



City Research Online

City, University of London Institutional Repository

Citation: Hoque, K., Bacon, N. & Parr, D. (2014). Employer disability practice in Britain: assessing the impact of the Positive About Disabled People 'Two Ticks' symbol. *Work, Employment and Society*, 28(3), pp. 430-451. doi: 10.1177/0950017012472757

This is the accepted version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version.

Permanent repository link: <https://openaccess.city.ac.uk/id/eprint/6199/>

Link to published version: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0950017012472757>

Copyright: City Research Online aims to make research outputs of City, University of London available to a wider audience. Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. URLs from City Research Online may be freely distributed and linked to.

Reuse: Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

City Research Online:

<http://openaccess.city.ac.uk/>

publications@city.ac.uk

Employer disability practice in Britain: assessing the impact of the Positive About Disabled People ‘Two Ticks’ symbol

Abstract

This paper assesses the extent to which employers displaying the Positive About Disabled People ‘Two Ticks’ symbol adhere to the five commitments they are expected to uphold and whether adherence to these commitments is greater in Two Ticks than non-Two Ticks workplaces. It also assesses levels of support for and dialogue with Disability Champions in Two Ticks workplaces. These issues are explored in the public and private sectors separately. The analysis finds only limited adherence to the five commitments in Two Ticks workplaces, no consistent evidence that adherence is higher in Two Ticks than non-Two Ticks workplaces, and limited evidence of support for/ dialogue with Disability Champions in Two Ticks workplaces. It also finds little evidence of variation between public and private sector workplaces.

Keywords

Disability, Two Ticks symbol, Disability Champions, equal opportunities, trade unions

Introduction

The labour market disadvantage experienced by disabled people has been an issue of longstanding public concern. Sociological accounts have attributed this disadvantage in part to employer ignorance of the capabilities disabled people possess and an unwillingness to accommodate their needs (Berthoud, 2008). Attempts have been made in Britain to address these problems by providing additional employment rights for disabled people within the Disability Discrimination Act (1995, 2005), and since 2006 by placing responsibilities on public sector organisations to promote disability equality (Barnes and Mercer, 2005; Conley, 2012; Foster, 2007). Arguably, these recent legal changes represent an important (if limited) move away from a medical model of disability whereby the disability the person suffers is viewed as limiting the tasks they can perform, towards a social model of disability whereby

the responsibility lies with organisations to adapt in order to facilitate the employment of disabled people (Barnes and Mercer, 2005).

These legislative changes appear, however, to have had only a limited impact in terms of reducing persistent disability disadvantage in the British labour market. Disabled people remain almost twice as likely to be unemployed (Berthoud, 2008; Riddell et al., 2010), and the latest Labour Force Survey (January-March 2012) estimates the employment rate for disabled people and those with long-term health problems to be 51 percent compared with 77 percent for the non-disabled (ONS, 2012). The disabled are also over-represented in low-skilled and low-status jobs (Goldstone and Meager, 2002; Riddell et al., 2010) and they continue to experience disadvantage in career progression and access to training opportunities (Jones, 2008; Meager and Higgins, 2011). In addition, they are paid significantly less (Jones, 2008), with the pay gap between disabled and non-disabled employees estimated at slightly less than a pound an hour (Riddell et al., 2010).

The limited impact of recent legislative change is also reflected in the continued paucity of disability practices within British workplaces. Almost a decade after the Disability Discrimination Act (1995), the Workplace Employment Relations Survey 2004 found that only 23 percent of workplaces monitored recruitment and selection and 9 percent monitored promotions by disability, while only 19 percent reviewed recruitment and selection procedures, 10 percent reviewed promotion procedures and 4 percent reviewed relative pay rates by disability (Kersley et al., 2006). There is also evidence of continued employer reluctance to engage in dialogue on disability equality with stakeholders, with only a minority of public sector organisations having introduced arrangements to consult disabled employees prior to the introduction of the Disability Equality Duty (Equal Opportunities Review, 2006). Woodhams and Corby (2007) argue that while the Disability Discrimination Act resulted in some increase in the prevalence of disability practices aimed at ensuring greater procedural

justice, it also resulted in a decline in the use of more radical disability practices such as reserved jobs, work introduction schemes and special external recruitment events for disabled people as a result of the abolition of the quota system within the DP(E)A (1944) which required 3 percent of jobs in organisations with 20 or more employees to be filled by registered disabled people.

It would appear, therefore, that further steps may be necessary to encourage employers to implement the sort of equality practices that might help reduce disability disadvantage in the labour market. One such step, which might be deemed consistent with Britain's largely neo-liberal approach to equality, involves encouraging employers to sign up to voluntary standards and make commitments to introduce changes to promote greater equality. A range of such standards exist both in non-disability related areas (Opportunity Now, Race for Opportunity, Stonewall Diversity Champions and Top Employers for Working Families for example) and in relation to disability equality (The 'Positive About Disabled People' Two Ticks symbol). Although assessing the influence of all of these equality standards might be deemed important, not least as it would only be wise to advocate greater employer engagement them if it can first be demonstrated that they have the potential to engender genuine improvements in employer practice, this paper focuses specifically on an assessment of the 'Two Ticks' symbol. This might be deemed especially necessary given that much equalities research to date has focused on gender and race, with less attention having been paid to other areas such as disability (Dex and Forth, 2009). The analysis draws on data from a survey of trade union Disability Champions. The Disability Champion role is a lay union position that focuses specifically on representing the needs of disabled people. A formal element of the role is to audit the organisation against the commitments expected of employers that display the Two Ticks symbol, hence Disability Champions are particularly well placed to comment on issues relevant to this paper.

The Two Ticks symbol and employer disability practice

Launched in 1990, the Positive About Disabled People 'Two Ticks' symbol has become a common and highly recognisable feature on job advertisements and application forms in Britain. Awarded to employers by Jobcentre Plus, the symbol is intended to help disabled job applicants identify employers that have made positive commitments regarding the treatment of disabled people within recruitment, training and retention processes, and have sought to raise disability awareness within their organisations.

Since 1993, employers displaying the symbol have been expected to adhere to five commitments (Dibben et al., 2002), these being: to interview all disabled applicants who meet the minimum criteria for a job vacancy and to consider them on their abilities; to discuss with disabled employees, at any time but at least once a year, what both parties can do to make sure disabled employees can develop and use their abilities; to make every effort when employees become disabled to make sure they stay in employment; to take action to ensure that all employees develop the appropriate level of disability awareness; and to review the commitments each year and assess what has been achieved, plan ways to improve on them and let employees and Jobcentre Plus know about progress and future plans (www.direct.gov.uk). Given that the commitments require employers to go beyond the requirements of the Equality Act (2010), and given that nearly one in five of the British population of working age have a long-term disability (Riddell et al., 2010), the symbol has the potential to influence the working lives of large numbers of people.

Adoption of the symbol has been reasonably widespread. For example, Dibben et al. (2001) found that 21 percent of the top 200 FTSE companies in their sample were displaying it, while Woodhams and Corby (2007) found its use to have increased from 27 percent of the companies surveyed in 1995 to 46 percent in 2003. Goldstone and Meager (2002) found that

while 10 percent of companies within their sample were using the symbol overall, 35 percent of workplaces with 500 or more employees were displaying it. In total, between 1990 and 2012, the symbol was awarded to 8,387 employers (DWP, 2012).

A particularly notable feature of the Two Ticks symbol, however, is that there is little in terms of independent monitoring or governance arrangements to review how employers meet the five commitments they are expected to uphold (Trades Union Congress, 2009). Although it is Jobcentre Plus policy to audit employers' adherence to the commitments annually, it does not keep data on how many reviews have been undertaken and how many of these reviews have resulted in the symbol being withdrawn (DWP, 2012). The symbol would appear, therefore, to be underpinned by a market-based neo-liberal philosophy within which improvements in employer disability practice are not seen as requiring compulsion but instead can (and should) be left to employer goodwill and self-enforcement.

This has significant implications, however, in terms of the anticipated impact of the symbol on employer disability practice. On the one hand, disability practice might be expected to be considerably better in Two Ticks than non-Two Ticks workplaces given that employers will arguably only choose to adopt the symbol should they have first recognised a business case for adhering to its five commitments. On the other hand, it is often argued that employers frequently fail to perceive a business case where disability is concerned (Dibben et al., 2001; Woodhams and Danieli, 2000), given the potential costs involved in making workplace adjustments (Dickens, 2005) and a failure to recognise the specific skills or abilities that disabled people possess. Many employers displaying the symbol, therefore, may do so not because they have recognised a business case for adhering to its commitments, but instead to secure its broader reputational benefits or to give the impression of a concern for disability issues. It is generally acknowledged that as a result of Britain's largely neo-liberal approach to equality, equal opportunities policies are often little more than 'empty shells' that

may be good for impression management purposes but contain little of substance to protect those in positions of disadvantage (Hoque and Noon, 2004). Should the Two Ticks symbol similarly constitute an ‘empty shell’, this might be interpreted as a further indication of the limitations of what a market-based neo-liberal approach to equality is able to achieve.

The little research undertaken on the impact of the Two Ticks symbol on employer disability practices has, however, proved inconclusive. Dickens (2005) argues that the symbol’s increasing adoption suggests on the surface that employers are taking disability issues more seriously. Indeed, Woodhams and Corby (2007) found the proportion of disabled employees to be higher in Two Ticks than non-Two Ticks workplaces, while Goldstone and Meager (2002) found formal disability practices and the active encouragement of disabled applicants to be more widespread. Against this, however, Dibben et al. (2001) found little evidence of disability receiving greater attention at the highest levels in large (FTSE) companies displaying the symbol. The Trades Union Congress (2009) has also raised concerns over the disability practices implemented by Two Ticks employers.

This paper seeks to add to this debate by drawing on the survey of union Disability Champions outlined above in two ways. The first is to explore how far union Disability Champions in Two Ticks workplaces state that the five Two Ticks commitments are adhered to, and whether adherence to the commitments is higher than in non-Two Ticks workplaces. The second is to assess the extent to which the symbol is associated with employer willingness to provide support for and engage in dialogue with Disability Champions, and whether this is greater in Two Ticks than in non-Two Ticks workplaces. This might be anticipated given the value one would expect Two Ticks employers to place on the unique skills and understanding of disability issues that Disability Champions possess and the role they might play in translating disabled employees’ concerns into improved disability policies and practice (Foster, 2007).

In addressing these issues, however, one might expect differences to emerge between the public and private sectors. This is for two main reasons. The first concerns differences in cultural values, reflected not least by the efforts of some local authority employers dating back to the 1980s to promote the employment of disabled people (Woodhams and Corby, 2007). Second, the Disability Equality Duty might arguably encourage public sector managers to uphold the Two Ticks commitments and provide support for/ engage in dialogue with Disability Champions. That said, a survey of 65 public sector organisations prior to the introduction of the positive duty revealed that many respondents did not know whether their organisation supported the Two Ticks symbol, over one-third did not know how many disabled people were employed by their organisation, and less than one-quarter had arranged training on disability issues for all staff involved in recruitment (Equal Opportunities Review, 2006). In addition, adherence to the public sector Race Equality Duty introduced in 2003 has been limited (Dex and Forth, 2009; Kersley et al., 2006), suggesting that the effect of the Disability Equality Duty may also have been weak. Nevertheless, the paper's final aim is to explore whether there is a stronger relationship between the Two Ticks symbol and adherence to the Two Ticks commitments and support for/ dialogue with Disability Champions in the public than the private sector workplaces within the sample.

Data and Methods of Analysis

The analysis uses data from a survey of trade union Disability Champions conducted between June and November 2010. The survey was distributed to all Disability Champions who had attended the Trades Union Congress-sponsored Disability Champion training course. Union representatives undergo this training before becoming Disability Champions, hence the whole Disability Champion population was surveyed. The survey was conducted online with participants being emailed a link. Hard copies or alternative formats were offered to

respondents on request. The link was distributed to 497 Disability Champions, of whom 159 replied (representing a response rate of 32 percent). 116 responses were used once respondents who undertook the training but were not playing the role and once observations with missing data were excluded. As discussed earlier, Disability Champions might be well placed to comment on the issues of interest here given their specific area of expertise. However, it must also be remembered that the sample is not representative of all Two Ticks workplaces, particularly given that non-union workplaces – which comprise 84 percent of private sector workplaces with 10 or more employees (Kersley et al., 2006) – are excluded from the sample. The results need to be interpreted with this caveat in mind.

The paper's first aim is to assess how far Disability Champions in Two Ticks workplaces state that the five commitments are adhered to, and whether adherence to the commitments is higher than in non-Two Ticks workplaces. Respondents were asked whether the employer adheres to each commitment on a four-point scale where 4 = always and 1 = never. A scale was also created concerning the number of commitments adhered to¹. These measures were cross-tabulated with a dichotomous variable where 1 = Disability Champions in Two Ticks workplaces and 0 = Disability Champions in non-Two Ticks workplaces, and chi2 statistics (or a t-test for the continuous variable concerning the number of commitments adhered to) were calculated to identify differences in adherence between each cohort.

It is possible, however, that any variation between the two cohorts might be explained by differences in observable workplace and organisational characteristics (sector, workplace and organisational size, for example). Multivariate analysis was therefore conducted to control for these characteristics. The control variables are described in the Appendix table. Ordered probit was used given the categorical nature of the dependent variables, except for the analysis of the number of commitments adhered to, for which ordinary least squares was used.

The paper's second aim is to assess the extent to which the symbol is associated with employer willingness to provide support for and engage in dialogue with Disability Champions, and whether such support and engagement is greater in Two Ticks than in non-Two Ticks workplaces. Disability Champions were asked whether the employer provides them with: sufficient office space; sufficient communication equipment (e.g. phone, email, internet); reasonable time off to conduct the role; and adequate information to conduct the role. They were also asked whether the employer has a disability or equality committee and whether they attend this committee in their Disability Champion capacity, and whether managers at their workplace value their Disability Champion role (on a scale of 1 to 5 where 5=strongly agree and 1=strongly disagree). These measures were cross-tabulated with the dichotomous Two Ticks variable described above and chi² statistics were calculated to identify variation between Two Ticks and non-Two Ticks workplaces. Multivariate analysis was also conducted to identify whether the relationships held once observable organisational and workplace characteristics were controlled for. Controls for individual characteristics (described in the Appendix table) were also included². The analysis was conducted using probit except for the analysis of whether managers value the Disability Champion's activities, for which ordered probit was used.

The paper's third aim is to explore whether there is a stronger relationship between the Two Ticks symbol and adherence to the Two Ticks commitments and support for/ dialogue with Disability Champions in the public than the private sector workplaces within the sample. A dichotomous variable was created where 1=Disability Champions in public sector workplaces and 0= Disability Champions in private sector workplaces (voluntary sector workplaces were excluded). This was then interacted with the Two Ticks variable. The combined significance of the interaction term and the main effect coefficients was then calculated to identify whether a Two Ticks effect existed in one sector but not the other.

Results

Adherence to the five Two Ticks commitments

The paper's first aim is to assess how far Disability Champions in Two Ticks workplaces state that the five commitments are adhered to, and whether adherence to the commitments is higher than in non-Two Ticks workplaces. The bivariate results, presented in table 1, suggest overall adherence to the five commitments in the Two Ticks workplaces is somewhat limited. On average, the Disability Champions in the Two Ticks workplaces state that only 1.93 of the five commitments are fully adhered to, and 18 percent claim that none are fully adhered to. The results also demonstrate that while Disability Champions in the Two Ticks workplaces are slightly more positive (at the 8 percent significance level) than are their counterparts in the non-Two Ticks workplaces in terms of whether the employer interviews all disabled applicants who meet the minimum criteria for a vacancy, they are no more likely to state that their employer adheres to the other four commitments.

INSERT TABLE 1 HERE

The multivariate analysis controlling for sector, organisation size and workplace size, presented in Table 2, verifies the results of the bivariate analysis, with no differences emerging between the Two Ticks and the non-Two Ticks workplaces in terms of adherence to the five commitments, with the exception that Disability Champions in the Two Ticks workplaces are slightly more likely (at the 10 percent significance level) to state that the employer interviews all disabled employees who meet the minimum criteria. The analysis of the overall number of commitments adhered to further confirms that adherence is no greater in the Two Ticks than the non-Two Ticks workplaces within the sample.

INSERT TABLE 2 HERE

Support for and dialogue with Disability Champions

The paper's second aim is to assess the extent to which the symbol is associated with employer willingness to provide support for and engage in dialogue with Disability Champions, and whether such support and engagement is greater in Two Ticks than in non-Two Ticks workplaces. The bivariate results in table 3 reveal no statistically significant differences between the two cohorts. They also suggest that some elements of support and dialogue within the Two Ticks workplaces are somewhat limited. For example, only just over half of Disability Champions in the Two Ticks workplaces state that managers provide them with reasonable time off, and only 46 percent state that their employer provides them with adequate information. Additionally, 40 percent of Disability Champions in Two Ticks workplaces disagree or strongly disagree that managers value them, while only 24 percent agree or strongly agree with this statement.

INSERT TABLE 3 HERE

The multivariate analysis, reported in table 4, demonstrates that the lack of significance within the bivariate results remains once workplace, organisational and individual characteristics are controlled for, with the exception that a weak positive Two Ticks effect emerges with regard to whether the employer provides sufficient office equipment³.

INSERT TABLE 4 HERE

Public/ private sector differences

The paper's third aim is to explore whether there is a stronger relationship between the Two Ticks symbol and adherence to the five commitments and support for/ dialogue with Disability Champions in the public than the private sector workplaces within the sample. The results are reported in table 5.

INSERT TABLE 5 HERE

Turning first to adherence to the five commitments, there is no evidence in the public sector subsample of greater adherence in the Two Ticks than the non-Two Ticks workplaces (as demonstrated by the lack of significance of the combined coefficient of the interaction term and the Two Ticks coefficient). In the private sector, adherence to three of the five commitments is higher in the Two Ticks than the non-Two Ticks workplaces (as demonstrated by the Two Ticks workplaces coefficients). There is no evidence, therefore, of a stronger Two Ticks effect in the public than the private sector concerning adherence to the five commitments. If anything the opposite is true.

Turning to support for and dialogue with Disability Champions, the public sector results (as demonstrated by the significance of the combined coefficient of the interaction term and Two Ticks coefficient) suggest only a weak Two Ticks effect, with equality/ disability forums in which the Disability Champion participates being more prevalent, and communication equipment being slightly more likely to be provided (at the 10 percent significance level) in Two Ticks than non-Two Ticks workplaces. Where the private sector is concerned, none of the Two Ticks workplaces have equality/ disability forums in which the Disability Champion participates. Where the other forms of support and dialogue are

concerned, the results (as demonstrated by the Two Ticks workplaces coefficients) suggest no differences between Two Ticks and non-Two Ticks private sector workplaces. In neither sector, therefore, was there evidence of a consistent Two Ticks effect with regard to support for or dialogue with Disability Champions.

Also notable is that there is no evidence in tables 2 and 4 that adherence to the five commitments and support for/ dialogue with Disability Champions is any greater in the public than the private sector workplaces in the sample. Hence, the lack of a consistent Two Ticks effect in the public sector is not explained by higher overall levels of adherence to the commitments and support for/ dialogue with Disability Champions within the sector.

Discussion and Conclusions

This paper has sought to shed light on the disability practices adopted by employers displaying the Positive About Disabled People 'Two Ticks' symbol. In the event, notwithstanding the caveats outlined above, the results suggested only limited adherence to the five Two Ticks commitments and support for/ dialogue with Disability Champions in the Two Ticks workplaces within the sample. There was very little evidence that the commitments were more widely adhered to, or that support for and dialogue with Disability Champions was any greater in the Two Ticks than in the non-Two Ticks workplaces. There was also no consistent evidence of a stronger Two Ticks effect in the public than the private sector, suggesting that in both sectors, the symbol may often comprise little more than an 'empty shell' (Hoque and Noon, 2004)

These results have several implications. First, as argued earlier, the Two Ticks symbol is underpinned by a market-led, neo-liberal philosophy within which compliance with the five commitments employers are expected to uphold is dependent on employer goodwill, and compulsion is seen as neither necessary nor desirable. Hence, there is significant scope for

employers who do not perceive a business case for adhering to the five commitments to display the symbol for impression management purposes or to take advantage of its potential reputational benefits rather than because of a genuine concern for disability issues. The lack of difference between the Two Ticks and the non-Two Ticks workplaces in terms of adherence to the five commitments and support for/ dialogue with disability champions in the analysis presented here suggests support for this argument. It also suggests support for the argument made by Dibben et al. (2001) and Woodhams and Danieli (2000) that where employer recognition of a business case for equality is limited, there is little hope that neo-liberal voluntarist approaches to equality will deliver improvements. The Two Ticks symbol would appear, therefore, to lack substance. Arguably it will continue to do so unless it moves away from its neo-liberal underpinnings, and a degree of regulation, possibly in the form of an independent awarding and monitoring body as called for by the Trades Union Congress (2009), is introduced to ensure compliance with the five commitments.

Second, the results have implications for the public sector Disability Equality Duty. As argued earlier, adherence to the five commitments and the provision of support for/ dialogue with Disability Champions could be viewed as ways in which public sector managers might demonstrate adherence to the duty. Notwithstanding the caveat that public sector Disability Champions might apply a stricter criteria than their private sector counterparts in assessing adherence to the commitments and levels of support and dialogue, the results could be interpreted as suggesting that the duty has had little effect thus far.

Third, the results have implications for the government's plans to reduce the current number of disability benefit claimants by moving up to 1 million of the 2.63 million people currently on disability benefits into employment (Jones and Latreille, 2009). These plans are in part dependent upon employer receptiveness to the notion of employing disabled people in larger numbers. The limited adherence among many Two Ticks employers to the

commitments expected of them and their limited support for/ dialogue with Disability Champions in the results presented here, however, suggests that the relatively widespread adoption of the Two Ticks symbol cannot be taken as indicative of this.

In reaching these conclusions, however, one must keep in mind the caveat that while the sample used here has the advantage that the respondents are likely to be well informed about employer disability practice, it has the disadvantage that it is not representative of all (especially private sector) Two Ticks workplaces, particularly given that non-union private sector workplaces are excluded from the sample. As Hoque and Bacon (2014, forthcoming) demonstrate, EO practices are particularly poor within such workplaces, hence it is possible that the private sector estimates are biased upwards, and that a more representative sample might yield greater public-private sector differences than identified here. Additionally, one might expect the workplaces in the sample used in this paper (i.e. unionised workplaces with a Disability Champion) to be among the best in terms of the implementation of disability practices. Were the analysis to be replicated using a more representative sample, overall levels of adherence to the Two Ticks commitments may be found to be even lower than reported here.

Further research on the Two Ticks symbol is therefore needed to confirm or refute the results reported in this paper. This research might also seek to: ascertain employers' views of whether the Two Ticks symbol has engendered changes in practice; gather disabled employees' views of whether it has led to their needs being addressed; and evaluate the reasons for the symbol's apparently limited impact. Finally, while the analysis here has yielded insights on the Two Ticks symbol, developing a body of evidence on other voluntary equality standards will allow a broader explanation of the extent to which such standards have the potential to generate improvements in employer equality practice.

Notes

¹ Workplaces were considered to be upholding each commitment if the Disability Champion stated that it was ‘always’ adhered to.

² Controls for Disability Champion individual characteristics are not included in the earlier equations assessing employer adherence to the Two Ticks commitments as there are no reasons why employer adherence to the commitments might be affected by these characteristics. The results do not change, however, if these characteristics are controlled for.

³ Given the relatively small sample size, the robustness of the results was verified by re-estimating the equations using a more parsimonious model containing fewer independent variables. First, all non-significant variables were dropped from the equations. Second, the equations were re-estimated using a model within which the dummies for organisation size, workplace size and industry were collapsed. In the event, neither of these steps had a major impact on the coefficients for the main Two Ticks dummy with regard to either adherence to the five Two Ticks commitments (Table 2) or levels of support for and dialogue with disability champions (reported in Table 4). These models are available on request.

References

Barnes, C. and Mercer, G. (2005) ‘Disability, work and welfare: challenging the social exclusion of disabled people’, *Work, Employment & Society* 19 (3): 527-545.

Berthoud, R. (2008) ‘Disability employment penalties in Britain’, *Work, Employment & Society* 22 (1): 129-148.

Conley, H. (2012) ‘Using equality to challenge austerity: new actors, old problems’, *Work, Employment & Society* 26 (2): 349-359.

Dex, S. and Forth, J. (2009) 'Equality and diversity at work'. In W. Brown, A. Bryson, J. Forth and K. Whitfield (eds) *The Evolution of the Modern Workplace*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 230-255.

Dibben, P., James, P. and Cunningham, I. (2001) 'Senior management commitment to disability: the influence of legal compulsion and best practice', *Personnel Review* 30 (4): 454-467.

Dibben, P., Cunningham, I. and Smythe, D. (2002) 'Employers and employees with disabilities in the UK: An economically beneficial relationship?', *International Journal of Social Economics* 29 (6): 453-467.

Dickens, L. (2005) 'Walking the Talk? Equality and diversity in employment', in Bach S. (ed.) *Managing Human Resources*, 4th edition. Oxford: Blackwell.

Disability Rights Commission (2005) *The Duty to Promote Disability Equality, Statutory Code of Practice, England and Wales*. London: The Stationery Office.

DWP (2012) *Response to FoI Request No1542*. Sheffield: Department of Work and Pensions.

Equal Opportunities Review (2006) *Disability Equality Duty: an EOR Survey*. No. 159: 6-13.

Foster, D. (2007) 'Legal obligation or personal lottery? Employee experiences of disability and the negotiation of adjustments in the public sector workplace', *Work, Employment & Society* 21 (1): 67-84.

Goldstone, C. and Meager, N. (2002) *Barriers to Employment for Disabled People*. Research Report 95. Department of Work and Pensions

Hoque, K. and Bacon, N. (2014) 'Unions, joint regulation and workplace equality policy and practice in Britain: evidence from the 2004 Workplace Employment Relations Survey', *Work, Employment and Society*, forthcoming.

Hoque, K. and Noon M. (2004) 'Equal opportunities policy and practice in Britain: evaluating the 'empty-shell' hypothesis', *Work, Employment and Society*, 18 (3), 481-506.

Jones, M. (2008) 'Disability and the labour market: a review of the empirical evidence', *Journal of Economic Studies* 35 (5): 405-424.

Jones, M. and Latreille, P. (2009) 'Disability, health and the labour market: evidence from the Welsh Health Survey', *Local Economy* 24 (3): 192-210.

Kersley, B., Alpin, C., Forth, J., Bryson, A., Bewley, H., Dix, G. and Oxenbridge, S. (2006) *Inside the Workplace: Findings from the 2004 Workplace Employment Relations Survey*. London: Routledge.

Meager, N. and Higgins, T. (2011) *Disability and Skills in a Changing Economy*. London: UK Commission for Employment and Skills.

ONS (2012) Table A08 Labour Market Status of Disabled People (Last Updated May 2012). Office for National Statistics.

Riddell, S., Edward, S., Weedon, E. and Ahlgren, L. (2010) *Disability, Skills and Employment: A review of recent statistics and literature on policy and initiatives*. Equality and Human Rights Commission, Manchester.

Trades Union Congress (2009) 'Congress Decisions 2009' www.tuc.org.uk/the_tuc/tuc-17093-f0.pdf. Accessed 11th October, 2011.

Woodhams, C. and Corby, S. (2007) 'Then and now: disability legislation and employers' practices in the UK', *British Journal of Industrial Relations* 45 (3): 556-580.

Woodhams, C. and Danieli, A. (2000) 'Disability and diversity – a difference too far?' *Personnel Review* 29 (3): 402-416.

www.direct.gov.uk/en/DisabledPeople/Employmentsupport/LookingForWork/DG_4000314. Accessed 7th October, 2011.

Table 1: Adherence to Two Ticks commitments in Two Ticks and non-Two Ticks workplaces

| | Two Ticks Workplaces (%) | Non-Two Ticks workplaces (%) | Chi2/ t-test |
|---|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------|
| Employer interviews all disabled applicants who meet the minimum criteria for a job vacancy (n=87): | | | |
| Always | 82 | 71 | |
| Sometimes | 11 | 24 | |
| Rarely | 8 | 0 | |
| Never | 0 | 5 | pr=0.073* |
| Employer makes sure that disabled employees can discuss, at least once a year, how they can best develop their skills (n=92): | | | |
| Always | 29 | 23 | |
| Sometimes | 34 | 41 | |
| Rarely | 13 | 23 | |
| Never | 24 | 14 | pr=0.501 |
| Employer makes every effort to help any employee who becomes disabled to stay in work (n=103): | | | |
| Always | 38 | 33 | |
| Sometimes | 42 | 56 | |
| Rarely | 18 | 11 | |
| Never | 1 | 0 | pr=0.590 |
| Employer takes action to make sure all staff know what support disabled people need from them (n=102): | | | |
| Always | 21 | 12 | |
| Sometimes | 33 | 54 | |
| Rarely | 36 | 19 | |
| Never | 11 | 15 | pr=0.158 |
| Employer looks once a year at what has been done to support disabled employees and how to do it better (n=90): | | | |
| Always | 21 | 9 | |
| Sometimes | 32 | 41 | |
| Rarely | 32 | 27 | |
| Never | 15 | 23 | pr=0.499 |
| Number of Two Ticks commitments adhered to ¹ (n=68): | | | |
| All | 15 | 0 | |
| Four | 5 | 0 | |
| Three | 13 | 15 | |
| Two | 11 | 23 | |
| One | 38 | 31 | |
| None | 18 | 31 | |
| Mean number of commitments adhered to | 1.93 | 1.23 | pr=0.159 |

Note: number of observations varies as respondents answering 'Don't know' are removed from each calculation.

¹ Definition of 'adhered to': respondent states employer 'always' adheres to the commitment in question

Table 3: Employer support for Disability Champions in Two Ticks and non-Two Ticks workplaces

| | Two Ticks workplaces n=82 % | Non-Two Ticks workplaces n=34 % | Chi2 |
|--|--------------------------------------|--|----------|
| To conduct the Disability Champion role, the employer provides: | | | |
| Sufficient office space | 54 | 59 | pr=0.611 |
| Sufficient communication equipment (e.g. phone, email, internet) | 74 | 62 | pr=0.174 |
| Reasonable time off | 51 | 53 | pr=0.866 |
| Adequate information | 46 | 62 | pr=0.130 |
| Employer has a disability or equality committee/ forum which the Disability Champion regularly attends | 37 | 24 | pr=0.173 |
| Do managers value your Disability Champion activities? | | | |
| Strongly agree | 6 | 12 | |
| Agree | 18 | 29 | |
| Neither agree nor disagree | 37 | 38 | |
| Disagree | 20 | 6 | |
| Strongly disagree | 20 | 15 | pr=0.233 |

Table 4: Employer support for Disability Champions: multivariate analysis

| | Employer provides: | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------|-----------|------------------------------------|----------|---------------------|------------|
| | Sufficient office space | | Sufficient communication equipment | | Reasonable time off | |
| Two Ticks workplace | 0.276 | (0.399) | 0.755 | (0.435)* | -0.396 | (0.456) |
| Sector (reference category: Public sector): | | | | | | |
| Private sector | 0.886 | (0.531)* | 0.498 | (0.547) | -0.600 | (0.607) |
| Not-for-profit/ voluntary sector | 0.411 | (0.731) | -1.030 | (0.729) | 0.308 | (0.745) |
| Industry group (reference category: Public administration and defence): | | | | | | |
| Education | -0.375 | (0.660) | -0.358 | (0.761) | 0.030 | (0.817) |
| Health and social work | -0.066 | (0.641) | 0.320 | (0.736) | 0.911 | (0.736) |
| Transport, storage and communications | -0.395 | (0.520) | -0.313 | (0.530) | -0.639 | (0.585) |
| Other community, social and personal services | -0.875 | (0.670) | 0.358 | (0.662) | 0.864 | (0.682) |
| Other industry sector | 0.707 | (0.627) | 0.542 | (0.634) | 1.189 | (0.664)* |
| Workplace size (reference category: 50 employees or less) | | | | | | |
| 51-100 employees | 2.031 | (0.955)** | 1.306 | (0.814) | 0.185 | (0.735) |
| 101-250 employees | 0.479 | (0.693) | -0.015 | (0.712) | 0.696 | (0.784) |
| 251-500 employees | 0.196 | (0.627) | -0.354 | (0.658) | 0.638 | (0.662) |
| 501-1000 employees | 0.634 | (0.613) | -0.357 | (0.650) | 1.578 | (0.722)** |
| Over 1000 employees | 0.412 | (0.568) | 0.175 | (0.630) | 2.135 | (0.677)*** |
| Organisation size (reference category: 999 employees or less) | | | | | | |
| 1000-4999 employees | 0.575 | (0.652) | 0.689 | (0.770) | 2.165 | (0.797)*** |
| 5000-9999 employees | -0.401 | (0.652) | -0.838 | (0.660) | 0.428 | (0.743) |
| 10000 employees or more | -0.766 | (0.628) | -0.575 | (0.656) | -0.359 | (0.725) |
| Occupational groups represented (reference category: managers, senior officials and professionals) | | | | | | |
| Managers, senior officials and professionals <i>and</i> non-management staff | 0.036 | (0.645) | -0.855 | (0.658) | -0.871 | (0.663) |
| Non-management staff only | -0.553 | (0.627) | -0.961 | (0.614) | -1.366 | (0.706)* |
| Age (reference category: 44 years old or younger): | | | | | | |
| 45-49 years old | -0.248 | (0.504) | 0.120 | (0.480) | 0.295 | (0.501) |
| 50-54 years old | -0.177 | (0.512) | -0.272 | (0.542) | 0.515 | (0.533) |
| 55-59 years old | -0.011 | (0.596) | 1.019 | (0.722) | 1.411 | (0.761)* |
| 60 years old or older | -0.142 | (0.574) | 0.866 | (0.661) | 0.646 | (0.648) |
| Time spent as Disability Champion (reference category: less than one year) | | | | | | |
| 1 to less than 2 years | -0.705 | (0.559) | -0.104 | (0.563) | 0.339 | (0.602) |
| 2 to less than 5 years | -0.381 | (0.483) | 0.039 | (0.510) | -0.438 | (0.538) |
| 5 to less than 10 years | -0.399 | (0.539) | -0.672 | (0.568) | -1.192 | (0.622)* |
| Hours per week spent on Disability Champion activity (reference category: Less than one hour): | | | | | | |
| 1 to less than 2 hours | -0.066 | (0.527) | 0.642 | (0.607) | 1.271 | (0.629)** |
| 2 to less than 5 hours | -0.637 | (0.512) | -0.449 | (0.511) | 0.789 | (0.590) |
| 5 hours or more | -0.093 | (0.556) | -0.230 | (0.577) | 0.648 | (0.675) |
| Previously held another union post | 0.162 | (0.836) | 0.313 | (0.777) | 0.696 | (0.745) |
| Holds another union post | 1.279 | (0.663)* | 0.659 | (0.535) | 0.425 | (0.587) |
| Female | -0.331 | (0.368) | -0.210 | (0.365) | -1.245 | (0.443)*** |
| Ethnic minority | -0.182 | (0.525) | 0.307 | (0.577) | 0.334 | (0.588) |
| Long-term illness, health problem or disability | -0.836 | (0.393)** | -0.348 | (0.419) | -1.592 | (0.495)*** |
| Pseudo R2 | 0.325 | | 0.280 | | 0.385 | |
| N | 116 | | 116 | | 116 | |

| | Employer provides adequate information | | Managers value disability champion's activities | | Equality/disability forum in which the Disability Champion participates | |
|--|--|------------|---|------------|---|------------|
| Two Ticks workplace | -0.018 | (0.398) | -0.203 | (0.271) | 0.416 | (0.419) |
| Sector (reference category: Public sector): | | | | | | |
| Private sector | 0.470 | (0.554) | 0.118 | (0.377) | -0.826 | (0.610) |
| Not-for-profit/ voluntary sector | 1.931 | (0.748)*** | 0.790 | (0.479)* | 2.118 | (0.811)*** |
| Industry group (reference category: Public administration and defence): | | | | | | |
| Education | -1.107 | (0.689) | -0.681 | (0.507) | -0.144 | (0.722) |
| Health and social work | -0.518 | (0.696) | -0.577 | (0.450) | 0.199 | (0.632) |
| Transport, storage and communications | -0.465 | (0.514) | -1.157 | (0.388)*** | 0.825 | (0.569) |
| Other community, social and personal services | -0.388 | (0.669) | -0.225 | (0.437) | -1.392 | (0.910) |
| Other industry sector | 0.488 | (0.603) | 0.277 | (0.420) | 0.596 | (0.617) |
| Workplace size (reference category: 50 employees or less) | | | | | | |
| 51-100 employees | 0.857 | (0.757) | 0.182 | (0.504) | -0.575 | (0.820) |
| 101-250 employees | -0.696 | (0.718) | 0.048 | (0.475) | 0.054 | (0.752) |
| 251-500 employees | -0.220 | (0.616) | -0.174 | (0.457) | 0.491 | (0.683) |
| 501-1000 employees | 0.193 | (0.608) | -0.239 | (0.444) | -0.096 | (0.819) |
| Over 1000 employees | 0.647 | (0.545) | 0.773 | (0.389)** | 0.397 | (0.583) |
| Organisation size (reference category: 999 employees or less) | | | | | | |
| 1000-4999 employees | 1.101 | (0.701) | -0.193 | (0.429) | -0.271 | (0.672) |
| 5000-9999 employees | 0.872 | (0.685) | -0.532 | (0.452) | 0.299 | (0.679) |
| 10000 employees or more | -0.028 | (0.606) | -1.068 | (0.421)*** | -0.188 | (0.648) |
| Occupational groups represented (reference category: managers, senior officials and professionals) | | | | | | |
| Managers, senior officials and professionals <i>and</i> non-management staff | -0.210 | (0.612) | -0.719 | (0.461) | 1.137 | (0.721) |
| Non-management staff only | -0.830 | (0.601) | -0.873 | (0.455)* | -0.123 | (0.771) |
| Age (reference category: 44 years old or younger): | | | | | | |
| 45-49 years old | -0.286 | (0.503) | -0.425 | (0.342) | 0.087 | (0.647) |
| 50-54 years old | -0.669 | (0.536) | -0.841 | (0.366)** | 1.057 | (0.658) |
| 55-59 years old | 0.317 | (0.623) | -0.311 | (0.408) | 0.579 | (0.723) |
| 60 years old or older | -0.085 | (0.618) | -0.853 | (0.431)** | 0.265 | (0.772) |
| Time spent as Disability Champion (reference category: less than one year) | | | | | | |
| 1 to less than 2 years | -0.524 | (0.565) | -0.492 | (0.392) | 0.090 | (0.667) |
| 2 to less than 5 years | -0.188 | (0.488) | -0.729 | (0.353)** | 0.941 | (0.614) |
| 5 to less than 10 years | -0.677 | (0.565) | -0.762 | (0.411)* | 1.336 | (0.656)** |
| Hours per week spent on Disability Champion activity (reference category: less than one hour): | | | | | | |
| 1 to less than 2 hours | 0.123 | (0.544) | 0.739 | (0.358)** | -0.540 | (0.562) |
| 2 to less than 5 hours | 0.082 | (0.491) | 0.803 | (0.345)** | -0.610 | (0.498) |
| 5 hours or more | 0.434 | (0.568) | 1.800 | (0.420)*** | -1.056 | (0.576)* |
| Previously held another union post | 1.212 | (0.795) | -0.261 | (0.542) | 0.975 | (0.827) |
| Currently holds another union post | -0.900 | (0.538)* | 0.149 | (0.398) | -0.636 | (0.619) |
| Female | -0.603 | (0.368) | -0.459 | (0.255)* | 0.155 | (0.412) |
| Ethnic minority | 0.153 | (0.561) | 0.029 | (0.382) | 1.315 | (0.619)** |
| Long-term illness, health problem or disability | -1.261 | (0.406)*** | -0.844 | (0.274)*** | 0.533 | (0.458) |
| Pseudo R2 | 0.339 | | 0.165 | | 0.379 | |
| N | 116 | | 116 | | 116 | |

Notes:

Coefficients given, standard errors in brackets. *** significant at 1 percent; ** significant at 5 percent; * significant at 10 percent
All dependent variables are dichotomous, except for 'Managers value Disability Champion's activities' (categorical measure)
Probit used except for the analysis of whether managers value Disability Champion's activities (ordered probit)

Table 5: Employer adherence to Two Ticks commitments and support for Disability Champions in Public and Private sector workplaces

| | Employer interviews all disabled employees who meet the minimum criteria | Employer makes sure that all disabled employees can discuss, at least once a year how they can best develop and use their skills | Employer makes every effort to help any employee who becomes disabled to stay in work |
|---|---|--|---|
| Two Ticks workplaces | 2.123 (0.854)** | 1.435 (0.613)** | 0.929 (0.583) |
| Public sector | 1.481 (0.882)* | 0.755 (0.592) | 0.354 (0.559) |
| Two Ticks workplaces x Public sector | -1.321 (0.974) | -1.673 (0.687)** | -0.855 (0.668) |
| Pseudo R2 | 0.275 | 0.083 | 0.116 |
| N | 79 | 87 | 94 |
| <i>Public sector Two Ticks vs. public sector non-Two Ticks workplaces</i> | $-1.321 + 2.123 = 0.802$ | $-1.673 + 1.435 = -0.238$ | $-0.855 + 0.929 = 0.074$ |
| <i>Public sector Two Ticks vs. private sector Two Ticks workplaces</i> | $-1.321 + 1.481 = 0.160$ | $-1.673 + 0.755 = -0.918$ | $-0.855 + 0.354 = -0.501$ |
| | Employer takes action to make sure all staff know what support disabled people need from them | Employer looks every year at what has been done to support disabled employees and how to do it better | Number of Two Ticks commitments adhered to |
| Two Ticks workplaces | 1.297 (0.595)** | 0.972 (0.671) | 1.483 (1.337) |
| Public sector | 0.855 (0.584) | 0.344 (0.668) | 0.851 (1.320) |
| Two Ticks workplaces x Public sector | -1.340 (0.670)** | -0.704 (0.738) | -0.759 (1.446) |
| Pseudo R2 | 0.081 | 0.097 | 0.002 |
| Adjusted R2 | | | |
| N | 93 | 82 | 63 |
| <i>Public sector Two Ticks vs. public sector non-Two Ticks workplaces</i> | $-1.340 + 1.297 = -0.043$ | $-0.704 + 0.972 = -0.268$ | $-0.759 + 1.483 = 0.724$ |
| <i>Public sector Two Ticks vs. private sector Two Ticks workplaces</i> | $-1.340 + 0.855 = -0.485$ | $-0.704 + 0.344 = -0.360$ | $-0.759 + 0.851 = 0.092$ |

Notes:

Coefficients given, standard errors in brackets

*** significant at 1 percent; ** significant at 5 percent

All dependent variables are based on a 4 point scale where 4=always, 3=sometimes, 2=rarely and 1=never, except for the dependent variable for the number of Two Ticks commitments adhered to (count measure)

Ordered probit used except for the analysis of the number of Two Ticks commitments adhered to (OLS).

All equations control for: SIC major group; workplace size; organisation size

| | Employer provides sufficient office space | Employer provides sufficient communication equipment | Employer provides reasonable time off |
|---|---|--|--|
| Two Ticks workplaces | -0.268 (0.853) | -0.280 (0.910) | -1.431 (1.105) |
| Public sector | -1.509 (0.767)** | -1.209 (0.775) | -0.428 (0.920) |
| Two Ticks workplaces x Public sector | 0.730 (0.931) | 1.232 (0.982) | 1.846 (1.177) |
| Pseudo R2 | 0.322 | 0.318 | 0.446 |
| N | 105 | 105 | 105 |
| <i>Public sector Two Ticks vs. public sector non-Two Ticks workplaces</i> | $0.730 + (-0.268) = 0.462$ | $1.232 + (-0.280) = 0.952^*$ | $1.846 + (-1.431) = 0.415$ |
| <i>Public sector Two Ticks vs. private sector Two Ticks workplaces</i> | $0.730 + (-1.509) = -0.779$ | $1.232 + (-1.209) = 0.023$ | $1.846 + (-0.428) = 1.418$ |
| | Employer provides information | Managers value disability champion's activities | Equality/disability forum in which the Disability Champion participates ^a |
| Two Ticks workplaces | -0.766 (0.896) | -0.109 (0.571) | 2.511 (1.128)** |
| Public sector | -1.451 (0.834)* | -0.201 (0.508) | |
| Two Ticks workplaces x Public sector | 1.249 (0.980) | 0.010 (0.641) | |
| Pseudo R2 | 0.368 | 0.164 | 0.504 |
| N | 105 | 105 | 85 |
| <i>Public sector Two Ticks vs. public sector non-Two Ticks workplaces</i> | $1.249 + (-0.766) = 0.483$ | $0.010 + (-0.109) = -0.099$ | |
| <i>Public sector Two Ticks vs. private sector Two Ticks workplaces</i> | $1.249 + (-1.451) = -0.202$ | $0.010 + (-0.201) = -0.191$ | |

Notes:

Coefficients given, standard errors in brackets. ** significant at 5 percent; * significant at 10 percent

All dependent variables are dichotomous, except for 'Managers value Disability Champion's activities' (ordinal measure) and 'Number of forms of employer support provided' (count measure).

Probit used except for the analysis of whether managers value Disability Champion's activities (ordered probit)

All equations control for: whether the Disability Champion previously held a union post; whether the Disability Champion currently holds another union post; length of time as Disability Champion; hours spent on Disability Champion activities; gender; age; ethnicity; whether the Disability Champion has any long-term illness, health problem or disability; whether the Disability Champion represents managers/ professionals, non-managers or both groups; SIC major group; workplace size; organisation size

^a Analysis excludes private sector as none of the private sector Two Ticks workplaces have an equality or disability forum in which the Disability Champion participates

Appendix table: Independent and control variable means

| | |
|---|-------|
| <i>Independent variable:</i> | |
| Two Ticks Workplace | 0.707 |
| <i>Control variables: workplace characteristics</i> | |
| Sector: | |
| Public sector | 0.733 |
| Private sector | 0.172 |
| Not for profit/ voluntary sector | 0.095 |
| Industry group: | |
| Public administration and defence | 0.302 |
| Education | 0.103 |
| Health and Social Work | 0.121 |
| Transport, storage and communications | 0.172 |
| Other community, social and personal services | 0.129 |
| Other industry sector | 0.172 |
| Workplace size: | |
| 50 employees or less | 0.155 |
| 51-100 employees | 0.086 |
| 101-250 employees | 0.112 |
| 251-500 employees | 0.155 |
| 501-1000 employees | 0.129 |
| Over 1000 employees | 0.362 |
| Organisation size: | |
| 999 employees or less | 0.121 |
| 1000-4999 employees | 0.250 |
| 5000-9999 employees | 0.207 |
| 10000 employees or more | 0.422 |
| <i>Control variables: individual characteristics</i> | |
| Occupational groups represented: | |
| Managers, senior officials and professionals | 0.103 |
| Managers, senior officials and professionals AND non-management staff | 0.302 |
| Non-management staff only | 0.595 |
| Disability Champion's age: | |
| 44 years old or younger | 0.198 |
| 45-49 years old | 0.293 |
| 50-54 years old | 0.207 |
| 55-59 years old | 0.155 |
| 60 years old or older | 0.147 |
| Time spent as Disability Champion: | |
| Less than one year | 0.164 |
| 1 to less than 2 years | 0.181 |
| 2 to less than 5 years | 0.491 |
| 5 to less than 10 years | 0.164 |
| Hours spent per week on Disability Champion activity: | |
| Less than 1 hour | 0.224 |
| 1 to less than 2 hours | 0.233 |
| 2 to less than 5 hours | 0.328 |
| 5 hours or more | 0.216 |
| Disability Champion previously held another union post | 0.931 |
| Disability Champion currently holds another union post | 0.879 |
| Ethnic minority | 0.103 |
| Female | 0.371 |
| Long-term illness, health problem or disability | 0.724 |

n=116