 3 (3,27381) which, when interpreted inversely, indicates that the perception that it is more expensive to employ persons with

disabilities than any other employee, was identified by respondents as a constraint to the employment of persons with disabilities.

The mean for question 22 is below 3 (2,79762) which, when interpreted inversely, indicates that the perception that employees with disabilities are absent from work due to illness more often than other employees, was not identified by respondents as a constraint to the employment of persons with disabilities.

The mean for question 23 is above 3 (5,28571) which, when interpreted inversely, indicates that the perception that employers are not willing to employ persons with disabilities was identified by respondents as a constraint to the employment of persons with disabilities.

The mean for question 24 is above 3 (5,55952) which, when interpreted inversely, indicates that the perception that workplaces are not friendly towards disabled persons, was identified by respondents as a constraint to the employment of persons with disabilities.

The mean for question 25 is above 3 (4,69048) which, when interpreted inversely, indicates that the perception that employers do not properly consider a CV indicating that a job applicant is disabled, was identified by respondents as a constraint to the employment of persons with disabilities.

The mean for question 26 is above 3 (4,80952) which, when interpreted inversely, indicates that the perception that organisations ignore disability management issues because it conflicts with business objectives, were identified by respondents as a constraint to the employment of persons with disabilities.

The mean for question 27 is above 3 (3,88095) which, when interpreted inversely, indicates that the perception that organisations encourage managers to ignore disability issues because it conflicts with business objectives, was identified by respondents as a constraint to the employment of persons with disabilities.

The definition of Jahiel (2007) as discussed in Chapter 2 defined disability as the “set of limits imposed by the interaction of the social and physical environment...”. Throughout the research the environmental accessibility and reasonable accommodation have been raised by respondents which essentially relates to the “physical environment” referred to by Jahiel. The “social environment” refers to the manner in which other people respond to persons with disabilities in normal life. Perceptions are a significant determinant in this regard. Within the South African context of a complex political history, perceptions are a very important aspect of daily living. Section 9 of the Constitution, 1996, PEPUDA and the EEA have been enacted to deal with discrimination. Perceptions originate within the model of disability as discussed in Chapter 3. Kaplan date unknown, Kluth 2006, and Albert 2004 and others identified several disability models of which the medical model and the social model are the most prominent. The social model specifically emphasises the human rights based approach which views persons with disabilities as subjects and not as objects and moving away from viewing persons with disabilities as problems to viewing them as rights holders (Waddington 1995:6, INDS 1997:11, Quinn and Degener 2002:10). The fact that the South African legislative framework prohibits discrimination against persons with disabilities but the key role players who should implement it, is not aware of it and therefore does not implement it nullifies the effects of the said legislative framework.

In summary, the abovementioned research results identified perceptions which are constraints to the employment of persons with disabilities and the perceptions need to be addressed in terms of the strategy to employ persons with disabilities. These perceptions are set out in Table 64 below. The strategic output required to mitigate these constraints will be discussed in more detail in the following chapter.

**Table 64: Summary of the constraints identified in relation to the general perceptions**

CONSTRAINT NUMBER	DESCRIPTION OF CONSTRAINTS IDENTIFIED
9.	<p>Respondents identified the following general perceptions as constraints:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Employees with disabilities are not able to do physically strenuous work.</li> <li>➤ Employees with disabilities require special attention from their supervisors.</li> <li>➤ Employees with disabilities are more expensive to employ than any other employee.</li> <li>➤ Employers are not willing to employ persons with disabilities.</li> <li>➤ Workplaces are not friendly towards disabled persons.</li> <li>➤ A CV indicating that a job applicant is disabled is not properly considered by organisations.</li> <li>➤ Organisations ignore disability management issues because it conflicts with business objectives.</li> <li>➤ Organisations encourage managers to ignore disability issues because it conflicts with business objectives.</li> </ul>

**9.2.4 SECTION 5: AVAILABILITY OF DISABILITY MANAGEMENT POLICY, CAPACITY AND COMMITMENT OF KEY ROLE-PLAYERS IN RESPONDENTS' ORGANISATION - QUESTIONS 28 – 35**

The part of the questionnaire related to the availability of disability management policy and capacity in respondents' organisations was divided into 14 questions of a quantitative nature. Questions 28 to 34 (7 questions) and its response categories are presented in Table 65 below:

**Table 65: Questions and response categories related to the availability of disability management policy and capacity in respondents' organisations**

NO	QUESTION/STATEMENT	RESPONSE						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
28.	Does your organisation have approved and clear written policies or guidelines on employing employees with disabilities?	1 Indicates not at all.	2	3	4	5	6	7 Indicates completely/fully.
29.	Do you use the policy or written guidelines to guide your disability management related decisions at work?	1 Indicates not at	2	3	4	5	6	7 Indicates com-

		all.						pletely/ fully.
30.	Does your organisation have a disability office or a disability ombudsman to whom employees can report suspected discrimination or receive advice about disability issues?	1 Indicates not at all.	2	3	4	5	6	7 Indicates completely/ fully.
31.	Does your HR department act as the primary resource for your organisation's disability initiative?	1 Indicates not at all.	2	3	4	5	6	7 Indicates completely/ fully.
32.	Are HR professionals involved in formulating disability management policies for your organisation?	1 Indicates not at all.	2	3	4	5	6	7 Indicates completely/ fully.
33.	Are the individuals responsible for managing the disability programme in your organisation qualified and experienced for the task?	1 Indicates not at all.	2	3	4	5	6	7 Indicates completely/ fully.
34.	Do employees know who to contact when requiring information on disability management?	1 Indicates not at all.	2	3	4	5	6	7 Indicates completely/ fully.

The results are presented in Table 66 below:

**Table 66: Responses to questions 28 to 34 grouped into three categories indicating disagreement, neutrality or agreement with each statement**

Question	DISABLED			NOT DISABLED			COMBINED		
	Not at all	Neutral	Fully	Not at all	Neutral	Fully	Not at all	Neutral	Fully
28.	11 32%	3 9%	20 59%	13 29%	4 9%	28 62%	24 30%	7 9%	48 61%
29.	18 53%	2 6%	14 41%	17 38%	7 16%	21 47%	35 44%	9 11%	35 44%
30.	18 53%	0	16 47%	28 62%	3 7%	14 31%	46 58%	3 4%	30 38%
31.	11 32%	5 15%	18 53%	15 33%	5 11%	25 56%	26 33%	10 13%	43 54%
32.	13 38%	8 24%	13 38%	14 31%	7 16%	24 53%	27 34%	15 19%	37 47%
33.	18 53%	2 6%	14 41%	19 42%	8 18%	18 40%	37 47%	10 13%	32 41%
34.	14 41%	4 12%	16 47%	16 36%	8 18%	21 47%	30 38%	12 16%	37 47%

**Question 28 (Does your organisation have approved and clear written policies or guidelines on employing employees with disabilities?)**

It is observed from Table 66 that a total of 20 (59%) disabled respondents agreed while 11 (32%) disagreed with the statement that their organisations have policies in place.

Twenty eight (28 - 62%) not disabled respondents agreed that their organisations have policies in place while 13 (29%) disagreed with the statement.

Overall, 48 (61%) respondents agreed with the statement that their organisations have policies in place while 24 (30%) indicated to the contrary.

**Question 29 (Do you use the policy or written guidelines to guide your disability management related decisions at work?)**

It is observed from Table 66 that 18 (53%) disabled respondents indicated that they do not use the policies or written guidelines to guide disability management related decisions while 14 (41%) indicated that they use such policies or guidelines.

A total of 21 (47%) not disabled respondents indicated that they use such policies or written guidelines while 17 (38%) indicated that they do not use such documents.

Overall, the respondents were evenly divided as 35 (44%) respondents revealed that they use such policies or written guidelines while 35 mentioned that they do not use such documents.

**Question 30 (Does your organisation have a disability office or a disability ombudsman to whom employees can report suspected discrimination or receive advice about disability issues?)**

It is observed from Table 66 that a total of 18 (53%) of disabled respondents do not have a disability ombudsman in the organisations that they work for while 16 (47%) have an ombudsman. According to the not disabled group, 28 (62%) do not have a disability ombudsman while 14 (31%) have such a person in the organisation that they work for.

The overall responses showed that 46 (58%) respondents do not have a disability ombudsman while 30 (38%) indicated that they have one in the organisation that they work for.

**Question 31 (Does your HR department act as the primary resource for your organisation's disability initiative?)**

It is observed from Table 66 that overall, 43 (54%) respondents indicated that their human resource management components act as the primary resource of the



organisations' disability initiative while 26 (33%) indicated that they do not act as such.

**Question 32 (Are HR professionals involved in formulating disability management policies for your organisation?)**

It is observed from Table 66 that overall, 37 (47%) respondents indicated that human resource management professionals are involved in the formulation of disability management policies for their respective organisations, while 27 (34%) indicated that they are not sufficiently involved.

**Question 33 (Are the individuals responsible for managing the disability programme in your organisation qualified and experienced for the task?)**

It is observed from Table 66 that overall, 37 (47%) respondents indicated that those individuals who are responsible for managing the disability programme in their respective organisations are not qualified for and experienced in the task while 32 (41%) stated that they are qualified and experienced.

**Question 34 (Do employees know who to contact when requiring information on disability management?)**

It is observed from Table 66 that overall, the outcome of the responses to this question is that 37 (47%) respondents mentioned that they know whom to contact when requiring information on disability management while 30 (38%) did not know.

**Question 35**

Questions 35.1 to 35.7 (7 questions) and its response categories are presented in Table 67 below:

**Table 67: The questions and response categories related to the commitment of key role players to disability management**

35.	To what extent are the following key people in your organisation committed to disability management? Tick only the positions relevant to your organisation.							
35.1.	CEO/Director-General/Top Management.	1 Indicates not at all.	2	3	4	5	6	7 Indicates completely/fully.
35.2.	Senior management.	1 Indicates not at all.	2	3	4	5	6	7 Indicates completely/fully.
35.3.	Middle management.	1 Indicates not at all.	2	3	4	5	6	7 Indicates completely/fully.
35.4.	Direct supervisor.	1 Indicates not at all.	2	3	4	5	6	7 Indicates completely/fully.
35.5.	Subordinates.	1 Indicates not at all.	2	3	4	5	6	7 Indicates completely/fully.
35.6.	Peers.	1 Indicates not at all.	2	3	4	5	6	7 Indicates completely/fully.
35.7.	Other employees.	1 Indicates not at all.	2	3	4	5	6	7 Indicates completely/fully.

The responses were tabulated as follows:

**Table 68: Responses to question 35 grouped into three categories indicating disagreement, neutrality and agreement with each statement**

QUESTION	DISABLED			NOT DISABLED			COMBINED		
	Not at all	Neutral	Fully	Not at all	Neutral	Fully	Not at all	Neutral	Fully
35.									
35.1.	8 36%	4 18%	10 45%	11 33%	2 6%	20 61%	19 35%	6 11%	30 55%
35.2.	11 50%	2 9%	9 41%	11 33%	4 12%	18 55%	22 40%	6 11%	27 49%
35.3.	9 41%	5 23%	8 36%	12 36%	7 21%	14 42%	21 38%	12 22%	22 40%
35.4.	6 27%	5 23%	11 50%	15 45%	3 9%	15 45%	21 38%	8 15%	26 47%
35.5.	9 41%	3 14%	10 45%	12 36%	7 21%	14 42%	21 38%	10 18%	24 44%
35.6	8 36%	5 23%	9 41%	11 33%	7 21%	15 45%	19 35%	12 22%	24 44%
35.7.	8 36%	9 41%	5 23%	11 33%	10 30%	12 36%	19 35%	19 35%	17 31%

### Question 35 (Commitment of key role player to disability management)

It is observed from Table 68 that overall, 50% or less of the disabled respondents indicated that the various strategic role-players as listed in question 35.1. to 35.7 are fully committed to disability management. Between 9% and 41% of disabled respondents had a neutral response, which is significant because a neutral response is indicative of doubt whether there is commitment or not. Commitment is important to make an impact in challenging situations and their responses indicate that persons with disabilities generally view the commitment as lacking.

Twenty (20 - 61%) not disabled respondents responded that the “CEO/Director-General/Top Management” is fully committed to disability management. The responses in respect of the other role-players are significantly lower.

The means of questions 28 to 35.7 are presented in Table 69 below.

**Table 69: Means of questions 28 to 35.7 related to respondents’ views regarding the availability of disability management policy and capacity and the commitment of key role-players in respondents’ organisations**

QUESTION	N	MEAN
28.	79	4,63291
29.	79	4,02532
30.	79	3,43038
31.	79	4,36709
32.	79	4,12658
33.	79	3,81013
34.	79	4,10127
35.1.	55	4,70909
35.2.	55	4,18182
35.3.	55	4,07273

QUESTION	N	MEAN
35.4.	55	4.12727
35.5.	55	3.96364
35.6.	55	4.10909
35.7.	55	3.94545

It is observed from Table 69 that the means of all these questions are below 5 which are indicative that disability management policy and capacity were not available in respondents' organisations. Based on the interpretation key, whereas the respective means of questions 28 to 35.7 is below 5, these are constraints to the employment of persons with disabilities including the commitment of key people in organisations.

The INDS (1997) follows a socio-political approach to disability management which determines that disability is located in the social environment, but within a supportive political environment. Persons with disabilities can actively contribute to changing the social construct by advocating and lobbying in the political domain for improvements in their material and legal situation.

From the abovementioned research results it is evident that employers are not institutionalising disability management within organisations and the political environment in South Africa does not substantially support the process of disability management.

Chapter III of the EEA requires of designated employers to implement affirmative action measures which, if implemented, would have addressed constraint 10, 11 and 12 directly. Constraints 13 to 17 are practical measures which would assist employers to implement disability management.

In considering the abovementioned research results, the constraints to the employment of persons with disabilities that need to be addressed in terms of the strategy to employ persons with disabilities, are set out in Table 70 below. The strategic output required to mitigate these constraints will be discussed in more detail in the following chapter.

**Table 70: Constraints identified in relation to the availability of disability management policy, capacity and commitment of key role-players in respondents' organisations**

CONSTRAINT NUMBER	DESCRIPTION OF CONSTRAINTS IDENTIFIED
10.	Organisations do not have approved and clear written policies or guidelines on employing employees with disabilities.
11.	Existing policy or written guidelines are not utilised to guide disability management related decisions at work.
12.	Organisations do not have a disability office or a disability ombudsman to whom employees can report suspected discrimination or receive advice about disability issues.
13.	HR departments do not act as the primary resource for the disability initiative of organisations.
14.	HR professionals are not involved in formulating disability management policies for their organisations.
15.	Individuals responsible for managing the disability programme in organisations are not qualified and experienced for the task.
16.	Employees do not know who to contact when requiring information on disability management.
17.	The following key people in organisations are not sufficiently committed to disability management: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ CEO/Director-General/Top Management.</li> <li>➤ Senior management.</li> <li>➤ Middle management.</li> <li>➤ Subordinates.</li> <li>➤ Peers.</li> <li>➤ Other employees.</li> </ul>

#### 9.2.5 SECTION 6: PREVALENCE OF EMPLOYEES WITH DISABILITIES - QUESTIONS 36 TO 39

The part of the questionnaire related to the prevalence of employees with disabilities and existing recruitment practices in respondents' organisations, was divided into 5 questions and 7 subquestions. Questions 36 to 39 and their response categories are presented in Table 71 below:

**Table 71: Questions and response categories related to the prevalence of employees with disabilities in respondents' organisations**

NO	QUESTION/STATEMENT	RESPONSE		
36.	How many employees does your organisation employ?	Number.	<input type="text"/>	
37.	How many employees with disabilities does your organisation employ?	Number.	<input type="text"/>	
38.	How many NEW employees with disabilities did your organisation employ in the past 12 months?	Number.	<input type="text"/>	
39.	How many employees employed by your organisation are?	Sight disabled.	<input type="text"/>	
		Intellectually disabled.	<input type="text"/>	
		Emotionally disabled.	<input type="text"/>	
		Hearing disabled.	<input type="text"/>	
		Communication disabled.	<input type="text"/>	
		Physically disabled.	<input type="text"/>	
		Other.	<input type="text"/>	

It is observed from Table 71 that the questions do not relate to the constraints in employing persons with disabilities but rather to the prevalence of persons with disabilities. Practically, the nature of the responses made it very difficult to analyse the responses and obtain meaningful results. Some respondents did also not have this detailed information and could therefore not respond to the questions. From those respondents that did respond, the percentage of employees employed by disabled respondents' organisations was 13% of their total workforce. This is exceptionally high by South African standards due to a number of disabled respondents being employed by organisations specialising in the employment of persons with disabilities. The organisations of not disabled respondents employed significantly fewer disabled employees, namely 4% of their total workforce. Although this percentage was significantly lower than the responses for the disabled group, it was still significantly higher than the South African national average of less than 1% as discussed in Chapters 1 and 6.

The prevalence of persons with disabilities is therefore skewed with the relatively small number of respondents who completed this question. It was therefore decided that the responses to questions 36 to 39 would not be considered.

## Question 40

Question 40 and its response categories are presented in Table 72 below:

**Table 72: Questions and response categories related to the method of recruiting employees with disabilities**

NO	QUESTION/STATEMENT	RESPONSE			
		No.		Yes.	No.
40.	How does your organisation recruit employees with disabilities?	No.		Yes.	No.
		40.1.	No specific effort is made.		
		40.2.	Normal recruitment processes.		
		40.3.	Headhunting.		
		40.4.	Recruitment agencies.		
		40.5.	Recruitment agencies specialising in finding persons with disabilities.		
		40.6.	Adverts in the magazines published by organisations for the disabled?		
		40.7.	Other (describe please).		

### **Question 40.1 (How does your organisation recruit employees with disabilities? - No specific effort is made)**

A total of 13 (34%) disabled respondents indicated that no specific efforts were made to recruit persons with disabilities while 25 (66%) responded that special efforts were made. Of the not disabled respondents, 21 (47%) mentioned that no special efforts were made to recruit persons with disabilities while 24 (53%) indicated that special efforts were indeed made.

### **Question 40.2 (How does your organisation recruit employees with disabilities? - Normal recruitment processes)**

Seventeen (17 - 45%) disabled respondents responded that normal recruitment processes were followed while 21 (55%) responded that such processes were not followed. A total of 28 (62%) not disabled respondents indicated that normal recruitment processes were followed while 17 (38%) responded that normal processes were not followed.



**Question 40.3 (How does your organisation recruit employees with disabilities? – Headhunting)**

In this case, 5 (13%) disabled respondents mentioned that headhunting was used to recruit persons with disabilities while 33 (87%) stated that headhunting was not used. Also, 6 (13%) of not disabled respondents indicated that headhunting was used to recruit persons with disabilities while 39 (87%) responded negatively to this statement.

**Question 40.4 (How does your organisation recruit employees with disabilities? - Recruitment agencies)**

A total of 33 (89%) disabled respondents and 31 (67%) not disabled respondents states that recruitment agencies were not used.

**Question 40.5 (How does your organisation recruit employees with disabilities? - Recruitment agencies specialising in finding persons with disabilities)**

Seven (7 - 18%) disabled respondents indicated that specialised recruitment agencies were used to recruit persons with disabilities while 31 (82%) responded that this was not the case. The not disabled group had a similar response with 8 (18%) respondents indicating that specialised recruitment agencies were used for recruitment while 37 (82%) responded that this was not the case.

**Question 40.6 (How does your organisation recruit employees with disabilities? - Adverts in the magazines published by organisations for the disabled?)**

Here 6 (16%) disabled respondents indicated that adverts were placed in magazines targeting persons with disabilities while 32 (84%) revealed that this was not the case. A similar trend was identified with not disabled respondents of whom 38 (84%)

indicated that adverts were not placed in magazines targeting persons with disabilities.

In considering the trends which became evident in the analysis of the responses to these questions, it would appear as if the organisations to which respondents belong do not have special initiatives in place to recruit persons with disabilities. No identifiable pattern could be distinguished to indicate a recipe for success. The strategy would have to provide strategic direction to the recruitment process since recruitment is the human resource management process which directly impacts on the employment of persons with disabilities.

In considering the abovementioned research results the constraints to the employment of persons with disabilities which requires to be addressed in terms of the strategy to employ persons with disabilities are presented in Table 73 below. The strategic output required to mitigate these constraints will be discussed in more detail in the following chapter.

**Table 73: Constraint identified in relation to the recruitment of persons with disabilities**

CONSTRAINT NUMBER	DESCRIPTION OF CONSTRAINTS IDENTIFIED
18.	Lack of a focused strategy to recruit persons with disabilities.

#### 9.2.6 SECTION 7: HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PRACTICES

The part of the questionnaire related to various human resource management practices in respect of respondents' organisations, are divided into the following sections:

Training and Development	Questions 41 to 44
Performance Management	Questions 45 to 49
Recruitment and Selection	Questions 50 to 54
Employee Retention and Exit Management Strategy	Questions 55 to 63
Labour Relations Management Strategy	Questions 64 to 69

## SECTION 7.1: Training and development- Questions 41 to 44

Questions 41 to 44 and their response categories read as follows:

**Table 74: Questions and response categories related to the training and development in respondents' organisations**

NO	QUESTION/STATEMENT	RESPONSE						
		<table border="1" style="width: 100%; text-align: center;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;">Yes.</td> <td style="width: 50%;">No.</td> </tr> </table>						
Yes.	No.							
41.	Does your organisation provide training in dealing with issues related to the employment of persons with disabilities? If yes, please describe.	<hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>						
42.	How often have you used the principles taught in this training to guide your decisions at work?	1 Indicates never.	2	3	4	5	6	7 Indicates always.
43.	Please indicate which areas do you think should be covered in an employment focused disability management training programme?							
44.	Who should undergo this training?	Managers.						
Middle managers.								
Lower level.								
All staff.								
Other.								

**Question 41 (Does your organisation provide training in dealing with issues related to the employment of persons with disabilities? If yes, please describe)**

Twenty six percent (26%) of disabled respondents indicated that their organisations do provide training in employment of persons with disabilities while 28 (74%) mentioned that such training is lacking. Similarly 16 (35%) of the not disabled respondents indicated that training is provided while 30 (65%) indicated that no training is provided.

The respondents indicating “yes” described the following training programmes which are presented:

- Sensitisation/awareness;

- sign language;
- Braille training;
- orientation and mobility;
- employment equity;
- Constitution, 1996;
- recruitment and selection practice with regard to disabled employees;
- training for HR professionals; and
- communication.

**Question 42 (How often have you used the principles taught in this training to guide your decisions at work?)**

The frequencies of responses to question 42 are presented in Table 75 below:

**Table 75: Frequencies to question 42 indicating how often respondents used the principles taught in disability management training to guide their decisions at work**

CATEGORY	DISABLED		NOT DISABLED		COMBINED	
	FREQUENCY	%	FREQUENCY	%	FREQUENCY	%
1	12	44	19	44	31	44
2	2	7	5	12	7	10
3	2	7	1	2	3	4
4	2	7	4	9	6	9
5	4	15	5	12	9	13
6	2	7	3	7	5	7
7	3	11	5	12	8	11

It is observed from Table 75 that the disabled and not disabled respondents, 12 (44%) and 19 (44%) respectively, indicated that the principles taught in the training are never used. The remainder of the respondents are spread evenly throughout the other response categories.

**Question 43 (Areas to be covered in an employment focused disability management training programme)**

The respondents identified a number of areas that should be covered in an employment focused disability management training programme. These areas are

detailed in Table 76 below and has broadly been categorised into two types of training, namely disability sensitisation and human resource management related.

**Table 76: Areas that should be covered in an employment focused disability management training programme**

TYPE OF TRAINING	AREAS INCLUDED
Disability sensitisation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Total awareness and understanding;</li> <li>➤ dealing with needs of persons with disabilities;</li> <li>➤ awareness of prejudices and stereotypes;</li> <li>➤ assisting persons with disabilities with matters related to transferring to wheelchairs, eating, filing, reaching and lifting items, draining of urinal bags and other physical needs;</li> <li>➤ different types of disabilities and an awareness of the specific individual difficulties experienced by the different types of disability;</li> <li>➤ motivating and inspiring persons with disabilities;</li> <li>➤ responding to emergencies;</li> <li>➤ office etiquette; and</li> <li>➤ time management.</li> </ul>
Human resource management related.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Identification of training needs of persons with disabilities;</li> <li>➤ identifying abilities of disabled persons during the recruitment process and thereafter (focussed on senior and middle level managers);</li> <li>➤ medical and psychological testing;</li> <li>➤ confidentiality and disclosure;</li> <li>➤ employment planning and how to improve employment of persons with disability;</li> <li>➤ summary of the TAG, legislation related to disability and employment;</li> <li>➤ exhibition and exposure to assistive devices;</li> <li>➤ assisting with career development of persons with disabilities;</li> <li>➤ performance evaluation - applies to employee as well as his or her supervisor;</li> <li>➤ training that will improve the performance of persons with disabilities;</li> <li>➤ case studies to show that it is not more expensive to employ people with disabilities;</li> <li>➤ independence training, orientation and mobility training, JAWS programme on computer for persons with disabilities;</li> <li>➤ mainstreaming of disability;</li> <li>➤ universal design;</li> <li>➤ good practice; and</li> <li>➤ accessibility.</li> </ul>

**Question 44 (Who should undergo disability management training? – Managers, Middle managers, Lower level, All staff, Other)**

The majority, namely 80 (98%) respondents indicated that “all staff” should attend the training. This overwhelming response should be an indication that training needs do exist and that all staff should be trained to understand disability management better.

In summary, the responses revealed that training was presented in a relatively small number of the respondents’ organisations. The notable area, however, was that the training provided was not utilised in making decisions related to disability management. The research does not clarify the reasons for the phenomena. In speculating about these reasons it could be the following contributing factors:

- The opportunities to utilise the training does not present itself due to the general lack of interest in employing persons with disabilities;
- persons with disabilities do not assert their rights as encapsulated in the Constitution, 1996, the EEA and other policy documents; and
- the work environment has not prioritised this area as a key performance area for managers at the various levels in the organisation.

**SECTION 7.2: Performance management – Questions 45 to 49**

Questions 45 to 49 and their response categories are presented in Table 77 below:

**Table 77: Questions and response categories related to performance management in respondents’ organisations**

NO	QUESTION/STATEMENT	RESPONSE						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
45.	To what extent does your organisation have an effective performance management system?	Indicates not at all.						Indicates completely/fully.
46.	To what extent is this performance management system applicable to employees with disabilities?	Indicates not at						Indicates com-

		all.						pletely/ fully.
47.	To what extent are the same performance standards applicable to employees with disabilities and employees who are not disabled?	1 Indi- cates not at all.	2	3	4	5	6	7 Indi- cates com- pletely/ fully.
48.	To what extent are the same rewards given for good performance to employees with disabilities and employees who are not disabled?	1 Indi- cates not at all.	2	3	4	5	6	7 Indi- cates com- pletely/ fully.
49.	Please describe any changes required in the performance management system to accommodate disabled employees more effectively: (open text)							

The responses to questions 45 to 48 are presented in Table 78 below:

**Table 78: Responses to questions 45 to 48 grouped into three categories indicating disagreement, neutrality or agreement with each statement**

QUES- TION	DISABLED			NOT DISABLED			COMBINED		
	Not at all	Neutral	Fully	Not at all	Neutral	Fully	Not at all	Neutral	Fully
45.	7 21%	1 3%	26 76%	10 23%	1 2%	32 74%	17 22%	2 3%	58 75%
46.	12 35%	9 26%	13 38%	10 23%	8 19%	25 58%	22 29%	17 22%	38 43%
47.	9 26%	3 9%	22 65%	9 21%	7 16%	27 63%	18 23%	10 13%	49 64%
48.	9 24%	6 18%	19 56%	8 19%	5 12%	30 70%	17 22%	11 14%	49 64%

The results of question 45 to 48 are discussed below. The results for the disabled and the not disabled groups are combined and not discussed separately throughout this section because the two groups have responded similarly. In those instances

where the two groups responded differently, it will be highlighted in the presentation of the results.

**Question 45 (The extent to which respondents' organisations has an effective performance management system)**

A total of 58 (75%) respondents overall revealed a positive response to the effect that their organisations do have a performance management system in place.

**Question 46 (The extent to which this performance management system is applicable to employees with disabilities)**

In this case, 38 (43%) respondents indicated a positive response, namely that a performance management system was applicable equally while 22 (29%) indicated that it was not the case.

**Question 47 (The extent to which the same performance standards are applicable to employees with disabilities and employees who are not disabled)**

Here 49 (64%) respondents stated that the same performance standards applied to disabled as well as not disabled employees while 18 (23%) respondents indicated that it was not the case.

**Question 48 (The extent to which the same rewards are given for good performance to employees with disabilities and employees who are not disabled)**

A total of 49 (64%) respondents revealed that the same rewards were granted to employees with disabilities and to employees who were not disabled while 17 (22%) respondents revealed that this was not the case.



**Question 49 (Description of changes required to the performance management system to accommodate disabled employees more effectively - open text)**

The qualitative analysis of the responses to question 49 identified eight areas of change required in the performance management system to accommodate disabled employees more effectively. These areas of change are:

- Understanding the difficulties experienced by persons within the various categories of disability. A quadriplegic respondent explained this best by indicating that he cannot be judged on things pertaining to physical actions, yet there is nothing wrong with his brain. He also indicated that he can be judged on par with his peers regarding the work that he does but there are certain things that would take him longer to finalise than it would take a not disabled person.
- More frequent absences impact on achieving performance objectives while performance standards are also ignored once persons with disabilities are absent more frequently. Even though performance standards are met, the frequent absences are mainly held against persons with disabilities.
- Training of managers to manage persons with disabilities. A number of disabled respondents indicated that managers tend to lose objectivity and focus on irrelevant issues and that they adopt a different attitude when dealing with persons with disabilities. A disabled respondent also indicated that managers informed peers: "Look at what Mr Disabled can accomplish and he is in a wheelchair, what's wrong with you?" This results in negativity amongst peers and subordinates and even resentment leading one respondent to indicate that "resentment is the enemy of any disabled person for once these peers and subordinates resent your success, human nature dictates their reluctance in helping you with your physical disabilities. Subtly not helping the disabled person with proper toilet routines, eating and drinking disrupts the disabled person's routine, weaken his body, enforcing illness and absence from work; thus putting the disabled person in a bad image with the employer". The respondents also expressed the necessity to fully understand relevant legislation and guidelines to integrate into a performance management system. Senior managers must undergo training to be sensitive to disability issues, including job profiling and performance

rating when a person with disabilities is present. This must be factored into the performance assessments of the relevant manager.

- Accessibility and reasonable accommodation necessitate that adjustments be made to the work plans of persons with disabilities to accommodate their impairment as part of reasonable accommodation. Provision should be made to allow for adoption of the inherent requirements of the job to suit the disability of the post incumbent. The performance management system should be aligned to the reasonable accommodation process.
- Clear performance standards which is either the same or different for persons with disabilities. Respondents have opposing views on whether the same or different performance standards should be applied to persons with disabilities and not disabled persons. The one view is that adjustments must be made to the work plans of persons with disabilities to accommodate their specific disability. Another view is that no adjustments should be made and that employees should be evaluated on the same performance standard. This matter will thus be addressed in the strategy to employ persons with disabilities.
- Training to persons with disabilities to improve their work performance and improve the support to persons with disabilities.
- Clear performance management policy to clarify the measuring of the performance of persons with disabilities.
- Objective assessment of the performance of persons with disabilities.

In summary, the nature of the responses revealed that confusion exists concerning the human resource management practice of performance management. The manner in which it is applied is therefore regarded as a constraint to the employment of persons with disabilities.

### **SECTION 7.3: Recruitment and selection – Questions 50 to 54**

Questions 50 to 54 and their response categories are presented in Table 79 below:

**Table 79: Questions and response categories related to the recruitment and selection in respondents' organisations**

NO	QUESTION/STATEMENT	RESPONSE						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
50.	To what extent does your organisation have an effective recruitment and selection strategy?	1 Indicates not at all.	2	3	4	5	6	7 Indicates completely/fully.
51.	To what extent is the strategy applicable to employees with disabilities?	1 Indicates not at all.	2	3	4	5	6	7 Indicates completely/fully.
52.	To what extent is the same selection criteria applied in the recruitment of employees with disabilities and employees who are not disabled?	1 Indicates not at all.	2	3	4	5	6	7 Indicates completely/fully.
53.	To what extent are the same remuneration package offered to employees with disabilities and employees who are not disabled?	1 Indicates not at all.	2	3	4	5	6	7 Indicates completely/fully.
54.	Please describe any changes in the recruitment and selection strategy which is required to accommodate disabled employees more effectively:							

The responses to questions 50 to 53 are presented in Table 80 below:

**Table 80: Responses to questions 50 to 53 grouped into three categories indicating disagreement, neutrality or agreement with each statement**

QUESTION	DISABLED			NOT DISABLED			COMBINED		
	Not at all	Neutral	Fully	Not at all	Neutral	Fully	Not at all	Neutral	Fully

QUESTION	DISABLED			NOT DISABLED			COMBINED											
	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage	Count									
50.	11	32%	9	26%	14	41%	5	11%	4	9%	35	80%	16	21%	13	17%	49	63%
51.	16	47%	10	29%	8	24%	14	32%	10	23%	20	45%	30	38%	20	26%	28	36%
52.	7	21%	9	26%	18	53%	10	23%	7	16%	27	61%	17	22%	16	21%	45	58%
53.	4	12%	9	27%	21	62%	4	9%	5	11%	35	80%	8	10%	14	18%	56	72%

**Question 50 (The extent to which the respondents’ organisations have an effective recruitment and selection strategy)**

It is observed from Table 80 that 14 (41%) of disabled respondents indicated that the organisations they work for do have an effective recruitment and selection strategy in place while 11 (32%) indicated that their organisations do not have such a strategy in place. A relatively high number of 35 (80%) not disabled respondents indicated that their organisations do have an effective recruitment and selection strategy while only 5 (11%) indicated that they do not have one. Overall, 49 (63%) respondents indicated that the organisations they work for do have an effective recruitment and selection strategy in place while 16 (21%) indicated that they do not.

**Question 51 (The extent to which the recruitment and selection strategy is applicable to employees with disabilities)**

It is observed from Table 80 that 8 (24%) disabled respondents mentioned that their organisations’ recruitment and selection strategy was applicable to employees with disabilities while 16 (47%) mentioned that it was inapplicable. Of the disabled respondents, 10 (29%) completed a neutral response to this question. A total of 20 (45%) not disabled respondents indicated that the recruitment strategy was fully applicable to employees with disabilities while 14 (32%) indicated that it was not the case.

The trend of responses to this question was somewhat different from the trend in the previous two questions. The overall responses revealed that in the case of only 28 (36%) of respondents' employers the strategy was applicable to employees with disabilities.

**Question 52 (The extent to which the same selection criteria is applied in the recruitment of employees with disabilities and employees who are not disabled)**

In this case, 18 (53%) disabled respondents mentioned that the same selection criteria was applied during the recruitment of employees with disabilities than with employees who were not disabled while 7 (21%) mentioned that this was not the case. The not disabled respondents responded similarly and 27 (61%) responded that the same selection criteria was applied while 10 (23%) indicated that this was not the case. Overall, the number of respondents indicating that the same criteria were applied was higher due to the relatively higher number of not disabled respondents indicating that the same criteria were applied.

Considering the number of employees with disabilities employed by the respondents' organisations and the strong trend identified in the use of the same selection criteria, this is not identified as a constraint in the employment of persons with disabilities. The perception which may exist that lesser selection criteria must be used for persons with disabilities, is dispelled by the responses to this question. It would be interesting to have known how a non-purposive sample would have responded to this question. This is an area which would be carried forward to the further topics for research in future.

**Question 53 (The extent to which the same remuneration package offered to employees with disabilities and employees who are not disabled)**

A total of 21 (62%) disabled respondents indicated that the same remuneration package was offered to employees with disabilities than to employees who were not disabled while 35 (80%) not disabled respondents indicated the same.

This indication is a positive trend caused by the Constitutional protection against discrimination and supported by the EEA. The principle of “equal work, for equal pay” is well entrenched in the management of remuneration practice in South Africa.

**Question 54 (Description of changes required in the recruitment and selection strategy which is required to accommodate disabled employees more effectively)**

The qualitative analysis of the responses to question 54 identified 12 areas or categories of response which respondents identified as requirements of changes to the recruitment and selection strategy to accommodate disabled employees more effectively. These categories are:

- Accessible adverts placed in the media frequented by persons with disabilities.
- Credible selection processes and selection panels.
- Reasonable accommodation of persons with disabilities in the recruitment and selection process.
- Job design specific to persons with disabilities.
- Attitude and approach of management towards persons with disabilities are not positive.
- A clear strategy and targets to employ persons with disabilities are required.
- Proper planning.
- A scorecard and incentives could be put in place to employ more persons with disabilities.
- Promotion of employees with disabilities to more senior positions.
- Experiential learnership.
- Regional database of persons with disabilities seeking employment.
- Training of managers and human resources practitioners in effective recruitment processes for persons with disabilities.

The identification of these areas confirmed the relevant problem statement, namely that inadequate recruitment and selection processes are constraining the employment of persons with disabilities. It does, however, not assist in providing the answer as to what to do to manage this constraint effectively. The 12 areas or

categories of response identified through the qualitative analysis would be utilised to formulate the recruitment part of the strategy to employ persons with disabilities.

#### **SECTION 7.4: Employee retention and exit management strategies - Questions 55 to 63**

Questions 55 to 63 and their response categories are presented in Table 81 below:

**Table 81: Questions and its response categories related to the employee retention and exit management strategies in respondents' organisations**

NO	QUESTION/STATEMENT	RESPONSE						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
55.	To what extent does your organisation have an effective employee retention strategy?	Indicates not at all.						Indicates completely/fully.
56.	To what extent is the employee retention strategy applicable to employees with disabilities?	Indicates not at all.						Indicates completely/fully.
57.	To what extent are the same initiatives to retain staff applicable to employees with disabilities and employees who is not disabled?	Indicates not at all.						Indicates completely/fully.
58.	Please describe any changes in the employee retention strategy which is required to accommodate disabled employees more effectively:							
59.	To what extent does your organisation have an effective exit management strategy?	Indicates not at all.						Indicates completely/fully.
60.	To what extent is this exit management strategy applicable to employees with disabilities?	Indicates						Indicates

		not at all.						completely/fully.
61.	To what extent are the same exit management initiatives applicable to employees with disabilities and employees who are not disabled?	1 Indicates not at all.	2	3	4	5	6	7 Indicates completely/fully.
62.	To what extent are the same benefits paid to employees with disabilities and employees who are not disabled to retain them?	1 Indicates not at all.	2	3	4	5	6	7 Indicates completely/fully.
63	Please describe any changes in the exit management strategy required to accommodate disabled employees more effectively: (Open text)							

The responses to questions 55 to 57 are presented in Table 82 below:

**Table 82: Responses to questions 55 to 57 grouped into three categories indicating disagreement, neutrality or agreement with each statement**

QUESTION	DISABLED			NOT DISABLED			COMBINED		
	Not at all	Neutral	Fully	Not at all	Neutral	Fully	Not at all	Neutral	Fully
55.	15 43%	8 23%	12 34%	19 42%	3 7%	23 51%	34 43%	11 14%	35 44%
56.	14 40%	6 17%	15 43%	18 40%	3 7%	24 53%	32 40%	9 11%	39 49%
57.	8 23%	6 17%	21 60%	15 33%	2 4%	28 62%	23 29%	8 10%	49 61%



**Question 55 (The extent to which respondents' organisation has an effective employee retention strategy)**

It is observed from Table 82 that 15 (43%) disabled respondents indicated that their organisation does not have an effective employee retention strategy while 12 (34%) said that it does. A total of 8 (23%) respondents had a neutral response to this question. Slightly more, (23 - 51%) not disabled respondents indicated that their organisation does have such a strategy while 19 (42%) indicated that it does not. Overall the respondents were spread evenly with 35 (44%) indicating to the positive and 34 (43%) indicating to the negative.

**Question 56 (The extent to which the employee retention strategy is applicable to employees with disabilities)**

Here, 39 (49%) of respondents stated that their organisation's employee retention strategy was applicable to employees with disabilities while 32 (40%) indicated that it was inapplicable.

**Question 57 (The extent to which the same retention initiatives are applicable to employees with disabilities and employees who are not disabled)**

A total of 49 (61%) respondents indicated that their employers applied the same retention measures to disabled as well as not disabled employees while 23 (29%) respondents also indicated that the same retention initiatives were not applied.

**Question 58 (Description of changes required in the employee retention strategy to accommodate disabled employees more effectively)**

The qualitative analysis of the responses to question 58 identified nine areas or categories of response which respondents identified as changes required to the employee retention strategy to accommodate disabled employees more effectively. These categories are discussed below:

- No retention strategy in place or it is ineffective.

- Accessibility and reasonable accommodation, for example rules related to sick leave and late coming should be more flexible and personalised depending on circumstances. Working conditions should be improved to ensure safety as well as the comfort of persons with disabilities to enable them to perform duties to the best of their abilities. Appropriate assistive devices, accessible transport and an accessible physical environment should also be provided. If the employers are willing to reasonably adapt the workplace to accommodate persons with disabilities a sense of belonging will be fostered and persons with disabilities will be more likely to stay loyal to that employer.
- Senior and middle managers should be trained to respond appropriately to retain employees. The management culture needs to be directed towards retaining skilled employees.
- A retention strategy is not required as the staff turnover is very low. Due to discrimination against employees with disabilities not too many employees with disabilities find new employment and therefore resign. This could change if more employers are willing to employ persons with disabilities, because they tend to stay longer simply since it is more difficult for them to handle change.
- Develop persons with disabilities by providing them with decent jobs at the appropriate level, because they want the same challenges as not disabled persons.
- The same retention initiatives must apply to persons with disabilities and to not disabled persons.
- Employee retention must be performance based and pro-active.
- Exit interviews should be conducted to determine the reasons why employees are leaving.
- Retention of employees should be considered as part of employment equity targets.

In summary it has been observed that a retention strategy is a fairly unknown approach in talent management in South Africa. In other words, when an employee indicates that he or she intends leaving the organisation, it is accepted. Efforts are not really made to keep on stimulating the growth of employees and to retain them.

Retention strategy could become an important component of managing disability. With the increased awareness being created with employment of persons with disabilities, employers could face increased mobility of persons with disabilities. This trend is to some extent already visible in the number of employees with disabilities employed by respondents' organisations. The disabled respondents had either been employed for more than 10 years or for less than two years, which indicates mobility amongst persons with disabilities in employment. A strategy for the employment of persons with disabilities would therefore have to include retention of employees with disabilities. Retention has not been identified as a constraint *per se*, but it is a valuable human resource management practice in ensuring that persons with disabilities are kept employed.

The low prevalence of retention strategies in respondents' organisations is a constraint in the employment of persons with disabilities. The effect of the low prevalence of such policy is that not disabled employees becoming disabled while employed would not be dealt with in accordance with agreed policy guidelines. The management decisions would be *ad hoc* of nature and cause uncertainty. The provisions of the LRA and the TAG are not sufficient to protect the employment rights of such a person.

The critical aspect in relation to disability management that should form part of an employer's retention strategy remains the reasonable accommodation and rehabilitation of a person with disabilities.

## **SECTION 7.5: Exit management strategy – Questions 59 to 62**

Responses to questions 59 to 62 are presented in Table 83 below:

**Table 83: Responses to questions 59 to 62 grouped into three categories indicating disagreement, neutrality or agreement with each statement**

QUESTION	DISABLED			NOT DISABLED			COMBINED		
	Not at all	Neutral	Fully	Not at all	Neutral	Fully	Not at all	Neutral	Fully
59.	15 47%	5 16%	12 38%	22 50%	6 14%	16 36%	37 49%	11 14%	28 37%
60.	17 53%	6 19%	9 28%	18 41%	7 16%	19 43%	35 46%	13 17%	28 37%
61.	10 31%	8 25%	14 44%	16 36%	6 14%	22 50%	26 34%	14 18%	36 47%
62.	11 34%	8 25%	13 41%	13 30%	6 14%	25 57%	24 32%	14 18%	38 50%

**Question 59 (The extent to which respondents' organisation have an effective exit management strategy)**

It is observed from Table 83 that 37 (49%) respondents indicated that their organisations do not have an effective exit management strategy while 28 (37%) indicated that the organisations they work for do have such a strategy.

**Question 60 (The extent to which the exit management strategy is applicable to employees with disabilities)**

Here 35 (46%) respondents revealed that their organisations' exit management strategy was not equally applicable to employees with disabilities while 28 (37%) respondents indicated that it was equally applicable. A total of 13 (17%) respondents responded neutrally to this question, while 8 respondents (10%) did not complete the question.

**Question 61 (The extent to which the same exit management initiatives are applicable to employees with disabilities and employees who are not disabled)**

A total of 36 (47%) respondents indicated that the same exit management initiatives were applied while 26 (34%) indicated that this was not the case. Seven (7 - 8%) respondents did not complete the question.

**Question 62 (The extent to which the same benefits are paid to employees with disabilities and employees who are not disabled to retain them)**

The majority disabled respondents responded either negatively or neutrally (11 – 34% responded negatively and 8 - 25% neutrally) to the question to what extent the same benefits are paid to employees with disabilities and not disabled employees to retain them. The large number of disabled respondents who responded in this manner is alarming. Furthermore, a similar trend was confirmed by not disabled respondents (13 – 30% responded negatively and 6 – 14% neutrally). The emphasis on prevention of unfair discrimination in South Africa seems to not yet have had the desired effect in this regard. This could be merely a perception but since a similar trend was confirmed by both groups of respondents it is unlikely to be merely a perception. Seven (7 - 8%) respondents did not complete the question.

**Question 63 (Description of changes required to the exit management strategy to accommodate disabled employees more effectively - Open text)**

The qualitative analysis of the responses to question 63 identified five areas or categories of response. These categories are discussed below:

- No exit management strategy is in place.
- Exit interviews are performed or the reasons for leaving are recorded.
- Exit packages are offered when an employee becomes disabled while employed.
- Organisations should act on the reasons why employees are leaving.
- The exit management strategy must be linked to the employment equity process.

Similar to the retention strategy discussed above, an exit management strategy is a relatively unknown concept in the South African human resource management environment. It is a constraint that it is not clear how an employee who becomes disabled is managed when it is necessary to exit the organisation. The benefits payable to such employee, the support available and the conditions on which a person exit the environment should be disability friendly.

## SECTION 7.6: Labour relations management strategy – Questions 64 to 68

Questions 64 to 68 and their response categories are presented in Table 84 below:

**Table 84: Questions and response categories related to the labour relations management strategies in respondents' organisations**

NO	QUESTION/STATEMENT	RESPONSE						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
64.	To what extent does your organisation have an effective labour relations management strategy?	1 Indicates not at all.	2	3	4	5	6	7 Indicates completely/fully.
65.	To what extent is the labour relations management strategy applicable to employees with disabilities?	1 Indicates not at all.	2	3	4	5	6	7 Indicates completely/fully.
66.	To what extent are the labour relations initiatives similarly applicable to employees with disabilities and employees who are not disabled?	1 Indicates not at all.	2	3	4	5	6	7 Indicates completely/fully.
67.	Please describe any changes required in the labour relations management strategy to accommodate disabled employees more effectively:							
68.	Do any <u>other</u> employment policies and practices require review to accommodate disabled persons? Please explain:							

The responses to questions 64 to 66 are presented in Table 85 below:

**Table 85: Responses to questions 64 to 66 grouped into three categories indicating disagreement, neutrality or agreement**

QUESTION	DISABLED			NOT DISABLED			COMBINED		
	Not at all	Neutral	Fully	Not at all	Neutral	Fully	Not at all	Neutral	Fully
64.	9 28%	6 19%	17 53%	6 13%	6 13%	33 73%	15 19%	12 15%	50 65%
65.	11 34%	8 25%	13 41%	7 16%	6 13%	32 71%	18 23%	14 18%	45 58%
66.	6 19%	5 16%	21 66%	5 11%	6 13%	34 76%	11 14%	11 14%	55 71%

**Question 64 (The extent to which respondents' organisation has an effective labour relations management strategy)**

It is observed from Table 85 that a total of 50 (65%) respondents indicated that their organisations do have a labour relations strategy in place while 15 (19%) respondents indicated that this was not the case in the organisations they work for. Six (6 - 7%) respondents did not complete the question.

**Question 65 (The extent to which the labour relations management strategy is applicable to employees with disabilities)**

In this case, 45 (58%) respondents responded by mentioning that the labour relations strategy was applicable equally to employees with disabilities while 18 (23%) respondents mentioned that it was not applicable to employees with disabilities. Six (6 - 7%) respondents did not complete the question. A marked difference in the responses by disabled respondents and not disabled respondents is apparent because in the view of the disabled respondents, the labour relations strategy was less applicable to employees with disabilities.

**Question 66 (The extent to which the labour relations initiatives are similarly applicable to employees with disabilities and employees who are not disabled)**

A total of 55 (71%) respondents stated that similar initiatives were applied to disabled and not disabled employees in terms of the relevant labour relations strategies. It would appear positive if labour relations initiatives were applied similarly to both groups of employees, but actually this was not the case. The unique circumstances surrounding disability require different approaches to certain human resource management (including labour relations management) practices. These practices do impact on the employment relationship on an individual as well as a collective basis. Seven (7 - 8%) respondents did not complete the question.

**Question 67 (Description of changes required in the labour relations management strategy to accommodate disabled employees more effectively)**

The qualitative analysis of the responses to question 67 identified four areas or categories of response. These categories are discussed below:

- No labour relations management strategy is in place.
- Educate the unions concerning disability management and the rights of persons with disabilities. Unions, unfortunately, are reluctant to assist persons with disabilities with specific work related problems. Labour relations management practitioners should address these issues with organised labour.
- Labour relations strategy should not be the same for persons with disabilities and not disabled persons. Incapacity could be redefined to better accommodate persons with disabilities.
- Labour relations practitioners do not prioritise disability management and the rights of persons with disabilities. Persons with disabilities are not taken seriously by human resource management practitioners. The effect of a disability on a person's ability to perform and be rewarded should be emphasised in the labour relations strategy as this might have an adverse effect on the relationship between the employer and employee. The strategy should be specific to the responsibilities of both the employer and the



disabled employee in ensuring enhanced performance and greater collaboration with specialists in the field of disability management.

In summary, labour unions and labour relations practitioners have not prioritised disability management and the rights of persons with disabilities. The indication that incapacity should be redefined indicates that labour relations strategy should be assessed to ensure that it accommodates disability management.

### **Question 68**

The qualitative analysis of the responses to question 68 identified seven areas or categories of response. These categories are discussed below:

- Training and development is emphasised as an empowerment strategy for persons with disabilities.
- Mentoring programmes for persons with disabilities could assist with the empowerment of persons with disabilities.
- Employers should have strategic focus on the employment and reasonable accommodation of persons with disabilities.
- Penalties should be imposed on companies for not achieving employment equity targets in respect of disability.
- All employment related policies require modification to accommodate persons with disabilities and the correct mindset is critical to bring about changes. The need for policies dealing specifically with disability management is required and thus measurable performance standards need to be developed for senior and middle management in order to ensure compliance with policies. Medical benefits for employees also need to be examined.
- Accessibility and reasonable accommodation were raised consistently by especially disabled respondents as the most significant constraint to the employment of persons with disabilities. Raising the understanding of peers and subordinates of what and why persons with disabilities are employed is vital for that is where the breakdown occurs. Compulsory accessibility audit of all buildings/venues and the allocation of a rating to a degree of accessibility is crucial.

- Flexible work options should be instituted, for example home offices could be set up where possible if the movement of a disabled employee is impaired. Flexible working hours, sabbaticals and time off to recover from trauma, clinical depression and other conditions could be provided.

Labour relations practitioners have a role to play in disability management. The role relates to training, developing labour relations strategies that are disability friendly and placing the rights of persons with disabilities on the labour relations agenda with labour unions.

The mean for the quantitative questions 45 to 66 (excluding questions 49, 54, 58 and 63 which are qualitative) are presented in Table 86 below:

**Table 86: Means of questions 45 to 48, 50 to 53, 55 to 57, 59 to 62 and 64 to 66 related to respondents' views regarding the various human resource management practices in respondents' organisations**

QUESTION	N	MEAN
45.	77	4,96104
46.	77	4,53247
47.	77	5,01299
48.	77	5,10390
50.	78	4,70513
51.	78	3,89744
52.	78	4,97436

QUESTION	N	MEAN
53.	78	5,44872
55.	80	3,83750
56.	80	4,05000
57.	80	4,58750
59.	76	3,76316
60.	76	3,72368
61.	76	4,14474
62.	76	4,46053
64.	77	4,97403
65.	77	4,92208
66.	77	5,36364

Section 7 of the questionnaire dealt with the human resource management practices of:

- Training and development;
- performance management;
- recruitment and selection;
- employee retention and exit management strategy; and
- labour relations management strategy.

The pattern followed in formulating the questions in Section 7 (human resource management practices) was consistent in respect of each of the individual human resource management practices, namely:

- Whether a strategy in relation to the practice was in place.
- The extent to which the said strategy was applicable to employees with disabilities.
- Whether the same criteria or initiatives or benefits are applicable to employees with disabilities and employees who are not disabled.
- In their own words to indicate changes required to the specific practice to accommodate persons with disabilities more effectively.

In respect of training and development, the majority of respondents indicated that training in dealing with issues related to the employment of persons with disabilities was not provided. This is clearly a constraint to the employment of persons with disabilities.

However, the result of question 43 contradicted the principles of sound human resource management since little training in disability management issues was provided and the little that was provided was not used in making decisions. Close to 50% of the respondents indicated that the principles they were taught in the training was “never” used. A normal response of human resource management practitioners to an issue of strategic importance is to create awareness and to transfer skills through training. If the training would not add value as the responses above are indicating, more creative ways of skills transfer and raising awareness need to be found or ways of enforcement should be resorted to. Experience has taught that training which is not used or required to be used will fade away and no value will ensue. In developing the strategy this aspect will be addressed.

In respect of questions 47 (5,01299), 48 (5,10390), 53 (5,44872), and 66 (5,36364) the mean were greater than 5 indicating that these are not regarded as constraints. The remainder of the questions in this section of the questionnaire had a mean below 5, indicating that they constrain the employment of persons with disabilities namely as follows:

- Question 45 – The extent to which respondents’ organisations has an effective performance management system.
- Question 46 – The extent to which this performance management system is applicable to employees with disabilities.
- Question 50 – The extent to which the respondents’ organisations have an effective recruitment and selection strategy.
- Question 51 – The extent to which the recruitment and selection strategy is applicable to employees with disabilities.
- Question 52 – The extent to which the same selection criteria is applied in the recruitment of employees with disabilities and employees who are not disabled.
- Question 55 – The extent to which respondents’ organisation has an effective employee retention strategy.
- Question 56 – The extent to which the employee retention strategy is applicable to employees with disabilities.
- Question 57 – The extent to which the same retention initiatives are applicable to employees with disabilities and employees who are not disabled.
- Question 59 – The extent to which respondents’ organisation have an effective exit management strategy.
- Question 60 – The extent to which the exit management strategy is applicable to employees with disabilities.
- Question 61 – The extent to which the same exit management initiatives are applicable to employees with disabilities and employees who are not disabled.
- Question 62 – The extent to which the same benefits are paid to employees with disabilities and employees who are not disabled to retain them.
- Question 64 – The extent to which respondents’ organisation has an effective labour relations management strategy.
- Question 65 – The extent to which the labour relations management strategy is applicable to employees with disabilities.

As discussed in Chapter 2, various authors including Brewster et al (2008) indicated that the human resource management function had to become innovative and

relevant in the demanding environment, leading to the emergence of talent management during early 2000. Brewster et al (2008:16) indicated that talent management is the use of an integrated set of human resource management activities to ensure an organisation attracts, retains, motivates and develops the talented people it needs. In the case of people with disabilities the research found that none of the six human resource management practices supported the employment of people with disabilities, but rather constrains it. It also emanated from the research that the human resource management framework has not been aligned to the requirements of the EEA in respect of persons with disabilities.

In considering the abovementioned research results the constraints to the employment of persons with disabilities which requires to be addressed in terms of the strategy to employ persons with disabilities are set out in Table 87 below. The strategic output required to mitigate these constraints will be discussed in more detail in the following chapter.

**Table 87: Constraints identified in relation to the various human resource management practices**

CONSTRAINT NUMBER	DESCRIPTION OF CONSTRAINTS IDENTIFIED
19.	<p>Training and development practices are not effectively presented to all employees resulting in the following constraints to the employment of persons with disabilities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Lack of awareness of disability management.</li> <li>➤ Training provided in disability management is not being used by the persons trained.</li> <li>➤ Persons with disabilities are not empowered to assert their rights in terms of disability management.</li> <li>➤ Work environments do not prioritise disability management.</li> <li>➤ Disability management is not linked to the performance indicators of all managers at all levels.</li> </ul>
20.	<p>Performance management practice is inadequate in respect of persons with disabilities resulting in it being a constraint due to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Effective performance management systems are not in place.</li> <li>➤ Performance management systems do not apply to all employees.</li> <li>➤ Difficulties experienced by persons with disabilities are not understood by employers.</li> <li>➤ Managers are not trained in managing the performance of persons with disabilities.</li> <li>➤ Accessibility and reasonable accommodation impact on the performance of persons with disabilities.</li> <li>➤ Clarity does not exist whether the same or different performance standards must apply to persons with disabilities.</li> </ul>

CONSTRAINT NUMBER	DESCRIPTION OF CONSTRAINTS IDENTIFIED
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Assessments are not conducted objectively by managers.</li> </ul>
21.	<p>Recruitment and selection practices are inadequate and not strategically aligned resulting in it being a constraint due to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Adverts are not accessible to persons with disabilities.</li> <li>➤ Adverts do not target persons with disabilities.</li> <li>➤ Selection processes are not seen as a credible process by persons with disabilities.</li> <li>➤ Persons with disabilities are not being reasonably accommodated during the selection process.</li> <li>➤ Job design is not considering persons with disabilities adequately to provide for their unique circumstances.</li> <li>➤ Managers and supervisors do not understand disability resulting in deciding not to employ persons with disabilities due to negative perceptions they may have of persons with disabilities.</li> </ul>
22.	<p>Retention and exit management strategies are not utilised in disability management resulting in it being a constraint due to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Inconsistent treatment of employees with disabilities and not disabled employees.</li> <li>➤ Reasonable accommodation and rehabilitation of employees who become disabled are not effectively dealt with.</li> <li>➤ The reasons why employees leave the employment are known but nothing is done to correct it which results in persons with disabilities not being retained.</li> <li>➤ Employment equity strategies are not aligned resulting in persons with disabilities not being affirmed.</li> </ul>
23.	<p>Labour relations management strategy is inadequate resulting in it being a constraint due to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Human resource management practitioners and union officials do not prioritise disability management and the rights of persons with disabilities.</li> <li>➤ The rights and the unique circumstances of persons with disabilities are not recognised resulting in the labour relations processes not providing for persons with disabilities.</li> </ul>
24.	<p>Lack of strategic focus of employers on disability management constrains the employment of persons with disabilities.</p>
25.	<p>The role of human resource management practitioners is not clearly defined in terms of disability management resulting in them not prioritising persons with disabilities as a designated group in terms of the EEA.</p>

## 9.2.7 SECTION 8: REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION – QUESTIONS 69 TO 72

Questions 69 to 72 and their various response categories are presented in Table 88 below:

**Table 88: Questions and response categories related to reasonable accommodation in respondents' organisations**

<p>Reasonable accommodation refers to the steps an employer takes to adjust the work environment to make it possible for an employee with disabilities to be fully functional in performing his or her work. This includes the provision of visual aids to a visually impaired employee, hearing aids to a hearing impaired employee, etc. The questions relate to how far an employer is willing to go to accommodate a disabled employee, keeping in mind that some of the initiatives may be costly.</p>								
69.	To what extent does your organisation have a policy detailing the steps your organisation is willing to take to accommodate an employee with disabilities? (Please attach a copy).	1 Indicates not at all.	2	3	4	5	6	7 Indicates completely/fully.
70.	How much money would your organisation be willing to spend to accommodate an employee with disabilities?		R0.					
			R0 to R 1000.					
			R1 000 to R10 000.					
			R10 000 to R20 000.					
			R20 000 to R30 000.					
			R30 000 to R50 000.					
			R50 000 and more.					
71.	To what extent would your organisation employ an expert to advise on the best method to accommodate a disabled person?	1 Indicates not at all.	2	3	4	5	6	7 Indicates completely/fully.
72.	To what extent is the building in which your organisation do business, disability friendly?	1 Indicates not at all.	2	3	4	5	6	7 Indicates completely/fully.

**Question 69 (The extent to which respondents' organisations do have a policy detailing the steps the organisation is willing to take to accommodate an employee with disabilities)**

The responses are presented in Table 89 below:



**Table 89: Frequencies to question 69 indicating whether respondents' organisation do have reasonable accommodation policies in place**

CATEGORY	DISABLED		NOT DISABLED		COMBINED	
	FREQUENCY	%	FREQUENCY	%	FREQUENCY	%
1	10	29	16	38	26	34
2	7	21	6	14	13	17
3	3	9	1	2	4	5
4	3	9	3	7	6	8
5	6	18	4	10	10	13
6	3	9	4	10	7	9
7	2	6	8	19	10	13

It is observed from Table 89 above that overall a total of 43 (57%) respondents indicated that their organisations do not have a policy on reasonable accommodation in place while 27 (36%) respondents indicated that it does. Six (6 - 9%) respondents had a neutral response.

**Question 70 (The amount of money respondents' organisations would be willing to spend to accommodate an employee with disabilities)**

Responses are presented in Table 90 below:

**Table 90: Amount of money respondents' organisations would spend on reasonable accommodation**

AMOUNT WILLING TO BE SPENT ON REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION	DISABLED	NOT DISABLED	OVERALL
R0.	15 39%	0	15 18%
R0 to R 1000.	5 13%	13 28%	18 21%
R1 000 to R10 000.	1 3%	0	1 1%
R10 000 to R20 000.	4 11%	7 15%	11 13%
R20 000 to R30 000.	5 13%	8 17%	13 15%

AMOUNT WILLING TO BE SPENT ON REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION	DISABLED	NOT DISABLED	OVERALL
R30 000 to R50 000.	0	2 4%	2 2%
R50 000 and more.	2 5%	3 7%	5 6%

Two (2 - 2%) respondents did not complete the question.

**Question 71 (The extent to which respondents' organisations would employ an expert to advise on the best method to accommodate a disabled person)**

The responses are presented in Table 91 below:

**Table 91: Frequencies to question 71 indicating the extent to which respondents' organisations would employ an expert to advise on the best method to accommodate a person with disabilities**

CATEGORY	DISABLED		NOT DISABLED		COMBINED	
	FREQUENCY	%	FREQUENCY	%	FREQUENCY	%
1	7	21	4	9	11	14
2	2	6	3	7	5	6
3	2	6	2	5	4	5
4	7	21	4	9	11	14
5	6	18	18	41	24	31
6	5	15	4	9	9	12
7	4	12	9	20	13	17

From Table 91 it is observed that overall 24 (31%) respondents mentioned that it is "somewhat" likely that their organisations would employ an expert to assist with the implementation of disability management. If the categories are divided as discussed above, 46 (60%) respondents indicated that their organisation would employ an expert to advise them on the best method to employ persons with disabilities while 20 (26%) respondents indicated that their organisations are unlikely to do so.

**Question 72 (The extent to which the building in which the respondents do business is disability friendly)**

The responses are presented in Table 92 below:

**Table 92: Frequencies to question 72 the extent to which the building in which the respondents' organisation do business is disability friendly**

CATEGORY	DISABLED		NOT DISABLED		COMBINED	
	FREQUENCY	%	FREQUENCY	%	FREQUENCY	%
1	3	9	5	11	8	10
2	4	12	3	7	7	9
3	3	9	10	23	13	17
4	4	12	8	18	12	15
5	8	24	4	9	12	15
6	9	26	7	16	16	21
7	3	9	7	16	10	13

It is observed from Table 92 above that 38 (49%) respondents indicated that their organisations' building was disability friendly while 28 (36%) indicated that this was not the case. Six (6 - 7%) respondents did not complete the question.

As extensively discussed in Chapter 2, the accessibility of the environment is a key disabling factor (Kaplan date unknown, Kluth 2006, and Albert 2004).

The nature of disability dictates that certain jobs can be performed based on the inherent requirements of the job while other jobs cannot because the disability causes the disabled employee not to be able to perform certain inherently required job functions. Opportunities exist for the employment of persons with disabilities in virtually any job with reasonable accommodation and the correct attitude from employers. It is important to identify the jobs which could respond best to a strategy to employ persons with disabilities. The perception by employers that reasonable accommodation would be very costly and would cause "hardship", is a major constraint to the employment of persons with disabilities. The US experience in this regard (refer to paragraph 4.5.2) is well-researched and indicative of the benefit of a well-structured legal and policy framework.

In considering the abovementioned research results the constraints to the employment of persons with disabilities which are required to be addressed in terms of the strategy to employ persons with disabilities are set out in Table 93 below. The strategic output required to mitigate these constraints will be discussed in more detail in the following chapter.

**Table 93: Identification of constraint related to the reasonable accommodation of persons with disabilities in the workplace**

CONSTRAINT NUMBER	DESCRIPTION OF CONSTRAINTS IDENTIFIED
26.	<p>Reasonable accommodation is not clearly defined in the employment context resulting in it being a constraint due to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Persons with disabilities are not being reasonably accommodated because employers do not have policy documents in place to guide them in making decisions in providing reasonable accommodation to employees.</li> <li>➤ The perception which exists that reasonable accommodation is costly and would result in undue hardship to employers, is a constraint.</li> <li>➤ Office buildings are generally not disability friendly resulting in a constraint to employ persons with disabilities and those that are employed, not being able to work effectively.</li> <li>➤ Inherent job requirements are generally not defined resulting in persons with disabilities not being employed or being employed in positions not suitable to their specific disabilities.</li> </ul>

### 9.2.8 SECTION 9: GENERAL - QUESTION 73

Question 73 and its response categories are presented in Table 94 below:

**Table 94: Question and response categories related to the extent to which respondents' organisations monitor and evaluate the disability management programme**

NO	QUESTION/STATEMENT	RESPONSE						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
73.	To what extent does your organisation monitor and evaluate the implementation of a disability management program?	Indicates not at all.						Indicates completely/fully.

The responses are presented in Table 95 below:

**Table 95: Frequencies to question 73 indicating the extent to which respondents' organisations monitor and evaluate the disability management programme**

CATEGORY	DISABLED		NOT DISABLED		COMBINED	
	FREQUENCY	%	FREQUENCY	%	FREQUENCY	%
1	11	33	11	25	22	29
2	3	9	7	16	10	13
3	2	6	3	7	5	6
4	5	15	9	20	14	18
5	9	27	3	7	12	16
6	3	9	7	16	10	13
7	0	0	4	9	4	5

It is observed from Table 95 that overall the majority (22 – 29%) respondents indicated that their organisations do “not at all” monitor the implementation of their disability management programme. If the categories are divided as discussed above, 26 (34%) respondents indicated that their organisation does monitor the implementation of their disability management programme while 37 (48%) respondents indicated that this is not the case. A total of 7 (8%) respondents did not complete the question.

It is evident from the research results that efforts to implement disability management are not being monitored through means of a well-structured monitoring and evaluation framework. Managers and human resource management practitioners would therefore not be able to monitor progress with the implementation of disability management.

In considering the abovementioned research results the constraint to the employment of persons with disabilities requiring to be addressed in terms of the strategy to employ persons with disabilities, is set out in Table 96 below. The strategic output required to mitigate this constraint will be discussed in more detail in the following chapter.

**Table 96: Constraint identified in respect of the monitoring and evaluation of disability management programmes**

CONSTRAINT NUMBER	DESCRIPTION OF CONSTRAINTS IDENTIFIED
27.	Progress with the implementation of disability management programmes are not being monitored resulting in slow progress with implementation and a lack of strategic focus.

### 9.3 SUMMARY

The main objective of this research is to identify the constraints to the employment of persons with disabilities and to develop an integrated human resource management strategy to enhance the employment of more persons with disabilities in South African organisations. The quantitative research design was applied when a purposive sample of 84 knowledgeable persons in this field (persons with disabilities and human resource managers with experience in employing persons with disabilities) were surveyed with a semi-structured Likert-type questionnaire to determine the constraints. The questionnaire was specifically constructed for this purpose adding breadth to the research. The questionnaire also included a number of open-ended questions to add the required depth to the data.

Descriptive and inferential statistical methods were used to analyse the participants' quantified scores. The qualitative method of Content Analysis (ATLAS.ti) was applied to further identify categories and subcategories of constraints obtained. From the results, the most significant constraints that inhibit the employment of persons with disabilities were identified. The identified constraints were tabulated and will form the basis of the integrated strategy to enhance the employment of persons with disabilities.

**Table 97: Summary of the research findings per research question**

RESEARCH QUESTIONS (PRIMARY)					
Are there constraints that inhibit the employment of persons with disabilities in organisations? If so, what are these constraints and how can they be addressed?					
AREAS COVERED BY THE SECONDARY RESEARCH QUESTIONS					
AREA 1:	AREA 2:	AREA 3:	AREA 4:	AREA 5:	AREA 6:
Defining disability for employment purposes.	Usefulness of the SA disability management framework for employment purposes.	Perceptions concerning persons with disabilities in employment.	Availability of disability management policy and capacity in organisations.	The impact of human resource management policies on the employment of persons with disabilities.	The willingness of employers to reasonably accommodate persons with disabilities in the workplace and the commitment of key persons in the organisation.
Research finding: The definition and the various terms used in the definition are unclear and require to be clarified or changed.	Research finding: The Constitution, EEA, INDS and TAG are not sufficiently useful to manage disability in the workplace.	Research finding: Perceptions do exist which are both positive and negative. These reflect a lack of knowledge and understanding of disability management.	Research finding: Disability management policy and capacity are not available in organisations. In those instances where it is available, it is not used.	Research finding: Human resource management policies and practices do constrain the employment of persons with disabilities.	Research finding: Employers appear to be willing to reasonably accommodate persons with disabilities but they require policy guidelines and assistance to implement it.
SECONDARY RESEARCH QUESTIONS					
Is the definition of disability as set out in the EEA useful in managing disability in the employment context?	Is the South African legislative and policies framework utilised by managers and human resource practitioners?	Are the perceptions which employers and persons with disabilities have of each other a constraint in the employment of persons with	Is disability policy available in South African organisations and do organisations have capacity to implement it?	Does human resource management practices contribute to the employment of persons with disabilities or does it constrain it?	Do respondent organisations have a policy on reasonable accommodation?

RESEARCH QUESTIONS (PRIMARY)					
Are there constraints that inhibit the employment of persons with disabilities in organisations? If so, what are these constraints and how can they be addressed?					
AREAS COVERED BY THE SECONDARY RESEARCH QUESTIONS					
AREA 1:	AREA 2:	AREA 3:	AREA 4:	AREA 5:	AREA 6:
		disabilities?			
Research finding: The definition is not useful in managing disability in the employment context. The respondents indicated that they agree with the definition. However, the nature of the responses to the question, how the definition should be amended, indicated that respondents do not actually agree with the definition and significant changes were recommended.	Research finding: The South African legislative and policy framework were hardly ever used to assist with disability management.	Research finding: These perceptions are not based on knowledge and understanding. Facts should lead to better understanding of disability management. Like any employment decision it should be substantiated by facts, supported by the principles of fairness. It is therefore concluded that certain perceptions are not based on knowledge and understanding and is a constraint to the employment of persons with disabilities.	Research finding: Disability management policy and capacity are not available in South African organisations and in those instances where it is available, it is not used.	Research finding: Significant constraints have been identified caused by the various human resource management practices. These constraints relate to the absence of disability management principles in these human resource management policies and practices. Human resource management practitioners are not the first line of information in respect of disability management resulting in the human resource management practitioners not being responsive to disability issues.	Research finding: Reasonable accommodation policies are not in place.



RESEARCH QUESTIONS (PRIMARY)					
Are there constraints that inhibit the employment of persons with disabilities in organisations? If so, what are these constraints and how can they be addressed?					
AREAS COVERED BY THE SECONDARY RESEARCH QUESTIONS					
AREA 1:	AREA 2:	AREA 3:	AREA 4:	AREA 5:	AREA 6:
Do respondents agree with this definition?	Do managers and human resource management practitioners understand the legislation and policy framework?		Do organisations have policies on employment of persons with disabilities?	What methods do respondent organisations follow to recruit persons with disabilities?	How much money would respondent organisations be willing to spend on reasonable accommodation?
Research finding: The majority of the respondents indicated that they agree with the definition. However, the nature of the responses to the question on how the definition should be amended indicates that the definition requires to be changed. The respondents have proposed material changes.	Research finding: The respondents have expressed serious training needs and further that the policy framework must be clearer and more user friendly. This led to the conclusion that the legislation and policy framework is not well understood.		Research finding: Organisations do not have clear written and approved disability management policies and guidelines in place.	Research finding: Various methods are utilised but a single successful method could not be identified.	Research finding: The amounts vary. Some employers are willing to spend up to R50 000 while others are not willing to spend any money at all.
Does this definition include all categories of			Are these policies used?	What role do specific human resource management	Would respondent organisations be willing to utilise

RESEARCH QUESTIONS (PRIMARY)					
Are there constraints that inhibit the employment of persons with disabilities in organisations? If so, what are these constraints and how can they be addressed?					
AREAS COVERED BY THE SECONDARY RESEARCH QUESTIONS					
AREA 1:	AREA 2:	AREA 3:	AREA 4:	AREA 5:	AREA 6:
disability?				practices play in employing persons with disabilities?	experts to assist with reasonable accommodation?
Research finding: The majority of respondents indicated that the definition includes all categories of disability. However, the nature of the responses to the question on how the definition of disability should be amended, made it clear that respondents actually do not agree that the definition includes all the categories of disability.			Research finding: In those instances where the policies do exist, they are not used.	Research finding: The role is limited due to the limited contribution the practices make to disability management at present.	Research finding: Organisations are to a limited extent inclined to appoint an expert to advise them on reasonable accommodation.
Does this definition assist in dealing with issues of disability in employment?			Do organisations have a disability ombudsman in its employ?	How should these practices be changed to facilitate the increased employment of	

RESEARCH QUESTIONS (PRIMARY)					
Are there constraints that inhibit the employment of persons with disabilities in organisations? If so, what are these constraints and how can they be addressed?					
AREAS COVERED BY THE SECONDARY RESEARCH QUESTIONS					
AREA 1:	AREA 2:	AREA 3:	AREA 4:	AREA 5:	AREA 6:
				persons with disabilities?	
Research finding: The respondents expressed uncertainty and it was not conclusive whether the definition assisted in disability management.			Research finding: Organisations do not have a disability office or a disability ombudsman in place.	Research finding: The practices should be adjusted to recognise the principles of disability management and to be made disability friendly.	
			What role do human resource management practitioners play in disability management?	Human resource management practitioners are not the first point of entry for disability management in organisations resulting in them not playing a leading role in the initiatives of organisations to employ persons with disabilities.	

----- o O o -----