

EMPLOYERS PERSPECTIVES SCOPING REVIEW

Abstract

Individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities (IDD), experience high rates of unemployment and underemployment. Although research often focuses on job training and preparing people with IDD for work, fewer address the perspectives of the employers toward the employment of people with IDD. In this scoping review, research on the perspectives of employers of individuals with IDD working in community integrated employment settings were identified and evaluated. Findings revealed varying research trends by country and journal type since the 1960s, that <50% of employers have prior experience working/hiring individuals with IDD, and that studies have been conducted globally using primarily a quantitative/descriptive methodology and informal non-validated survey tools. Limitations and implications for future research are provided.

Keywords: Intellectual and developmental disability, autism spectrum disorder, employment, employer perspectives, scoping review

EMPLOYERS PERSPECTIVES SCOPING REVIEW

Employers' perspectives on individuals with IDD in community integrated employment settings: A scoping review

Employment is a socially normative activity that often defines adulthood and is critical to individuals' personal autonomy and quality of life (Grun et al., 2010; Saleh & Bruyere, 2018; Walsh et al., 2014). Individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities (IDD), including those with autism spectrum disorder (ASD) and intellectual disability (ID), and their families have expressed strong desires to be employed (Ali et al., 2011; Kocman & Weber, 2016) and prefer to work in integrated employment settings (Migliore et al., 2007; Scott et al., 2017; Simonsen & Neubert, 2013). National and global inclusion efforts have attempted to improve employment outcomes for individuals with IDD, including United States legislative efforts such as the Higher Education Opportunity Act (2008) and the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (2014), as well as global efforts through the *United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities* (2006). **Despite these efforts, only 15% of adults with IDD in the United States are competitively employed in individual jobs (Hiersteiner et al., 2018) and global employment ratios of individuals with disabilities vary between 30-31% in South Africa and Japan to 81-92% in Switzerland and Malawi (World Health Organization, 2011).**

Barriers to employment have been recently categorized as supply-side and demand-side barriers (Erickson et al., 2014). Supply-side barriers are associated with a paucity of employment-related hard and/or soft skills and limited evidence-based training to prepare individuals with IDD for employment. Moreover, demand-side barriers are related to the employer, such as organizational culture, beliefs on additional costs, and negative attitudes of staff. Demand-side research has shown that employers have unfavorable attitudes toward hiring individuals with IDD (Scott et al, 2019; Solomon, 2020), report concerns with perceived lack of

EMPLOYERS PERSPECTIVES SCOPING REVIEW

skills and legal issues (Kocman et al., 2017; Scott et al., 2017), have limited knowledge regarding disability (Bowman, 2020; Ju et al., 2013), and worry about poor productivity (Graffam et al., 2002; Scott et al., 2017). Further research has found that employers lack the motivation to employ an individual with IDD or to improve the accessibility of the work environment (e.g., provide reasonable accommodations; Waisman-Nitzan et al., 2019). These demand-side barriers may contribute not only to poor employment outcomes but also to negative societal attitudes toward individuals with IDD (Johnson & Joshi, 2014; Scott et al., 2019; Solomon, 2020) and a lack of organizational leadership to create positive employment opportunities (Bowman, 2020). Thus, it is imperative to investigate employers' capacity, perspectives, and concerns in supporting individuals with IDD in integrated employment.

Recent research has determined that these demand-side barriers are present even when individuals with IDD receive proper training and employment preparation and have skills that are beneficial to the workplace, including cognitive strengths, attention to detail, expertise in specific areas, scientific dispositions, and fairness (de Schipper et al., 2016; Scott et al., 2017). For example, Hedley and colleagues (2017) conducted a systematic literature review to identify effective employment support programs and program factors that resulted in successful outcomes for individuals with ASD. The authors found that when individuals with ASD were enrolled in a comprehensive employment support program, employment outcomes improved, including obtaining and maintaining work, wages, and number of hours worked. Despite participation in these employment training programs, however, employers continued to perceive those with ASD as having severe limitations in their work abilities and failed to build a supportive workplace that focused on the strengths of individuals with ASD (Hedley et al., 2017).

EMPLOYERS PERSPECTIVES SCOPING REVIEW

In another systematic review, Rashid et al. (2017) identified studies examining employer capacity or the competence of employers to hire and support employment for individuals with IDD in the workforce. Their findings revealed that employers reported job coaches as a primary tool to support employer capacity and comfort with hiring. However, Rashid and colleagues determined that job coaches were continually used to support the individuals with IDD and not the employer. Moreover, their findings identified minimal research was conducted regarding employers' perspectives of individuals with IDD in the workforce and ways to change the social environment, such as coworker education and diversity acceptance.

Therefore, even though individuals with IDD have shown to meet workplace requirements, improve the organizational inclusion culture, and have not shown to increase costs to employers (Hedley et al., 2017; Rashid et al., 2017; Scott et al., 2017), those with IDD continue to be un- or under-employed in the community. Thus, research on demand-side barriers specifically focusing on employer capacity, perspectives, and strategies to improve the social environment is critical. Such information may provide insights on how to build employer knowledge and capacity to create an inclusive employment culture and potentially diminish prejudice and discrimination that is a barrier for individuals with IDD (Erickson et al., 2014).

Current Review

Decreased revenue, adverse interactions between employees, and increased assistance/accommodation for only one employee are just a few of the negative perceptions' employers have of individuals with IDD in the workplace (Scott et al., 2017). However, when employers have these mis- and negative perceptions, it deprives individuals with IDD an opportunity to improve their financial stability, quality of life, and social opportunities (Jahoda et al., 2009). Hedley et al. (2017) and Rashid et al. (2017) have examined employment support

EMPLOYERS PERSPECTIVES SCOPING REVIEW

programs and employer capacity to hire and support individuals with IDD in the workforce, but there are no reviews aggregating research on employers' perspectives of individuals with IDD in integrated employment settings. Therefore, the current scoping review was conducted to provide a thorough picture of the employers' experience of hiring and working with individuals with IDD. This review posed the following four research questions:

1. What are the publication trends of studies focusing on employer perspectives of individuals with IDD in integrated employment settings?
2. What demographic characteristics have been represented in the employer perspectives literature?
3. What methodological approaches have been utilized when examining employers' perspectives?
4. What have been the employers' perspectives toward hiring and working with individuals with IDD in integrated employment settings?

Method

Search Procedures

A scoping review was conducted to identify the employer perspective literature as well as to describe the methodologies and data collection methods utilized to examine employer perspectives and determine gaps in the literature (Arksey & O'Malley, 2005; Munn et al., 2018).

To conduct this scoping review, we followed the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping reviews statement (PRISMA-ScR, Tricco et al., 2018; see Figure 1). An extensive search was conducted using eight educational and social sciences databases: CINHALL Plus, Education Full Text, ERIC, PsycArticles, PsychInfo, SCOPUS, Sociological Abstracts, and Social Sciences Citation Index. Databases were initially

EMPLOYERS PERSPECTIVES SCOPING REVIEW

searched in January 2018 and updated in January 2020 with the following search terms used: participant characteristics (*employer, supervisor, manager, compan**), outcomes (*perspective, perception, belief, view*), disability (*autism, intellectual disabilit*, cognitive impair*, mental retard**), and settings (*employment, support* employment, experience, internship, vocational, support*, rehab*, work, job, career, customiz* employment*). The terms were combined using the Boolean search operator “and” to include participant characteristics, outcomes, disabilities, and settings. The search was not limited by publication date and yielded 1,895 articles. **Publication date was not limited in this search because we wanted to include all published articles that potentially discussed employers prior to the national call for integrated employment of the 1980s.**

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

For this review, the term *employer* was defined as someone who employs, hires, or supervises employees in an internship, job, or vocational setting. Examples of employers include administrators, directors, human resource personnel, managers, supervisors, and owners. A *community integrated employment setting* was defined as a workplace situated in a local area that employed both individuals with and without disabilities. These employees would be working or interning together in the same spaces and have the same or similar work expectations. **If a study used the term *competitive integrated employment* instead of *community integrated employment*, the study still met the inclusion criteria due to the similarities in definitions between the two terms.** Articles included in this review had to meet the following criteria: (a) include employers in the participant pool; (b) employers were from community integrated employment settings; (c) collect employer perspectives about people with IDD in the workplace (could include a mixed sample of individuals with IDD and other types of disabilities); (d) collect the perspectives via self-report; **(e) be a research study (e.g., quantitative, qualitative, mixed methods);** and (f)

EMPLOYERS PERSPECTIVES SCOPING REVIEW

published in English. Exclusion criteria included: (a) perspectives not collected directly from the employers (e.g., perspectives reported by parents or educators); (b) did not discuss individuals with IDD; (c) was not a data-based research article (e.g., conceptual or theoretical manuscripts); and (d) took place in a segregated employment setting.

Study Selection

The first two authors screened titles and abstracts to identify potential articles following the inclusion and exclusion criteria. A reliability check to decrease researcher bias was conducted across 30.5% ($n = 578$) of the articles by two trained graduate students and averaged 85% reliability. After this initial screening, full-text copies were retrieved, and the first two authors conducted a second more in-depth screening confirming the collection of employer perspectives through self-report and to verify type of disability. Any discrepancies were resolved through discussion. Following this second screening, a total of 23 articles were identified to be included in this review. Ancestral (i.e., reference list review) and forward searches (i.e., Google citations) were conducted on these 23 articles resulting in an additional 24 articles for a total of 47 articles included in this review (see Table 1).

Data Extraction

To extract data from the 47 articles, a code book was written and refined to collect data regarding (a) participant demographics (e.g., number of participants, ethnicity, gender, age, education level); (b) disability types (e.g., ASD, ID); and (c) countries and settings (e.g., urban, rural, suburban). Then, the research methodology used was collected. Quantitative articles were defined as (a) evaluating an intervention using a group design or single case design or (b) conducting a survey with statistical analyses of the results (e.g., descriptive, correlational). Qualitative research designs such as phenomenological, ethnography, or case study were

EMPLOYERS PERSPECTIVES SCOPING REVIEW

collected. Mixed method studies were defined as implementing both quantitative and qualitative methodologies during data collection and/or analysis. The category “other” was defined as using both qualitative and quantitative methods but not analyzing the data at any stage. Next, data collection methods were gathered. Data collection methods were broken down into the following categories: (a) measures with reliability/validity; (b) informal or researcher-created measures with limited to no reliability/validity; (c) direct observation; (d) interviews; (e) focus groups; and (f) other which used a different data collection method not previously mentioned. Finally, data analysis information was collected and categorized as: (a) descriptive statistics; (b) inferential statistics; (c) thematic analysis (qualitative data were analyzed through an iterative process and themes emerged from the data); (d) content analysis (predetermined topics and themes identified and analyzed in the data); and (e) other (e.g., frequency counts, rank order of topics).

Extracted data were entered into an excel spreadsheet and the total items in each category were tallied. For example, the total number of employers in the study was entered into the column “employers.” Then, the number of male and female employers in the study were entered into the designated “male” or “female” columns. If the study did not explicitly mention how many male/female employers were included, the total number of employers was entered into the “Not Clearly Specified” column. For yes/no categories such as experience with individuals with IDD or data collection methods, a “1” or a “0” was entered in the column. For example, if a study used an informal survey created by the researchers to collect data, a “1” was entered into the “Informal Survey” column and a “0” was entered into the other data collection method options. Extracted data were tallied and the specific number of category items (e.g., employers, male employers) or the number of studies included that category (e.g., experience working with individuals with IDD, data collected by interviews) were reported. Finally, the outcomes specific

EMPLOYERS PERSPECTIVES SCOPING REVIEW

to employer perspectives were recorded and same outcomes across studies were identified and tallied. Examples of these outcomes included employer perspectives on inclusion, correlations between demographic data (e.g., age, education, size of company) and employer perspectives, and employer expectations for individuals with IDD in the workplace. A reliability check on the data extraction was conducted by the first two authors on 38.3% ($n = 18$) of the articles and found to be 89% reliable. Discrepancies were resolved through discussion.

Results

Results are presented within the four research questions proposed in this review. First, we present trends in publication of research across the years, countries, and types of journals. Next, demographic characteristics included in the studies are described. Then, types of research designs, data collection methods, and data analyses used in these particular studies are presented. Finally, employer perspectives of individuals with IDD in the workplace are reported.

Research Question 1: Publication Trends

For trends in publications, the year the study was published, where the study took place (e.g., country, setting), and type of journal the study was published in were extracted. Research on employer perspectives of individuals with IDD began in the 1960s (see Figure 2). The number of studies has been variable since then, but a peak happened in the 1990s ($n = 11$) and the 2010s ($n = 14$) with nine of those 14 studies published between 2016-2019. Out of the 47 articles, 27 studies (55%) were conducted in the United States with only one study conducted between 2006-2019. Canada completed six studies (12.2%) between 1989-2019. The remaining studies were conducted in Australia ($n = 4$), Israel ($n = 4$), United Kingdom ($n = 3$), Italy ($n = 2$), Taiwan ($n = 1$), Austria ($n = 1$), and Sweden ($n = 1$). Black et al., (2019) conducted a study utilizing data from three countries, Australia, the US, and Sweden.

EMPLOYERS PERSPECTIVES SCOPING REVIEW

Studies were also categorized according to the type of journal that published the article. Twenty articles were published in disability specific journals (e.g., *American Journal on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities*, *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities*), seven articles in journals focused on special education (e.g., *Career Development and Transition for Exceptional Individuals*, *Education and Training in Autism and Developmental Disabilities*), seven studies in general rehabilitation or medical journals (e.g., *Global Pediatric Health*, *Journal of Rehabilitation*), and eight studies in vocational rehabilitation journals (e.g., *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*, *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin*, *Vocational Evaluation & Work Adjustment Bulletin*). Only two articles were published in general education journals (e.g., *Canadian Journal of Education*) and three articles in human resource or business ethics journals (e.g., *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality*).

Research Question 2: Demographic Characteristics

Participant demographic data were collected across seven categories: (a) types of participants, (b) ethnicity, (c) gender, (d) age, (e) employer education level, (f) employer experience working/interacting with individuals with IDD, (g) type of IDD, and (h) company size (see Table 2).

Employer Demographics

There were 4,902 employers included in the 47 studies and 1,017 other participants (e.g., coworkers, parents). Employers included supervisors, managers, human resource personnel, and owners of the company. Based on the available data reported in the articles, the majority of employers were white and male; however, ethnicity and gender were not reported for 86.2% and 60.4% of participants respectively. Ages for employers ranged between 16-77 years old. Employers' education ranged from graduating from high school or attending a technical school

EMPLOYERS PERSPECTIVES SCOPING REVIEW

to earning a bachelor's degree or a postgraduate degree (e.g., masters or doctorate); yet education level was not reported for 70.5% of employers (while gender was not provided).

Employer experience was coded into two different categories, length as an employer and previous experience with an employee with IDD. Employers were in their current position ranging from 1 to 25 years, however, 70.2% ($n = 33$) of studies did not report the length the employer participants were in their current position. In terms of experience, 36 studies reported the employers (76.6%) had previous experience working with or hiring an employee with IDD.

Employee Demographics

There were 688 employees with IDD included across the studies. Employees with IDD ranged in age from 15-48 years old. Types of disabilities of employees were separated into three sub-categories of disabilities identified under the umbrella term IDD: ASD, ID, and Other (e.g., learning disabilities, traumatic brain injury, cerebral palsy). Employers focused their attention and perspectives toward individuals with ID in 41 studies, six studies concentrated on ASD, and seven studies included individuals with additional disabilities.

Company Demographics

The majority of studies included companies that were either defined as “small” (less than 50 employees) or “medium” (between 50-250 employees; Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, 2020), ranging from food service, hotels/motels, manufacturing, retail, and hospitality. However, 23 studies did not report the size or type of companies.

Research Question 3: Methodology, Data Collection Methods, and Data Analyses

Studies were categorized into four types of methodologies, including quantitative, qualitative, mixed methods, or other. The primary methodology used to explore employer perspectives was quantitative ($n = 34, 72.3\%$) with descriptive and inferential statistics (e.g.,

EMPLOYERS PERSPECTIVES SCOPING REVIEW

Pearson's *r*, *t*-tests, regressions, chi-square tests) to analyze the data. While six studies (12.8%) used validated measures (e.g., the Community Living Attitude Scale), the majority of studies ($n = 34, 72.3\%$) used author-created or adapted surveys to collect data. Among those 34 studies, some kind of psychometric properties (e.g., content validity, internal consistency reliability) of the author-created measures were provided in 16 studies (34%); no validity or reliability information was provided in the remaining 18 studies (38.3%). Eight studies (17.0%) used a qualitative methodology with interviews and focus groups to gather data and several types of analyses were conducted (e.g., thematic analysis, content analysis) to identify emerging or predetermined themes in the data. There were three mixed methods studies (6.4%) using quantitative methods (e.g., surveys) and qualitative methods (e.g., interviews) to collect data and merge the data during analyses. Two studies (e.g., Beyer et al., 2016; Smith, 1981) utilized both quantitative and qualitative data collection methods but did not mix or synthesize the data at the collection or analysis stage. There were no intervention studies, group designs, or single case designs implemented to explore employers' perspectives.

Research Question 4: Employer Perspectives

Across the six decades, an increase in positive perspectives about individuals with IDD in the workplace began after 1990. Coincidentally, this is the same year the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) was enacted, and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) was reauthorized (originally the Education for All Handicapped Children Act), to prohibit discrimination against and to provide a free and public education for individuals with disabilities. Across the identified studies, 10 (21.3%) indicated that employers reported having low expectations or perceived more barriers for individuals with IDD; 80% of the studies with these negative findings were conducted prior to 1990 (e.g., Mahoney, 1976; Shafer et al., 1987).

EMPLOYERS PERSPECTIVES SCOPING REVIEW

Alternatively, 18 studies (38.3%) reported employers having high expectations of individuals with IDD in the workplace with close to 40% of these studies with positive findings conducted prior to 1990 (e.g., Hill & Wehman, 1979; Chamberlain, 1988). Only three studies (6.4%) published prior to 1990 included employers' positive experiences working with individuals with IDD (e.g., Harrison & Tomes, 1990; Marcouiller et al., 1987; Wilgosh & Mueller, 1989). Furthermore, similar positive beliefs and perspectives of individuals with IDD in the workplace have also been seen globally, ranging from the United States ($n = 7$) and Canada ($n = 5$) to the United Kingdom ($n = 2$), Israel ($n = 2$), Taiwan ($n = 1$), and Italy ($n = 1$).

Employers who had previous experience with employees with IDD in the workplace had more positive perspectives about individuals with IDD, felt that they had a positive effect on the workplace, and were more likely to hire them in the future (e.g., Huang & Chen, 2015). The employers believed that the employees with IDD could be successful in their place of work, were loyal and punctual, and could perform entry-level skills. On the other hand, employers who did not have any experience with individuals with IDD reported concerns with safety in the workplace (e.g., Marcouiller et al., 1987; Morgan & Alexander, 2005). Additionally, employers who had participated in an employer preparation program reported positive perceptions of working with and hiring individuals with IDD in the workforce (e.g., Nicholas et al., 2019a, 2019b).

The education level of the employers (e.g., beyond high school) and the age of the employers (e.g., younger than 39) were commonly reported outcome factors that demonstrated slightly more positive perspectives of individuals with IDD in the workplace than those who were older or had less education. Additionally, when compared with small and medium-sized enterprises, employers of reported larger companies demonstrated a more positive perception

EMPLOYERS PERSPECTIVES SCOPING REVIEW

about working with and hiring individuals with IDD. While employers overall desired employees with IDD to be independent in the workplace (e.g., complete tasks, seek clarification if needed), employers reported they were open to job coaches in the workplace to support employees with IDD as they believe adequate support was critical for the employees with IDD to be successful (e.g., Gallagher & Bennett, 2013; Hill & Wehman, 1979; Irvine & Lupart, 2008).

Discussion

The purpose of this review was to aggregate and review the employer perspectives' literature about individuals with IDD working in the community. We examined 47 international articles across journals from various disciplines published between 1960 - 2019. Although employer perceptions have been studied internationally utilizing different methodologies and methods for almost 60 years, the literature remains limited. However, several important findings emerged from this scoping review.

First, although community integrated employment has been deemed a universal right for individuals with IDD (United Nations Convention, 2006), research on employers' perspectives has only been conducted in nine countries (United States, Australia, Canada, the United Kingdom, Israel, Italy, Taiwan, Austria, and Sweden) with the majority taking place in the United States. Although the United States may have led the initial surge in research, only one study was conducted in the United States between 2006 and 2019 with Canada moving into the lead with five studies conducted since 2006. Despite the limited research across countries, an important finding was that employers, globally, appeared to hold similar beliefs about the inclusion of individuals with IDD in the workforce (e.g., positive effect on the workplace, generally satisfied with the performance of employees with IDD, positive perspectives with previous experience working with employees with IDD). This is interesting because not every

EMPLOYERS PERSPECTIVES SCOPING REVIEW

country has the same workforce, experience, or type of business; yet they harbor similar perspectives. Employers in other countries may have different strategies that have improved employment outcomes based on the respective business culture (World Health Organization, 2011). Increasing the research to encompass a more diverse and global employer population could potentially provide critical information to improve employers' perspectives, hiring practices of those with IDD, and integrated employment models that could be applied to other employment and cultural contexts.

Second, the studies on employers' perspectives were primarily published in disability-specific journals, vocational rehabilitation journals, special education journals, and general rehabilitation journals focused on mental health, occupational therapy, or psychology. Whereas general education and human resource or business journals published the least. The audience of these types of journals are likely to be stakeholders who have already been involved in preparing individuals with IDD (e.g., special educators, rehabilitation counselors, occupational therapists) for postschool employment and are familiar with this area of research and knowledge. However, employers who are hiring and working with individuals with IDD may not be exposed to or familiar with IDD-type journals that more extensively address the positive outcomes of inclusive employment than business-type journals (e.g., *Journal of Finance*, *Journal of Labor Economics*, *Management Science*). Therefore, researchers should consider publishing in different types of journals to reach a wider audience and potentially change the perceptions of employers with regards to working directly with and/or hiring individuals with IDD in the workplace.

Third, there is a dearth of demographic information included in the studies on the employers themselves. The vast majority of studies did not report ethnicity, gender, age, or education level of the employer participants. With the ever-changing global markets, there is a

EMPLOYERS PERSPECTIVES SCOPING REVIEW

more diverse employer pool than ever before (Beazley et al., 2017; Nathan & Lee, 2013); thus, demographic information is critical to identify trends in perspectives as well as generalizability of findings. This information can provide an in-depth understanding of the employers themselves as well as how their perspectives may have evolved due to their education, access, and experiences. In addition, demographic information can provide a starting point for researchers to develop training and interventions for employer groups to potentially change their perspectives and attitudes towards individuals with IDD working in the community and ultimately improve employment outcomes for individuals with IDD.

Most of the research focused on employers' perspectives about individuals with ID compared to ASD or other disabilities working in the community. While there may have been an increase in employing those with ID in the 1980s due to the national call for integrated employment opportunities by Madeleine Will (1986), the working population with disabilities has changed (Grinker, 2020; Wehman et al., 2013). Given the increase in prevalence of transition-age individuals with ASD (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2019; Shattuck et al., 2014), there has been an increase in postsecondary education programs and vocational rehabilitation services that specifically target the ASD population to improve their post-school employment (Gerhardt et al., 2014). In addition, employers have increased recruitment efforts to specifically hire individuals with ASD based on their unique and diverse talents (Office of Disability Employment Policy, n.d.). Despite all these efforts initiated by the vocational rehabilitation services and employers, employment outcomes among individuals with ASD have not necessarily improved (Burgess & Cimera, 2014; Scott et al., 2019). Given only six studies were identified specific to the population, research exploring employers' perspectives,

EMPLOYERS PERSPECTIVES SCOPING REVIEW

knowledge, and organizational leadership about individuals with ASD in the workforce is critical with the increased number of potential employees with ASD (Bowman, 2020; Solomon, 2020).

A fourth finding identified that the majority of studies examined employer perceptions primarily using informal measures through quantitative methods (e.g., surveys) that were created by the study authors. There were few studies that gathered employer perspectives using formal measures that were deemed reliable and valid. The informal measures focused on specific constructs (e.g., employability of those with IDD, experience with inclusion, hiring practices, attitudes) that the authors wanted to pursue and understand. This poses a problem when attempting to compare employer perspectives across studies as the data gathered are not necessarily comparable. Additionally, there were no intervention studies or longitudinal studies conducted examining potential effective strategies and/or factors that could lead to changes in the employers' perspectives across time. Finally, there were a limited number of studies utilizing a qualitative methodology (e.g., ethnography, case study, phenomenology) and methods (e.g., interviews, focus groups) to investigate how the employers' perspectives were potentially developed based on their experiences. This information could be important to develop interventions or programs potentially changing employer perspectives of individuals with IDD.

Overall, employers from multiple countries reported perceiving individuals with IDD in the workplace positively and felt those with IDD made an impact on organizational culture and outcomes (e.g., Beyer et al., 2016; Levy et al., 1993; Waisman-Nitzan et al., 2019). Most positive attitudes were related to previous experience either hiring or working with individuals with IDD in the workplace, the education level of the employers (i.e., more education), and the age of the employers (i.e., younger). Similar to previous research (Ju et al., 2013; Kregel & Tomiyasu, 1994; Scott et al., 2017), the company size (i.e., larger) also appeared to impact this

EMPLOYERS PERSPECTIVES SCOPING REVIEW

positive perspective as reported in the studies. Furthermore, employers continued to report job coaching as a critical support for employees with IDD to be successful (Rashid et al., 2017).

Despite progress in more positive perspectives toward working with and hiring individuals with IDD, those with IDD continue to be un- and under-employed in community integrated employment settings (Chen et al., 2015; Baldwin et al., 2014). As some studies found that employers continued to harbor negative attitudes and low expectations of individuals with IDD engaging in work (e.g., Morgan et al., 2005; Zappella et al., 2015), this continued negative perception of individuals with IDD by the people who would be hiring along with the low employment rate of those with IDD and the lack of interventions focused on potentially changing employers' perspectives is disconcerting. Further research on exploring employers' perspectives about including individuals with IDD is vital to understand how these perspectives may impact outcomes as well as developing interventions to change these negative perceptions and minimize the impact on the employment outcomes of those with IDD in integrated work settings.

Limitations

Overall, studies reported employer perspectives were increasingly positive with research conducted globally using a variety of methodologies and tools. However, there were several limitations identified in this review. First, half of the articles identified for this review were found through the ancestral and forward searches conducted on the initial 23 articles. These initial articles were identified through databases generally used to locate articles in educational, vocational rehabilitation, rehabilitation, and social science research. Therefore, conducting article searches in business-focused databases (e.g., ABI/INFORM complete, Business source complete, EconLit), and journals (e.g., *Journal of Finance*, *Journal of Labor Economics*) may have resulted in a more comprehensive picture of employers' perspectives.

EMPLOYERS PERSPECTIVES SCOPING REVIEW

Second, there was a dearth of employer demographic data reported as well as a lack of reliable and valid data collection tools used to collect the perspectives. Without such details, stakeholders may find it difficult to apply and generalize the results of those studies to their own organization's situation. Future research studies should include detailed employer demographics as well as causal research designs and statistical analyses to examine if particular factors (e.g., education, age, company size) and/or intervention (e.g., employer training and support) have an impact on the development of their perspectives. Furthermore, researchers should consider using formal and standardized assessments to measure employer perspectives so participant groups and outcomes can be compared across studies, settings and locations.

Finally, our search included only articles written in English; yet we included studies conducted globally. It is possible that potential articles written in languages other than English could have been excluded. In addition, only peer-reviewed data-based journal articles were included in this review. With this inclusion criteria, we may have excluded literature such as case studies, non-peer reviewed articles, and gray literature (e.g., dissertations, books) that explored employer perspectives using different methodological or data collection approaches.

Implications for Research

Based on the results and limitations from this scoping review, there are several opportunities for potential future research. First, additional studies should be conducted in more countries to deepen our understanding on how employers perceive individuals with IDD working in integrated work settings. This will provide a more holistic view of what inclusive employment, hiring practices, and employer perspectives may look like in different countries and cultural contexts. Second, post-school employment research for individuals with IDD may need to move from an educator focus to an interdisciplinary focus across stakeholders in areas such as

EMPLOYERS PERSPECTIVES SCOPING REVIEW

education, human resources, vocational rehabilitation, business, and organization management.

Third, researchers should publish in a wider array of journal types. In this review, employers who had experiences hiring and working with individuals with IDD (e.g., Duvdevany et al., 2016; Nicholas et al., 2019a, 2019b) reported more positive perspectives and accepting attitudes toward hiring individuals with IDD and how it impacts their organizational culture. Thus, publishing in more business-focused or human resource type journals may reach more employers and demonstrate these positive experiences and perspectives employers have with employees with IDD to create a more inclusive and integrated workplace. Finally, future research needs to include more detailed demographic information of the employers and businesses in the studies to help determine perspectives, trends in research, and potential generalizability of the findings.

Implications for Practice

While understanding how employers perceive and interact with individuals with IDD in the workforce is critical, it is even more imperative to use such information to develop interventions to work with employers and coworkers to build their disability awareness and knowledge as well as how to work, socialize with, and supervise individuals with IDD in the workplace. Interventions that could change employer and coworker negative perspectives in the workplace and improve employment practices and cultures could result in a more positive and inclusive work environment for both individuals with and without IDD. Stakeholders can also use this review to further develop tools (e.g., brochures, websites) and trainings (e.g., Chamber of Commerce presentations, disability awareness trainings) to assist employers and hopefully change the employment outcomes for individuals with IDD (Chen et al., 2015). Furthermore, employers can support the inclusion of high school students with IDD by connecting with special

EMPLOYERS PERSPECTIVES SCOPING REVIEW

educators and transition specialists to offer work-based learning opportunities since these experiences are positive predictors of postschool outcomes (Mazzotti et al., 2016).

Implications for Policy

While this scoping review does not demonstrate causality between experience working with individuals with IDD and positive employer perspectives, policy makers can continue to encourage the inclusion of individuals with IDD in the workplace by passing inclusive policy and legislation. State legislatures have initiated or are lobbying for *Employment First* laws to require state agencies to support competitive integrated employment for adults with IDD. In addition, it is necessary to create funding programs such as the Visionary Opportunities to Increase Competitive Integrated Employment (VOICE) initiative to assist in developing statewide policies to increase inclusive competitive employment and opportunities for individuals with IDD (Office of Disability Employment Policy, 2020). Therefore, promoting both state and national legislation to encourage a diverse workforce and to improve employment outcomes of both individuals with and without IDD is critical.

Conclusion

While individual studies suggest a shift towards positive perspectives of adults with IDD as well as workplace inclusion, understanding exactly how to support employers and build capacity to create competitive inclusive employment continues to be limited. Results from this review may provide stakeholders with a broad understanding of the employer perspective literature and how employers perceive individuals with IDD in employment settings. Such information may encourage more interagency collaboration among the school, adult services, and work to potentially change employer perspectives and hiring practices and improve employment outcomes of individuals with IDD. Ultimately, by including perspectives from both

EMPLOYERS PERSPECTIVES SCOPING REVIEW

the employer (demand-side) and employee (supply-side) may help identify strategies that can potentially build employer capacity and decrease the stigma towards individuals with IDD in the workforce (Erickson et al., 2014).

EMPLOYERS PERSPECTIVES SCOPING REVIEW

References

- Agran, M., Hughes, C., Thoma, C. A., & Scott, L. A. (2016). Employment social skills: What skills are really valued? *Career Development and Transition for Exceptional Individuals*, 39(2), 111-120. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2165143414546741>
- Ali, M., Schur, L., & Blanck, P. (2011). What types of jobs do people with disabilities want? *Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation*, 21(2), 199-210. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10926-010-9266-0>
- Arksey, H., & O'Malley, L. (2005). Scoping studies: Towards a methodological framework. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 8(1), 19-32. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1364557032000119616>
- Baldwin, S., Costley, D., & Warren, A. (2014). Employment activities and experiences of adults with high-functioning autism and Asperger's Disorder. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 44(10), 2440-9. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-014-2112-z>
- Beazley, A., Ball, C., & Vernon, K. (2017). Workplace age diversity: The employers' perspectives. In *Managing the Ageing Workforce in the East and the West*. Emerald Publishing Limited.
- Bowman, A. D. (2020). What we know about employers' perspectives on successfully integrating adults with autism spectrum disorders in the workplace. *International Journal of Psychiatry Research*, 3(1), 1-4.
- Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2019, January 4). *The employment situation - December 2018*. [News release]. Retrieved from https://www.bls.gov/news.release/archives/empsit_01042019.pdf

EMPLOYERS PERSPECTIVES SCOPING REVIEW

- Burgess, S., & Cimera, R. E. (2014). Employment outcomes of transition-aged adults with autism spectrum disorders: A state of the states report. *American Journal on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities, 119*(1), 64-83. <https://doi.org/10.1352/1944-7558-119.1.64>
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2019). *Data & Statistics on Autism Spectrum Disorder*. <https://www.cdc.gov/ncbddd/autism/data.html>
- Chen, J. L., Sung, C., & Pi, S. (2015). Vocational rehabilitation service patterns and outcomes for individuals with autism of different ages. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders, 45*(9), 3015-29. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-015-2465-y>
- de Schipper, E., Mahdi, S., de Vries, P., Granlund, M., Holtmann, M., Karande, S., Almodayfer, O., Shulman, C., Tonge, B., Wong, V., Zwaigenbaum, L., & Bölte, S. (2016). Functioning and disability in autism spectrum disorder: A worldwide survey of experts. *Autism Research, 9*(9), 959-969. <https://doi.org/10.1002/aur.1592>
- Erickson, W. A., von Schrader, S., Bruyere, S. M., & VanLooy, S. A. (2014). The employment environment: Employer perspectives, policies, and practices regarding the employment of persons with disabilities. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin, 57*(4), 195-208. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0034355213509841>
- Gerhardt P. F., Cicero F., & Mayville E. (2014) Employment and related services for adults with autism spectrum disorders. In F. Volkmar, B. Reichow, & J. McPartland (Eds.), *Adolescents and Adults with Autism Spectrum Disorders* (4th ed., pp. 105-119). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4939-0506-5_6

EMPLOYERS PERSPECTIVES SCOPING REVIEW

- Graffam, J., Smith, K., Shinkfield, A., & Polzin, U. (2002). Employer benefits and costs of employing a person with a disability. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation, 17*(4), 251–63.
- Grinker, R. R. (2020). Autism, “stigma”, disability: A shifting historical terrain. *Current Anthropology, 61*(21), S55-S67. <https://doi.org/10.1086/705748>
- Grun, C., Hauser, W., & Rhein, T. (2010). Is any job better than no job? Life satisfaction in re-employment. *Journal of Labor Research, 31*(3), 285–306.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s12122-010-9093-2>
- Hedley, D., Uljarević, M., Cameron, L., Halder, S., Richdale, A., & Dissanayake, C. (2017). Employment programmes and interventions targeting adults with autism spectrum disorder: A systematic review of the literature. *Autism, 21*(8), 929-941. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362361316661855>
- Hiersteiner, D., Butterworth, J., Bershadsky, J., & Bonardi, A. (2018). Working in the community: The status and outcomes of people with intellectual and developmental disabilities in integrated employment - Update 3. (NCI Data Brief). Cambridge, MA: Human Services Research Institute.
- Higher Education Opportunity Act of 2008, P.L. 110–315, 20 U.S.C. §§1001 et seq. (2008)
- Jahoda, A., Banks, P., Dagnan, D., Kemp, J., Kerr, W., & Williams, V. (2009). Starting a new job: The social and emotional experience of people with intellectual disabilities. *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities, 22*(5), 421-425.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-3148.2009.00497.x>

EMPLOYERS PERSPECTIVES SCOPING REVIEW

- Johnson, T. D., & Joshi, A. (2014). Disclosure on the spectrum: Understanding disclosure among employees on the autism spectrum. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 7*(2), 278–281. <https://doi.org/10.1111/iops.12149>
- Ju, S., Roberts, E., & Zhang, D. (2013). Employer attitudes toward workers with disabilities: A review of research in the past decade. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation, 38*(2), 113–123. <https://doi.org/10.3233/JVR-130625>
- Kocman, A., Fischer, L., & Weber, G. (2017). The employers' perspective on barriers and facilitators to employment of people with intellectual disability: A differential mixed-method approach. *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities, 31*(1), 120–131. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jar.12375>
- Kocman, A., & Weber, G. (2016). Job satisfaction, quality of work life and work motivation in employees with intellectual disability: A systematic review. *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities, 31*(1), 1-22. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jar.12319>
- Kregel, J., & Tomiyasu, Y. (1994). Employers' attitudes toward workers with disabilities: Effect of the Americans with Disabilities Act. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation, 4*(3), 165–173. <https://doi.org/10.3233/JVR-1994-4305>
- Lysaght, R., Cobigo, V. & Hamilton, K. (2012). Inclusion as a focus of employment-related research in intellectual disability from 2000 to 2010: A scoping review. *Disability and Rehabilitation, 34*(16), 1339-1350. <https://doi.org/10.3109/09638288.2011.644023>
- Lysaght, R., Petner-Arrey, J., Howell-Moneta, A., & Cobigo, V. (2017). Inclusion through work and productivity for persons with intellectual and developmental disabilities. *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities, 30*(5). 922-935.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/jar.12284>

EMPLOYERS PERSPECTIVES SCOPING REVIEW

Mazzotti, V. L., Rowe, D. A., Sinclair, J., Poppen, M., Woods, W. E., & Shearer, M. L. (2016).

Predictors of post-school success: A systematic review of NLTS2 secondary analyses.

Career Development and Transition for Exceptional Individuals, 39(4), 196-215.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/2165143415588047>

Migliore, A., Mank, D., Grossi, T., & Rogan, P. (2007). Integrated employment or sheltered

workshops: Preferences of adults with intellectual disabilities, their families, and staff.

Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation, 26(1), 5-19.

<https://doi.org/10.24226/JVR.2016.04.26.1.5>

Munn, Z., Peters, M. D. J., Stern, C., Tufanaru, C., McArthur, A., & Aromataris, E. (2018).

Systematic review or scoping review? Guidance for authors when choosing between a

systematic or scoping review approach. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 18, 143-

150. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-018-0611-x>

Nathan, M., & Lee, N. (2013). Cultural diversity, innovation, and entrepreneurship: Firm-level

evidence from London. *Economic Geography*, 89(4), 367-394.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/ecge.12016>

Office of Disability Employment Policy. (n.d.). *Employment first*.

<https://www.dol.gov/agencies/odep/initiatives/employment-first>

Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development. (2020). *Employees by business size*

(indicator). [https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/industry-and-services/employees-by-business-](https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/industry-and-services/employees-by-business-size/indicator/english_ceaf53c9-en)

[size/indicator/english_ceaf53c9-en](https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/industry-and-services/employees-by-business-size/indicator/english_ceaf53c9-en)

Rashid, M., Hodgetts, S., & Nicholas, D. (2017). Building employers' capacity to support

vocational opportunities for adults with developmental disabilities. *Review Journal of*

EMPLOYERS PERSPECTIVES SCOPING REVIEW

- Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 4, 165-173. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40489-017-0105-5>
- Roux, A. M., Shattuck, P. T., Rast, J. E., & Anderson, K. A. (2017). *National Autism Indicators Report*. Philadelphia, PA: Drexel University.
- Saleh, M. C., & Bruyère, S. M. (2018). Leveraging employer practices in global regulatory frameworks to improve employment outcomes for people with disabilities. *Social Inclusion*, 6(1), 18-28. <https://doi.org/10.17645/si.v6i1.1201>
- Scott, M., Jacob, A., Hendrie, D., Parsons, R., Girdler, S., Falkmer, T., & Falkmer, M. (2017). Employers' perception of the costs and the benefits of hiring individuals with autism spectrum disorder in open employment in Australia. *PLoS ONE*, 12(5), 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0177607>
- Scott, M., Milbourn, B., Falkmer, M., Black, M., Bölte, S., Halladay, A., Lerner, M., Taylor, J. L., & Girdler, S. (2019). Factors impacting employment for people with autism spectrum disorder: A scoping review. *Autism*, 23(4), 869-901. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362361318787789>
- Shattuck, P. T., Steinberg, J., Yu, J., Wei, X., Cooper, B. P., Newman, L., & Roux, A. M. (2014). Disability identification and self-efficacy among college students on the autism spectrum. *Autism Research and Treatment*, 2014, 1-7. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2014/924182>
- Simonsen, M. L., & Neubert, D. A. (2013). Transitioning youth with intellectual and other developmental disabilities: Predicting community employment outcomes. *Career Development and Transition for Exceptional Individuals*, 36(3), 188-198. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2165143412469399>

EMPLOYERS PERSPECTIVES SCOPING REVIEW

Solomon, C. (2020). Autism and employment: Implications for employers and adults with ASD.

Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders. Advance online publication.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-020-04537-w>

The Office of Disability Employment Policy. (2020, February 5). *U.S. Department of Labor selects 12 states and the District of Columbia to increase employment of people with mental health disabilities* [News release]. Retrieved from

<https://www.dol.gov/newsroom/releases/odep/odep20200205>

The United Nations. (2006). Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. Treaty Series, 2515, 3.

Tricco, A. C., Lillie, E., Zarin, W., O'Brien, K. K., Colquhoun, H., Levac, D., Moher, D., Peters, M. D. J., Horsely, T., Weeks, L., Hempel, S., Akl, E. A., Chang, C., McGowan, J., Stewart, L., Hartling, L., Aldcroft, A., Wilson, M. G., Garritty, C., ... Straus, S. E. (2018). PRISMA extension for scoping reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and explanation. *Annals of Internal Medicine*, 169(7), 467-473. <https://doi.org/10.7326/M18-0850>

Waisman-Nitzan, M., Gal, E., & Schreuer, N. (2019). Employers' perspectives regarding reasonable accommodations for employees with autism spectrum disorder. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 25(4), 481-498. <https://doi.org/10.1017/jmo.2018.59>

Walsh, L., Lydon, S., & Healy, O. (2014). Employment and vocational skills among individuals with autism spectrum disorder: Predictors, impact, and interventions. *Review Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 1(4), 266-275. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40489-014-0024-7>

EMPLOYERS PERSPECTIVES SCOPING REVIEW

Wehman, P.H., Schall., C.M., McDonough, J., Kregel., J., Brooke, V., Molinelli, A., Ham, W.,

Graham, C. W., Riehle, J. E., Collins, H. T., & Thiss, W. (2013). Competitive employment for youth with autism spectrum disorders: Early results from a randomized clinical trial. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 44(3), 487-500.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-013-1892-x>

Will, M. (1986). *Educating students with learning problems—A shared responsibility. A report to the Secretary*. Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, US Department of Education.

Winsor, J., Timmons, J., Butterworth, J., Migliore, A., Domin, D., Zalewska, A., & Shepard, J. (2018). *StateData: The national report on employment services and outcomes*. Boston, MA. Institute for Community Inclusion.

Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act, P.L. 113-128, 29 U.S.C. § 3101 (2014)

World Health Organization. (2011). *World Report on Disability*. Geneva. Retrieved from https://www.who.int/disabilities/world_report/2011/report.pdf