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Title I of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA) requires employers to provide reasonable accommodations to qualified persons with disabilities who need them in order to work (EEOC, 1992). The ADA defines reasonable accommodation ambiguously. The current study used a policy capturing approach to examine the effects of characteristics of the person with a disability (i.e., type of disability, previous performance level, employment status), characteristics of the accommodation (i.e., cost, type of accommodation), and characteristics of the observer (i.e., occupational status, disability status, gender) on judgments of reasonable accommodation. Students and employed persons (n = 107) completed the policy capturing profiles. Results indicate that low cost accommodations were judged to be more reasonable than high cost accommodations, accommodations for high performers were judged to be more reasonable than accommodations for low performers, and accommodations for incumbents were judged to be more reasonable than accommodations for new hires. Type of disability, type of accommodation, and respondent group characteristics did not significantly influence perceptions of reasonable accommodation.
Introduction

Nearly 49 million Americans have a disability and approximately 29.5 million of these are working aged (i.e., 17.9% of the U.S. population aged 15 to 64) (McNeil, 1993). Title I of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA) requires employers to provide reasonable accommodations to qualified persons with disabilities who need them in order to work. However, the ADA defines reasonable accommodation ambiguously. Thus, perceptions of reasonable accommodations may vary. In a particular situation in which an employee with a disability has requested an accommodation, perceptions of the reasonableness of that accommodation are likely to be influenced by variables in the situation that are related to the accommodation itself (ADA, 1990), the person with a disability (D. L. Stone & Colella, 1996), and the observer.

The current study took a policy capturing approach to examine the influence of characteristics of the person with the disability and characteristics of the accommodation on participants' judgments of reasonable accommodation. In addition, it sought differences in such judgments by respondent group characteristics. First, this paper explains the requirements of the ADA and presents problems that Americans with disabilities face when attempting to gain and to maintain employment. Next, it describes attitudes toward persons with disabilities in America, including attitudes toward employing and accommodating them. Then, it explains the policy capturing technique and the variables that were expected to influence judgments of reasonable accommodation.

The Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990

Historically, many Americans with disabilities who were able to work were denied employment opportunities because of their disability (E. F. Stone, D. L. Stone, & Dipboye, 1992). An initial government attempt to improve this problem was the
passage of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (Fisher, Schoenfeldt, & Shaw, 1993). This law requires government agencies and employers who have $2500 or more in federal contracts to take affirmative action in hiring persons with disabilities, including reasonably accommodating their needs to allow them to work. Although some persons with disabilities benefited from the requirements of the Rehabilitation Act, the law did not significantly improve the employment status of most Americans with disabilities (McFarlin, Song, & Sonntag, 1991). Reports to the president and Congress on federal compliance with the act suggested slight improvements in employment opportunities for persons with disabilities, but less than full compliance with the law (U.S. Department of Education, 1979; 1985). Another report indicated that only a small proportion of private employers with federal contracts covered by the law followed its requirements (Carrell & Heavrin, 1987). Employment discrimination against persons with disabilities continued.

The United States government made another attempt to improve the quality of life for persons with disabilities by passing the ADA in 1990. Title I prohibits employment discrimination against individuals with disabilities. Private employers, state and local governments, employment agencies, labor unions, and joint labor-management committees must comply. This paper generally refers to these groups as employers. The act applies to employers who have 15 or more employees (full- or part-time) working 20 or more calendar weeks during the present calendar year or the last calendar year. It requires employers who are made aware of physical or mental limitations of qualified employees or job applicants to provide accommodations that allow the individuals to work and to be eligible for aspects of working (e.g., training, promotion) that persons who are not disabled enjoy. The law requires only employment accommodations that are reasonable and indicates that employers are not
obligated to provide such accommodations when they would pose an undue hardship on the employer.

The act indicates that reasonable accommodations may include adjusting physical facilities and equipment, obtaining special equipment, altering work schedules, restructuring jobs, transferring disabled employees to vacant positions, providing readers or interpreters, and performing similar actions that will enable qualified disabled persons to perform the job. The act defines undue hardship as a change that requires considerable effort or expense. Variables that are to be considered in determining whether an accommodation would pose an undue hardship are the nature of the accommodation, the associated cost, the financial resources of the organization, the size and nature of the organization, and the effect of the accommodation on the operation of the organization.

Although the ADA gives guidelines for determining what is a reasonable accommodation and what may constitute an undue hardship, it does not provide rules that delineate appropriate accommodations for every combination of job and disability. Reasonable accommodations and undue hardship are to be determined on a case-by-case basis. This ambiguity in the ADA has resulted in new problems for persons with disabilities and for employers (Bureau of National Affairs, 1995). For example, the vague definitions have led to misunderstandings and disagreement between employers and persons with disabilities as to who is entitled to accommodations and what accommodations are appropriate and reasonable (Parry, 1996). The fact that over 72,000 disability-related discrimination cases that have been filed with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) since 1992 provides evidence of this disagreement (Baker, 1997; "Disposition of ADA charges received by EEOC," 1996).
Title I of the ADA is enforced in the same manner as is discrimination under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, and the Civil Rights Act of 1991 (Eason & Eason, 1996). Persons who believe that an employer has violated their rights may file a charge with the EEOC or a state or local EEO agency, which will investigate the case and determine whether or not illegal discrimination took place (Fisher et al., 1993). The ADA technical assistance manual (Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, 1992) indicates that the EEOC encourages employers and persons with disabilities to engage in dispute resolution through informal negotiation or mediation procedures where possible before filing formal charges of discrimination.

Thousands of disability-related complaints are filed with the EEOC each year. In fiscal year 1993, 15,097 charges were filed; in 1994, 18,884 charges were filed; in 1995, 19,750 charges were filed ("Disposition of ADA charges received by EEOC," 1996); in 1996, 17,954 charges were filed (Baker, 1997). Moreover, in 1995, discrimination based on disability accounted for approximately 22.6% of the EEOC cases filed, whereas discrimination based on race accounted for 34.3% and discrimination based on gender accounted for 29.9% (Jones, 1996).

The total number of ADA charges received by the EEOC through the first quarter of 1996 was 58,735. As of that time, 40,366 of these cases had been resolved. In 2,138 (5.3%) of the resolved cases, the EEOC found the complaint to have merit and reached a settlement. In 3,163 (7.8%) of the resolved cases, the complainant withdrew the charge after receiving the desired benefits from the employer. In 1,001 (2.5%) of the resolved cases, the EEOC determined that reasonable cause existed to conclude that illegal discrimination took place and made efforts to conciliate the matter. In 16,651 (41.2%) of the resolved cases, the EEOC determined that reasonable cause did not exist to conclude that illegal discrimination took place. In
17,415 (43.1%) of the resolved cases, the EEOC closed the charge for administrative reasons. These reasons include failure to locate the complainant, lack of response from complainant to EEOC communications, or results of related litigation indicate that proceeding with the case will be fruitless ("Disposition of ADA charges received by EEOC," 1996).

ADA charges filed with the EEOC most frequently involve persons with back impairments (18.7%). Other common impairments are: emotional or psychiatric impairments (12.1%), neurological impairments (11.4%), impairments of bodily extremities (8.4%), heart impairments (4.2%), and diabetes (3.5%). Most cases are filed due to perceived unfair discharge (51.5%). Other reasons for filing a charge are: failure to provide a reasonable accommodation (27.1%), harassment (11.5%), hiring (10.1%), discipline (7.6%), and layoff (4.8%) ("Disposition of ADA charges received by EEOC," 1996).

It is clear that the ambiguity associated with the notion of reasonable accommodation has caused confusion among employers and persons with disabilities. The current study examined some of the variables that may be relevant in an accommodation situation in order to gain understanding of what people perceive as reasonable.

Discrimination, Attitudes, and Expectancies About Hiring Persons with Disabilities

Persons who have mental or physical disabilities are members of a stigmatized group, which may result in being awarded fewer opportunities, including job opportunities, than individuals without disabilities (E. F. Stone et al., 1992). A Louis Harris (1994) poll reported that 30% of the respondents with disabilities aged 16 to 64 indicated they had experienced job discrimination. The forms of disability-based discrimination included being denied a job, given less responsibility than co-workers, refused a job interview, denied health insurance, denied a promotion, refused other
work-related benefits, and paid less than similarly qualified employees in similar positions.

Attitudes about persons with disabilities influence discrimination toward them (Yuker, 1988). For example, Heuman (1993) suggested that many people do not think that persons with disabilities, especially those with severe disabilities, have much to contribute to American society. Hahn (1993) explains that prejudice against persons with disabilities stems from the perception that disabled persons violate cultural values, and that these violations justify setting them apart from the rest of the population. Two of these Western societal values are personal appearance and individual autonomy. Persons who do not meet minimal standards of physical appearance and functional independence may be stigmatized and treated differently from members of society who do meet these standards.

Expectations about the consequences of hiring persons with disabilities influence attitudes toward hiring them (Lee & Newman, 1992). Employers may resist hiring and accommodating employees with disabilities because they expect negative consequences in terms of the cost of the accommodation, disruption of the workplace, and negative reactions of co-workers. Moreover, employers may be hesitant to hire persons with disabilities due to possibly unfounded beliefs that employees with disabilities are costly in terms of safety risks, health-care, absenteeism, and lower performance in comparison to non-disabled employees (Louis Harris and Associates, 1994; E. F. Stone et al., 1992). Braddock and Bachelder (1994) stated that employers often rely on stereotypes and myths about the capabilities and motivation of persons with disabilities. Employers may falsely assume that persons with disabilities will be less productive, less able to get along with co-workers, and less interested in career advancement than non-disabled persons.
Furthermore, the very nature of the ADA may work against employees with disabilities in terms of employers’ expectations of their performance capabilities (Colella, 1994). More specifically, the stipulation that employers must reasonably accommodate qualified employees with disabilities may suggest to employers that these persons require special treatment and cannot perform at the level of employees without disabilities. Similarly, affirmative action research has indicated that participants perceived individuals as less competent when information indicated that they were affirmative action hires (Heilman, Block, & Lucas, 1992). Thus, observers may view individuals in a protected class (e.g., disability, gender, race) as less competent when they believe that legal and regulatory documents such as the ADA and affirmative action plans are partly responsible for their selection and treatment in the organization.

As individuals may differ in their views of persons with disabilities, especially in regard to work, and many variables may influence these views, it is useful to examine people's judgments of the reasonableness of employment accommodations. Policy capturing is a means by which one can explore the impact of variables on judgments. The following sections introduce the policy capturing technique and the variables included in the current study.
Policy Capturing

When making decisions, people act as information processors (Donnelly & Bownas, 1984). They take in limited amounts of information and use it to produce meaningful decisions. Decision researchers use policy capturing methods to model the structure of judgments in terms of the bits of information individuals use to produce the decisions (A. Brehmer & B. Brehmer, 1988).

Policy capturing is an idiographic approach to examining the influence of situational variables on decision makers' judgments in a particular context. The approach assumes that each judge uses a unique policy for making such decisions, and that this policy can be estimated through the analysis of repeated judgments relevant to that context (Cooksey, 1996). The policy capturing method requires each participant to read a series of profiles or vignettes that vary in the combination of the levels of a number of cues or predictors. For each profile, the participant provides a judgment on the criterion of interest. Using these judgments, a regression equation can be calculated that represents the participant's unique policy for combining and weighting the cues presented (A. Brehmer & B. Brehmer, 1988; Cooksey, 1996; Kline & Sulsky, 1995; Stewart, 1988). Cooksey (1996) explained that policy capturing, as an idiographic approach, is a technique that falls under the larger category of judgment analysis. Judgment analysis also allows for aggregation over the sample of judges, and for between-subjects or nomothetic analyses of decisions.

Judgment analysis as a research paradigm traces its roots back to Brunswik's (1952) theory of probabilistic functionalism and the lens model he developed (as cited in Cooksey, 1996). Probabilistic functionalism is a psychological theory that holds that the goal of psychology is to examine the functional relationship between an organism and its environment, and that this relationship is dependent upon probabilistic relations among variables in the environment. The lens model represents
Brunswik's theory of perception, which suggests that individuals do not perceive objects in the environment directly, but through a set of proximal cues. Hammond (1955) applied the principles of probabilistic functionalism to clinical judgment. Later, Hammond, Stewart, B. Brehmer, and Steinmann (1975) drew together various approaches utilizing the lens model under the domain of social judgment theory, a framework for the study of human judgment in the social arena. Social judgment theory states that the process of forming judgments about a distal variable entails the combination of information from proximal cues. Judgment analysis examines the relationship between such cues and the judgment. These theoretical developments support the study of policy formation, as policy formation is a means by which people attempt to develop satisfactory relations with their environment (Mumpower & Adelman, 1980).

Although researchers may choose to study the components of real world decisions that have already been made (Roehling, 1993), judgment analysis is appropriate when using hypothetical cases to explore judges' preferences for particular alternatives, or to determine what judges believe to be important in the judgment context (Cooksey, 1996). This technique has been used in the context of social policy formation when the goal was to determine and compare the decision policies of a number of persons, including experts and non-experts. The preferences of non-experts are useful to determine and to include in social policy formation because these persons often have a stake in the issue, although they are not in a decision-making capacity. Many policy capturing studies have been conducted that examined judgments relevant to the fields of public policy and industrial psychology. Topics explored in such studies include evaluating proposed transportation services for persons with disabilities (Allen & Muchinsky, 1984), public opinion of sports facility construction (Rohrbaugh & Wehr, 1978), sexual harassment determination (York,
1989), employee discipline decisions (Klaas & Wheeler, 1990), position choice (Feldman & Arnold, 1978), managerial selection decisions (Hitt & Barr, 1989), managerial salary raise decisions (Sherer, Schwab, & Heneman, 1987), and task importance within jobs (Sanchez & Levine, 1989).

Judgment analysis, and policy capturing in particular, were useful for the current study because the techniques allow for the statistical estimation of the components used in a reasonable employment accommodation decision simulation. As research relevant to meeting the requirements of Title I of the ADA is in the developmental stage, an investigation of the relationship between several variables that may be important in an accommodation situation and the resulting decision regarding the reasonableness of the proposed accommodation was timely and useful. Specifically, the resulting information depicts the individual judgment policies of the participants and reveals variables important to perceptions of reasonable accommodation.
Variables That May Influence Judgments of Reasonable Employment Accommodations

Many variables may play a role in one's perception of a reasonable accommodation. This study focused on three sets of variables or cues. The model in Figure 1 proposes that (1) characteristics of the person with a disability, (2) characteristics of the proposed accommodation, and (3) characteristics of the respondent influence observers' perceptions of reasonable accommodation. The current study used policy capturing and judgment analysis to explore the following research questions. When given hypothetical profiles of employees with disabilities that include information regarding the characteristics of the person with a disability and of the proposed accommodation, how will participants use this information in making judgments of how reasonable the proposed accommodation is? Will judgments differ across respondent groups (i.e., occupational status, disability status, gender)?

It should be made clear that the criterion of interest in the current study was perceptions of reasonable accommodation, not decisions about whether or not to provide the accommodation. Decisions regarding whether or not to provide the accommodation are likely to be influenced by these perceptions and, in addition, by a determination of whether or not the accommodation, although reasonable, would constitute an undue hardship on the operation of the organization. As indicated by ADA technical assistance (EEOC, 1992), the determination of undue hardship may be influenced by the characteristics of the accommodation, and the size, nature, and financial resources of the organization.

This paper suggests a mechanism by which observers use information about the characteristics of the person with a disability and of the accommodation to form judgments of reasonable accommodation. Specifically, observers consider the
Figure 1. Variables that may influence judgments of reasonable employment accommodations.
characteristics of the person with a disability and of the accommodation in terms of costs relative to benefits. Decision makers may develop anticipatory beliefs about the effects of providing the accommodation to a person with a disability (c.f. D. L. Stone & Colella, 1996). For example, a manager may expect that providing an accommodation will improve the person's performance or have no effect on performance. Observers may consider their beliefs about potential benefits (e.g., in terms of performance, company reputation, employee well-being, etc.) relative to their beliefs about potential costs (e.g., in terms of money, effort, inconvenience to co-workers, etc.) of providing the proposed accommodation. Such beliefs are likely to influence an observers' perception of how reasonable the accommodation is, which would likely precede a decision regarding whether or not to provide that accommodation. An employer is unlikely to agree to provide a requested employment accommodation when he or she does not think that the benefits will be worth the costs (Cleveland, Barnes-Farrell, & Huestis, 1996).

In fact, in Vande Zande v. Wisconsin Department of Administration (1995), the court decided that employers may consider estimated costs relative to benefits when determining reasonable accommodations. When the cost of an accommodation is not worth the gain, an employer may argue that the accommodation is unreasonable. In the above mentioned case, an employee, who used a wheelchair, requested that a lower sink be installed in a kitchen, although an accessible sink was available in the women's room. The court decided that because the potential benefit of installing the lower sink was trivial relative to the cost, the accommodation was not reasonable, even though the cost of installing the sink would not have posed an undue hardship on the employer.
Characteristics of the Person With a Disability

In an employment accommodation situation, the characteristics of the person with a disability are likely to influence others' perceptions of how reasonable the proposed accommodation is. D. L. Stone and Colella (1996) developed a model of factors that may influence the treatment of employees with disabilities in organizations. In their model, treatment refers to a broad class of actions aimed at employees including job assignment, training, pay, mentoring, helping behavior, and inclusion in work groups and social events. Thus, accommodation is one form of treatment. Based on social cognition theory and research, D. L. Stone and Colella predicted that the attributes of the person with a disability affect the treatment that person receives.

The focus of social cognition theory and research is to understand how individuals perceive, or make sense of, others and themselves (Fiske & Taylor, 1991). The literature suggests that through experiences, people develop a social schema, or cognitive structure, that represents their knowledge of a particular stimulus domain. This general knowledge about the stimulus enables the individual to develop expectations useful for effective functioning in the environment. For example, from experience, people are likely to develop a schema representing mothers. When they meet someone who is a mother, they may use their schema to infer characteristics about the woman and what behavior may be expected from her.

Researchers believe that observers categorize target persons based on the attributes of these persons (Fiske & Taylor, 1991; Higgins & Bargh, 1987). Observers may compare what they know about the target person to prototypes or exemplars of possible categories to determine an appropriate category (Fiske & Taylor, 1991). Next, observers apply their schematic prior knowledge about people who fit that category to form inferences about the target person and expectations of future
interactions with the target person (Wyer & Carlston, 1979). Moreover, people may
develop preferences for interacting with certain categories of persons, and may
evaluate target persons based on their expectations of whether such interaction will be
pleasant or unpleasant (Fiske & Taylor, 1991). Therefore, it is plausible that people
use information about the characteristics of a person with a disability to categorize
and to develop anticipatory beliefs about that person and the potential outcomes of

Such beliefs will affect the way individuals treat persons with disabilities in
organizations. Moreover, observers will engage in more positive employment-related
treatment of persons with disabilities when observers think that working with these
persons will result in positive outcomes. Specifically, observers are likely to develop
expectations of the disabled employee's work performance, which in turn partially
influence the observer's determination of the benefits relative to the costs of providing
the proposed accommodation. This study explored the effects of three characteristics
of persons with disabilities that may influence judgments of reasonable
accommodation: (a) the type of disability, (b) the previous performance level of the
person with a disability, and (c) the employment status of the person with a disability.

**Type of disability.** The nature of a person's disability (e.g., physical, mental,
sensory, learning, neurological, addictive) influences observers' reactions to that
person (D. L. Stone & Colella, 1996). Tringo (1970) found that a hierarchy of
preference for persons with different disability types exists in which people tend to
react most positively toward those with physical disabilities (e.g., arthritis, asthma,
diabetes), less positively toward those with sensory disabilities (e.g., blindness,
deafness), even less positively toward those with neurological (e.g., epilepsy, cerebral
palsy) and severe, disfiguring, or contagious physical disabilities (e.g., paraplegic,
hunchback, tuberculosis), and least positively toward those with mental retardation,
alcoholism, and mental illness. Recently, Jones and D. L. Stone (1995) conducted a study similar to Tringo’s, except that the criterion of interest was respondents’ affective reaction toward working with persons with disabilities. They found that respondents reacted more positively toward working with persons who had physical impairments than those who had mental impairments.

E. F. Stone et al. (1992) suggested that the uncertainty associated with the behavior of the disabled person influences attitudes toward disabled persons. The authors reason that this may at least partly explain why employers may react more positively to persons with physical disabilities than those with mental disabilities (c.f. Bordieri & Drehmer, 1986; Jones & D. L. Stone, 1995; C. Stone & Sawatzki, 1980). Persons whose conditions are not well understood or that are expected to result in unpredictable situations are viewed less positively than persons whose conditions are believed to yield more predictable behavior. It may be that observers expect interaction with individuals whose disabilities are likely to result in more predictable occurrences to have a lower associated cost than interaction with individuals whose disabilities are likely to result in unpredictable occurrences. Alternatively, it may be that when a condition is unfamiliar, it is more difficult for observers to estimate the costs and benefits of interacting with that person.

This study compared the influence of two types of disability, a back impairment and a learning disability, on evaluations of reasonable accommodation. Back impairment was chosen because back or spine problems are the most common cause of limitations among working age Americans (i.e., affecting approximately 2.4% of Americans age 15 to 64; McNeil, 1993) and because more disability-related employment discrimination cases are filed with the EEOC when back impairment is the complaining condition than any other type of disability ("Disposition of ADA charges received by EEOC," 1996). Learning disability was chosen as an interesting
comparison because it is a legitimate mental condition covered by the ADA (Anderson, Kazmierski, & Cronin, 1995; EEOC, 1992), but it is not associated with a safety risk that observers may assume possible with other types of mental conditions (e.g., major depression, schizophrenia). Choosing learning disability to be included in the current study allowed for comparison between physical and mental disability without introducing a potentially confounding dimension, safety. In addition, employers often have questions regarding their obligation to accommodate persons with learning disabilities, and the appropriate accommodations for them.

Evidence from Tringo (1970) and Jones and D. L. Stone (1995) suggests that participants will react more positively to a person with a back impairment than to a person with a learning disability. It may be that in general, people are more familiar with back injuries and impairments than they are with learning disabilities. If this is true, they are likely to have stronger and better-formed schemas for persons with back impairments than for persons with learning disabilities (Fiske & Taylor, 1991). As such, the observer may know more about what to expect from a person with a back impairment than from a person with a learning disability. Observers may be unsure of what the implications for the judgment to be made are when they are less familiar with the incoming information relevant to the decision at hand (Wyer & Carlston, 1979). Uncertainty associated with accommodating and working with a person with a disability may make observers uncomfortable and lead to a preference to avoid dealing with such persons (E. F. Stone et al., 1992).

Hypothesis 1: Accommodations involving individuals with a back impairment will receive higher ratings of reasonableness than will accommodations involving individuals with a learning disability.

Previous performance level. Employers are concerned about the performance of their organizations and their employees (Cascio, 1991). Furthermore, organizations
benefit from selecting and retaining employees who are expected to perform well (Fisher et al., 1993). In addition, managers in organizations may use information regarding previous performance to determine who will be trained (Cardy & Dobbins, 1994), who will be rewarded, and who will be disciplined (Fisher et al., 1993). The previous performance level of the person with a disability was chosen as a variable to include in the profiles because performance is important to organizations and because performance information may influence perceptions of individuals' contributions to organizations.

In their model, D. L. Stone and Colella (1996) argued that the previous performance level of the person with a disability will influence reactions toward that person in an employment context. They indicated that employees with disabilities who have demonstrated high performance will be preferred to those who have demonstrated low performance. In some circumstances, no information about the previous performance of an employee will be available, as when a person is hired directly after graduation or when performance records have not been kept. Therefore, the current study employed three levels of previous performance, high, low, and no information available. Based on D. L. Stone and Colella, it was expected that judges would find employment accommodations for persons with disabilities who have demonstrated high performance more reasonable than accommodations for those who have not because a greater return for the accommodation costs can be expected from the person with the high previous performance record. As no evidence is available to suggest the direction of a hypothesis for the difference between a record of low performance and no record of performance, a formal hypothesis specifically comparing these two levels was not generated.

Hypothesis 2: Accommodations involving individuals whose previous performance was high will receive higher ratings of reasonableness than will
accommodations involving individuals whose previous performance was low or for whom no previous performance information is available.

Employment status. Individuals may prefer to provide accommodations for employees who have demonstrated their service to the organization than to employees who were just hired. Employers have expressed concern about providing accommodations to applicants with disabilities during testing and selection (Denning, 1995; Gebhardt, 1995; Zink, 1995), but research has not compared reactions to accommodating job incumbents and recently hired applicants. A preference for accommodating incumbents may be partially due to a sense of loyalty, or to a perception that training or other investments have been made that make retaining the incumbent advantageous. In addition, evidence of the previous performance level of the person with a disability is likely to be stronger when that person is a job incumbent rather than a job applicant. D. L. Stone and Colella (1996) explain that there is greater uncertainty associated with job applicants' ability to perform than with job incumbents' ability to perform the job. This uncertainty may lead observers to rely on stereotypes about disabled persons, which will influence observers' expectations of their performance and subsequent treatment of them. D. L. Stone and Colella predicted that persons with disabilities will undergo more treatment-related difficulties when their previous performance level is unclear or unsubstantiated than when it is not. It is possible that incumbents have already proved themselves and have demonstrated that they are worthy of accommodation, whereas new hires have not. Thus, members of an organization may be more agreeable to incumbents who request an accommodation than new hires who do so.

Hypothesis 3: Accommodations involving incumbents will receive higher ratings of reasonableness than will accommodations involving new hires.
Characteristics of the Accommodation

As previously mentioned, the ADA technical assistance manual (EEOC, 1992) indicates that the nature of the accommodation should be considered in determining what is reasonable. The nature of the accommodation is likely to partially influence decision makers' determinations of the costs relative to the benefits of providing the proposed accommodation. This study explored the effects of two characteristics of the accommodation that are likely to influence judgments of reasonable accommodation, the cost of the accommodation and the category or type of accommodation.

Accommodation cost. Individuals may look at employment accommodations in terms of the investment of resources (Michaels, Nappo, Barrett, Risucci, & Harles, 1993). Although it may appear obvious that individuals would prefer a lower cost accommodation to a higher cost accommodation, there may be circumstances under which this does not hold true. For example, cost may not be an important variable for some participant groups. Exploring the effect of cost in a policy capturing study such as this allows researchers to assess the relative importance of cost to other variables.

Hypothesis 4: Low monetary cost accommodations will receive higher ratings of reasonableness than will high monetary cost accommodations.

Accommodation category. Michaels et al. (1993) conceptualized employment accommodations as falling into three categories, based on the type of accommodation. First, environmental modifications refer to elimination of physical or architectural barriers to allow persons with disabilities greater access to buildings and offices (see also EEOC, 1992). Second, equipment modifications involve providing tools or devices to assist persons with disabilities in performing their jobs (see also EEOC, 1992). Third, procedural modifications include restructuring jobs, altering work schedules, and changing work procedures and policies (see also EEOC, 1992).
Michaels et al. indicated that employers appear to be more comfortable providing environmental and equipment modifications than procedural modifications. Michaels et al. suggested that this may be because the procedural modifications category is the least definite category of employment accommodations. It is a broad category and includes accommodations that may require more of an individualized approach than do environmental or equipment modifications. Specifically, the adequacy of a procedural accommodation will depend on the job and the needs of the person with a disability. As such, it may require more negotiation and fine-tuning than would environmental or equipment modifications. In addition, changes in procedures are likely to be less tangible than the acquisition of equipment or the removal of physical barriers. As such, it may be more difficult to estimate the true cost of procedural changes than the cost of purchasing equipment or making architectural changes. Furthermore, part of the difficulty in assessing such a cost is that the provision of procedural changes may have a continuous or on-going nature, whereas the provision of environmental or equipment modifications may have a one-time nature.

This study explored reactions to two of the above categories of employment accommodations, equipment modifications and procedural modifications. It did not explore environmental modifications because these are not typically associated with persons who have learning disabilities. Moreover, as procedural modifications is a broad category, the current study focused on one procedural employment accommodation, altering work schedules. Based on Michaels et al. (1993), it was expected that participants would respond more positively to equipment accommodations than to scheduling accommodations.

Hypothesis 5: Accommodations entailing the purchase of equipment will receive higher ratings of reasonableness than will accommodations entailing flexible scheduling.
Relative Importance of Cues to Judgments

This study determined the relative importance of the five variables discussed above to the judgments of reasonable accommodation. Traditionally, determining the relative importance of cues is a very important part of policy capturing studies (Cooksey, 1996; Donnelly & Bownas, 1984; Kline & Sulsky, 1995). For example, Allen and Muchinsky (1984) conducted a policy capturing study that explored the impact of four dimensions of bus proposals on judgments of the suitability of public transportation for persons with physical disabilities. The authors found that of the four variables that comprised the bus proposals, the participants only used two on a consistent basis. Other policy capturing research has demonstrated that most of the variance in judgments is frequently accounted for by only a portion of the variables presented to participants (Cooksey, 1996). Therefore, it was expected that the cues included in the current study would not carry equal weight in influencing judgments of reasonable accommodation. However, there was no a priori basis to predict which variables would be the most influential. Therefore, no formal hypothesis regarding the relative of importance of the cues was posited.

Characteristics of the Respondent

The characteristics of the observer or respondent may influence that person's treatment of a person with a disability in an organization (D. L. Stone & Colella, 1996). These attributes are likely to influence the observer's judgment of what is a reasonable accommodation, possibly through the observer's beliefs about the benefits of providing the accommodation relative to the costs. This study explored differences in judgments of reasonable accommodation by group membership (cf. Hitt & Barr, 1989). Researchers in policy formation have recommended the use of different types of participants to explore policy formation from the perspectives of different
stakeholders (Allen & Muchinsky, 1984; Rohrbaugh & Wehr, 1978). As this portion of the study was exploratory in nature, no formal hypotheses were generated.

Comparing the judgments of employed persons and students. The current study included a sample of organizational employees, a portion of whom were managers or supervisors. These individuals are most likely to have made accommodation decisions, and are most likely to be responsible for ensuring that the accommodations were carried out. The other group of employees were in non-supervisory positions. These persons' judgments of what is a reasonable employment accommodation are important because these employees may be impacted by the accommodation decisions made by managers. For example, they may be asked by their supervisor to take over some of the duties of an employee with a disability, or they may observe an employee with a disability receiving what appears to be preferential treatment.

In addition, the current study included a sample of university students. It is not unusual in policy capturing studies to compare the judgments of students and employed persons (Allen & Muchinsky, 1984; York, 1989). Although this group is unlikely to have made employment accommodation decisions, university students may have considered ADA issues. Furthermore, when they gain employment, if they have not already done so, they will encounter various employment regulations including the ADA. In addition, value may be gained from comparing the judgments of the student sample to those of the employed sample, particularly if being in the work force impacts perceptions of reasonable accommodation.

Literature suggests that students may rate accommodations more leniently (i.e., as more reasonable) than employed persons (Allen & Muchinsky, 1984; Bernstein, Hakel, & Harlan, 1975). Bernstein et al. (1975) reviewed several studies that compared the decision-making processes of employment interviewers and university
student participants and found that the only statistically significant and practical differences between the two groups were that students tended to rate interviewees more leniently than did employment interviewers. Similarly, Allen and Muchinsky (1984) found that students indicated higher ratings of desirability for bus proposals for persons with physical disabilities than did Department of Transportation (DOT) employees. Allen and Muchinsky suggested three reasons why the college students may have provided more liberal ratings. First, the students tended to be younger than the DOT employees and may have had more liberal values regarding social problems. Second, the students were not employed full-time and thus, paid less taxes than the DOT employees. The authors suggested that the DOT employees may have recognized to a greater extent that it was their tax dollars that would be supporting such transportation services. Third, sample bias may have existed. Specifically, because the DOT employees worked in a state department where the issue of transportation for the physically disabled had been debated previously, the topic may have brought up bitter feelings. The current study explored differences in ratings between employed and student participants.

Comparing the judgments of participants who have disabilities and participants who do not have disabilities. The judgment policies of participants who have disabilities may differ from those who do not have disabilities. For example, the subject of employment accommodations may be more salient, or more emotionally charged (Wyer & Carlston, 1979), for persons with disabilities, and thus, they may judge the profiles more leniently than persons who do not have disabilities. Alternatively, consistent with the notion of competitive self-interest (i.e., support of practices that benefit the economic interests of one's own group relative to those of a competing group; Smith & Kluegel, 1984), persons who do not have disabilities may judge the profiles more harshly. Furthermore, previous literature has found that
persons with disabilities and persons who are not disabled often have different expectations concerning the modification of work settings (Braddock & Bachelder, 1994; Johnson, 1993). Therefore, evidence exists to suggest that these two groups will differ in their judgments of reasonable accommodation.

Comparing the judgments of female and male participants. Some researchers have found that women had more positive attitudes toward persons with disabilities than did men (Berry & Meyer, 1995; McQuilkin, Freitag, & Harris, 1990). Yet, the evidence is inconsistent because others have found no gender effects (as summarized by Yuker, 1988). However, this literature did not explore men's and women's attitudes specifically toward hiring and accommodating persons with disabilities. Some evidence exists to suggest that women may have more positive reactions than men to hiring and accommodating persons with disabilities.

Kravitz and Platania (1993) found that women had more positive attitudes than men toward affirmative action plans (AAPs) directed at persons with disabilities. The authors explained this finding as being consistent with the notion of cooperative self-interest (Smith & Kluegel, 1984), that individuals will endorse policies that are expected to assist others directly and oneself indirectly. Specifically, women will react more positively toward policies that help others fight discrimination because it will ultimately help women fight gender-based discrimination. In addition, in Kravitz and Platania, women indicated that they were more politically liberal than did men, which may have explained why women had more positive AAP attitudes than did men.

Attitudes toward AAPs targeted at persons with disabilities may be similar to attitudes toward providing employment accommodations for persons with disabilities. In fact, under the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, affirmative action for persons with disabilities may include provision of reasonable accommodations. If these attitudes
are similar, women may have more positive attitudes than men toward accommodations if women believe that improving opportunities for persons with disabilities will eventually lead to improved opportunities for women, or if women tend to be more politically liberal.

In addition, Jones and D. L. Stone (1995) suggested that women may have more positive attitudes toward working with persons with disabilities because women are socialized to be caregivers and may have more empathy than men for persons with disabilities. The current study explored the effect of respondent gender on judgments.

**Hypothesis Summary**

Hypothesis 1: Accommodations involving individuals with a back impairment will receive higher ratings of reasonableness than will accommodations involving individuals with a learning disability.

Hypothesis 2: Accommodations involving individuals whose previous performance was high will receive higher ratings of reasonableness than will accommodations involving individuals whose previous performance was low or for whom no previous performance information is available.

Hypothesis 3: Accommodations involving incumbents will receive higher ratings of reasonableness than will accommodations involving new hires.

Hypothesis 4: Low monetary cost accommodations will receive higher ratings of reasonableness than will high monetary cost accommodations.

Hypothesis 5: Accommodations entailing the purchase of equipment will receive higher ratings of reasonableness than will accommodations entailing flexible scheduling.
Method

Participants

One hundred nine individuals completed the survey materials. Regression equations could not be calculated for two participants because there was no variance in their responses to the 50 profiles. Thus, their responses were eliminated from all analyses. This resulted in a total sample size of 107. Fifty-eight participants were undergraduate students recruited from a large, southern university. Forty-six were female and one did not indicate his/her gender. Nine students reported having a disability and 49 (84.5%) were White. Students reported a mean of 2.35 years of full-time work experience (SD = 3.74) and a mean age of 22.38 years (SD = 4.94). Forty-nine participants were full-time employed, the majority of whom were recruited from a community service organization composed of professionals in a large, southwestern city (i.e., Rotary Club). Employed participants spanned a broad range of occupations and most worked for different employers or for themselves. Eighteen were female, 12 reported having a disability, and 46 (93.9%) were White. Employed participants reported a mean of 17.57 years of full-time work experience (SD = 11.84) and a mean age of 39.39 years (SD = 12.73). Thirty were in managerial or supervisory positions. Of these, nine were female and nine reported having a disability (see Table 1).

Procedure

Participants completed a survey packet that included the employment accommodation situation profiles. First, a cover letter explained the purpose of the research and allowed participants to give their informed consent. Second, the packet provided background information regarding the ADA, briefly explaining the law and its reasonable accommodation requirement. Third, the task of evaluating each profile was explained. Fourth, participants read and judged the full series of profiles. Fifth, participants distributed 100 points among the cues in a manner representing the
importance of each cue to the judgments made. This data allowed for comparison to the regression weights produced, in order to explore participants' awareness of their own policies. Sixth, the survey collected demographic information relevant to group membership of the respondents (i.e., occupational status, disability status, gender) and qualitative data relevant to perceptions of reasonable accommodation.

Design

The policy capturing study was a $2 \times 3 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2$ design. The levels of each of five variables or cues were fully crossed to ensure orthogonality, resulting in 48 profiles. In addition, two profiles were duplicated to assess judgment reliability, yielding 50 profiles total. Specifically, the cues were type of disability (back impairment, learning disability), previous performance level (high, low, no information), employment status (incumbent, new hire), cost of accommodation ($500, $6,000), and type of accommodation (equipment, flexible scheduling). The figures representing a low and a high cost of the accommodation were selected using the following rationale. First, it has been estimated that most employment
accommodations cost under $500 (Blanck, 1996; Braddock & Bachelder, 1994). It is likely that employers would consider the cost negligible when it is less than this amount. Second, Leckband, Schneider, and Fraser (1997) had college students estimate the maximum cost for an employment accommodation under the ADA for each of five jobs. The figures ranged from approximately $2,570 for a cleaning person to $9,720 for a marketing manager. For a real estate agent, the mean estimated maximum cost was approximately $5,735. Because the position used in the current profiles was most similar to a real estate agent, $6,000 is likely to be perceived as a high cost.

Although some policy capturing studies employ profiles containing correlated cues that mirror reality (Cooksey, 1996), this study set the cues to be uncorrelated because no a priori basis exists to expect correlation among the cues in the environment. In addition, utilizing a factorial design allows the researcher to interpret the unique variance associated with each cue as an indicator of importance (Feldman & Arnold, 1978; Sanchez & Levine, 1989; Stewart, 1988). A. Brehmer and B. Brehmer (1988) indicated that using an orthogonal cue set is appropriate for basic research such as that proposed here, and that there is no evidence to suggest that using an orthogonal cue set negatively influences researchers' ability to estimate a judge's policy.

A multitude of variables is likely to exist in any real world employment accommodation situation. To create a judgment task that was representative of variables occurring in natural situations but would also allow for statistical estimation of judgment parameters and be possible for participants to complete in a reasonable amount of time (Cooksey, 1996), only five cues were used. Cooksey recommended that policy capturing studies use only a limited number of cues (i.e., 5-9) to avoid excessively taxing the cognitive resources of the judges. In addition, policy capturing
studies have found that most judges use only a subset of the cues provided in making their decisions (A. Brehmer & B. Brehmer, 1988).

One might question the use of written profiles to explore judgment policies. Kline and Sulsky (1995) indicated that because judges are not usually presented with issues requiring decisions in the form of profiles, like those used in policy capturing studies, researchers must be cautious about concluding that the decisions produced in such studies mirror those produced in reality. However, A. Brehmer and B. Brehmer (1988) asserted that the use of "paper people" is completely appropriate in basic research such as that presented here, and that it can provide insight into such judgments that would be difficult to gain using real cases that have a multitude of variables. Furthermore, they indicated that there was no evidence that using paper people results in significant distortions of the policies.

**Measures**

The basic scenario used to create the profiles was derived from an actual case of employment accommodation under the ADA. Each profile began with the same brief description of the situation, "An employee of a privately owned real estate business (which employs 50 people) has a job inspecting property (land and buildings). The employee drives to the properties to photograph them, estimate their value, and write a short report." Five statements depicted the independent variables present. The cues were presented in the same order in each profile (i.e., employment status, previous performance level, type of disability, type of accommodation, cost of accommodation). A sixth statement, which is identical in each scenario, reminded the participant that the employee in the profile is considered covered by the ADA. See Appendix A for the background information and task instructions, and Appendix B for profiles used.
Profiles were presented in random order (cf. Feldman & Arnold, 1978; Klaas & Wheeler, 1990), except that care was taken to ensure that the two duplicate profiles were not presented close to the originals in the series. Participants evaluated each profile by answering the following question, "Based on the information above, to what extent is the proposed accommodation reasonable?" Participants circled the number representing their response on a seven-point scale (1 = "extremely unreasonable," 7 = "extremely reasonable").

After responding to the 50 profiles, participants estimated the weight they placed on each cue when making judgments of reasonable accommodation. This measure instructed participants to distribute a total of 100 points among the five cues to represent the importance they placed on each and provided examples. Participants were also asked to indicate whose perspective they took (e.g., customer, manager), if any, in judging the accommodations. See Appendix C for the factor importance measure.

To explore the effects of respondent characteristics on judgments, demographic information was collected. This measure asked for information regarding occupational status, disability status, gender, and other variables that may be related to perceptions of accommodations. See Appendices D and E for the demographic measures for employed persons and students.

Analysis Strategy

Policy capturing. The policy capturing technique uses multiple regression procedures to produce a linear equation that represents the relationship between the cues (i.e., predictors) given to the participant and the resulting decision (i.e., criterion) (A. Brehmer & B. Brehmer, 1988; Cooksey, 1996). Thus, a regression equation is produced for each respondent. The $R^2$ indicates the proportion of variance in judgments captured by the judge's linear model, and the standardized regression
coefficients can be used to estimate the relative importance of the cues to the participant's judgment (Cooksey, 1996; Stewart, 1988). The multiple $R$ associated with the regression equation indicates the participant's consistency (Kline & Sulsky, 1995), or cognitive control (Cooksey, 1996), in applying his or her judgment policy over the profiles.

In addition to determining the idiographic policy statistics, one may create an average policy equation for the entire sample by calculating the mean beta weights (Cooksey, 1996; Kline & Sulsky, 1995). Furthermore, researchers can explore policy equations by groups when an a priori reason exists to believe that participants will produce different judgment policies based on some pre-existing characteristic. For example, one can examine differences in judgments between experienced and inexperienced judges, or between females and males.

Previous policy capturing research has demonstrated that the linear additive model is more powerful in demonstrating judgment policies than models including configural cues (i.e., interactions). Interactions, if they exist, are likely to explain minimal variance in judgments (A. Brehmer & B. Brehmer, 1988; Cooksey, 1996; Donnelly & Bownas, 1984). Some researchers have chosen to explore the possibility of configural cue effects. Sanchez and Levine (1989) found no significant interactions in their study of task importance within jobs, supporting the effectiveness of a simple linear model. Similarly, in their study of managerial salary raise decisions, Sherer et al. (1987) found two significant interactions, but each explained an average of only 1% of the variance in the decision.

In addition to examining the relative cue weights produced in the regression procedure, one may be interested in participants' subjective weights of the cues. Several methods exist for determining judges' perceptions of how they used or weighted the cues presented when forming their decisions. For example, subjective
weights can be compared to the derived regression weights to explore each judge's awareness of his or her own judgment policy. Cooksey (1996) indicated that the most common means for capturing subjective weights is to have participants allot 100 points among the cues presented so as to reflect the relative importance they attached to each of the cues (cf. Feldman & Arnold, 1978; York, 1989). York referred to this procedure as "insight analysis." He created predicted scores using the participants' subjective weights and the absolute values of the beta weights. He then correlated the two sets of predicted scores as an indicator of the judges' ability to describe their weighting of the cues when making the judgments. This approach was taken in this study.
Results

Mean Rating

Across all participants and all profiles, the mean rating of accommodation reasonableness was 3.99 (SD = 1.77). Ratings of reasonable accommodation were not significantly correlated with any of the respondent group characteristics of interest in this study. Participants reported moderate familiarity with the ADA (M = 4.30, SD = 1.66; on a seven-point scale) and a supportive attitude toward providing employment accommodations to qualified persons with disabilities (M = 5.48, SD = 1.41; on a seven-point scale).

Idiographic Policy Statistics

The predictors were dummy coded (see Table 2) and perceptions of accommodation reasonableness were regressed onto the independent variables. The beta weights representing each participant’s regression equation are presented in Table 3. Disability type was significant in 21 idiographic equations (19.6%). Contrary to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disability Type</td>
<td>learning</td>
<td>back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Performance A</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>no information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Performance B</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td>new hire</td>
<td>incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation Type</td>
<td>procedural</td>
<td>equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Status</td>
<td>not disabled</td>
<td>disabled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Status</td>
<td>employed</td>
<td>student</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3
Participants' Standardized Betas for Each Cue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S#a</th>
<th>Db</th>
<th>P1c</th>
<th>P2d</th>
<th>Fc</th>
<th>Cf</th>
<th>A8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.33*</td>
<td>-.37*</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td>.59*</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.48*</td>
<td>-.79*</td>
<td>.44*</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.83*</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.40*</td>
<td>-.60*</td>
<td>.38*</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.25*</td>
<td>-.42*</td>
<td>.55*</td>
<td>.41*</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.32*</td>
<td>-.53*</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.63*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.29*</td>
<td>-.45*</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.82*</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.32*</td>
<td>-.55*</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.41*</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.40*</td>
<td>-.70*</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.56*</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.31*</td>
<td>-.52*</td>
<td>.46*</td>
<td>.59*</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.82*</td>
<td>-.95*</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.54*</td>
<td>-.71*</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.50*</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.57*</td>
<td>-.81*</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.42*</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.22*</td>
<td>-.51*</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>.69*</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.58*</td>
<td>-.50*</td>
<td>.43*</td>
<td>.49*</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.68*</td>
<td>-.98*</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td>-.26*</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.73*</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.34*</td>
<td>-.71*</td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.47*</td>
<td>-.55*</td>
<td>.47*</td>
<td>.47*</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.29*</td>
<td>-.82*</td>
<td>.49*</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>-.62*</td>
<td>.57*</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.11*</td>
<td>-.27*</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.85*</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.53*</td>
<td>-.45*</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.54*</td>
<td>-.64*</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.49*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.37*</td>
<td>-.71*</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.61*</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.29*</td>
<td>-.41*</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.69*</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.25*</td>
<td>-.53*</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.70*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.46*</td>
<td>-.75*</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.29*</td>
<td>-.58*</td>
<td>.50*</td>
<td>.38*</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.47*</td>
<td>-.78*</td>
<td>.45*</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continued)
(Table 3 continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S#a</th>
<th>Db</th>
<th>P1c</th>
<th>P2d</th>
<th>Ee</th>
<th>Cf</th>
<th>A8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.39*</td>
<td>-.67*</td>
<td>.43*</td>
<td>.46*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.28*</td>
<td>-.72*</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.49*</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>-.26*</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.89*</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.08*</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.94*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.25*</td>
<td>-.50*</td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td>.65*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.28*</td>
<td>-.50*</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.55*</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.41*</td>
<td>-.52*</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.57*</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.43*</td>
<td>-.64*</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>.47*</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.22*</td>
<td>-.52*</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.71*</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.67*</td>
<td>-.57*</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td>-.33*</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.88*</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.27*</td>
<td>-.46*</td>
<td>.72*</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>-.52*</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.69*</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.32*</td>
<td>-.36*</td>
<td>.42*</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.25*</td>
<td>.46*</td>
<td>.74*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.05*</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.97*</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.39*</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.34*</td>
<td>.46*</td>
<td>.57*</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>.55*</td>
<td>.67*</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.71*</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.39*</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td>.42*</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.78*</td>
<td>.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>-.24*</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.84*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>-.30*</td>
<td>-.29*</td>
<td>-.32*</td>
<td>.49*</td>
<td>.49*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td>-.57*</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.72*</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.28*</td>
<td>-.63*</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.67*</td>
<td>.11*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.42*</td>
<td>-.70*</td>
<td>.37*</td>
<td>.57*</td>
<td>.16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.41*</td>
<td>-.72*</td>
<td>.38*</td>
<td>.43*</td>
<td>.13*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.46*</td>
<td>-.81*</td>
<td>.42*</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.29*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td>-.42*</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>-.48*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continued)
(Table 3 continued)

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.22*</td>
<td>-0.33*</td>
<td>0.55*</td>
<td>0.58*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.56*</td>
<td>-0.60*</td>
<td>0.53*</td>
<td>0.28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.41*</td>
<td>-0.35*</td>
<td>0.38*</td>
<td>0.63*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.16*</td>
<td>-0.70*</td>
<td>0.41*</td>
<td>0.26*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.42*</td>
<td>-0.44*</td>
<td>0.41*</td>
<td>0.44*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.18*</td>
<td>-0.28*</td>
<td>0.36*</td>
<td>0.73*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.21*</td>
<td>0.46*</td>
<td>0.49*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>-0.28*</td>
<td>-0.33*</td>
<td>-0.46*</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.48*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>-0.32*</td>
<td>-0.25*</td>
<td>-0.42*</td>
<td>0.20*</td>
<td>0.26*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>-0.13*</td>
<td>-0.43*</td>
<td>-0.57*</td>
<td>0.28*</td>
<td>0.56*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>-0.11*</td>
<td>-0.23*</td>
<td>-0.38*</td>
<td>0.53*</td>
<td>0.59*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>0.15*</td>
<td>-0.16*</td>
<td>-0.26*</td>
<td>0.31*</td>
<td>0.76*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>-0.15*</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.31*</td>
<td>0.36*</td>
<td>0.67*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>-0.16*</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.60*</td>
<td>0.33*</td>
<td>0.44*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>-0.13*</td>
<td>-0.14*</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.64*</td>
<td>0.60*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>-0.31*</td>
<td>-0.27*</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>0.33*</td>
<td>0.37*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>-0.28*</td>
<td>-0.36*</td>
<td>-0.83*</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.46*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>-0.23*</td>
<td>-0.40*</td>
<td>-0.63*</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.49*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>-0.12*</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.89*</td>
<td>0.25*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.12*</td>
<td>-0.09*</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.95*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.29*</td>
<td>-0.32*</td>
<td>0.64*</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>0.19*</td>
<td>-0.29*</td>
<td>-0.52*</td>
<td>0.76*</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>-0.25*</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.54*</td>
<td>0.54*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.13*</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.40*</td>
<td>0.80*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.20*</td>
<td>-0.09*</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.93*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.31*</td>
<td>-0.79*</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.60*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.34*</td>
<td>-0.76*</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.57*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.47*</td>
<td>-0.56*</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.48*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>0.41*</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.19*</td>
<td>0.71*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.19*</td>
<td>0.74*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continued)
(Table 3 continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S#a</th>
<th>Db</th>
<th>P1c</th>
<th>P2d</th>
<th>Fc</th>
<th>Ff</th>
<th>Ag</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.74*</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.74*</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>-.25*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.85*</td>
<td>-.31*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.67*</td>
<td>-.31*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.67*</td>
<td>.49*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.30*</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.52*</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.22*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.85*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.55*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.73*</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.45*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.79*</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.26*</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.73*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.27*</td>
<td>-.39*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>-.28*</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.76*</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.88*</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>-.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00*</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.53*</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.40*</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pooled</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.25*</td>
<td>-.41*</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.53*</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Idiographic equations were arranged in order from most to least similar to the aggregate equation, in terms of significant variables. The order is maintained in Table 4.

aSubject number.
bDisability type.
cPrevious performance column A.
dPrevious performance column B.
eEmployment status.
fCost.
gAccommodation type.
*p<.05.
expectations, 15 participants rated the accommodation more reasonable for the target with a learning disability than for the target with a back impairment. In the equations, two coefficients represent previous performance because three levels of previous performance were included in the series of scenarios (i.e., low, high, no information). The first performance coefficient was significant for 77 participants (72.0%), each indicating that a record of high previous performance was preferred to no record of performance. The second performance coefficient was significant for 91 participants (85.1%), all but one indicating that high previous performance was preferred to low previous performance. Employment status was significant in 85 of the equations (79.4%), all but one indicating that accommodating incumbents was preferred to accommodating new hires. Cost was significant in 103 of the equations (96.3%), all but one indicating a preference for low cost accommodations over high cost accommodations. Type of accommodation was significant for 28 (26.2%) participants. Contrary to expectations, 20 preferred procedural accommodations to equipment accommodations.

Cognitive control, or the consistency with which judges applied their policies across profiles, was examined through the multiple $R$ values. The multiple $Rs$ were high, indicating that participants were very consistent in applying their policies ($M = .86$, median = .89, range = .43 to 1.0). Multiple $R$ values were not significantly different between respondent groups ($M_{\text{women}} = .85$, $M_{\text{men}} = .86$, $t(104) = -0.49$, n.s.; $M_{\text{not disabled}} = .86$, $M_{\text{disabled}} = .82$, $t(105) = 1.58$, n.s.; $M_{\text{full-time employed}} = .86$, $M_{\text{student}} = .85$, $t(105) = .27$, n.s.). See Table 4 for each participant's mean rating of accommodation reasonableness and multiple $R$ (cognitive control).

To further examine intra-rater reliability, two profiles were repeated in the series. Participants were consistent in their responses to the repeated profiles (Cronbach's alpha = .92). The data regarding cognitive control and consistent
Table 4
Participants' Profile Rating Means and Standard Deviations, Multiple Rs, and Insight Rs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S#</th>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
<th>SD Rating</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>Insight R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S#</td>
<td>Mean Rating(^b)</td>
<td>SD Rating</td>
<td>Multiple (R^2)</td>
<td>Insight (r^d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Mean Rating</td>
<td>SD Rating</td>
<td>Multiple $R^2$</td>
<td>Insight $r^d$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
(Table 4 continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject #</th>
<th>Mean Rating (^b)</th>
<th>SD Rating</th>
<th>Multiple (R^2)</th>
<th>Insight (R^d)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>6.58</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Dashes indicate that a correlation could not be calculated because the participant failed to complete the subjective weighting measure.

\(^a\)Subject number.

\(^b\)Mean rating of accommodation reasonableness.

\(^c\)Consistency in applying policy over profiles.

\(^d\)Correlation between predicted scores using subjective weights and absolute value of obtained weights.
responses to repeated profiles indicates that individual participants responded reliably to the series of profiles.

**Judges' insight.** The materials asked participants to indicate how much weight they placed on each of the five variables manipulated in the profiles. Following York's (1989) insight analysis procedure, two sets of predicted values were created, one using the absolute value of the obtained regression coefficients and the other using participants' subjective weights of the five independent variables. For each participant, the two sets of predicted values were correlated. The correlations ranged from 0.40 to 1.00, with a mean correlation of .85. Thus, participants had a high degree of insight into their own policies. That is, participants were quite successful at depicting the weight they had given to each of the independent variables when responding to the profiles. Moreover, the mean subjective weighting of the cues reflects the group-level policy statistics. See Table 4 for the idiographic correlations reflecting judges' insight and Table 5 for descriptive statistics for the subjective cue weights.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>disability type</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>9.76</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accommodation type</td>
<td>8.93</td>
<td>9.16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>performance level</td>
<td>26.76</td>
<td>13.10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employment status</td>
<td>27.84</td>
<td>13.24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cost</td>
<td>30.53</td>
<td>16.63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 104
Group-level Analyses

The idiographic policy statistics were averaged to create an aggregate equation for the entire sample. Equation 1 reports the mean standardized betas for the sample. In the group-level equation, disability type and accommodation type are not significant. Performance A indicates that participants preferred accommodating persons with a record of high performance than persons with no performance information. Performance B indicates that participants preferred accommodating persons with a record of high performance than low performance. Participants judged accommodations for incumbents to be more reasonable than accommodations for new hires, and judged low cost accommodations to be more reasonable than high cost accommodations.

\[-.03 \text{ Disability Type } + -.25 \times \text{ Performance A } + -.41 \times \text{ Performance B } + \]
\[.29 \times \text{ Employment Status } + .53 \times \text{ Cost } + -.04 \times \text{ Accommodation Type.} \quad (1)\]

Squared semi-partial correlation coefficients were obtained to determine the proportion of variance accounted for uniquely by each of the independent variables manipulated in the profiles. The cost of the accommodation explained the most variance, 21.8%. When the two columns representing performance were entered into the hierarchical regression equation on the same step, performance explained 9.2% of the variance in perceived accommodation reasonableness. Next, employment status explained 6.5% of the variance in perceived accommodation reasonableness. Finally, type of disability and type of accommodation each explained less than one percent of the variance in perceived accommodation reasonableness (see Table 6).

Although meaningful interactions are rarely found in policy capturing research, hierarchical moderated regression was used to explore the possibility of an interaction between performance (low or high) and employment status (new hire or incumbent)
### Table 6
Regression Summary for Profile Cues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>.468*</td>
<td>.218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance A</td>
<td>-.216*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance B</td>
<td>-.346*</td>
<td>.092a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td>.256*</td>
<td>.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation Type</td>
<td>-.039*</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Type</td>
<td>-.027*</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R² = .412

N = 5,336

*Performance columns A and B entered into regression together.

* p < .05

**p < .01

on ratings of accommodations. The interaction explained less than one percent of the variance in judgments.

**Examination of hypotheses.** Hypotheses were examined on the group level using mean correlations between cues and judgments. Hypotheses 1, 2, and 3 addressed the relationship between characteristics of the individual with a disability and the perceived reasonableness of the proposed accommodation. Hypothesis 1 was not supported. Type of disability (back impairment or learning disability) was not related to judgments of reasonableness (mean r = .02, n.s.). Hypothesis 2 was partially supported. Accommodations involving individuals whose previous performance was high received higher ratings of reasonableness than did accommodations involving individuals whose previous performance was low (mean r = -.32, p < .01). However, when no previous performance information was available, this variable was uncorrelated with the ratings (mean r = -.05, n.s.). Hypothesis 3 was supported.
Accommodations involving incumbents received higher ratings of reasonableness than did accommodations involving new hires (mean $r = .36, p < .01$). Therefore, in the current study, two characteristics of the person with a disability, previous performance level and employment status, were associated with judgments of reasonable accommodation.

Hypotheses 4 and 5 addressed the relationship between characteristics of the accommodation and the perceived reasonableness of the accommodation. Hypothesis 4 was supported. Low cost accommodations received higher ratings of reasonableness than did high cost accommodations (mean $r = .62, p < .01$). Hypothesis 5 was not supported. Type of accommodation (equipment or flexible scheduling) was not related to the ratings received (mean $r = -.09$, n.s.). Therefore, in the current study, one characteristic of the accommodation, cost, was associated with judgments of reasonable accommodation.

To examine the effects of respondent group characteristics on judgments of accommodation reasonableness, occupational status, disability status, and gender of participants were entered into the regression equation on Step 2, after the five manipulated independent variables were entered on Step 1. When entered together, the three respondent group characteristics of interest explained less than one percent of the variance in perceived accommodation reasonableness (see Table 7). Thus, in the current study, respondent group characteristics did not influence perceptions of reasonable accommodation.

**Judgment perspectives.** After responding to the profiles, participants were asked to indicate whose perspective they took (i.e., who they imagined they were in the situation) when deciding how reasonable the proposed accommodations were. Participants could circle all the perspectives that applied. Eighty-nine respondents indicated that they took the perspective of a manager or supervisor. Fifty-eight
Table 7
Hierarchical Regression Summary for Profile Cues and Respondent Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>.466**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance A</td>
<td>-.216**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance B</td>
<td>-.345**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td>.256**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation Type</td>
<td>-.039**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Type</td>
<td>-.026*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>.416</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>-.080**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Status</td>
<td>.049**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Status</td>
<td>.030*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 5,286
*p<.05
**p<.01

respondents considered their own ideas (as opposed to considering themselves to be playing a role) in conjunction with considering another perspective. Thirty-two participants took the perspective of a person with a disability. Fourteen participants took the perspective of a judge or juror. Eleven took the perspective of a coworker without a disability. Seven only considered their own ideas (i.e., took no identifiable perspective other than their own). Four participants took the perspective of a doctor, and four took the perspective of a customer.

Chi-square tests revealed that the percentage of women who took the perspective of a person with a disability (40.6%) was greater than the percentage of men who took this perspective (11.9%; $\chi^2 = 10.11, p < .05$). Also, a higher
percentage of persons with disabilities (52.4%) indicated taking the perspective of a
person with a disability than did persons who did not have a disability (24.4%;
$\chi^2 = 6.30, p < .05$). No other differences based on respondent group characteristics
existed.

Qualitative responses. Near the end of the survey instrument, participants
were asked two open-ended questions to collect qualitative data on attitudes toward
providing accommodations. Responses were grouped into homogeneous content
categories, and are included here only if indicated by ten or more participants. When
asked, "Why are you supportive of, or opposed to, providing accommodations to
persons with disabilities," 37 participants responded that persons with disabilities have
a right to work if they are able, 10 participants responded that persons with disabilities
deserve equal treatment or opportunity as persons who do not have disabilities, and 10
participants responded that it benefits organizations to accommodate and retain
effective employees.

When asked, "What factors, other than those included in this study, are
important in deciding whether or not an employment accommodation for a person
with a disability is reasonable," 12 indicated the disabled person's motivation to be
productive or attitude toward work. Interestingly, ADA interpretive guidance (EEOC,
1992) does not mention this variable and it may be difficult to defend in court due to
its subjective nature. Legally defensible variables, such as the size of the organization,
the organization's available funds for providing accommodations, and the type of job,
were each mentioned by fewer than 10 respondents.
Discussion

The idiographic policy statistics suggest that the policy capturing methodology was useful for examining how individuals may use variables presented to judge the reasonableness of proposed employment accommodations for persons with disabilities. Although trends in important variables can be observed across the individual equations, the equations demonstrate that individuals differ in the factors that are important to their perceptions of what is reasonable. In fact, only 41.1% of the idiographic equations were identical to the mean equation, in terms of significant variables. Although two variables were not significant on the group level (i.e., type of disability, type of accommodation), each was considered by at least 19.6% of the participants. Because accommodation decisions are often made by individuals rather than by teams, it is important to examine individual policies in addition to group trends.

Examination of the individual and group-level equations suggests that the cost of the proposed accommodation will nearly always be an important consideration in determining reasonable accommodation. In addition, employment status and the past performance of the individual requesting the accommodation are often important. Although type of disability and type of accommodation are important to some individuals, overall, they were not important variables in the context explored.

In sum, this study provided some support for the model presented in Figure 1. Two characteristics of the person with a disability, previous performance and employment status, and one characteristic of the proposed accommodation, cost, influenced participants' perceptions. However, respondent characteristics did not influence perceptions of reasonable accommodation.
Implications for Practice

The good news. The ADA interpretive guidance supports considering the nature of the accommodation in deciding what is reasonable (EEOC, 1992). Therefore, employers are entitled to consider cost when making accommodation decisions. The results of this study provide additional justification for choosing low cost accommodations because individuals tend to agree that they are more reasonable than high cost accommodations. Evidence that the majority of participants took the perspective of a manager or supervisor in judging accommodations partially explains why cost was important, as managers are likely to be concerned about organizational expenses.

In addition, from a legal standpoint it is positive that the majority of participants did not consider type of disability or type of accommodation in judgments of reasonable accommodation. Specifically, ADA interpretive guidance (EEOC, 1992) states that both persons with mental and physical disabilities are entitled to accommodations, and lists providing equipment and allowing flexible scheduling as examples of possible accommodations.

The results of this study provide evidence that observers' perceptions of reasonable accommodation do not vary by demographic characteristics (i.e., occupational status, disability status, gender). Employers may be encouraged to know that persons with disabilities recognize that the cost of an accommodation, for example, is an important consideration. Moreover, it does not appear that increased awareness of other stakeholder perspectives is warranted. However, decision makers are likely to benefit from increased awareness of the requirements of the ADA, and from increased awareness that individuals may differ to some degree in their ideas of what is reasonable. It may be useful in an accommodation situation to discuss the variables that each party thinks are important, and to identify those not supported by
the ADA. Agreeing to remove these variables from consideration may ease the process of finding an accommodation both sides agree upon. It may foster the adoption of similar perspectives on employment accommodations, which may lead to more productive discussions of accommodation options.

Furthermore, evidence suggests that people support the provision of accommodations, particularly when doing so is likely to benefit the employer. Organizations that readily provide needed accommodations to employees with disabilities may be encouraged to continue doing so, knowing that the practice is positively regarded by citizens and potential customers. Similarly, the results of this study may encourage organizations that have resisted hiring and accommodating persons with disabilities to adopt the practice. Most individuals do not expect employers to give persons with disabilities expensive accommodations or every accommodation they request. Instead, they tend to believe that the employer is entitled to provide low cost accommodations and to reap some benefit from providing them. This should assuage the fears of managers who avoided providing accommodations based on anxiety that doing so would result in overwhelming expectations to make costly changes in the workplace.

The bad news. A potential problem exists for organizations if managers are including variables that are not legally defensible in their decisions to provide employment accommodations. Specifically, the ADA and its interpretive guidance do not support using the characteristics of the person with a disability to decide what accommodations are reasonable (EEOC, 1992). Employers are not entitled to use the employment status or the previous performance of an individual to make accommodation decisions. In fact, the law specifies that employers must provide reasonable accommodations to qualified applicants or employees with disabilities. Furthermore, such accommodations do not have to result in high performance.
Rather, they only have to enable the person with a disability to perform the essential functions of the job.

Evidence that previous performance is important to individuals, but not a valid consideration under the law, has important implications for employers. Employers do not want to retain low performers, even though they are capable of performing the essential functions of the job. The ADA technical guidance (EEOC, 1992) implies that the employee with a disability need only be able to perform the essential functions at the minimally acceptable level, regardless of the level expected from other employees. Managers may feel forced to retain persons with disabilities who perform the essential functions of a job at a lower than expected level, because they fear discrimination-based lawsuits. This may be particularly problematic for employers when poor performance appears to be related to motivation rather than to disability.

Conflict between ADA guidelines and what individuals find important will persist until either technical guidance is changed to reflect what is important to organizations, or individuals learn how the law is to be interpreted and applied. However, even those aware of legal guidelines may continue to consider illegal variables, then conceal or deny their use. Those who do so will be placing themselves and their employers in legal jeopardy if a judge can be convinced that accommodations were denied without valid legal justification.

It is important to address why individuals may consider variables that are not legal. First, individuals appear to find accommodations more reasonable when they believe the employee had contributed or was likely to contribute to the success of the organization. Earlier, this paper suggested that observers may consider the characteristics of the person with a disability and of the accommodation in terms of costs relative to benefits when forming judgments of reasonable accommodation. The
results of the study provide some indirect support for this assertion in that participants judged accommodations as more reasonable for individuals who had made past contributions to the organization (i.e., incumbents) or who were likely to make large contributions (i.e., individuals with a record of high performance). It appears that individuals may judge accommodations as more reasonable when the employer is expected to benefit from providing them.

Second, individuals may consider illegal variables because they are relatively uninformed regarding the specifics of the ADA. This relative lack of awareness is evidenced in that approximately 30% of the participants in this study indicated being at least somewhat unfamiliar with the ADA. Individuals in organizations may inadvertently gather inaccurate ADA information from newspaper reports or from anecdotes, which may lead to poor decision-making.

Training and increased awareness about ADA requirements may increase reliance on legally valid variables. Specifically, training should indicate the variables in an accommodation situation that are defensible in court (e.g., cost, effect of the accommodation on the functioning of the organization). Furthermore, decision-makers should be informed that individuals may erroneously include factors in their decision that may put themselves and their employing organization in legal jeopardy. In addition, they should be warned that persons with disabilities may try to call attention to such variables when negotiating an accommodation in an attempt to persuade the employer to provide the desired accommodation. Although considering the contributions of the person with a disability to the organization in terms of tenure or performance may be important to individuals in organizations, it is not supported by the ADA.
Implications for Research

The results of this study indicate that policy capturing is a useful means for studying the influence of a variety of cues on judgments of reasonable accommodation. However, because participants' subjective weights of the cues mirrored the obtained weights (i.e., participants had insight into their own policies), simply having participants weight cues presented, instead of evaluating profiles, may be a useful approach for examining perceptions of accommodation variables when time or funding for research is limited.

The evidence that monetary cost is important in perceptions of reasonable accommodation augments the findings of Leckband et al. (1997) that cost is important in accommodation cases. In addition, the results provide partial support for D. L. Stone and Colella's (1996) assertion that the attributes of persons with disabilities influence the treatment they receive in organizations. Specifically, for most participants, previous performance level and employment status were important variables, although type of disability was not. Furthermore, this study did not provide support for D. L. Stone and Colella's assertion that observer characteristics are important determinants of reactions to persons with disabilities in organizations. However, the lack of differences between student and full-time employed participants points to the usefulness of using student samples to study ADA issues, particularly when those students have some work experience.

Limitations

A limitation of this study is that it included only two disability types. It may be that other examples of physical and mental disabilities, or other types of disabilities (e.g., addictive disorders), may influence judgments of accommodations. Likewise, this study included only two accommodation types. It may be that other examples of procedural or equipment accommodations, or other types of accommodations (e.g.,
environmental), influence judgments of accommodations. In addition, the independent variables in this study were manipulated in only one job context. Participants may weight the significant predictors in this study differently when considered in another job context. Furthermore, disability type and accommodation type might be important when accommodations are requested for jobs other than the one used here.

**Future Research**

Future research regarding employment accommodations should examine the influence of disabilities, accommodations, and jobs not included in the current study. In particular, research should determine the aspects of accommodations aside from cost, and the aspects of jobs that are important to perceptions of what is reasonable.

Policy capturing may also be useful in examining variables that influence perceptions of undue hardship. Organizational variables such as size and profitability are important considerations when accommodations are requested. Future research should go beyond examining perceptions of what is reasonable to determining variables that influence decisions to provide accommodations. Specifically, such research should include organizational variables that may impact judgments of undue hardship along with characteristics of the job and characteristics of the accommodation.

Furthermore, although respondent group characteristics did not influence perceptions of reasonable accommodation, they may influence decisions about providing accommodations. For example, rater experience with persons with disabilities and with making accommodation decisions may impact the likelihood of providing an accommodation, the type of accommodation chosen, and the ease with which the accommodation problem-solving process was carried out. Future research
should explore the influence of respondent group characteristics on decisions to provide accommodations.

Finally, future research should examine actual accommodation decisions that have been made. It should identify the important variables considered in such decisions, explore how decision makers deal with the conflict between what is important to them and what the law allows them to consider, and determine whether managers made decisions based on variables that are not legally justified.
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Appendix A
Background Information

Employment Accommodations for Persons with Disabilities

The United States government passed the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) in 1990. Title I of the ADA makes it illegal for employers to discriminate against individuals with disabilities. As long as the individual is qualified to perform the job (with or without an accommodation), the employer cannot use the disability against the employee or job applicant when making employment-related decisions. Approximately 18% of working-aged Americans are protected by this law.

The ADA requires employers who are made aware of physical or mental limitations of qualified employees or job applicants to provide accommodations (or changes) that allow the individuals to work and to be eligible for aspects of working that persons who are not disabled enjoy (such as training and promotion). The law requires only employment accommodations that are reasonable and indicates that employers do not have to provide such accommodations when they would pose an undue hardship (considerable effort or expense) on the employer. What is a reasonable accommodation will vary, based on the person with a disability and the job. Furthermore, the ADA does not provide rules indicating what is and is not reasonable.

TASK INSTRUCTIONS

The purpose of the current study is to explore judgments of reasonable accommodations. The study will determine the importance of several factors to respondents' opinions of what is and is not reasonable. Please read and respond to each of the following profiles depicting a situation in which a person with a disability has requested an employment accommodation. There are no right or wrong answers. Although the profiles appear highly similar, each one differs slightly. Please respond
to each profile independently of the others. That is, consider each one based on the factors represented in it, rather than considering one profile relative to another. Do not skip any profiles. After responding to the profiles, please answer the questions at the end of the survey.
Appendix B
Profiles

Profile No. 1

An employee of a privately owned real estate business (which employs 50 people) has a job inspecting property (land and buildings). The employee drives to the properties to photograph them, estimate their value, and write a short report. The following factors are present:

1. The employee has worked for the company for five years.
2. The employee has been a high performer.
3. The employee has a back impairment and experiences severe pain after walking for long periods of time.
4. A specialist has provided documentation that the employee has the disability, and the specialist recommends that the employer provide the employee an electric scooter to reduce the amount of walking required while inspecting properties.
5. The proposed accommodation is estimated to cost the employer around $500.
6. The employee is covered by the ADA. That is, the employee has a disability that substantially limits a major life activity, and the employee is capable of performing the job with the proposed accommodation.

Based on the information above, to what extent is the proposed accommodation reasonable? Please indicate your answer by circling the number on the scale below that best represents how reasonable you think the accommodation is in this situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXTREMELY UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>QUIET UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>NEITHER UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY REASONABLE</td>
<td>QUITE REASONABLE</td>
<td>EXTREMELY REASONABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Profile No. 2

An employee of a privately owned real estate business (which employs 50 people) has a job inspecting property (land and buildings). The employee drives to the properties to photograph them, estimate their value, and write a short report. The following factors are present:

1. The employee has worked for the company for five years.
2. The employee has been a high performer.
3. The employee has a back impairment and experiences severe pain after walking for long periods of time.
4. A specialist has provided documentation that the employee has the disability, and the specialist recommends that the employee receive physical therapy to reduce the pain. To enable the employee to receive therapy during clinic hours, the employer has been asked to let the person leave work an hour early once a week. The employer is not being asked to pay for the therapy, but there is a cost associated with leaving early.
5. The proposed accommodation is estimated to cost the employer around $500 over the course of the year.
6. The employee is covered by the ADA. That is, the employee has a disability that substantially limits a major life activity, and the employee is capable of performing the job with the proposed accommodation.

Based on the information above, to what extent is the proposed accommodation reasonable? Please indicate your answer by circling the number on the scale below that best represents how reasonable you think the accommodation is in this situation.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
EXTREMELY  QUITE  SLIGHTLY  NEITHER  SLIGHTLY  QUITE  EXTREMELY
UNREASONABLE  UNREASONABLE  UNREASONABLE  UNREASONABLE  REASONABLE  REASONABLE  REASONABLE
NOR REASONABLE
Profile No. 3

An employee of a privately owned real estate business (which employs 50 people) has a job inspecting property (land and buildings). The employee drives to the properties to photograph them, estimate their value, and write a short report. The following factors are present:

1. The employee has worked for the company for five years.
2. The employee has been a high performer.
3. The employee has a back impairment and experiences severe pain after walking for long periods of time.
4. A specialist has provided documentation that the employee has the disability, and the specialist recommends that the employer provide the employee an electric cart to reduce the amount of walking required while inspecting properties.
5. The proposed accommodation is estimated to cost the employer around $6,000.
6. The employee is covered by the ADA. That is, the employee has a disability that substantially limits a major life activity, and the employee is capable of performing the job with the proposed accommodation.

Based on the information above, to what extent is the proposed accommodation reasonable? Please indicate your answer by circling the number on the scale below that best represents how reasonable you think the accommodation is in this situation.

1________2_________3_________4_________5_________6_________7

EXTREMELY QUITE SLIGHTLY NEITHER SLIGHTLY QUITE EXTREMELY
UNREASONABLE UNREASONABLE UNREASONABLE UNREASONABLE REASONABLE REASONABLE REASONABLE
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Profile No. 4

An employee of a privately owned real estate business (which employs 50 people) has a job inspecting property (land and buildings). The employee drives to the properties to photograph them, estimate their value, and write a short report. The following factors are present:

1. The employee has worked for the company for five years.
2. The employee has been a high performer.
3. The employee has a back impairment and experiences severe pain after walking for long periods of time.
4. A specialist has provided documentation that the employee has the disability, and the specialist recommends that the employee receive physical therapy to reduce the pain. To enable the employee to receive therapy during clinic hours, the employer has been asked to let the person leave work an hour early twice a week. The employer is not being asked to pay for the therapy, but there is a cost associated with leaving early.
5. The proposed accommodation is estimated to cost the employer around $6,000 over the course of the year.
6. The employee is covered by the ADA. That is, the employee has a disability that substantially limits a major life activity, and the employee is capable of performing the job with the proposed accommodation.

Based on the information above, to what extent is the proposed accommodation reasonable? Please indicate your answer by circling the number on the scale below that best represents how reasonable you think the accommodation is in this situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXTREMELY</td>
<td>QUITE</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY</td>
<td>NEITHER</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY</td>
<td>QUITE</td>
<td>EXTREMELY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT REASONABLE</td>
<td>NOT REASONABLE</td>
<td>NOT REASONABLE</td>
<td>NOT REASONABLE</td>
<td>NOT REASONABLE</td>
<td>NOT REASONABLE</td>
<td>NOT REASONABLE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Profile No. 5

An employee of a privately owned real estate business (which employs 50 people) has a job inspecting property (land and buildings). The employee drives to the properties to photograph them, estimate their value, and write a short report. The following factors are present:

1. The employee was hired by the company yesterday.
2. References indicate that the employee has been a high performer.
3. The employee has a back impairment and experiences severe pain after walking for long periods of time.
4. A specialist has provided documentation that the employee has the disability, and the specialist recommends that the employer provide the employee an electric scooter to reduce the amount of walking required while inspecting properties.
5. The proposed accommodation is estimated to cost the employer around $500.
6. The employee is covered by the ADA. That is, the employee has a disability that substantially limits a major life activity, and the employee is capable of performing the job with the proposed accommodation.

Based on the information above, to what extent is the proposed accommodation reasonable? Please indicate your answer by circling the number on the scale below that best represents how reasonable you think the accommodation is in this situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EXTREMELY</td>
<td>QUITE</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY</td>
<td>NEITHER</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY</td>
<td>QUITE</td>
<td>EXTREMELY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nor Reasonable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Profile No. 6

An employee of a privately owned real estate business (which employs 50 people) has a job inspecting property (land and buildings). The employee drives to the properties to photograph them, estimate their value, and write a short report. The following factors are present:

1. The employee was hired by the company yesterday.
2. References indicate that the employee has been a high performer.
3. The employee has a back impairment and experiences severe pain after walking for long periods of time.
4. A specialist has provided documentation that the employee has the disability, and the specialist recommends that the employee receive physical therapy to reduce the pain. To enable the employee to receive therapy during clinic hours, the employer has been asked to let the person leave work an hour early once a week. The employer is not being asked to pay for the therapy, but there is a cost associated with leaving early.
5. The proposed accommodation is estimated to cost the employer around $500 over the course of the year.
6. The employee is covered by the ADA. That is, the employee has a disability that substantially limits a major life activity, and the employee is capable of performing the job with the proposed accommodation.

Based on the information above, to what extent is the proposed accommodation reasonable? Please indicate your answer by circling the number on the scale below that best represents how reasonable you think the accommodation is in this situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXTREMELY</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>NOT REASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUIT</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLIGHTLY</td>
<td>NEITHER</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY</td>
<td>QUITE</td>
<td>EXTREMELY</td>
<td>NOT REASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLIGHTLY</td>
<td>NEITHER</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY</td>
<td>QUITE</td>
<td>EXTREMELY</td>
<td>NOT REASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neither</td>
<td>slightly</td>
<td>neither</td>
<td>slightly</td>
<td>quite</td>
<td>extremely</td>
<td>not reasonable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Profile No. 7

An employee of a privately owned real estate business (which employs 50 people) has a job inspecting property (land and buildings). The employee drives to the properties to photograph them, estimate their value, and write a short report. The following factors are present:

1. The employee was hired by the company yesterday.
2. References indicate that the employee has been a high performer.
3. The employee has a back impairment and experiences severe pain after walking for long periods of time.
4. A specialist has provided documentation that the employee has the disability, and the specialist recommends that the employer provide the employee an electric cart to reduce the amount of walking required while inspecting properties.
5. The proposed accommodation is estimated to cost the employer around $6,000.
6. The employee is covered by the ADA. That is, the employee has a disability that substantially limits a major life activity, and the employee is capable of performing the job with the proposed accommodation.

Based on the information above, to what extent is the proposed accommodation reasonable? Please indicate your answer by circling the number on the scale below that best represents how reasonable you think the accommodation is in this situation.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7

EXTREMELY  QUITE  SLIGHTLY  NEITHER  SLIGHTLY  QUITE  EXTREMELY
UNREASONABLE  UNREASONABLE  UNREASONABLE  UNREASONABLE  REASONABLE  REASONABLE  REASONABLE
NOR REASONABLE
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Profile No. 8

An employee of a privately owned real estate business (which employs 50 people) has a job inspecting property (land and buildings). The employee drives to the properties to photograph them, estimate their value, and write a short report. The following factors are present:

1. The employee was hired by the company yesterday.
2. References indicate that the employee has been a high performer.
3. The employee has a back impairment and experiences severe pain after walking for long periods of time.
4. A specialist has provided documentation that the employee has the disability, and the specialist recommends that the employee receive physical therapy to reduce the pain. To enable the employee to receive therapy during clinic hours, the employer has been asked to let the person leave work an hour early twice a week. The employer is not being asked to pay for the therapy, but there is a cost associated with leaving early.
5. The proposed accommodation is estimated to cost the employer around $6,000 over the course of the year.
6. The employee is covered by the ADA. That is, the employee has a disability that substantially limits a major life activity, and the employee is capable of performing the job with the proposed accommodation.

Based on the information above, to what extent is the proposed accommodation reasonable? Please indicate your answer by circling the number on the scale below that best represents how reasonable you think the accommodation is in this situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EXTREMELY</td>
<td>QUITE</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY</td>
<td>NEITHER</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY</td>
<td>QUITE</td>
<td>EXTREMELY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOR REASONABLE</td>
<td>NOR REASONABLE</td>
<td>NOR REASONABLE</td>
<td>NOR REASONABLE</td>
<td>NOR REASONABLE</td>
<td>NOR REASONABLE</td>
<td>NOR REASONABLE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Profile No. 9

An employee of a privately owned real estate business (which employs 50 people) has a job inspecting property (land and buildings). The employee drives to the properties to photograph them, estimate their value, and write a short report. The following factors are present:

1. The employee has worked for the company for five years.
2. The employee has been a low performer.
3. The employee has a back impairment and experiences severe pain after walking for long periods of time.
4. A specialist has provided documentation that the employee has the disability, and the specialist recommends that the employer provide the employee an electric scooter to reduce the amount of walking required while inspecting properties.
5. The proposed accommodation is estimated to cost the employer around $500.
6. The employee is covered by the ADA. That is, the employee has a disability that substantially limits a major life activity, and the employee is capable of performing the job with the proposed accommodation.

Based on the information above, to what extent is the proposed accommodation reasonable? Please indicate your answer by circling the number on the scale below that best represents how reasonable you think the accommodation is in this situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXTREMELY UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>QUITE UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>NEITHER UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY REASONABLE</td>
<td>QUITE REASONABLE</td>
<td>EXTREMELY REASONABLE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Profile No. 10

An employee of a privately owned real estate business (which employs 50 people) has a job inspecting property (land and buildings). The employee drives to the properties to photograph them, estimate their value, and write a short report. The following factors are present:

1. The employee has worked for the company for five years.
2. The employee has been a low performer.
3. The employee has a back impairment and experiences severe pain after walking for long periods of time.
4. A specialist has provided documentation that the employee has the disability, and the specialist recommends that the employee receive physical therapy to reduce the pain. To enable the employee to receive therapy during clinic hours, the employer has been asked to let the person leave work an hour early once a week. The employer is not being asked to pay for the therapy, but there is a cost associated with leaving early.
5. The proposed accommodation is estimated to cost the employer around $500 over the course of the year.
6. The employee is covered by the ADA. That is, the employee has a disability that substantially limits a major life activity, and the employee is capable of performing the job with the proposed accommodation.

Based on the information above, to what extent is the proposed accommodation reasonable? Please indicate your answer by circling the number on the scale below that best represents how reasonable you think the accommodation is in this situation.
Profile No. 11

An employee of a privately owned real estate business (which employs 50 people) has a job inspecting property (land and buildings). The employee drives to the properties to photograph them, estimate their value, and write a short report. The following factors are present:

1. The employee has worked for the company for five years.
2. The employee has been a low performer.
3. The employee has a back impairment and experiences severe pain after walking for long periods of time.
4. A specialist has provided documentation that the employee has the disability, and the specialist recommends that the employer provide the employee an electric cart to reduce the amount of walking required while inspecting properties.
5. The proposed accommodation is estimated to cost the employer around $6,000.
6. The employee is covered by the ADA. That is, the employee has a disability that substantially limits a major life activity, and the employee is capable of performing the job with the proposed accommodation.

Based on the information above, to what extent is the proposed accommodation reasonable? Please indicate your answer by circling the number on the scale below that best represents how reasonable you think the accommodation is in this situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXTREMELY</td>
<td>QUITE</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY</td>
<td>NEITHER</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY</td>
<td>QUITE</td>
<td>EXTREMELY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Profile No. 12

An employee of a privately owned real estate business (which employs 50 people) has a job inspecting property (land and buildings). The employee drives to the properties to photograph them, estimate their value, and write a short report. The following factors are present:

1. The employee has worked for the company for five years.
2. The employee has been a low performer.
3. The employee has a back impairment and experiences severe pain after walking for long periods of time.
4. A specialist has provided documentation that the employee has the disability, and the specialist recommends that the employee receive physical therapy to reduce the pain. To enable the employee to receive therapy during clinic hours, the employer has been asked to let the person leave work an hour early twice a week. The employer is not being asked to pay for the therapy, but there is a cost associated with leaving early.
5. The proposed accommodation is estimated to cost the employer around $6,000 over the course of the year.
6. The employee is covered by the ADA. That is, the employee has a disability that substantially limits a major life activity, and the employee is capable of performing the job with the proposed accommodation.

Based on the information above, to what extent is the proposed accommodation reasonable? Please indicate your answer by circling the number on the scale below that best represents how reasonable you think the accommodation is in this situation.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Extremely Quite Slightly Neither Slightly Quite Extremely
Unreasonable Unreasonable Unreasonable Unreasonable Reasonable Reasonable Reasonable
Not Reasonable
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Profile No. 13

An employee of a privately owned real estate business (which employs 50 people) has a job inspecting property (land and buildings). The employee drives to the properties to photograph them, estimate their value, and write a short report. The following factors are present:

1. The employee was hired by the company yesterday.
2. References indicate that the employee has been a low performer.
3. The employee has a back impairment and experiences severe pain after walking for long periods of time.
4. A specialist has provided documentation that the employee has the disability, and the specialist recommends that the employer provide the employee an electric scooter to reduce the amount of walking required while inspecting properties.
5. The proposed accommodation is estimated to cost the employer around $500.
6. The employee is covered by the ADA. That is, the employee has a disability that substantially limits a major life activity, and the employee is capable of performing the job with the proposed accommodation.

Based on the information above, to what extent is the proposed accommodation reasonable? Please indicate your answer by circling the number on the scale below that best represents how reasonable you think the accommodation is in this situation.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
EXTREMELY  QUITE  SLIGHTLY  NEITHER  SLIGHTLY  QUITE  EXTREMELY
UNREASONABLE  UNREASONABLE  UNREASONABLE  UNREASONABLE  REASONABLE  REASONABLE  REASONABLE
    NOT REASONABLE
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Profile No. 14

An employee of a privately owned real estate business (which employs 50 people) has a job inspecting property (land and buildings). The employee drives to the properties to photograph them, estimate their value, and write a short report. The following factors are present:

1. The employee was hired by the company yesterday.
2. References indicate that the employee has been a low performer.
3. The employee has a back impairment and experiences severe pain after walking for long periods of time.
4. A specialist has provided documentation that the employee has the disability, and the specialist recommends that the employee receive physical therapy to reduce the pain. To enable the employee to receive therapy during clinic hours, the employer has been asked to let the person leave work an hour early once a week. The employer is not being asked to pay for the therapy, but there is a cost associated with leaving early.
5. The proposed accommodation is estimated to cost the employer around $500 over the course of the year.
6. The employee is covered by the ADA. That is, the employee has a disability that substantially limits a major life activity, and the employee is capable of performing the job with the proposed accommodation.

Based on the information above, to what extent is the proposed accommodation reasonable? Please indicate your answer by circling the number on the scale below that best represents how reasonable you think the accommodation is in this situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXTREMELY UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>QUIT UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>NEITHER UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY REASONABLE</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY REASONABLE</td>
<td>QUIT REASONABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOR REASONABLE</td>
<td>NOR REASONABLE</td>
<td>NOR REASONABLE</td>
<td>NEITHER</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Profile No. 15

An employee of a privately owned real estate business (which employs 50 people) has a job inspecting property (land and buildings). The employee drives to the properties to photograph them, estimate their value, and write a short report. The following factors are present:

1. The employee was hired by the company yesterday.
2. References indicate that the employee has been a low performer.
3. The employee has a back impairment and experiences severe pain after walking for long periods of time.
4. A specialist has provided documentation that the employee has the disability, and the specialist recommends that the employer provide the employee an electric cart to reduce the amount of walking required while inspecting properties.
5. The proposed accommodation is estimated to cost the employer around $6,000.
6. The employee is covered by the ADA. That is, the employee has a disability that substantially limits a major life activity, and the employee is capable of performing the job with the proposed accommodation.

Based on the information above, to what extent is the proposed accommodation reasonable? Please indicate your answer by circling the number on the scale below that best represents how reasonable you think the accommodation is in this situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXTREMELY UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>QUITE UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>NEITHER UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY REASONABLE</td>
<td>QUITE REASONABLE</td>
<td>EXTREMELY REASONABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT REASONABLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Profile No. 16

An employee of a privately owned real estate business (which employs 50 people) has a job inspecting property (land and buildings). The employee drives to the properties to photograph them, estimate their value, and write a short report. The following factors are present:

1. The employee was hired by the company yesterday.
2. References indicate that the employee has been a low performer.
3. The employee has a back impairment and experiences severe pain after walking for long periods of time.
4. A specialist has provided documentation that the employee has the disability, and the specialist recommends that the employee receive physical therapy to reduce the pain. To enable the employee to receive therapy during clinic hours, the employer has been asked to let the person leave work an hour early twice a week. The employer is not being asked to pay for the therapy, but there is a cost associated with leaving early.
5. The proposed accommodation is estimated to cost the employer around $6,000 over the course of the year.
6. The employee is covered by the ADA. That is, the employee has a disability that substantially limits a major life activity, and the employee is capable of performing the job with the proposed accommodation.

Based on the information above, to what extent is the proposed accommodation reasonable? Please indicate your answer by circling the number on the scale below that best represents how reasonable you think the accommodation is in this situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EXTREMELY UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>QUITE UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>NEITHER UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY REASONABLE</td>
<td>QUITE REASONABLE</td>
<td>EXTREMELY REASONABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

81
Profile No. 17

An employee of a privately owned real estate business (which employs 50 people) has a job inspecting property (land and buildings). The employee drives to the properties to photograph them, estimate their value, and write a short report. The following factors are present:

1. The employee has worked for the company for five years.
2. The employee has been a high performer.
3. The employee has a learning disability that causes the employee difficulty in writing reports of the properties. Specifically, the reports often contain spelling errors and poor handwriting.
4. A specialist has provided documentation that the employee has the disability, and the specialist recommends that the employer provide the employee a word processor that will check the employee's spelling and print the reports required.
5. The proposed accommodation is estimated to cost the employer around $500.
6. The employee is covered by the ADA. That is, the employee has a disability that substantially limits a major life activity, and the employee is capable of performing the job with the proposed accommodation.

Based on the information above, to what extent is the proposed accommodation reasonable? Please indicate your answer by circling the number on the scale below that best represents how reasonable you think the accommodation is in this situation.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
EXTREMELY QUITE SLIGHTLY NEITHER SLIGHTLY QUITE EXTREMELY
UNREASONABLE UNREASONABLE UNREASONABLE UNREASONABLE REASONABLE REASONABLE REASONABLE
NOR REASONABLE
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Profile No. 18

An employee of a privately owned real estate business (which employs 50 people) has a job inspecting property (land and buildings). The employee drives to the properties to photograph them, estimate their value, and write a short report. The following factors are present:

1. The employee has worked for the company for five years.
2. The employee has been a high performer.
3. The employee has a learning disability that causes the employee difficulty in writing reports of the properties. Specifically, the reports often contain spelling errors, grammar errors, and poor handwriting.
4. A specialist has provided documentation that the employee has the disability, and the specialist recommends that the person enroll in a course designed to help persons with learning disabilities learn to compensate for their weaknesses. Because the course is held during the early evening, the employer has been asked to let the person leave work an hour early once a week. This course will be paid for by a private agency, but there is a cost to the employer associated with leaving early.
5. The proposed accommodation is estimated to cost the employer around $500 over the course of the year.
6. The employee is covered by the ADA. That is, the employee has a disability that substantially limits a major life activity, and the employee is capable of performing the job with the proposed accommodation.

Based on the information above, to what extent is the proposed accommodation reasonable? Please indicate your answer by circling the number on the scale below that best represents how reasonable you think the accommodation is in this situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Unreasonable</td>
<td>Quite Unreasonable</td>
<td>Slightly Unreasonable</td>
<td>Neither Unreasonable</td>
<td>Slightly Reasonable</td>
<td>Quite Reasonable</td>
<td>Extremely Reasonable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreasonable</td>
<td>Unreasonable</td>
<td>Unreasonable</td>
<td>Unreasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Profile No. 19

An employee of a privately owned real estate business (which employs 50 people) has a job inspecting property (land and buildings). The employee drives to the properties to photograph them, estimate their value, and write a short report. The following factors are present:

1. The employee has worked for the company for five years.
2. The employee has been a high performer.
3. The employee has a learning disability that causes the employee difficulty in writing reports of the properties. Specifically, the reports often contain spelling errors, grammar errors, and poor handwriting.
4. A specialist has provided documentation that the employee has the disability, and the specialist recommends that the employer provide the employee a laptop computer with writing programs to check the employee's spelling and grammar in reports required while inspecting properties.
5. The proposed accommodation is estimated to cost the employer around $6,000.
6. The employee is covered by the ADA. That is, the employee has a disability that substantially limits a major life activity, and the employee is capable of performing the job with the proposed accommodation.

Based on the information above, to what extent is the proposed accommodation reasonable? Please indicate your answer by circling the number on the scale below that best represents how reasonable you think the accommodation is in this situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXTREMELY UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>QUITE UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>NEITHER UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY REASONABLE</td>
<td>QUITE REASONABLE</td>
<td>EXTREMELY REASONABLE</td>
<td>NOR REASONABLE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Profile No. 20

An employee of a privately owned real estate business (which employs 50 people) has a job inspecting property (land and buildings). The employee drives to the properties to photograph them, estimate their value, and write a short report. The following factors are present:

1. The employee has worked for the company for five years.
2. The employee has been a high performer.
3. The employee has a learning disability that causes the employee difficulty in writing reports of the properties. Specifically, the reports often contain spelling errors, grammar errors, and poor handwriting.
4. A specialist has provided documentation that the employee has the disability, and the specialist recommends that the person enroll in a course designed to help persons with learning disabilities learn to compensate for their weaknesses. Because the course is held during the early evening, the employer has been asked to let the person leave work an hour early twice a week. This course will be paid for by a private agency, but there is a cost to the employer associated with leaving early.
5. The proposed accommodation is estimated to cost the employer around $6,000 over the course of the year.
6. The employee is covered by the ADA. That is, the employee has a disability that substantially limits a major life activity, and the employee is capable of performing the job with the proposed accommodation.

Based on the information above, to what extent is the proposed accommodation reasonable? Please indicate your answer by circling the number on the scale below that best represents how reasonable you think the accommodation is in this situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXTREMELY</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
<td>EXTREMELY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUITE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLIGHTLY</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEITHER</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLIGHTLY</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUIT</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXTREMELY</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Profile No. 21

An employee of a privately owned real estate business (which employs 50 people) has a job inspecting property (land and buildings). The employee drives to the properties to photograph them, estimate their value, and write a short report. The following factors are present:

1. The employee was hired by the company yesterday.
2. References indicate that the employee has been a high performer.
3. The employee has a learning disability that causes difficulty in writing reports. Specifically, the writing often contains spelling errors and poor handwriting.
4. A specialist has provided documentation that the employee has the disability, and the specialist recommends that the employer provide the employee a word processor that will check the employee's spelling and print the reports required.
5. The proposed accommodation is estimated to cost the employer around $500.
6. The employee is covered by the ADA. That is, the employee has a disability that substantially limits a major life activity, and the employee is capable of performing the job with the proposed accommodation.

Based on the information above, to what extent is the proposed accommodation reasonable? Please indicate your answer by circling the number on the scale below that best represents how reasonable you think the accommodation is in this situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EXTREMELY</td>
<td>QUITE</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY</td>
<td>NEITHER</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY</td>
<td>QUITE</td>
<td>EXTREMELY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Profile No. 22

An employee of a privately owned real estate business (which employs 50 people) has a job inspecting property (land and buildings). The employee drives to the properties to photograph them, estimate their value, and write a short report. The following factors are present:

1. The employee was hired by the company yesterday.
2. References indicate that the employee has been a high performer.
3. The employee has a learning disability that causes difficulty in writing reports. Specifically, the writing often contains spelling errors, grammar errors, and poor handwriting.
4. A specialist has provided documentation that the employee has the disability, and the specialist recommends that the person enroll in a course designed to help persons with learning disabilities learn to compensate for their weaknesses. Because the course is held during the early evening, the employer has been asked to let the person leave work an hour early once a week. This course will be paid for by a private agency, but there is a cost to the employer associated with leaving early.
5. The proposed accommodation is estimated to cost the employer around $500 over the course of the year.
6. The employee is covered by the ADA. That is, the employee has a disability that substantially limits a major life activity, and the employee is capable of performing the job with the proposed accommodation.

Based on the information above, to what extent is the proposed accommodation reasonable? Please indicate your answer by circling the number on the scale below that best represents how reasonable you think the accommodation is in this situation.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
EXTREMELY QUITE SLIGHTLY NEITHER SLIGHTLY QUITE EXTREMELY
UNREASONABLE UNREASONABLE UNREASONABLE UNREASONABLE REASONABLE REASONABLE REASONABLE
NOR REASONABLE
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Profile No. 23

An employee of a privately owned real estate business (which employs 50 people) has a job inspecting property (land and buildings). The employee drives to the properties to photograph them, estimate their value, and write a short report. The following factors are present:

1. The employee was hired by the company yesterday.
2. References indicate that the employee has been a high performer.
3. The employee has a learning disability that causes difficulty in writing reports. Specifically, the writing often contains spelling errors, grammar errors, and poor handwriting.
4. A specialist has provided documentation that the employee has the disability, and the specialist recommends that the employer provide the employee a laptop computer with writing programs to check the employee's spelling and grammar in reports required while inspecting properties.
5. The proposed accommodation is estimated to cost the employer around $6,000.
6. The employee is covered by the ADA. That is, the employee has a disability that substantially limits a major life activity, and the employee is capable of performing the job with the proposed accommodation.

Based on the information above, to what extent is the proposed accommodation reasonable? Please indicate your answer by circling the number on the scale below that best represents how reasonable you think the accommodation is in this situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXTREMELY UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>QUITE UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>NEITHER UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY REASONABLE</td>
<td>QUITE REASONABLE</td>
<td>EXTREMELY REASONABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOR REASONABLE</td>
<td>NOR REASONABLE</td>
<td>NOR REASONABLE</td>
<td>NOR REASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Profile No. 24

An employee of a privately owned real estate business (which employs 50 people) has a job inspecting property (land and buildings). The employee drives to the properties to photograph them, estimate their value, and write a short report. The following factors are present:

1. The employee was hired by the company yesterday.
2. References indicate that the employee has been a high performer.
3. The employee has a learning disability that causes difficulty in writing reports. Specifically, the writing often contains spelling errors, grammar errors, and poor handwriting.
4. A specialist has provided documentation that the employee has the disability, and the specialist recommends that the person enroll in a course designed to help persons with learning disabilities learn to compensate for their weaknesses. Because the course is held during the early evening, the employer has been asked to let the person leave work an hour early twice a week. This course will be paid for by a private agency, but there is a cost to the employer associated with leaving early.
5. The proposed accommodation is estimated to cost the employer around $6,000 over the course of the year.
6. The employee is covered by the ADA. That is, the employee has a disability that substantially limits a major life activity, and the employee is capable of performing the job with the proposed accommodation.

Based on the information above, to what extent is the proposed accommodation reasonable? Please indicate your answer by circling the number on the scale below that best represents how reasonable you think the accommodation is in this situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXTREMELY UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>QUITE UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>NEITHER UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY REASONABLE</td>
<td>QUITE REASONABLE</td>
<td>EXTREMELY REASONABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXTREMELY UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXTREMELY UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>NORTHEAST</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>NEITHER</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An employee of a privately owned real estate business (which employs 50 people) has a job inspecting property (land and buildings). The employee drives to the properties to photograph them, estimate their value, and write a short report. The following factors are present:

1. The employee has worked for the company for five years.
2. The employee has been a low performer.
3. The employee has a learning disability that causes the employee difficulty in writing reports of the properties. Specifically, the reports often contain spelling errors and poor handwriting.
4. A specialist has provided documentation that the employee has the disability, and the specialist recommends that the employer provide the employee a word processor that will check the employee's spelling and print the reports required.
5. The proposed accommodation is estimated to cost the employer around $500.
6. The employee is covered by the ADA. That is, the employee has a disability that substantially limits a major life activity, and the employee is capable of performing the job with the proposed accommodation.

Based on the information above, to what extent is the proposed accommodation reasonable? Please indicate your answer by circling the number on the scale below that best represents how reasonable you think the accommodation is in this situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely</td>
<td>Quite</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>Quite</td>
<td>Extremely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreasonable</td>
<td>Unreasonable</td>
<td>Unreasonable</td>
<td>Unreasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Not Reasonable | }
Profile No. 26

An employee of a privately owned real estate business (which employs 50 people) has a job inspecting property (land and buildings). The employee drives to the properties to photograph them, estimate their value, and write a short report. The following factors are present:

1. The employee has worked for the company for five years.
2. The employee has been a low performer.
3. The employee has a learning disability that causes the employee difficulty in writing reports of the properties. Specifically, the reports often contain spelling errors, grammar errors, and poor handwriting.
4. A specialist has provided documentation that the employee has the disability, and the specialist recommends that the person enroll in a course designed to help persons with learning disabilities learn to compensate for their weaknesses. Because the course is held during the early evening, the employer has been asked to let the person leave work an hour early once a week. This course will be paid for by a private agency, but there is a cost to the employer associated with leaving early.
5. The proposed accommodation is estimated to cost the employer around $500 over the course of the year.
6. The employee is covered by the ADA. That is, the employee has a disability that substantially limits a major life activity, and the employee is capable of performing the job with the proposed accommodation.

Based on the information above, to what extent is the proposed accommodation reasonable? Please indicate your answer by circling the number on the scale below that best represents how reasonable you think the accommodation is in this situation.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
EXTREMELY QUITE SLIGHTLY NEITHER SLIGHTLY QUIET EXTREMELY
UNREASONABLE UNREASONABLE UNREASONABLE UNREASONABLE Reasonable Reasonable Reasonable
NOR REASONABLE
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Profile No. 27

An employee of a privately owned real estate business (which employs 50 people) has a job inspecting property (land and buildings). The employee drives to the properties to photograph them, estimate their value, and write a short report. The following factors are present:

1. The employee has worked for the company for five years.
2. The employee has been a low performer.
3. The employee has a learning disability that causes the employee difficulty in writing reports of the properties. Specifically, the reports often contain spelling errors, grammar errors, and poor handwriting.
4. A specialist has provided documentation that the employee has the disability, and the specialist recommends that the employer provide the employee a laptop computer with writing programs to check the employee's spelling and grammar in reports required while inspecting properties.
5. The proposed accommodation is estimated to cost the employer around $6,000.
6. The employee is covered by the ADA. That is, the employee has a disability that substantially limits a major life activity, and the employee is capable of performing the job with the proposed accommodation.

Based on the information above, to what extent is the proposed accommodation reasonable? Please indicate your answer by circling the number on the scale below that best represents how reasonable you think the accommodation is in this situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXTREMELY UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>QUITE UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>NEITHER UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY REASONABLE</td>
<td>QUITE REASONABLE</td>
<td>EXTREMELY REASONABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT REASONABLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Profile No. 28

An employee of a privately owned real estate business (which employs 50 people) has a job inspecting property (land and buildings). The employee drives to the properties to photograph them, estimate their value, and write a short report. The following factors are present:

1. The employee has worked for the company for five years.
2. The employee has been a low performer.
3. The employee has a learning disability that causes the employee difficulty in writing reports of the properties. Specifically, the reports often contain spelling errors, grammar errors, and poor handwriting.
4. A specialist has provided documentation that the employee has the disability, and the specialist recommends that the person enroll in a course designed to help persons with learning disabilities learn to compensate for their weaknesses. Because the course is held during the early evening, the employer has been asked to let the person leave work an hour early twice a week. This course will be paid for by a private agency, but there is a cost to the employer associated with leaving early.
5. The proposed accommodation is estimated to cost the employer around $6,000 over the course of the year.
6. The employee is covered by the ADA. That is, the employee has a disability that substantially limits a major life activity, and the employee is capable of performing the job with the proposed accommodation.

Based on the information above, to what extent is the proposed accommodation reasonable? Please indicate your answer by circling the number on the scale below that best represents how reasonable you think the accommodation is in this situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXTREMELY UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>QUITE UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>NEITHER</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY REASONABLE</td>
<td>QUITE REASONABLE</td>
<td>EXTREMELY REASONABLE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Profile No. 29

An employee of a privately owned real estate business (which employs 50 people) has a job inspecting property (land and buildings). The employee drives to the properties to photograph them, estimate their value, and write a short report. The following factors are present:

1. The employee was hired by the company yesterday.
2. References indicate that the employee has been a low performer.
3. The employee has a learning disability that causes difficulty in writing reports. Specifically, the writing often contains spelling errors and poor handwriting.
4. A specialist has provided documentation that the employee has the disability, and the specialist recommends that the employer provide the employee a word processor that will check the employee's spelling and print the reports required.
5. The proposed accommodation is estimated to cost the employer around $500.
6. The employee is covered by the ADA. That is, the employee has a disability that substantially limits a major life activity, and the employee is capable of performing the job with the proposed accommodation.

Based on the information above, to what extent is the proposed accommodation reasonable? Please indicate your answer by circling the number on the scale below that best represents how reasonable you think the accommodation is in this situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXTREMELY UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>QUITE UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>NEITHER UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY REASONABLE</td>
<td>QUTE REASONABLE</td>
<td>EXTREMELY REASONABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOR REASONABLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Profile No. 30

An employee of a privately owned real estate business (which employs 50 people) has a job inspecting property (land and buildings). The employee drives to the properties to photograph them, estimate their value, and write a short report. The following factors are present:

1. The employee was hired by the company yesterday.
2. References indicate that the employee has been a low performer.
3. The employee has a learning disability that causes difficulty in writing reports. Specifically, the writing often contains spelling errors, grammar errors, and poor handwriting.
4. A specialist has provided documentation that the employee has the disability, and the specialist recommends that the person enroll in a course designed to help persons with learning disabilities learn to compensate for their weaknesses. Because the course is held during the early evening, the employer has been asked to let the person leave work an hour early once a week. This course will be paid for by a private agency, but there is a cost to the employer associated with leaving early.
5. The proposed accommodation is estimated to cost the employer around $500 over the course of the year.
6. The employee is covered by the ADA. That is, the employee has a disability that substantially limits a major life activity, and the employee is capable of performing the job with the proposed accommodation.

Based on the information above, to what extent is the proposed accommodation reasonable? Please indicate your answer by circling the number on the scale below that best represents how reasonable you think the accommodation is in this situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXTREMELY</td>
<td>QUITE</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY</td>
<td>NEITHER</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY</td>
<td>QUITE</td>
<td>EXTREMELY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT REASONABLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Profile No. 31

An employee of a privately owned real estate business (which employs 50 people) has a job inspecting property (land and buildings). The employee drives to the properties to photograph them, estimate their value, and write a short report. The following factors are present:

1. The employee was hired by the company *yesterday*.
2. References indicate that the employee has been a *low performer*.
3. The employee has a *learning disability* that causes difficulty in writing reports. Specifically, the writing often contains spelling errors, grammar errors, and poor handwriting.
4. A specialist has provided documentation that the employee has the disability, and the specialist recommends that the employer provide the employee a *laptop computer* with writing programs to check the employee's spelling and grammar in reports required while inspecting properties.
5. The proposed accommodation is estimated to cost the employer around $6,000.
6. The employee is covered by the ADA. That is, the employee has a disability that substantially limits a major life activity, and the employee is capable of performing the job with the proposed accommodation.

Based on the information above, to what extent is the proposed accommodation reasonable? Please indicate your answer by circling the number on the scale below that best represents how reasonable you think the accommodation is in this situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Unreasonable</td>
<td>Quite Unreasonable</td>
<td>Slightly Unreasonable</td>
<td>Neither Unreasonable</td>
<td>Slightly Reasonable</td>
<td>Quite Reasonable</td>
<td>Extremely Reasonable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Profile No. 32

An employee of a privately owned real estate business (which employs 50 people) has a job inspecting property (land and buildings). The employee drives to the properties to photograph them, estimate their value, and write a short report. The following factors are present:

1. The employee was hired by the company yesterday.
2. References indicate that the employee has been a low performer.
3. The employee has a learning disability that causes difficulty in writing reports. Specifically, the writing often contains spelling errors, grammar errors, and poor handwriting.
4. A specialist has provided documentation that the employee has the disability, and the specialist recommends that the person enroll in a course designed to help persons with learning disabilities learn to compensate for their weaknesses. Because the course is held during the early evening, the employer has been asked to let the person leave work an hour early twice a week. This course will be paid for by a private agency, but there is a cost to the employer associated with leaving early.
5. The proposed accommodation is estimated to cost the employer around $6,000 over the course of the year.
6. The employee is covered by the ADA. That is, the employee has a disability that substantially limits a major life activity, and the employee is capable of performing the job with the proposed accommodation.

Based on the information above, to what extent is the proposed accommodation reasonable? Please indicate your answer by circling the number on the scale below that best represents how reasonable you think the accommodation is in this situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXTREMELY UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>QUITE UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>NEITHER UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY REASONABLE</td>
<td>QUITE REASONABLE</td>
<td>EXTREMELY REASONABLE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Profile No. 33

An employee of a privately owned real estate business (which employs 50 people) has a job inspecting property (land and buildings). The employee drives to the properties to photograph them, estimate their value, and write a short report. The following factors are present:

1. The employee has worked for the company for five years.
2. The employee's previous performance information is not available.
3. The employee has a back impairment and experiences severe pain after walking for long periods of time.
4. A specialist has provided documentation that the employee has the disability, and the specialist recommends that the employer provide the employee an electric scooter to reduce the amount of walking required while inspecting properties.
5. The proposed accommodation is estimated to cost the employer around $500.
6. The employee is covered by the ADA. That is, the employee has a disability that substantially limits a major life activity, and the employee is capable of performing the job with the proposed accommodation.

Based on the information above, to what extent is the proposed accommodation reasonable? Please indicate your answer by circling the number on the scale below that best represents how reasonable you think the accommodation is in this situation.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
EXTRAEMELY QUITE SLIGHTLY NEITHER SLIGHTLY QUITE EXTRAEMELY
UNREASONABLE UNREASONABLE UNREASONABLE UNREASONABLE REASONABLE REASONABLE REASONABLE
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Profile No. 34

An employee of a privately owned real estate business (which employs 50 people) has a job inspecting property (land and buildings). The employee drives to the properties to photograph them, estimate their value, and write a short report. The following factors are present:

1. The employee has worked for the company for five years.
2. The employee's previous performance information is not available.
3. The employee has a back impairment and experiences severe pain after walking for long periods of time.
4. A specialist has provided documentation that the employee has the disability, and the specialist recommends that the employee receive physical therapy to reduce the pain. To enable the employee to receive therapy during clinic hours, the employer has been asked to let the person leave work an hour early once a week. The employer is not being asked to pay for the therapy, but there is a cost associated with leaving early.
5. The proposed accommodation is estimated to cost the employer around $500 over the course of the year.
6. The employee is covered by the ADA. That is, the employee has a disability that substantially limits a major life activity, and the employee is capable of performing the job with the proposed accommodation.

Based on the information above, to what extent is the proposed accommodation reasonable? Please indicate your answer by circling the number on the scale below that best represents how reasonable you think the accommodation is in this situation.
Profile No. 35

An employee of a privately owned real estate business (which employs 50 people) has a job inspecting property (land and buildings). The employee drives to the properties to photograph them, estimate their value, and write a short report. The following factors are present:

1. The employee has worked for the company for five years.
2. The employee's previous performance information is not available.
3. The employee has a back impairment and experiences severe pain after walking for long periods of time.
4. A specialist has provided documentation that the employee has the disability, and the specialist recommends that the employer provide the employee an electric cart to reduce the amount of walking required while inspecting properties.
5. The proposed accommodation is estimated to cost the employer around $6,000.
6. The employee is covered by the ADA. That is, the employee has a disability that substantially limits a major life activity, and the employee is capable of performing the job with the proposed accommodation.

Based on the information above, to what extent is the proposed accommodation reasonable? Please indicate your answer by circling the number on the scale below that best represents how reasonable you think the accommodation is in this situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXTREMELY UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>QUITE UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>NEITHER UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY REASONABLE</td>
<td>QUITE REASONABLE</td>
<td>EXTREMELY REASONABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOR REASONABLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Profile No. 36

An employee of a privately owned real estate business (which employs 50 people) has a job inspecting property (land and buildings). The employee drives to the properties to photograph them, estimate their value, and write a short report. The following factors are present:

1. The employee has worked for the company for five years.
2. The employee's previous performance information is not available.
3. The employee has a back impairment and experiences severe pain after walking for long periods of time.
4. A specialist has provided documentation that the employee has the disability, and the specialist recommends that the employee receive physical therapy to reduce the pain. To enable the employee to receive therapy during clinic hours, the employer has been asked to let the person leave work an hour early twice a week. The employer is not being asked to pay for the therapy, but there is a cost associated with leaving early.
5. The proposed accommodation is estimated to cost the employer around $6,000 over the course of the year.
6. The employee is covered by the ADA. That is, the employee has a disability that substantially limits a major life activity, and the employee is capable of performing the job with the proposed accommodation.

Based on the information above, to what extent is the proposed accommodation reasonable? Please indicate your answer by circling the number on the scale below that best represents how reasonable you think the accommodation is in this situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXTREMELY</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUITE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLIGHTLY</td>
<td>NEITHER</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEITHER</td>
<td>NEITHER</td>
<td>NEITHER</td>
<td>NEITHER</td>
<td>NEITHER</td>
<td>NEITHER</td>
<td>NEITHER</td>
<td>NEITHER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Profile No. 37

An employee of a privately owned real estate business (which employs 50 people) has a job inspecting property (land and buildings). The employee drives to the properties to photograph them, estimate their value, and write a short report. The following factors are present:

1. The employee was hired by the company yesterday.
2. The employee's previous performance information is not available.
3. The employee has a back impairment and experiences severe pain after walking for long periods of time.
4. A specialist has provided documentation that the employee has the disability, and the specialist recommends that the employer provide the employee an electric scooter to reduce the amount of walking required while inspecting properties.
5. The proposed accommodation is estimated to cost the employer around $500.
6. The employee is covered by the ADA. That is, the employee has a disability that substantially limits a major life activity, and the employee is capable of performing the job with the proposed accommodation.

Based on the information above, to what extent is the proposed accommodation reasonable? Please indicate your answer by circling the number on the scale below that best represents how reasonable you think the accommodation is in this situation.

1________2________3________4________5________6________7

**EXTREMELY** **QUIETLY** **SLIGHTLY** **NEITHER** **SLIGHTLY** **QUIET** **EXTREMELY**

**UNREASONABLE** **UNREASONABLE** **UNREASONABLE** **UNREASONABLE** **REASONABLE** **REASONABLE** **REASONABLE**

**AND UNREASONABLE**
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Profile No. 38

An employee of a privately owned real estate business (which employs 50 people) has a job inspecting property (land and buildings). The employee drives to the properties to photograph them, estimate their value, and write a short report. The following factors are present:

1. The employee was hired by the company yesterday.
2. The employee's previous performance information is not available.
3. The employee has a back impairment and experiences severe pain after walking for long periods of time.
4. A specialist has provided documentation that the employee has the disability, and the specialist recommends that the employee receive physical therapy to reduce the pain. To enable the employee to receive therapy during clinic hours, the employer has been asked to let the person leave work an hour early once a week. The employer is not being asked to pay for the therapy, but there is a cost associated with leaving early.
5. The proposed accommodation is estimated to cost the employer around $500 over the course of the year.
6. The employee is covered by the ADA. That is, the employee has a disability that substantially limits a major life activity, and the employee is capable of performing the job with the proposed accommodation.

Based on the information above, to what extent is the proposed accommodation reasonable? Please indicate your answer by circling the number on the scale below that best represents how reasonable you think the accommodation is in this situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXTREMELY UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>QUITE UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>NEITHER UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY REASONABLE</td>
<td>QUITE REASONABLE</td>
<td>EXTREMELY REASONABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOR REASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Profile No. 39

An employee of a privately owned real estate business (which employs 50 people) has a job inspecting property (land and buildings). The employee drives to the properties to photograph them, estimate their value, and write a short report. The following factors are present:

1. The employee was hired by the company yesterday.
2. The employee's previous performance information is not available.
3. The employee has a back impairment and experiences severe pain after walking for long periods of time.
4. A specialist has provided documentation that the employee has the disability, and the specialist recommends that the employer provide the employee an electric cart to reduce the amount of walking required while inspecting properties.
5. The proposed accommodation is estimated to cost the employer around $6,000.
6. The employee is covered by the ADA. That is, the employee has a disability that substantially limits a major life activity, and the employee is capable of performing the job with the proposed accommodation.

Based on the information above, to what extent is the proposed accommodation reasonable? Please indicate your answer by circling the number on the scale below that best represents how reasonable you think the accommodation is in this situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXTREMELY UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>QUITE UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>NEITHER UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY REASONABLE</td>
<td>QUITE REASONABLE</td>
<td>EXTREMELY REASONABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOR REASONABLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Profile No. 40

An employee of a privately owned real estate business (which employs 50 people) has a job inspecting property (land and buildings). The employee drives to the properties to photograph them, estimate their value, and write a short report. The following factors are present:

1. The employee was hired by the company yesterday.
2. The employee's previous performance information is not available.
3. The employee has a back impairment and experiences severe pain after walking for long periods of time.
4. A specialist has provided documentation that the employee has the disability, and the specialist recommends that the employee receive physical therapy to reduce the pain. To enable the employee to receive therapy during clinic hours, the employer has been asked to let the person leave work an hour early twice a week. The employer is not being asked to pay for the therapy, but there is a cost associated with leaving early.
5. The proposed accommodation is estimated to cost the employer around $6,000 over the course of the year.
6. The employee is covered by the ADA. That is, the employee has a disability that substantially limits a major life activity, and the employee is capable of performing the job with the proposed accommodation.

Based on the information above, to what extent is the proposed accommodation reasonable? Please indicate your answer by circling the number on the scale below that best represents how reasonable you think the accommodation is in this situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely Unreasonable</th>
<th>Quite Unreasonable</th>
<th>Slightly Unreasonable</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Slightly Reasonable</th>
<th>Quite Reasonable</th>
<th>Extremely Reasonable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Profile No. 41

An employee of a privately owned real estate business (which employs 50 people) has a job inspecting property (land and buildings). The employee drives to the properties to photograph them, estimate their value, and write a short report. The following factors are present:

1. The employee has worked for the company for five years.
2. The employee's previous performance information is not available.
3. The employee has a learning disability that causes the employee difficulty in writing reports of the properties. Specifically, the reports often contain spelling errors and poor handwriting.
4. A specialist has provided documentation that the employee has the disability, and the specialist recommends that the employer provide the employee a word processor that will check the employee's spelling and print the reports required.
5. The proposed accommodation is estimated to cost the employer around $500.
6. The employee is covered by the ADA. That is, the employee has a disability that substantially limits a major life activity, and the employee is capable of performing the job with the proposed accommodation.

Based on the information above, to what extent is the proposed accommodation reasonable? Please indicate your answer by circling the number on the scale below that best represents how reasonable you think the accommodation is in this situation.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

EXTREMELY UNREASONABLE QUITE UNREASONABLE SLIGHTLY UNREASONABLE NEITHER UNREASONABLE Slightly UNREASONABLE REASONABLE UNREASONABLE REASONABLE REASONABLE REASONABLE
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Profile No. 42

An employee of a privately owned real estate business (which employs 50 people) has a job inspecting property (land and buildings). The employee drives to the properties to photograph them, estimate their value, and write a short report. The following factors are present:

1. The employee has worked for the company for five years.
2. The employee's previous performance information is not available.
3. The employee has a learning disability that causes the employee difficulty in writing reports of the properties. Specifically, the reports often contain spelling errors, grammar errors, and poor handwriting.
4. A specialist has provided documentation that the employee has the disability, and the specialist recommends that the person enroll in a course designed to help persons with learning disabilities learn to compensate for their weaknesses. Because the course is held during the early evening, the employer has been asked to let the person leave work an hour early once a week. This course will be paid for by a private agency, but there is a cost to the employer associated with leaving early.
5. The proposed accommodation is estimated to cost the employer around $500 over the course of the year.
6. The employee is covered by the ADA. That is, the employee has a disability that substantially limits a major life activity, and the employee is capable of performing the job with the proposed accommodation.

Based on the information above, to what extent is the proposed accommodation reasonable? Please indicate your answer by circling the number on the scale below that best represents how reasonable you think the accommodation is in this situation.

I 2 3 4 5 6 7
EXTREMELY QUITE SLIGHTLY NEITHER SLIGHTLY QUITE EXTREMELY
UNREASONABLE UNREASONABLE UNREASONABLE UNREASONABLE REASONABLE REASONABLE REASONABLE
NOR REASONABLE
Profile No. 43

An employee of a privately owned real estate business (which employs 50 people) has a job inspecting property (land and buildings). The employee drives to the properties to photograph them, estimate their value, and write a short report. The following factors are present:

1. The employee has worked for the company for five years.
2. The employee's previous performance information is not available.
3. The employee has a learning disability that causes the employee difficulty in writing reports of the properties. Specifically, the reports often contain spelling errors, grammar errors, and poor handwriting.
4. A specialist has provided documentation that the employee has the disability, and the specialist recommends that the employer provide the employee a laptop computer with writing programs to check the employee's spelling and grammar in reports required while inspecting properties.
5. The proposed accommodation is estimated to cost the employer around $6,000.
6. The employee is covered by the ADA. That is, the employee has a disability that substantially limits a major life activity, and the employee is capable of performing the job with the proposed accommodation.

Based on the information above, to what extent is the proposed accommodation reasonable? Please indicate your answer by circling the number on the scale below that best represents how reasonable you think the accommodation is in this situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXTREMELY UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>QUITE UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>NEITHER UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY REASONABLE</td>
<td>QUITE REASONABLE</td>
<td>EXTREMELY REASONABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT REASONABLE</td>
<td>NOT REASONABLE</td>
<td>NOT REASONABLE</td>
<td>NOT REASONABLE</td>
<td>NOT REASONABLE</td>
<td>NOT REASONABLE</td>
<td>NOT REASONABLE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Profile No. 44

An employee of a privately owned real estate business (which employs 50 people) has a job inspecting property (land and buildings). The employee drives to the properties to photograph them, estimate their value, and write a short report. The following factors are present:

1. The employee has worked for the company for five years.
2. The employee's previous performance information is not available.
3. The employee has a learning disability that causes the employee difficulty in writing reports of the properties. Specifically, the reports often contain spelling errors, grammar errors, and poor handwriting.
4. A specialist has provided documentation that the employee has the disability, and the specialist recommends that the person enroll in a course designed to help persons with learning disabilities learn to compensate for their weaknesses. Because the course is held during the early evening, the employer has been asked to let the person leave work an hour early twice a week. This course will be paid for by a private agency, but there is a cost to the employer associated with leaving early.
5. The proposed accommodation is estimated to cost the employer around $6,000 over the course of the year.
6. The employee is covered by the ADA. That is, the employee has a disability that substantially limits a major life activity, and the employee is capable of performing the job with the proposed accommodation.

Based on the information above, to what extent is the proposed accommodation reasonable? Please indicate your answer by circling the number on the scale below that best represents how reasonable you think the accommodation is in this situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXTREMELY UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>QUITE UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>NEITHER UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY REASONABLE</td>
<td>QUITE REASONABLE</td>
<td>EXTREMELY REASONABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXTREMELY UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>QUITE UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>NEITHER UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY REASONABLE</td>
<td>QUITE REASONABLE</td>
<td>EXTREMELY REASONABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXTREMELY UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>QUITE UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>NEITHER UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY REASONABLE</td>
<td>QUITE REASONABLE</td>
<td>NOR REASONABLE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An employee of a privately owned real estate business (which employs 50 people) has a job inspecting property (land and buildings). The employee drives to the properties to photograph them, estimate their value, and write a short report. The following factors are present:

1. The employee was hired by the company yesterday.
2. The employee's previous performance information is not available.
3. The employee has a learning disability that causes difficulty in writing reports. Specifically, the writing often contains spelling errors and poor handwriting.
4. A specialist has provided documentation that the employee has the disability, and the specialist recommends that the employer provide the employee a word processor that will check the employee's spelling and print the reports required.
5. The proposed accommodation is estimated to cost the employer around $500.
6. The employee is covered by the ADA. That is, the employee has a disability that substantially limits a major life activity, and the employee is capable of performing the job with the proposed accommodation.

Based on the information above, to what extent is the proposed accommodation reasonable? Please indicate your answer by circling the number on the scale below that best represents how reasonable you think the accommodation is in this situation.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
EXTREMELY QUITE SLIGHTLY NEITHER SLIGHTLY QUITE EXTREMELY
UNREASONABLE UNREASONABLE UNREASONABLE UNREASONABLE REASONABLE REASONABLE REASONABLE
Profile No. 46

An employee of a privately owned real estate business (which employs 50 people) has a job inspecting property (land and buildings). The employee drives to the properties to photograph them, estimate their value, and write a short report. The following factors are present:

1. The employee was hired by the company yesterday.
2. The employee's previous performance information is not available.
3. The employee has a learning disability that causes difficulty in writing reports. Specifically, the writing often contains spelling errors, grammar errors, and poor handwriting.
4. A specialist has provided documentation that the employee has the disability, and the specialist recommends that the person enroll in a course designed to help persons with learning disabilities learn to compensate for their weaknesses. Because the course is held during the early evening, the employer has been asked to let the person leave work an hour early once a week. This course will be paid for by a private agency, but there is a cost to the employer associated with leaving early.
5. The proposed accommodation is estimated to cost the employer around $500 over the course of the year.
6. The employee is covered by the ADA. That is, the employee has a disability that substantially limits a major life activity, and the employee is capable of performing the job with the proposed accommodation.

Based on the information above, to what extent is the proposed accommodation reasonable? Please indicate your answer by circling the number on the scale below that best represents how reasonable you think the accommodation is in this situation.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
EXTREMELY UNREASONABLE QUTE UNREASONABLE SLIGHTLY UNREASONABLE NEITHER UNREASONABLE NEITHER UNREASONABLE
QUTTE SUGHTLY UNREASONABLE QUTTE SUGHTLY SUGHTLY QUTTE EXTREMELY
EXTREMELY UNREASONABLE UNREASONABLE UNREASONABLE UNREASONABLE REASONABLE REASONABLE REASONABLE
NOR REASONABLE
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Profile No. 47

An employee of a privately owned real estate business (which employs 50 people) has a job inspecting property (land and buildings). The employee drives to the properties to photograph them, estimate their value, and write a short report. The following factors are present:

1. The employee was hired by the company yesterday.
2. The employee's previous performance information is not available.
3. The employee has a learning disability that causes difficulty in writing reports. Specifically, the writing often contains spelling errors, grammar errors, and poor handwriting.
4. A specialist has provided documentation that the employee has the disability, and the specialist recommends that the employer provide the employee a laptop computer with writing programs to check the employee's spelling and grammar in reports required while inspecting properties.
5. The proposed accommodation is estimated to cost the employer around $6,000.
6. The employee is covered by the ADA. That is, the employee has a disability that substantially limits a major life activity, and the employee is capable of performing the job with the proposed accommodation.

Based on the information above, to what extent is the proposed accommodation reasonable? Please indicate your answer by circling the number on the scale below that best represents how reasonable you think the accommodation is in this situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXTREMELY UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>QUITE UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>NEITHER</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY REASONABLE</td>
<td>QUITE REASONABLE</td>
<td>EXTREMELY REASONABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT REASONABLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Profile No. 48

An employee of a privately owned real estate business (which employs 50 people) has a job inspecting property (land and buildings). The employee drives to the properties to photograph them, estimate their value, and write a short report. The following factors are present:

1. The employee was hired by the company *yesterday*.
2. The employee's previous performance information is *not available*.
3. The employee has a *learning disability* that causes difficulty in writing reports. Specifically, the writing often contains spelling errors, grammar errors, and poor handwriting.
4. A specialist has provided documentation that the employee has the disability, and the specialist recommends that the person enroll in a course designed to help persons with learning disabilities learn to compensate for their weaknesses. Because the course is held during the early evening, the employer has been asked to let the person *leave work an hour early* twice a week. This course will be paid for by a private agency, but there is a cost to the employer associated with leaving early.
5. The proposed accommodation is estimated to cost the employer around $6,000 over the course of the year.
6. The employee is covered by the ADA. That is, the employee has a disability that substantially limits a major life activity, and the employee is capable of performing the job with the proposed accommodation.

Based on the information above, to what extent is the proposed accommodation *reasonable*? Please indicate your answer by circling the number on the scale below that best represents how reasonable you think the accommodation is in this situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely unreasonable</td>
<td>Quite unreasonable</td>
<td>Slightly unreasonable</td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>Slightly reasonable</td>
<td>Quite reasonable</td>
<td>Extremely reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix C
Factor Importance Measure

How important were each of the following factors to your judgments of reasonable accommodation? Please distribute a total of 100 points among the five factors to represent the importance you placed on each. Give more points to factors that were more important and fewer points to factors that were less important.

Example A: The following example indicates that the participant placed the most importance on employment status (length of time worked) and the least importance on type of disability. Also, type of accommodation and cost of accommodation were given equal importance.

1. EMPLOYMENT STATUS (hired yesterday, worked five years) 40
2. PERFORMANCE LEVEL (low, high, no information available) 15
3. TYPE OF DISABILITY (back impairment, learning disability) 05
4. TYPE OF ACCOMMODATION (equipment, leave work early) 20
5. COST OF ACCOMMODATION ($500, $6,000) 20

TOTAL 100

Example B: The following example indicates that the participant placed the most importance on the cost of the accommodation. The previous performance level of the person with a disability and the type of disability were given equal, but less weight. The participant gave no importance to the employment status of the person with a disability (length of time worked) or to the type of accommodation.

1. EMPLOYMENT STATUS (hired yesterday, worked five years) 0
2. PERFORMANCE LEVEL (low, high, no information available) 30
3. TYPE OF DISABILITY (back impairment, learning disability) 30
4. TYPE OF ACCOMMODATION (equipment, leave work early) 0
5. COST OF ACCOMMODATION ($500, $6,000) 40

TOTAL 100
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Please distribute a total of 100 points among the five factors to represent the importance YOU placed on each, here. Give more points to factors that were more important and fewer points to factors that were less important.

1. EMPLOYMENT STATUS (hired yesterday, worked five years)  
2. PERFORMANCE LEVEL (low, high, no information available)  
3. TYPE OF DISABILITY (back impairment, learning disability)  
4. TYPE OF ACCOMMODATION (equipment, leave work early)  
5. COST OF ACCOMMODATION ($500, $6,000)  

TOTAL 100

Please distribute a total of 100 points among the five factors based on the importance that you think a person with a disability would place on each, here.

1. EMPLOYMENT STATUS (hired yesterday, worked five years)  
2. PERFORMANCE LEVEL (low, high, no information available)  
3. TYPE OF DISABILITY (back impairment, learning disability)  
4. TYPE OF ACCOMMODATION (equipment, leave work early)  
5. COST OF ACCOMMODATION ($500, $6,000)  

TOTAL 100

Please distribute a total of 100 points among the five factors based on the importance that you think a manager or supervisor would place on each, here.

1. EMPLOYMENT STATUS (hired yesterday, worked five years)  
2. PERFORMANCE LEVEL (low, high, no information available)  
3. TYPE OF DISABILITY (back impairment, learning disability)  
4. TYPE OF ACCOMMODATION (equipment, leave work early)  
5. COST OF ACCOMMODATION ($500, $6,000)  

TOTAL 100
Please distribute a total of 100 points among the five factors based on the importance that you think a coworker (who is not disabled) of a person with a disability would place on each, here.

1. EMPLOYMENT STATUS (hired yesterday, worked five years) ______
2. PERFORMANCE LEVEL (low, high, no information available) ______
3. TYPE OF DISABILITY (back impairment, learning disability) ______
4. TYPE OF ACCOMMODATION (equipment, leave work early) ______
5. COST OF ACCOMMODATION ($500, $6,000) ______

TOTAL 100

When you read and responded to the profiles above, whose perspective did you take (or who did you imagine that you were in the situation)? (circle all the numbers that apply)

1 CUSTOMER OR CLIENT
2 MANAGER OR SUPERVISOR
3 COWORKER WITHOUT A DISABILITY
4 JUDGE OR JUROR IN A COURTROOM
5 PERSON WITH A DISABILITY
6 DOCTOR OR MEDICAL SPECIALIST
7 SELF ONLY
   (NONE OF THE ABOVE, RELIED SOLELY ON OWN IDEAS)
8 SELF AND OPTIONS CIRCLED ABOVE
9 OTHER __________________
Appendix D

Demographic Information—Student Sample

Please respond to the following items by circling the most appropriate response or by filling in the blank. When answering questions that ask about a disability, keep in mind that all of the following conditions may be considered disabilities: long-term physical impairment, wheelchair use, missing limb, learning disability, drug addiction (if in recovery/no longer using), mental illness, mental retardation, HIV or AIDS, epilepsy, hearing impairment, vision impairment, cancer, asthma, heart disease, arthritis, diabetes, high blood pressure. Additional conditions that may be considered disabilities that are not included in this list should be regarded when answering the following questions.

1. Sex (circle one) FEMALE MALE

2. Do you have a disability? (circle one) NO YES
   If yes, what type? ________________________________

3. How many years of full-time (35 hours or more per week) work experience do you have? _______ years _______ months

4. Circle your current employment status:
   NOT EMPLOYED NOW EMPLOYED PART-TIME
   EMPLOYED FULL-TIME

   If you are currently employed, please answer items 5-8.
   If you are NOT currently employed, please skip to item 9.

5. What is your occupation? ________________________________

6. Are you in a management or supervisory position? NO YES

7. If yes, have you made decisions about providing employment accommodations to persons with disabilities in the past? (circle one)
   NO YES
8. To the best of your knowledge, about how many persons with disabilities do you currently work with?_______________

9. How familiar with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) were you prior to participating in this study? (circle the appropriate number)
   
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   VERY FAMILIAR
   UNFAMILIAR VERY FAMILIAR

10. In general, how supportive are you of providing employment accommodations to qualified persons with disabilities? (circle the appropriate number)
    
    1  2  3  4  5  6  7
    VERY SUPPORTIVE
    OPPOSED VERY SUPPORTIVE

11. Why, in your opinion, are you supportive of, or opposed to, providing accommodations to persons with disabilities? (use back of page if needed)
    
    __________________________________________

12. In your opinion, what factors, other than those included in this study, are important in deciding whether or not an employment accommodation for a person with a disability is reasonable? (use back of page if needed)
    
    __________________________________________

13. Do you have a family member or a close friend who has a disability?

   (circle one)  NO   YES

14. How would you characterize your political orientation?

   (circle the appropriate number)
   
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   LIBERAL CONSERVATIVE
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15. Race/Ethnicity (circle one)
   ASIAN       BLACK       HISPANIC       WHITE
   OTHER_________

16. Age_________

17. University classification (circle one)
   FRESHMAN    SOPHOMORE    JUNIOR
   SENIOR      GRADUATE STUDENT   OTHER_________
Appendix E

Demographic Information—Employed Sample

Please respond to the following items by circling the most appropriate response or by filling in the blank. When answering questions that ask about a disability, keep in mind that all of the following conditions may be considered disabilities: long-term physical impairment, wheelchair use, missing limb, learning disability, drug addiction (if in recovery/no longer using), mental illness, mental retardation, HIV or AIDS, epilepsy, hearing impairment, vision impairment, cancer, asthma, heart disease, arthritis, diabetes, high blood pressure. Additional conditions that may be considered disabilities that are not included in this list should be regarded when answering the following questions.

1. Sex (circle one) FEMALE MALE

2. Do you have a disability? (circle one) NO YES
   If yes, what type?____________________________________________________

3. How many years of full-time (35 hours or more per week) work experience do you have? _____years _____months

4. What organization do you work for? (optional)
   ___________________________________________________________________

5. What is your occupation? ___________________________________________

6. Are you in a management or supervisory position? (circle one)
   NO YES

7. If yes, have you made decisions about providing employment accommodations to persons with disabilities in the past? (circle one) NO YES

8. To the best of your knowledge, about how many persons with disabilities do you currently work with?________________
9. How familiar with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) were you prior to participating in this study? (Circle the appropriate number.)

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
VERY UNFAMILIAR  VERY FAMILIAR

10. In general, how supportive are you of providing employment accommodations to qualified persons with disabilities? (circle the appropriate number)

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
VERY OPPOSED  VERY SUPPORTIVE

11. Why, in your opinion, are you supportive of, or opposed to, providing accommodations to persons with disabilities? (use back of page if needed)

_______________________________________________________________________

12. In your opinion, what factors, other than those included in this study, are important in deciding whether or not an employment accommodation for a person with a disability is reasonable? (use back of page if needed)

_______________________________________________________________________

13. Do you have a family member or a close friend who has a disability?
(circle one) NO YES

14. How would you characterize your political orientation?
(circle the appropriate number)

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
LIBERAL  CONSERVATIVE

15. Race/Ethnicity(circle one)

ASIAN  BLACK  HISPANIC  WHITE
OTHER__________
16. Age________

17. Highest education level attained (circle one)
   SOME HIGH SCHOOL    HIGH SCHOOL DEGREE
   SOME COLLEGE        BACHELOR'S DEGREE
   SOME GRADUATE SCHOOL GRADUATE DEGREE
   OTHER___________
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