Philippine Journal of Psychology, 2014, 47(2), 27-64

Dimensions of Filipino Employers' Attitudes in Hiring Persons with Disability

Ederlyn Marie C. Gatchalian
James Peign N. Bulahao
Filam Grace G. Boyayao
Michelle M. Cataina
Janice S. Cumilang
Jovie Ann G. Dulnuan
Patricia Paola V. Salaguban
Saint Louis University

Despite numerous local and international statutes on their acceptance in mainstream employment, persons with disability (PWD) still experience various forms of discrimination. Considered as a minority group, the treatment they receive may result from the attitude–often unfounded or based on incorrect stereotypes–that employers hold toward them. To test this hypothesis, an attitude scale was given to 210 employers or HR practitioners from various industries in the Philippines. The data were subjected to factor analysis to uncover the dimensions that make up these attitudes. Multiple regression analysis and analysis of variance were also conducted to determine the relationships between these factors and the other variables in the study. Filipino employers were found to have a generally positive attitude towards PWDs and their decision to hire a PWD may be determined by the value this will add to the business. The attitude of employers likewise vary according to companies and PWD characteristics. In light of the results, several recommendations for the improvement of the employability of PWDs in the country are proposed.

Keywords: persons with disability, attitude, employment

Many persons with disability (PWD) belong to the poorest sectors of society and their poverty and disability severely limit their entry into employment. It has been pointed out that figures on the labor

Correspondence concerning this article can be addressed to Ederlyn Marie Gatchalian, HRDO, 2F Burgos Administrative Center, Saint Louis University, Bonifacio St., Baguio City, Philippines 2600. Tel No. (+6374)444-8246 to 48 loc 297. Email: ederlyn.cortes@gmail.com

participation of PWDs in the Philippines are inconsistent and not well-established (Buenaobra, 2011; "Enabling the Disabled," 2014). However, one study conducted in the Philippines in the middle of the last decade showed that out of 1,500 employable PWDs, only 34.25% are engaged in paid work (Ericta, 2005). This figure is close to figures in the United States where only 32% of PWDs are employed (Chi & Qu, 2003). About 22% in the Philippine survey are self-employed and the rest are homemakers or dependent on other family members for economic survival (Ericta, 2005). Similarly, the International Disability Rights Monitor reported that 57.12% of PWDs are employed in the country but more than half (30.94%) of this number work in the sectors of agriculture, forestry, or fisheries (International Disability Rights Monitor [IDRM], 2005). Apart from unemployment, research has shown that people with disability also often face the problem of underemployment (La Grow, 2003, as cited in Goertz, van Lierop, Houkes, & Nijhuis, 2010).

The Philippine Magna Carta for Disabled Persons (1992) defines disabled persons as "those suffering from restriction or different abilities, as a result of a mental, physical or sensory impairment, to perform an activity in the manner or within the range considered normal for a human being" (§ 4.a). Of particular interest in the present study is how a person with disability is perceived in work settings. The Canadian government, under its Employment Equity Act, states that persons with disabilities, in light of employment, are individuals "who have a long-term or recurring physical, mental, sensory, psychiatric, or learning impairment, and who (a) consider themselves to be disadvantaged in employment by reason of that impairment, or (b) believe that an employer or potential employer are likely to consider them to be disadvantaged in employment by reason of that impairment" (Department of Justice Canada, 1995, § 3).

As a member of the United Nations, the Philippines does its best to abide by the World Program of Action Concerning Disabled Persons through "the promotion of full participation and equalization of opportunities for Persons with Disabilities" (Asian Development Bank, 2005, p. 3) as member countries of the UN are mandated to develop the capacities of PWDs. No less than the Philippine Constitution and the Magna Carta for Persons with Disability guarantee this capacitating

and inclusion of PWDs into the mainstream society by stressing the importance of rehabilitation, self-development, and self-reliance of its constituents with disability (Philippine Constitution, 1987; Philippine Magna Carta for Disabled Persons, 1992).

Several studies have shown that one factor explaining the low employment rate of PWDs is the reluctance and unwillingness of employers to take in workers from this sector (Chi & Qu, 2003; Honey, Meager, & Williams, 1993; Mansour, 2009; Rimmerman, 1998; Unger, 2002). Employers play a vital role in the successful employment of PWDs. Their perception of what PWDs can (or cannot) bring to the company can affect the hiring decisions of the organization for or against PWDs. It is therefore important to know their perspective on employing PWDs if only to ease the "employer-perceived barriers" (Blessing, 1997, p. 2) in accommodating PWDs in the work arena.

On the other hand, research has also shown that many employers find PWDs as valuable workers in the organization. They are found to be loyal, dependable, productive, and cooperative (Chi & Qu, 2003; Levy, Jessop, Rimmerman, Francis, & Levy, 1993), and have shown better attendance record than their colleagues with no disability (Chi & Qu, 2003). Employing PWDs was also seen as a fulfillment of an organization's social responsibility and legal obligations, as well as widening one's recruitment market (Honey et al., 1993).

There are several studies that have previously looked into the factors which determine the attitudes of employers towards PWDs. Graffam, Shinkfield, Smith, and Polzin (2002) and Mansour (2009) identified four attitude determinants, namely individual, management, cost, and social factors. Individual factors included PWD personality characteristics such as loyalty and social behavior as well as elements of work performance. The management dimension consisted of employers' long-term plan of hiring of PWDs and other considerations in employment such as the availability of non-PWDs in the labor market. Cost factors include the concerns of employers over additional expenses on PWD accommodation and the high rate of absenteeism. Social factors reflect employers' concern about the company's social responsibility and the negative responses from customers.

Chi and Qu (2003) came up with three attitudinal dimensions on the hiring probability of persons with disabilities in the food service

industry. These were labeled as *work ethic, general evaluation, and employment risk* (loyalty, cooperation, attendance, dependability, job quality), *work performance and accommodation costs* (special accommodation at work, work efficiency, attendance and training concerns), and *negative stereotype* (usual excuses of employers against hiring PWDs). Blessing (1997) found that the social skills deficit of a PWD had the greatest impact on the hiring decision of employers.

Positive employer attitude regarding the employment potential of persons with disability have been established in several studies (Blessing, 1997; Chi & Qu, 2003; Graffam et al., 2002; Levy et al., 1993; Unger, 2002). Chi and Qu (2003) noted that in the food service industry, there are significant relationships between the attitudes of employers and the probability of hiring on the one hand, and between the attitudes and the employers' attributes (e.g., current position of employer) on the other. Managers who have presumably more interaction with PWDs show a more open stance toward them as employees than the business owners who seldom get to socialize with their employees.

There are also studies that found that a PWD's characteristics such as type or nature of disability (Rimmerman, 1998; Stone & Colella, 1996; Zissi, Rontos, Papageorgiou, Pierrakou, & Chtouris, 2007) affect potential employers' attitudes toward them. Rimmerman (1998) established that Israeli employers prefer those with mild intellectual disability over those with moderate intellectual disability. Likewise, Zissi et al. (2007) found that "it would be easier for people with diabetes, thalassaemia or renal insufficiency to gain employment than those with schizophrenia, blindness, learning disability and depression" (p. 14). Stone and Colella (1996) contended that the nature of disability is one of the important determinants of the treatment of PWDs in organizations in as far as the aesthetic quality, origin, disruptiveness, concealability, and danger of the disability is perceived by others. Similarly, Unger (2002) noted in her review of literature on employer attitudes on PWDs that the type of disability and even appearance of a PWD become major concerns in their employment.

Gender was also found to be a significant predictor of employment outcomes for PWDs where males are said to be more employable than females for those with visual impairment or other disabilities (Martz &

Xu, 2008; Smith, 2007). Stone and Colella (1996), however, countered that because males do not conform to the stereotype of a PWD (i.e., weak, dependent, helpless), they are less likely to be preferred in employment than female PWDs.

Education has also been discussed as a significant determinant in the employment of disabled individuals (Ficke, 1991; Loprest & Maag, 2003; Martz & Xu, 2008). PWDs with college education or degrees have nearly comparable employment rates with their non-disabled counterparts when compared to those who have reached only high school or its equivalent.

The position or job placement among PWDs is of great consideration when employers open up to these minority groups (Graffam et al., 2002; Kim, 2006). There appears a greater concentration of PWDs in "technical, clerical, and the blue-collar categories than in any of the other PATCOP (Professional, Administrative, Technical, Clerical, Other White-Collar) categories" (Kim, 2006, p. 389).

Blessing (1997) and Unger (2002) also found that employers who have had previous working experience with PWDs are more likely to hire or to continue hiring PWDs than those who have never hired from this group.

Research has further established that a positive evaluation of prior work performance of a PWD in a company increases their likelihood of further or continuing employment (Stone & Colella, 1996; Unger, 2002). Levy (1993) also found that employer or business characteristics that are related to their attitudes towards PWD as potential employees include:

- gender (female managers show a more favorable attitude);
- type of industry (the government sector is likely a top employer);
- number of employees (the more the employees, the more positive the attitude);
- annual sales (the lower the sales, the better the outlook); and
- educational attainment of employer (the higher the level completed, the more favorable towards hiring PWDs).

Research Objectives

There remains a dearth of studies in the Philippines explaining the reasons about the poor participation of PWDs in the employment sector, though what has been cited most are the lack of skills of the PWD applicants and the inadequacy of company resources to accommodate their special needs (Ilagan, 2005). In a review of literature conducted by Arce (2014) on Philippine studies on PWD employment, it was found that employers hold ambivalent attitudes on the hiring of PWDs. While most companies are open to hiring from this group, immediate supervisors have hesitancy in the ability of PWDs to work independently.

This study therefore aimed to fill this gap in the knowledge on acceptance of PWDs in employment to increase society's awareness on the plight of PWDs in this area. Specifically, it investigated the factors underlying employers' attitudes towards PWDs in certain job settings and how these relate to the probability of their hiring PWDs in their companies. It explored whether the factors found in several studies (e.g., Chi & Qu, 2003; Graffam et al., 2002; Mansour, 2009), such as individual, cost, management, social, and negative stereotype factors, comprise the attitudes of Filipino employers towards the employment of PWDs.

The study also tested if employers differed in their attitudes towards PWDs according to certain characteristics (i.e., type of industry, number of employees, and prior employment history of PWDs) and PWD workers' attributes (gender, position applied for, type of disability, highest educational attainment, and previous work experience).

Research Problems

This study aimed to answer the following questions:

1. What factors or dimensions make up the attitudes of local employers toward persons with disabilities in the workplace?
2. What is the impact of each of these factors on the hiring probability of PWDs?
3. Do employer characteristics (i.e., type of industry, number of

employees, and prior employment history of PWDs) influence the factors underlying attitudes of local employers toward employment of PWDs in the workplace? and

4. How do attributes of PWD-applicants (i.e., gender, position applied for, type of disability, highest educational attainment, and previous work experience) affect attitudes of local employers toward persons with disabilities in the workplace?

METHOD

Participants

Data were gathered from 210 respondents who were either employers (owners, managers) or HR practitioners randomly chosen from various companies within the Cordillera Administrative Region, Regions I and II, and Metro Manila. Data on their profiles are summarized in Table 1.

Instrument

Data were gathered using a 35-item attitude survey adapted from the studies of Chi and Qu (2003), Graffam et al. (2002), and Mansour (2009). Sample items include "PWDs are dependable employees" and "Other employees find it frustrating to work with PWDs," measured on a 4-point Likert scale from 1 *(strongly agree)* to 4 *(strongly disagree)*. The questionnaire included a section on information about the company: the type of industry, number of employees in their branch or locality, previous employment of PWDs, their assessment of the work performance of PWD employees, and the probability of hiring or continuing to hire PWDs in the company. Another section asks the respondents to choose the demographic characteristics of PWD-applicants which will likely increase the chances of employment of a PWD in their company. These include gender, type of disability, highest educational attainment, and work experience.

The survey was pretested with 25 Filipino employers and had a high reliability with Cronbach's alpha of .88. The final survey also yielded a high reliability with Cronbach's alpha of .76. As the research

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of Employers

Employer Characteristics		*n*	%
Industry	Retail/Wholesale	36	17.1
	Manufacturing	18	8.6
	Academic	50	23.8
	Service	75	35.7
	Government	19	9.0
	Others	12	5.7
Company Size	1-9 employees	55	26.2
	10-49 employees	66	31.4
	50-99 employees	36	17.1
	100-499 employees	35	16.7
	500-999 employees	10	4.8
	1000 and above employees	8	3.8
History of Employment of PWD	Yes	115	54.8
	No	94	44.8
	No response	1	.5

design is cross-sectional and a self-report questionnaire was used to gather information at one time, the data were tested for common method variance (CMV) or the "variance that is attributable to the measurement method rather than to the constructs the measures represent" (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003, p. 879) using Harman's one factor test (Podsakoff & Organ, 1986). The unrotated factor matrix resulted in 10 factors with eigenvalues higher than one with the first factor only accounting for 17.10% of the variance. The absence of a single general factor confirms that CMV is not a potential threat to the validity of the results.

Analysis

Data were analyzed using exploratory factor analysis to determine the dimensions that make up the attitudes of employers. The resulting dimensions or factors were entered as the attitude variable in the subsequent analyses, which consisted of (a) multiple regression analysis to examine the impact of factors affecting the attitudes of employers' (independent variable) on the hiring probability of PWDs (dependent variable) and (b) analysis of variance (ANOVA) to determine significant differences in the attitude dimensions based on the employers' and PWD-applicant characteristics.

RESULTS

Employers' Attitude Towards PWDs

Table 2 presents the preferences of employers in terms of attributes of a PWD that will most likely influence them in hiring a PWD-applicant to their company. Employers favor hiring males (41%), but have similar preferences for females (28.6%), and for either male or female (30.5%) applicants. Employers also prefer PWDs for other rank and file positions (51.9%) than for clerical (37.6%) or managerial (7.6%) posts. More than half of the respondents chose a PWD with motor disability (56.7%) than any other type of impairment. A PWD with visual (8.6%) or learning (9.5%) disability is least preferred by employers. Employers are more likely to hire PWD applicants who are

Table 2. Frequency Distribution of Preferred PWD Attributes by Employers and Probability of Hiring PWDs

PWD Characteristics		*f*	%
Gender	Male	86	41.0
	Female	60	28.6
	Either Male or Female	64	30.5
Position	Managerial	16	7.6
	Clerical	79	37.6
	Other Rank & File	109	51.9
	No response	6	2.9
Disability	Visual Impairment	18	8.6
	Hearing Impairment	37	17.6
	Motor Disability	119	56.7
	Learning Disability	20	9.5
	No response	16	7.6
Education	None Required	4	1.9
	Elementary	11	5.2
	High School	45	21.4
	Vocational	79	37.6
	College and Beyond	71	33.8
With Work	Yes	166	79.0
Experience	No	43	20.5
	No response	1	.5
	Very Unlikely	2	1.0
Probability of Hiring	Unlikely	41	19.5
a PWD	Likely	141	67.1
	Very Likely	24	11.4
	No response	2	1.0

vocational or college-educated (37.6% and 33.8%, respectively), and they least prefer applicants with no education (1.9%) or those who have completed elementary levels only (5.2%) when hiring. Majority favor PWDs with previous work experience (79%) over those with none (20.5%).

The overall mean for the 35 attitude statements is 2.62, suggesting that employers generally hold a favorable attitude towards PWD workers. Table 3 shows the mean and standard deviation of the respondents' assessment of the attitude statements.

Employers more likely agree to the idea that gainful employment will change in a positive way the lives of PWDs (M = 3.10). They also view PWDs agreeably on their loyalty, commitment and dedication on the job, and on the promotion of positive attitude among other employees their employment will bring into the company (M = 3.00). The respondents disagree on the perceived additional business costs that may result from accommodating PWDs in their companies like in training and in health and safety measures (M = 3.00).

The respondents, however, seem more circumspect about the preparation or training a PWD will need to prime him/her for work in the company, in the frustration and lowered productivity of other employees when working with PWDs, and in the job opportunities taken away from non-handicapped employees when PWDs are employed instead (M=2.50). Employers also show unfavorable attitudes towards PWDs in terms of attendance and punctuality, the turnover problems they may pose to the company, and to the negative interaction between PWDs and coworkers and/or customers (M = 2.50).

Employers' Attitude Dimensions

Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was used to look into the underlying dimensions of the attitudes of Filipino employers toward PWDs. Bartlett's test of sphericity ($p < .01$) and Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) value (.81) for the data both signified the appropriateness for factor analysis.

Initially, factor analysis using oblique rotation was done and 10 factors with eigenvalues greater than one were extracted. These accounted for 61.83% of the explained variance. However, because the

Table 3. Mean and SDs of Employers' Attitude Toward PWDs

Item No.	Attitude Statements	*M*	*SD*
16.	Employment enables PWDs to lead relatively normal lives	3.29	0.68
32.	Income from employment can change the quality of life for PWDs	3.13	0.68
11.	PWDs are usually loyal to the company	3.08	0.86
21.	PWDs display commitment and dedication to their jobs	3.08	0.70
15.	Most companies are concerned over additional health and safety measures in hiring PWDs	3.07	0.67
7.	Exposure to PWDs in job settings promotes positive attitudes in other employees	3.06	0.65
14.	Other employees are willing to work with PWDs	3.05	0.65
17.	PWDs require extra training to perform well	3.02	0.75
4.	In job settings, PWDs can demonstrate appropriate social skills or behaviors	2.99	0.64
27.	PWDs cooperate more on the job	2.83	0.62
18.	It is a company's corporate social responsibility to hire PWDs	2.81	0.80
10.	It's fair to make special accommodations for PWDs in the workplace	2.79	0.77
35.	PWDs reach the performance expectations of the company	2.75	0.66
3.	Employing PWDs enhances the company's image	2.74	0.79
31.	PWDs make better employees	2.74	0.62
8.	PWDs are dependable employees	2.70	0.75
19.	PWDs require closer supervision in the workplace	2.64	0.80
1.	Productivity rates of PWDs equal that of other employees	2.58	0.71
6.	PWDs are willing to take on less desirable jobs in the company	2.53	0.89

(Table 3 continued)

Item No.	Attitude Statements	*M*	*SD*
20.	Other employees feel that the separation of duties and responsibilities of PWDs is not fair	2.52	0.74
25.	PWDs incur more job-related accidents or errors than other employees	2.47	0.77
30.	Supervisors find it hard to get PWDs to adopt new methods on the job	2.46	0.68
9.	Other employees find it frustrating to work with PWDs	2.41	0.74
2.	Working with a PWD gives unnecessary challenge or burden to other employees	2.33	0.80
33.	Employment of PWDs would increase business costs	2.33	0.73
28.	Companies enjoy tax reduction from the government in hiring PWDs	2.32	0.93
29.	PWDs make other employees uncomfortable	2.32	0.68
26.	Other employees are not likely to interact with PWDs in the workplace or elsewhere	2.31	0.67
12.	Customers show negative responses or discomfort toward PWDs in the company	2.30	0.72
23.	PWDs quit their jobs sooner than others	2.21	0.76
13.	PWDs present absence and punctuality problems	2.20	0.60
24.	The productivity of other employees decreases when they work with PWDs	2.16	0.70
5.	No amount of training can prepare a PWD to work in this company	2.14	0.82
34.	Working with non-handicapped employees will only frustrate PWDs	2.14	0.65
22.	Employing PWDs takes jobs away from non-handicapped individuals	2.12	0.69
Overall		2.62	0.80

Note. Items 15, 17, 19, 20, 25, 30, 9, 2, 33, 29, 26, 12, 23, 13, 24, 5, 34, and 22 were reversely coded: 1 = Strongly Agree, 2 = Agree, 3 = Disagree, 4 = Strongly Disagree

scree plot showed the curve inflexion was at Factor 4, the researchers decided to retain only four factors (Field, 2000). The four factors accounted for 41.12% of the variance. Cronbach's alpha showed a good reliability of the measures for Factors 1 and 2 at .81 and .80, respectively. An acceptable range was found for the measures for Factors 3 and 4 at .70 and .60, respectively. The results of the factor analysis are shown in Table 4.

Negative stereotypes. The first factor revolved around concerns of employers on the possible counter-productive effects of PWD employment on non-handicapped workers like a decrease in the latter's productivity, their feelings of discomfort, and experience of unnecessary challenge or burden. This factor also covers respondents' apprehension about the increase in business costs, the difficulty of training PWDs, and the possible absence, punctuality and turnover problems PWDs may pose to the job. This factor was named after the attitude dimension of the same label found by Chi and Qu (2003). Like in the present study, this dimension covers the oft-cited defense of employers to avoid hiring PWDs.

Added business value. Factor 2 included variables about PWD work ethics (cooperation, commitment, dedication, and loyalty), PWD work performance (high productivity and performance levels), company prestige (corporate social responsibility and positive company image), improved employee morale and PWD welfare (positive attitude in other employees, fairness in making accommodations, and improvement of the lives of PWDs employed). This dimension is akin to the Work Ethic, General Evaluation and Employment Risk factor specified by Chi and Qu (2003) and to the Individual factor in the researches of Graffam et al. (2002) and Mansour's (2009) where a PWD's positive personal characteristics (loyalty and cooperativeness) and high work performance are valued by a company.

Added cost and efforts at management. The third factor comprised of items on extra management outlay in employing PWDs such as installing added safety and health features, giving further training, setting up a mechanism for closer supervision, and making allowances for work-related accidents and inaccuracies. This factor also covers the perception of fairness of other employees, particularly on the division of labor between them and PWDs in the company.

This is closely related to the Management and Cost dimensions in the researches of Graffam et al. (2002) and Mansour (2009), and to the Work Performance and Accommodation Costs dimension in Chi and Qu's (2003) study.

Social cost. Factor 4 consisted of two variables on concerns about socialization of PWDs with the company's customers and non-PWD employees. This factor is similar to the "Social" dimension in the studies of Mansour (2009) and Graffam et al. (2002).

Impact of Employers' Attitudes on Hiring Probability

Standard multiple regression analysis was used to determine the impact of these four dimensions or factors to the employers' probability of hiring PWDs as employees. The results are presented in Table 5.

The correlation coefficient of the four predictor variables (attitude dimensions) on the criterion variable Hiring Probability of PWDs was .22 indicating little correlation between the two variables. The coefficient of determination (R^2 = .048) shows that only about 4.8% of the variation in the criterion variable is determined by the attitude dimensions ($p < .05$). Specifically, only the dimension Added Business Value was shown to be a significant determinant of employers' decision to hire a PWD ($\beta = 2.161$, $p < .05$). This means that a positive employer outlook on the Added Business Value associated with employing PWDs will likely raise the probability of their hiring a PWD. This finding of the present study confirms the results of a study made by Chi and Qu (2003) which showed that the hiring probability is determined by employers' attitude dimensions towards PWDs.

Employer Characteristics and Employer Attitudinal Dimensions

ANOVA was used to explore whether attitude dimensions significantly differ based on the employer's characteristics. Post-hoc comparisons using Tukey's HSD were conducted where significant relationships were noted.

The results revealed that two employer-related variables are significantly related to employers' attitudes dimensions. As depicted

Table 4. Results of Exploratory Factor Analysis of Employers' Attitudes Using Oblique Rotation

	Factor 1: Negative Stereotype	Factor 2: Added Business Value	Factor 3: Added Cost and Efforts at Management	Factor 4: Social Cost
Decrease in productivity of other employees	.686			
Taking away job opportunities from others	.667			
Frustration in working with others	.620			
Harder to adopt new methods	.595			
Make others uncomfortable	.593			
Willingness to take on less desirable jobs	.573			
Harder to train for jobs	.562			
Quit jobs sooner	.519			
Increase business costs	.501			
Unlikely interaction with coworkers	.432			
Challenging or burdensome for coworkers	.389			
Present absence and punctuality problems	.330			
Make better employees		.687		
Corporate social responsibility		.635		
Display appropriate social skills or behaviors		.604		
Enhancement of company image		.556		
High productivity rates		.543		
Promotion of positive attitude in others		.507		
Willingness of others to work with PWDs		.494		
Reach performance expectations		.476		
Cooperate more on the job		.470		
Commitment and dedication to job		.460		
Fair to make special accommodations		.441		
Are dependable employees		.397		
Tax reduction for companies[a]	.496	.393		
Change the quality of life for PWDs[b]		.359	.431	
Loyal to the company[b]		.338	.479	
Employment for "normal" lives[b]		.316	.537	

(Table 4 continued)

	Factor 1: Negative Stereotype	Factor 2: Added Business Value	Factor 3: Added Cost and Efforts at Management	Factor 4: Social Cost
Additional health and safety measures			.713	
Require extra training			.658	
Need closer supervision			.566	
Incur more job-related accidents or errors			.459	
Make others feel segregation of duties is not fair			.371	
Negative responses or discomfort from customers				.719
Frustrating for other employees				.681

Notes. [a]This variable has a higher loading on Factor 1 but a closer inspection of the item shows that it is more appropriate for Factor 2 (where it has also loaded substantially) hence, it is placed under this factor. [b]These variables all have higher loadings on Factor 3 but a thorough look reveals that it is more suitable for Factor 2 where they have loaded the highest after Factor 3.

Table 5. Multiple Regression Analysis of the Attitude Dimensions as Predictors of Hiring

	Probability of Hiring		
Variables	B	*SE*	β
Negative Stereotype	-.06	-.04	-.44
Added Business Value	.26	.15	2.16*
Cost and Management	-.04	-.03	-.41
Social Cost	-.11	-.10	-1.32
R^2			.05
F^2			2.60*

*$p < .05$

Table 6. Analysis of Variance of Employers' Attitude Among Type of Industry

Source	SS	*df*	*MS*	*F*
Negative Stereotype				
Between Groups	.96	5	.19	.67
Within Groups	57.95	204	.29	
Total	58.86	209		
Added Business Value				
Between Groups	1.12	5	.22	1.26
Within Groups	36.17	204	.18	
Total	37.28	209		
Cost and Management				
Between Groups	2.79	5	.56	1.53
Within Groups	74.28	204	.36	
Total	77.07	209		
Social Cost				
Between Groups	10.29	5	2.06	4.66**
Within Groups	90.19	204	.44	
Total	100.48	209		

**$p < .01$

in Table 6, the type of industry was found to have a significant relationship with the Social Cost dimension only, $F(5, 204) = 4.66$, $p < .001$. The post-hoc comparisons showed that other types of industries are more concerned about possible problems on social costs when compared to the other types of industries. The service industries meanwhile appeared to be less concerned about socializing PWDs in the workplace than the academic sector ($p < .05$). This result is consistent with Blessing's (1997) findings that social skill deficits have a greater bearing on the attitude of employers than negative task-related behaviors.

Business or company size, as measured by number of employees, has shown a significant relationship with the attitude dimension Social Cost, $F(5,204) = 2.80$, $p < .05$ as shown in Table 7. The post-hoc test revealed that companies with 10 to 49 employees display the least worries over the likely interaction problems between PWD employees and the customers on the one hand and between PWDs and their co-employees on the other as compared to businesses with 1,000 and more employees ($p >. 05$). This runs counter to the findings of Levy et al. (2003) where companies with more employees have a more favorable attitude towards PWDs than those with fewer staff.

Employers' previous employment of PWDs has a significant effect on the dimension Added Cost and Efforts at Management, $F(2,207) = 1.19$, $p < .05$ as shown in Table 8. This means that respondents who have not employed PWDs in the past are more likely than those who have hired PWD employees previously to be concerned with the possible additional business costs and management efforts in employing PWDs ($p < .05$). This finding confirms the results of other studies (Blessing, 1997; Chi and Qu, 2003; Levy et al., 1993; Unger, 2002) where it was found that previous hiring experience of PWDs significantly affect employers' attitudes towards PWDs. Similarly, Stone and Colella (1996) suggested that employers who have more and had positive previous contact with PWDs display more positive attitudes towards this group.

PWD Attributes and Employer Attitudinal Dimensions

The ANOVA results revealed that the PWD-related variables

Table 7. Analysis of Variance of Employers' Attitude Among Number of Employees

Source	SS	*df*	*MS*	*F*
Negative Stereotype				
Between Groups	2.28	5	.46	1.64
Within Groups	56.58	204	.28	
Total	58.86	209		
Added Business Value				
Between Groups	1.63	5	.33	1.86
Within Groups	35.65	204	.18	
Total	37.28	209		
Cost and Management				
Between Groups	3.69	5	.74	2.05
Within Groups	73.37	204	.36	
Total	77.07	209		
Social Cost				
Between Groups	6.45	5	1.29	2.80*
Within Groups	94.03	204	.46	
Total	100.48	209		

* $p < .05$

Table 8. Analysis of Variance of Employers' Attitude Between Previous Employment of PWDs

Source	SS	*df*	*MS*	*F*
Negative Stereotype				
Between Groups	1.32	2	.66	.10
Within Groups	47.53	207	.28	
Total	58.86	209		
Added Business Value				
Between Groups	.133	2	.07	.69
Within Groups	37.15	207	.18	
Total	37.28	209		
Cost and Management				
Between Groups	2.37	2	1.19	
Within Groups	74.69	207	.36	.04*
Total	77.07	209		
Social Cost				
Between Groups	.28	2	.14	
Within Groups	100.21	207	.48	.75
Total	100.48	209		

*$p < .05$

are significantly related to employer attitudes dimensions. Post-hoc tests using Tukey's HSD were conducted to check for significant relationships.

Table 9 shows that a PWD's gender has a significant relationship with two of the attitude dimensions, namely Negative Stereotype, $F(2, 207) = 12.58$, $p < .001$ and Added Cost and Efforts at Management, $F(2, 207) = 4.98$, $p < .01$. Employers are most likely to specify the gender of the PWD they wish to hire as this significantly affects their attitude towards Negative Stereotype ($p < .001$) and Added Cost and Efforts at Management ($p < .01$), as compared to leaving this applicant characteristic to chance (i.e., when the PWD applicant is either male or female). Specifically, employers agree to a greater extent that leaving the gender of the applicant to chance will more likely result to the realization of the negative stereotypes associated with employing PWD than when this variable is specified in considering an applicant. Similarly, the respondents agree more that there will be less additional cost and management concerns when male PWDs are employed than when this variable is not indicated during hiring. These findings of the current study concur with what was earlier found that gender is a significant predictor of company employment decisions (i.e., male PWDs are favored over females for certain types of disabilities) (Martz & Xu, 2008; Smith, 2007).

The kind of job or position a PWD is applying for likewise showed a significant relationship with three of the attitude dimensions, namely Negative Stereotype, $F(3, 206) = 3.85$, $p<.05$; Added Cost and Efforts at Management, $F(3, 206) = 6.09$, $p < .01$; and Social Cost, $F(3,206) = 3.30$, $p < .05$ as summarized in Table 10. Post-hoc comparisons indicated that employers show a more favorable opinion towards PWDs applying for other rank and file jobs than those applying for managerial ($p < .05$) or clerical jobs ($p < .01$) in terms of additional cost and management requirements associated in hiring them. This means that businesses will be less likely to be cautious of any additional expenses on training, supervision, and the like when they hire PWDs for other rank and file positions as compared to when they hire them for clerical and/or managerial jobs. Respondents are also less anxious of the usual socialization problems linked with having PWD employees in the company when PWDs are placed in other rank and file jobs than

Table 9. Analysis of Variance of Employers' Attitude Between Gender of PWDs

Source	SS	*df*	*MS*	*F*
Negative Stereotype				
Between Groups	6.38	2	3.19	12.58**
Within Groups	52.48	207	.25	
Total	58.86	209		
Added Business Value				
Between Groups	.89	2	.45	2.54
Within Groups	36.39	207	.18	
Total	37.28	209		
Cost and Management				
Between Groups	3.54	2	1.77	4.50*
Within Groups	73.53	207	.36	
Total	77.07	209		
Social Cost				
Between Groups	1.03	2	.51	1.07
Within Groups	99.45	207	.48	
Total	100.48	209		

*$p < .05$
**$p < .01$

Table 10. Analysis of Variance of Employers' Attitude Among Position Applied for of PWDs

Source	SS	*df*	*MS*	*F*
Negative Stereotype				
Between Groups	3.12	3	1.04	3.85*
Within Groups	55.73	206	.27	
Total	58.86	209		
Added Business Value				
Between Groups	.63	3	.02	.12
Within Groups	37.22	206	.18	
Total	37.28	209		
Cost and Management				
Between Groups	6.28	3	2.09	6.09**
Within Groups	70.79	206	.34	
Total	77.07	209		
Social Cost				
Between Groups	4.60	3	1.53	3.30*
Within Groups	95.88	206	.47	
Total	100.48	209		

*$p < .05$
**$p < .01$

when they are assigned to clerical posts ($p < .05$). This result confirms findings that PWDs are most likely to be hired in technical and other blue-collar jobs than in professional or white-collar positions (Kim, 2006).

Table 11 reveals that the type of disability also significantly influences employers' attitude towards PWDs, particularly for the dimension Social Cost, $F(4, 205) = 2.42$, $p < .05$. The post-hoc test showed that employers are more concerned about socializing PWD employees with motor disability than they are with PWD employees with hearing impairment ($p < .05$). Although no research was found explaining this difference, it can be surmised that hearing-impaired individuals can successfully mingle with their coworkers or people from outside the company when given the proper support (e.g., hearing aids). People with motor disabilities on the other hand, may have limited mobility which can prevent them from participating in many social activities.

The highest educational attainment of a PWD was also shown to have a significant relationship with Negative Stereotype, $F(4, 205) = 7.73$, $p < .001$, and Added Cost and Efforts at Management, $F(4, 205) = 3.90$, $p < .01$, as presented in Table 12. The post-hoc comparisons showed that employers express more concerns over the negative stereotype associated with employing PWDs when the latter have finished college or beyond than when they are vocational ($p < .01$) or high school ($p < .05$) graduates. The respondents seem to have the same concerns in terms of the Added Cost and Efforts at Management factor when hiring PWDs who have completed a college degree over those who have finished elementary ($p < .01$). These findings do not correspond with previous research (e.g., Ficke, 1991; Loprest & Maag, 2003; Martz & Xu, 2008) indicating that the higher a PWD's educational attainment, the more positive the attitude of potential employers will be toward them. Philippine employers may perceive PWDs who have obtained a higher education to pose more burdens to the company in terms of turnover, absenteeism, and interaction with coworkers. The concern of the Filipino employers on Added Cost and Efforts at Management with regard to hiring PWDs with college education may be seen as an apprehension over the fact that better informed and educated PWDs may mean that they are more

Table 11. Analysis of Variance of Employers' Attitude Among Type of Disability of PWDs

Source	SS	*df*	*MS*	*F*
Negative Stereotype				
Between Groups	2.50	4	.63	2.27
Within Groups	56.36	205	.28	
Total	58.86	209		
Added Business Value				
Between Groups	1.07	4	.27	1.52
Within Groups	36.21	205	.18	
Total	37.28	209		
Cost and Management				
Between Groups	1.28	4	.32	.86
Within Groups	75.79	205	.37	
Total	77.07	209		
Social Cost				
Between Groups	4.54	4	1.13	2.42*
Within Groups	95.94	205	.47	
Total	100.48	209		

*$p < .05$

Table 12. Analysis of Variance of Employers' Attitude Among Education of PWDs

Source	SS	*df*	*MS*	*F*
Negative Stereotype				
Between Groups	7.72	4	1.93	7.73**
Within Groups	51.14	205	.25	
Total	58.86	209		
Added Business Value				
Between Groups	.84	4	.21	1.18
Within Groups	36.44	205	.18	
Total	37.28	209		
Cost and Management				
Between Groups	5.45	4	1.36	
Within Groups	71.61	205	.35	3.90**
Total	77.07	209		
Social Cost				
Between Groups	4.17	4	1.04	
Within Groups	96.32	205	.47	2.22
Total	100.48	209		

**$p < .01$

demanding and assertive of their rights and privileges (e.g., on equal pay, better accommodation, etc.) as employees.

The study also looked into the effect of a PWD's previous work experience on employers' attitudes. Data in Table 13 show that a PWD's previous work experience has a significant influence over the Negative Stereotype commonly associated with hiring PWDs, $F(2,207) = 3.869$, $p < .05$. Employers are less anxious of these negative notions when the PWDs have prior work experience than when they do not have any previous task background ($p < .05$). As can be expected, employers prefer individuals with prior and related work experience, whether a PWD or not, and see them as needing less training and doing tasks with less complaints, which will less likely increase business costs.

DISCUSSION

The attitude of Filipino employers towards PWDs are composed of Negative Stereotypes, Added Business Value, Added Cost and Efforts at Management, and Social Cost factors. This finding has been consistent with earlier studies on the dimensions that make up the attitude of employers towards persons with disabilities as potential employees (Chi & Qu, 2003; Graffam et al., 2002; Mansour, 2009). Among Filipino employers, it appears that there are less positive or favorable factors (Negative Stereotypes, Added Cost and Efforts at Management, and Social Cost) that make up the attitude of employers towards PWDs. Only one dimension is decidedly positive (i.e., Added Business Value). It is good to note however that even if the attitude dimensions lean on the negative side, Philippine employers display a more or less favorable attitude towards PWDs. This finding may prove to be advantageous for PWDs looking for work in the country as it has been proven in previous studies that employers with a more positive perception of PWDs may likely hire from members of this marginalized group (Blessing, 1997; Chi & Qu, 2003; Graffam et al., 2002; Levy et al., 1993; Unger, 2002)

Among the four factors, Added Business Value appeared to be the only predictor of hiring PWDs among Filipino employers. The primary and often only consideration of Philippine employers from various industries are the additional benefits their decisions with regard to

Table 13. Analysis of Variance of Employers' Attitude Among Work Experience of PWDs

Source	SS	*df*	*MS*	*F*
Negative Stereotype				
Between Groups	2.12	2	1.06	3.87*
Within Groups	56.74	207	.27	
Total	58.86	209		
Added Business Value				
Between Groups	.71	2	.36	2.02
Within Groups	36.57	207	.18	
Total	37.28	209		
Cost and Management				
Between Groups	.44	2	.22	.59
Within Groups	76.63	207	.37	
Total	77.07	209		
Social Cost				
Between Groups	.47	2	.24	.49
Within Groups	100.01	207	.48	
Total	100.48	209		

*$p < .05$

hiring PWDs will bring to the company. This, of course, makes for a sound business strategy as most companies will only take calculated risks when it comes to long-term judgments such as those made in hiring. Therefore, it will be good for PWDs seeking jobs to strengthen their labor market value through relevant trainings not only in required work proficiency but also in work ethics and socialization skills.

The attitude dimensions vary according to the attributes of the employer or business, particularly on the type of industry, size of the company, and on whether or not they have had previous hiring experience of a PWD.

Based on the findings of the current study, various types of business in the Philippines differ in the attitude dimension of Social Costs, that is, they have different levels of concern with how their PWD employees will interact with their non-PWD employees and with their clients. This finding is concurrent with former studies (e.g., Blessing, 1997) which found that the perceived lack of social graces prevents PWDs from securing employment. The current study revealed that the service sector (e.g., hotels and restaurants) which comprise the biggest number of respondents appear to be the least concerned about socialization issues with regard to PWD employees. This spells good news for PWD applicants who have the skills needed in these types of industries as they may find more accommodating employers in this sector. Next to the service industry, the academic sector had the second most number of employees in the current research. It is surprising to note, however, that they appeared to be the most concerned about possible socialization deficits of PWD employees. Educational institutions, ideally tasked to form consciousness, attitude, and skills, should be forerunners and advocates of inclusion. As employers therefore, schools should be able to incorporate more PWDs among their staff and provide for their adequate and appropriate interaction with coworkers, students, and surrounding communities.

Filipino employers likewise differ in the dimension Social Cost when it comes to the size of the company. Bigger companies or those employing 1,000 or more are more anxious of the social skills PWD employees in the company while relatively smaller companies disagree that employees with disabilities will bring socialization problems in to their business. This may reflect the Filipino value of maintaining

close-knit ties within the workplace, akin to having a second family at work (Gatchalian, 2002). This is not to say that larger businesses in the Philippines do not value as much their staff, but more employees may mean more diversity and lesser solidarity. Again, PWDs may want to capitalize on this finding by looking for work in smaller and perhaps family-owned businesses to increase their chances of being hired.

Filipino employers who have had past hiring experiences with PWDs claim to be less worried about the usual cost and management issues usually associated with hiring PWDs. This finding of the present research confirms other studies which state that businesses that have employed PWDs in the past hold a more positive attitude towards this group (Chi & Qu, 2003; Stone & Colella, 1996). This result may likewise indicate that the common notions about spending too much on accommodating and managing PWDs in the workplace may not have any truth in them. In the campaign towards acceptance of these employees in the world of work,companies who have employed PWDs might shed light on some of these prevailing misconceptions. It may also be practical for PWDs to apply in companies which have a known history of PWD employment.

The individual characteristics of PWDs also determine the attitudes of employers toward them. Like in mainstream employment, PWDs seem to move around a male-dominated work arena. Filipino employers prefer male PWDs over females or over leaving this characteristic to chance (i.e., having an applicant who is either male or female). They believe male PWDs pose less cost and management strains on the company and show less of the negative stereotypes associated with these workers. This finding does not support what has been proposed that males do not conform to the stereotype of a PWD (i.e., they are weak, dependent, helpless) (Stone & Colella, 1996). In general, female workers are less preferred because of, among other reasons, the mandatory costs (e.g., maternity benefits) that a company should expend on them upon employment especially if these workers are married and with children. Based on the results, female PWDs in the country appear to suffer double discrimination because of their gender and their handicap. This may mean that it will be more difficult for them to obtain gainful employment than do their male counterparts. If the Philippines and all other UN member-countries

truly wish for a more humane, inclusive, and equal society, they should encourage the creation of more job opportunities for female PWDs, who in many cases maybe the sole breadwinners for their families (see Ericta, 2005).

The attitudes of Filipino employers also differ depending on the kind of job or position a PWD is applying for, particularly in terms of cost and management as well as social costs associated with PWD employment. It looks as if businesses in the Philippines, like in many other countries, favor PWDs applying for non-professional and blue-collar jobs (Kim, 2006). In other words, PWDs are often relegated to the less desirable jobs in the company which leave PWDs with not much choice given the limited employment opportunities available everywhere. This finding is also related to another discovery in the current study: employers have a more positive attitude towards non-college degree holders than those who have finished higher studies with regard to cost and management concerns. In fact, employers favor PWDs who have only reached or completed elementary education over those who have college degrees when it comes to this dimension. These employers may feel that PWDs with lower educational background can be assigned to lower positions and will therefore need less training and supervision. This view is discriminatory at best and given this, many PWDs feel they are underemployed given the skills and educational background they hold (Goertz et al., 2010).

As for the type of disability of a PWD, Filipino employers differ only on the Social Cost dimension. They appear to be more concerned about incorporating PWDs with motor disability over those with hearing impairment into the company, particularly among customers and other workers. This finding seems unexpected as nearly 60% of the respondents in the current research preferred to hire PWDs with motor disability as compared to less than 18% who claimed they would much rather have PWDs with hearing impairments. This implies that PWDs who have restricted physical movements may find it easier to get jobs in most companies than other PWDs with a different handicap. However, when it comes to jobs that call for more interaction with coworkers and/or with customers, they may be least preferred in favor of other persons with disabilities like those with hearing difficulties. This finding may relate to what has been discussed by Stone and

Colella (1996) that certain stigmas are attached to disabilities based on aesthetic qualities, concealability, and disruptiveness, among others, as perceived by observers. In terms of the Social Cost dimension or the apprehension on the possible negative reaction from coworkers and customers to the PWD, hearing impairment as a disability may look less repulsive, may look less obvious, and may not impede social interaction as much as motor disability (Stone & Colella, 1996). As research has established that socialization skills are a major concern for many employers, it is in the best interest of PWDs and the government to provide for the former coaching on how to be proficient in their interactions with others given the limits imposed by their handicap.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The employment prospective of PWDs in the Philippines is looking up as concluded from a survey conducted by Soriano and Hechanova (2007). The findings of the current study confirm this by establishing an overall positive attitude among Filipino employers towards PWDs. When asked, majority of the respondents in this research assented that they will likely hire PWDs in their company. They likewise agree very much to the idea that employing PWDs will lead to positive changes in the PWD's life.

The move to integrate PWDs into mainstream employment will prove to be beneficial in many ways: (a) for the PWD, as they become productive and fully functioning contributors to the society apart from the psychological benefit of boosting their self-worth and affirmation of their capabilities; (b) for the company, to widen its recruitment base and to possibly receive incentives (e.g., tax cuts) from the government for employing PWDs; and (c) for the country, as it makes extensive use of its available human resources and the promotion of nationalism from a fully-engaged citizenry.

With the baseline information established by this study, the government and other concerned sectors can improve the employability of PWDs by building on the characteristics of businesses and PWDs alike as well as on the variables that enhance positive attitude towards PWDs.

Filipino employers believe that exposure of non-PWD workers to

PWDs in the workplace promotes positive attitudes in them towards the latter. Indeed, companies who provide for healthy relations and positive interactions among diverse staff within the workplace help in reducing fear, discrimination, and any notions of unfairness within the company (Jones, 2007; Stone & Colella, 1996).

The current study found that Filipino employers associate the typical damaging notions about PWD employees (e.g., absence and punctuality problems, quick turnover, harder to train) to PWD applicants who have had no previous and related work experience. Majority of the respondents evidently preferred PWDs with prior work experience. Thus, the Philippine government can provide support in the rehabilitation and preparation of PWDs for occupational readiness. It can promote equal training and/or educational opportunities to PWDs and to ensure that they will get into jobs that are commensurate totheir qualifications and be paid accordingly for it.

Jobs could be created in the different government agencies specifically designed for PWDs. It could encourage other companies to employ PWDs through promotion of benefits that will be received by organizations that will hire them. These benefits may include, among many, an enhancement of the company's image as being a socially-responsible organization, the enjoyment of tax cuts and other incentives, doing their share in uplifting the lives of PWDs in the country, and having a wider recruitment base. Different employment sectors and schools can tailor on-the-job trainings or apprenticeship programs for PWDs to provide them with the needed work experience to prepare them for employment.

The study has also established that employers show the least favorable attitude towards variables such as training and preparation needed for PWDs to work in the company,attendance and punctuality problems PWDs bring to the company, negative reaction of customers toward PWD employees, and taking of jobs away from non-handicapped applicants when PWDs are hired in their place. As suggested by the results, these form part of the negative stereotypes associated with PWDs. Stone and Colella (1996) contended that because of these often unfounded notions, others generally anticipate PWDs not to perform as well or succeed at work when compared to non-disabled workers. There should be more efforts at dispelling these harmful perceptions.

The work of Arce (2014), for example, advocated the concept of deaf-gain among Filipino employers. She developed visual infographic materials in print and video formats to campaign for the advantages and benefits of hiring hearing-impaired workers (e.g., deafworkers are highly visual and very detailed) who are often discriminated against at work because of their handicap. This can be replicated to promote the gains that employers can obtain from PWD workers.

The findings of the present research are preliminary at best. It is therefore recommended that a repeat of the study be done in other parts of the nation and with more respondents to yield more robust conclusions. This current study contributes additional information to existing literature on some possible assessment tools that may be used for similar attitude researches. Specifically, the scale used in the study to measure employer attitudes possesses high internal reliabilities and consistency for each factor when used on a sample of Filipino employers. Thus, it can then be used to appropriately measure the attitudes towards the hiring of PWDs in any study involving Philippine employers. It is likewise recommended that a more thorough study of the relationship among the variables in this research be conducted. For example, a cross-tabulation and analysis of variance of the probability of hiring based on different employer characteristics can be done. Another direction for future research could be to look into the relationship among employer attitudes towards, hiring probability of, and evaluation of work performance of PWDs.

REFERENCES

Arce, A. K. (2014). *Deaf-gain in the Philippines: Assessing attitudes toward hiring deaf employees* (Unpublished Master's thesis). Gallaudet University, Washington, U.S.A.

Asian Development Bank. (2005). *Disabled people and development: Philippines country report*. Retrieved from www.adb.org/.../Disabled-People-Development/disabled-people.pdf

Blessing, L. (1997). *Employing persons with developmental disability: Effects of previous experience*. Retrieved from www.collectionscanada.gc.ca/obj/s4/f2/dsk/ftp03/MQ33345.pdf

Buenaobra, M. (2011). *Overcoming disability challenges in the Philippines* [Web log post]. Retrieved from http://asiafoundation.org/in-asia/2011/10/26/overcoming-disability-challenges-in-the-philippines/

Chi, C. G., & Qu, H. (2003). Integrating persons with disabilities into the workforce: A study on employment of people in food service industry. *International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Administration, 4*(4), 59-83. doi:10.1300/J149v04n04_04

Department of Justice Canada (n.d.). *Employment Equity Act (S.C. 1995, c.44)*. Retrieved from Department of Justice Canada: http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/e-5.401/index.html

Enabling the disabled. (2014, May 26). *Business Mirror*. Retrieved from http://businessmirror.com.ph/index.php/en/news/opinion/32759-enabling-the-disabled

Ericta, C. (2005). Disability statistics: Philippines. Paper presented in the 5th Annual Meeting of the Washington Group on Disability Statistics. Retrieved from www.cdc.gov/nchs/ppt/citygroup/meeting5/WG5_Session4_Ericta.ppt

Ficke, R. C. (1991). *Digest of data on persons with disabilities*. Washington, DC: National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research.

Field, A. (2000). *Discovering statistics using SPSS for Windows*. London: SAGE Publications.

Gatchalian, E. (2002). *How Filipinos want to be managed* (Unpublished manuscript). Saint Louis University, Baguio City.

Goertz, Y., van Lierop, B., Houkes, I., & Nijhuis, F. (2010). Factors related to the employment of visually impaired persons: A systematic literature review. *Journal of Visual Impairment & Blindness,* 404-418.

Graffam, J., Shinkfield, A., Smith, K., & Polzin, U. (2002). Factors that influence employer decisions in hiring and retaining an employee with a disability. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation, 17*(3), 175-181.

Honey, S., Meager, N., & Williams, M. (1993). Employers' attitudes towards people with disabilities. In Institute of Manpower Studies University of Sussex, Manpower Commentary No. 54.

International Disability Rights Monitor. (2005). *Regional report*

of Asia. Retrieved from http://idrmnet.org/pdfs/CIR_IDRM_Asia_05.pdf

Jones, G. R. (2007). *Introduction to business: How companies create value for people*. New York: The McGraw Hill Companies.

Kim, P. S. (2006). An analysis of the employment of persons with disabilities in the Korean government: A comparative study with the American federal government. *Public Personnel Management, 35*(1), 15-31.

Levy, J., Jessop, D., Rimmerman, A., Francis, F., & Levy, P. (1993). Determinants of attitude of New York state employers toward the employment of persons with severe handicaps. *Journal of Rehabilitation,* 49-54.

Loprest, P., & Maag, E. (2003). *The relationship between early disability onset and education employment*. Retrieved from http://www.urban.org/uploadedPDF/410992_disability_education_employment.pdf

Mansour, M. (2009). Employers' attitudes and concerns about the employment of disabled people. Proceedings of the Asia-Pacific Business Research Conference (pp. 1-11). Australia: World Business Institute. Retrieved from www.wbiconpro.com/index.html

Martz, E., & Xu, Y. J. (2008). Person-related and service-related factors predicting employment of individuals with disabilities. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation, 28,* 97-104.

Philippine Magna Carta for Disabled Persons. (1992). RA 7277 § § 1-2.a, 4.a (1992 & Supp. 2013).

Philippine Constitution, § 13-13 (1987).

Podsakoff, P. M., & Organ, D. W. (1986). Self-reports in organizational research: Problems and prospects. *Journal of Management, 12*(4), 531-544.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(5), 879-903. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879

Rimmerman, A. (1998, September). Factors relating to attitudes of Israeli corporate executives toward the employability of persons with intellectual disability. *Journal of Intellectual &*

Developmental Disability, 23(3), 245-254.

Smith, D. L. (2007). The relationship of type of disability and employment status in the United States from the behaviorial risk factor surveillance system. *Journal of Rehabilitation, 73*(2), 32-40.

Soriano, E. D., & Hechanova, M. R. (2007). Job prospects brighten for persons with disabilities. In M. R. Hechanova, E. P. Franco, & R. G. Reyes (Eds.), *Pinoy at work* (pp. 35-39). Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Office of Research and Publications.

Stone, D., & Colella, A. (1996). A model of factors affecting the treatment of disabled individuals in organizations. *Academy of Management Review, 21*(2), 352-401.

Unger, D. (2002). Employer's attitudes toward persons with disabilities in the workforce: Myth or realities? *Focus on Autism and Other Developmental Disabilities, 17*(1), 2-10.

Zissi, A., Rontos, C., Papageorgiou, D., Pierrakou, C., & Chtouris, S. (2007). Greek employers' attitudes to employing people with disabilities: Effects of the type of disability. *Scandinavian Journal of Disability Research, 9*(1), 14-25. doi:10.1080/15017410600973234