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Project Grad

Preliminary Analysis of Instructional Accommodations, Assistive Technology, and Employment Outcomes for Postsecondary Students with Disabilities

Introduction

The purpose of this report is to provide a preliminary analysis of the data that collected thus far as part of Project Grad, a collaborative research study with the National Center for the Study of Postsecondary Educational Supports (NCSPES) and the Nisonger Center of The Ohio State University. The primary objective of this study is to examine various transition issues in relation to the high school, postsecondary, and workplace settings. Specifically, researchers are interested in learning more about the employment outcomes of postsecondary graduates and what types of accommodations and technologies were used in both postsecondary and workplace settings.

How the report is organized

This report is organized into four major sections: (1) Sample Characteristics—a general overview of participant demographics, (2) Instructional Accommodations—a summary of learning accommodations and strategies utilized in the education and workplace settings, (3) Assistive Technology—a summary of assistive technologies used to facilitate learning and productivity in the education and workplace settings, and (4) Employment Outcomes—a description of employment outcomes in relation to accommodations used, including assistive technology in the workplace. In all cases, data was obtained from the results of interviews conducted as part of Project Grad, summarized both in narrative and graphical forms. Readers are cautioned to review these results as preliminary findings, pending future efforts to broaden the sample. Nevertheless, the current sample of 94 participants provides a considerable base of information which can be used to begin the process of examining issues related to instructional accommodations, assistive technology, and employment outcomes for individuals with disabilities.
Sample Characteristics
AGE, MARITAL STATUS, AND ETHNICITY

Based on the currently available sample of the 94 respondents who participated in interview activities, nearly half (48%) reported a chronological age ranging from 18-24, while 30% indicated an age range of 25 to 34. As expected, the percentage of participants above the age 34 decreased steadily as age categories increased. For example, participants reporting an age between 35 to 44 represented 14% of the sample, followed by 6% in the 45-54 age category and 2% in the “55 and Over” category. As such, 78% of sample consisted of participants below the age of 35, with the remaining 21% reporting an age level beyond that threshold. With regard to gender, 44% of the sample consisted of males, while 56% consisted of females. Most (68%) of the participants in the sample indicated that they had “Never Married” in comparison to the 25% who reported that they are currently married. The remaining 7% indicated they were either “Separated” or “Divorced.” In terms of ethnicity, approximately 85% of the sample consisted of individuals who selected the “Caucasian” category, followed by 6% who indicated “Black” and an equal percentage (6%) declaring “Multiethnic.” About 2% selected the category of “Asian/Pacific Islander.” Depending on the overall characteristics of the “Multiethnic” category, the current sample does not include any participants who selected the “Hispanic/Latino” or the “American Indian/Alaskan Native” option.

FAMILY POSTSECONDARY HISTORY AND SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS

Because many studies have shown that educational attainment of family members and socioeconomic conditions have been found to be consistently related to postsecondary attendance and completion, the interview included questions to obtain general, “contextual,” background information. Specifically, study participants were asked “Has anyone in your immediate family gone to college?” and “In high school, did you ever participate in a free-lunch program?” Both of these questions were included to serve as general, “proxy” measures of participants’ postsecondary history and socioeconomic status. Based on their responses, 75% of the respondents indicated that a family member had attended a postsecondary institution and 15% indicated that they had participated in a free or reduced lunch program in high school.

DISABILITY CHARACTERISTICS

When study participants were asked to identify their “primary disability,” most (30%) indicated a “Learning Disability,” followed by an “Attention Deficit Disorder” (25%). In about 25% of all cases, participants selected more than one disability area. Figure 1 indicates the overall percentages of participants in each disability category.
When asked when at what point in their life their disability was first diagnosed, about 47% of the participants indicated that their disability was first diagnosed in “Elementary School” or earlier (e.g., birth, preschool). As expected, reductions in the percentages of participants decreased as grade levels increased, since many disabilities, with the possible exception of what are commonly referred to as “hidden disabilities,” are usually identified at a relatively early age. As a result, 12% of the participants indicated that their disability was diagnosed at the “Middle/Jr. High” level and 9% selected “High School.”

In contrast to this general anticipated trend, it was found that 31% of the participants indicated that their disability was first identified at “College.” In a further breakdown of specific disability areas, it was found that most participants who were first identified with a disability at the secondary level were those that indicated an Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD), Other Health Impaired, or Psychiatric Disorder. In the case of ADHD, 74% of those who indicated this as a primary disability were first identified either at the high school or postsecondary level. Similarly, 69% of participants declaring the Other Health Impaired category and 62% indicating a Psychiatric Disorder were also first identified either while in high school or college. The latter finding appears to be consistent with Unger’s (1992) observation that the onset of major mental illness occurs between the ages of 18-25—a time when many young adults are seeking postsecondary education, preparing for future careers, and developing significant social relationships.
Instructional Accommodations

HOW DISABILITY IMPACTED ACHIEVEMENT

Study participants were asked to identify how their disability impacted their capability to learn the academic setting. Given the options shown in Figure 2 and the opportunity to provide multiple responses to this interview question, 63% of the participants indicated problems in the basic skill area of reading. Difficulties in the area of attention span were also frequently cited, as reported by 61% of the participants. Problems in the area of listening comprehension and mathematics calculation were indicated by 39% and 38% of the participants, respectively. In contrast, difficulties associated with hearing and visual acuity were identified less frequently.

FIGURE 2 shows percentages of participants indicating how their disability impacted learning in the academic setting. Specific categories include: Reading Recognition and Comprehension, Written Expression, Listening Comprehension, Attention Span, Oral Expression, Mathematics Reasoning and Calculation, Abstract Reasoning, Orientation and Mobility, Hearing, Visual Acuity, and Spatial Orientation. Note that the above percentages represent multiple responses.

HOW DISABILITY WAS ASSESSED

Given the range of learning difficulties experienced by participants, interview questions were included to ascertain how their disability was assessed and the types of support personnel involved in the assessment and planning process. With regard to the issue of assessment, 59% of the participants indicated that they had participated in a formal assessment to identify instructional accommodations. In general, professional staff most frequently involved in the assessment process included Disability Support Services staff, along with “community-based” psychologists (e.g., clinical, counseling,
Personnel identified as most frequently involved in the assessment process are shown in Figure 3. As indicated in the figure, postsecondary Disability Support Services staff participated in the assessment at a rate of 53%. Community-based and school psychologists were also mentioned as frequent participants in the formal assessment process, constituting a combined frequency of about 41%.

**FIGURE 3** indicates the percentages of personnel involved in the instructional assessment process. Categories included: Disability Support Services (DSS), Psychologist (PSYC), School Psychologist (S PSYC), Vocational Rehabilitation (VR), and Physician (MD). Note that the above percentages represent multiple responses.

Participants indicated that physicians and vocational rehabilitation staff were involved in the assessment process in less than 10% of the cases. Among the other support staff options available, but not identified by the participants, included the involvement of physical therapists, occupational therapists, speech and language clinicians, and audiologists.

**ACCOMMODATIONS PROVIDED**

Participants were asked to identify instructional accommodations provided in high school, a postsecondary institution, and in the workplace. Figure 4 indicates the range of accommodations made available at the high school and postsecondary levels only. As shown, postsecondary instructional accommodations were provided with a much higher degree of frequency that those provided at high school. For example, 81% of the participants indicated that they were provided “Extra time for tests or assignments” at the postsecondary level, in comparison to the 25% who indicated the same at the high school level. Similar, but less severe discrepancies, were also found in participants’ responses regarding such instructional accommodations as a “Quite or alternative learning environment,” “Communicating with the Instructor,” “Recording of Lectures,” and other instructional accommodations. While rather marked differences were observed in the frequency in which various accommodations were employed, the overall consistency with which instructional accommodations were pro-
vided in the high school and the postsecondary settings were quite similar, as evidenced by a fairly high Spearman rank order coefficient, \( r_s (19) = .81, p < .01 \). This type of relationship was not observed when examining the overall relationship between either the high school or postsecondary setting when compared to the workplace.

**High School Instructional Accommodations**

Based on currently available data, the most frequently used high school accommodations typically involve such strategies as providing the students with extra time to complete tests or assignments, providing tutorial support, placing students in a quieter learning environment, reading tests to students, and utilizing preferential classroom seating. Given the range of options for this interview question, percentages selected by participants ranged from 0 to 25%. High frequency accommodations were those indicated above, while lower frequency accommodations (e.g., selected by 3% or less by participants) included such strategies as the use of: specialized software programs (3%), enlarged print (3%), Brailled materials (1%), scribes (2%) and communicating with the instructor about their disability (2%). It is important to note that the latter strategy, “Communicating with the instructor” about their disability is used much more frequently at the postsecondary level (47%) and to some extent, within the workplace setting (10%), but significantly less at the high school setting (2%).

**FIGURE 4** shows the percentages of accommodations received in high school and the postsecondary setting. Note that the above percentages represent multiple responses.
Postsecondary Instructional Accommodations

Unlike what was observed at the high school level, participants reported a much high frequency of use of all types of accommodations at the postsecondary level. As indicated in Figure 4, 81% of the participants indicated they were provided with extra time to take tests or complete assignments. Similarly, 67% indicated that they were provided with a quiet or alternative learning environment. Nearly half (47%) indicated that they communicated with the instructor about their disability and about the same percentage utilized tutorial services or priority registration/scheduling options. Accommodations that appeared with less frequency were those that are often designed for individuals with “low incidence” disabilities such as visual or hearing impairments, areas that constitute a small segment of the disability population.

Workplace Accommodations

Relative to either the high school or postsecondary level, “instructional” accommodations, even those that bear a strong relationship to common workplace tasks (i.e., reading) were found to be used very little in the workplace setting. These data do not appear in Figure 4, given the overall frequency range with which accommodation are used in the workplace were found to be negligible. For example, participants indicated that they used accommodations 2% or less in the 17 of 19 categories. In these cases, the accommodations selected were those associated with individuals with visual or hearing impairments. The only exceptions were in the case of where 10% of the participants indicated they “Communicated with their Employer,” and the 5% who indicated they utilized a quiet or alternative work environment.

Adequacy of Accommodations

Interview questions were included to assess overall satisfaction of participants with the types of accommodation received. When asked, “How satisfied were you with the accommodations and services you received from your college disability service provider?,” 68% of the participants indicated they were “Very Satisfied.” Approximately 6% indicated they were either “Somewhat Dissatisfied,” and only 1% indicated they were “Very Dissatisfied.” In most cases (85%), participants indicated that their accommodation was appropriate to meet their learning needs. In contrast, 15% of the study participants indicated that they were provided with an instructional accommodation that they did not want, or did not think what was needed. In addition, about 30% indicated that they were denied an instructional accommodation they thought was needed.

With regard to taking initiative to provide for their own accommodations without the support of professional support staff, 66% indicated they “made their own accommodations. Also, than half of the study participants (52%) indicated that they provided their own accommodations “Almost Always” or “Frequently,” while others indicated they did so “Sometimes” or “Once in a While.”
Assistive Technology

How Assistive Technology Needs Were Assessed

Interview questions were included to ascertain how assistive technology needs of participants were assessed and the types of support personnel involved in the assessment and planning process. With regard to the issue of AT assessment, 16% of the participants indicated that they had participated in a formal assessment to identify assistive technology needs. In general, professional staff most frequently involved in the AT assessment process included Disability Support Services staff (40%).

Personnel identified as most frequently involved in the AT assessment process are shown in Figure 5. As indicated in the figure, postsecondary Disability Support Services staff were identified most frequently, followed by Vocational Rehabilitation staff (VR), Physicians (MD), and community-based psychologists (PSYC), excluding school psychologists. Among other support staff options available, but not identified by any of the participants, included the involvement of school psychologists, physical therapists, occupational therapists, speech and language clinicians, and audiologists.

![Personnel Involved in AT Assessment](image)

**FIGURE 5** indicates the percentages of personnel involved in the assistive technology assessment process. Categories included: Disability Support Services (DSS), Vocational Rehabilitation (VR), Physician (MD), and Psychologist (PSYC). Note that the above percentages represent multiple responses.

Assistive Technology Support Provided

Participants were asked to identify AT devices used in the high school, postsecondary, and the workplace settings. To facilitate analysis of the use of AT devices within each of these areas, with a specific focus on the postsecondary level, data were broken out to reflect postsecondary-high school and postsecondary-work utilization of AT. Figure 6 indicates the range of AT devices used at the postsecondary and high school levels.
Postsecondary-High School AT Utilization
The results presented in Figure 6 indicate that AT devices were generally used with a greater degree of frequency at the postsecondary level. While the types of devices used were found to be similar in both settings, \( r(28) = .74, p < .01 \), participants were generally more likely to indicate that an AT device had been used at the postsecondary level. In general, the types of AT most frequently used are those which are considered “low-tech”—that is, devices or strategies that are widely available, and/or relatively inexpensive to purchase. For example, within the postsecondary setting, “Highlighters and Outliners” and “Scanners” were used by 26% of the participants, followed by

![Figure 6](image-url)
“Talking Books” (15%), “Specialized Tape Recorder” (12%), “Portable Notetaking Device” (12%) and “Mouse/Switch Options” (10%). All other AT devices were used by less than 10% of the participants, with a general relationship observed between frequency and use and overall expense and/or complexity (i.e., “high tech”). That is, as AT devices increased in expense, complexity (e.g., “high tech devices”), or for highly specialized applications (e.g., “Refreshable Braille Display”) the likelihood of their use appeared to diminish. For example, less than 1% of the participants, either at the postsecondary or high school level, reported the use of such devices as a “Refreshable Braille Display,” “TTY/TDD,” “Augmentative Communication,” or “Telebraille” device.

Postsecondary-Work AT Utilization

As shown in Figure 7, the frequency of use of certain types of AT devices appears to decline rather precipitously from the postsecondary level to the workplace. With the exception of a “Scanner,” a notable reduction was observed in the frequency in which all other types of AT devices are used. For example, in the case of “Highlighters and...
Outliners” the frequency in which this strategy is used drops significantly, from the 26% participants who indicated they used this strategy at the postsecondary level, to 1% in the workplace. A similar pattern was noted with nearly every other type of assistive technology with the exception of highly specialized devices for low incidence populations (e.g., “Hearing Aid” for individuals with hearing impairments).

Relative to the utilization of all types of AT options used in the workplace, the device used with the highest frequency was a “Scanner,” selected by 15% of the participants. Approximately 5% of the participants indicated they used a “Portable Notetaking Device.” All other AT devices were used by less than 5% of the participants in the workplace setting.

**LEARNING TO USE ASSISTIVE TECHNOLOGY**

Participants were asked a series of interview questions to obtain information about when they learned to use AT who taught them how to use it. When asked, “When did you first learn to use this assistive technology?,” most (38%) indicated that they learned to use assistive technology at the postsecondary level. About 30% indicated that they first learned to use AT while in high school, while the remainder of participants indicated either the preschool/elementary or middle/junior high levels. Only 3% indicated that they first learned to use their AT in the workplace setting.

With regard to the interview question “Who taught you how to use AT?,” 75% of the participants indicated that they taught themselves. Approximately 12% indicated they were taught to use AT by Disability Support Services staff, followed by 8% who indicated a family member and 3% who indicated a staff member representing vocational rehabilitation services. Neither “Special Education Staff” or “Medical Staff” were selected by any of the participants. These data are shown in Figure 8.

**FIGURE 8** shows the percentages of professional personnel and other individuals who taught participants how to use AT devices.
When participants were asked, “How much did you learn about assistive technology from your disability service provider?,” 12% indicated they “Learned Everything” and 47% indicated they either “Learned a Lot” or “Learned Some.” In contrast, 29% reported that they “Learned Almost Nothing,” while 12% indicated they “Learned a Little.” When asked “How much did you learn about assistive technology from other campus resources or peers?,” 38% of the participants indicated they “Learned Almost Nothing,” followed by 19% who indicated they “Learned a Little.” However, a cumulative total of 43% indicated they “Learned Some,” “Learned a Lot,” or “Learned Everything.”

**ADEQUACY OF ACCOMMODATIONS**

_Interview questions were included to assess overall satisfaction_ of participants with the types of AT devices used in the postsecondary setting. When asked, “How satisfied were you with the assistive technology support you obtained, regardless of how you obtained it?,” 60% of the participants indicated they were “Very Satisfied” and 19% indicated they were “Somewhat Satisfied.” Approximately 1% indicated they were “Somewhat Dissatisfied,” and 3% indicated they were “Very Dissatisfied.”

When participants were asked “Were you ever asked to use assistive technology that you did not want, or didn’t think you needed?,” approximately 11% indicated that they were asked to use a AT device that they did not want or did not think was needed. When study participants were asked, “Did you ever need an assistive technology device that was not provided?,” 14% indicated that a certain type of AT was not provided they considered necessary to meet their educational needs in the postsecondary setting. In an overview of follow-up data collected for those who indicated they that a certain types of AT was not provided to them, about half of the devices needed involved computer-related hardware and software, ranging a “Keyboard” and “Spell Checker” to a “Computer” and “Voice Automated System.” Video tapes, audio tapes, and a CCTV were also devices selected by participants.

With regard to identifying the type of setting in which the AT was considered most useful, 42% of the participants indicated that it was most useful only “As a Student” and 1% indicated that it was most useful in the workplace (i.e., “On the Job”). However, 29% indicated that their AT was most useful both as a student and in the workplace. Only 6% of the participants indicated that their AT was useful to them in either the case “As a Student” or “On the Job,” suggesting perhaps that whatever type of AT that was used may simply not have been applicable to the learning or workplace setting.
Employment Outcomes

CURRENT EMPLOYMENT STATUS

A series of interview questions were asked of participants in order to obtain information about their postschool employment outcomes. Information was also collected from participants to assess their employment history, particularly during the time they were attending a postsecondary institution. For example, when study participants were asked “Did you have a job while attending college?,” 73% indicated that they had, with 78% reporting that they had held a part-time job and 22% indicating that they worked on a full-time basis at some point in their postsecondary educational experience.

Status of Participants Currently Employed

Based on the current sample, 85% of the participants indicated that they were employed, working an average of 34 hours per week. In terms of their most current employment, most (51%) reported job titles which fell into the U.S. Department of Labor’s “One-Digit Occupational Categories” of “Professional, Technical, and Managerial Occupations”—a classification scheme that includes nine broad categories (U.S. Department of Labor, 1991). These categories are only intended to provide a general description of various occupations. Nevertheless, they do give some indication of the general range of jobs held by individuals. The data shown in Figure 9 indicates the current job status of participants based on descriptions of their job titles.

FIGURE 9 shows the percentages of occupations currently reported by participants. Based on the U.S. Department of Labor’s Dictionary of Occupational Titles—Occupational Categories, Divisions, and Groups.

The types of jobs included in the “Professional, Technical, and Managerial Occupations” category include those in the areas of education, life sciences, medicine, law, and computer-related occupations, among others. Specific job descriptions that reported by
participants that fell in this category included “teacher,” “auditor,” “web designer,” and the like. Similarly, those who fell in the occupational category of “Clerical and Sales” indicated such jobs as “administrative secretary” and “retail store manager.” Jobs in the category of “Service Occupations” included “waitress” and “personal trainer.” “Structural Work Occupations” included “welder” and “construction manager,” while “Agricultural and Related Occupations” included “farmhand.” Although, “Military” is not included in the classification system, 2% of the participants are currently serving in this area.

Based on the above occupational categories, half (50%) of the participants indicated they were employed in a field related to their postsecondary studies. Most of those who indicated that their job was related to their course of study were in the area of “Professional, Technical, and Managerial Occupations.” Approximately 73% of the participants with jobs in this category indicated a relationship. In contrast, 35% of those in the “Clerical and Sales Occupations” and 38% in “Service Occupations” reported that their current employment was in a field related to their major course of postsecondary study.

In general, most participants currently employed indicated that they either found the job by themselves or through an informal network of family and friends. These job seeking strategies accounted for about 83% of the responses when participants were asked “Who helped you find your primary job?” Other job seeking supports identified by participants included: employment agency (4%), department at the college (4%), vocational rehabilitation services (2%) college career or job placement center (1%), and “Other,” resources or strategies for finding work (6%). While service providers were not frequently identified as a resource to help participants find their primary job, 18% of those interviewed indicated that a staff member from an agency or program still “keeps in touch with them to see how things are going on the job.”

Wages and Hours Worked Per Week

Once again, based on the sample of the 85% of participants who indicated they were currently working, their average (i.e., mean) hourly salary is $12.00 per hour. However, given the high level of variation ($SD = $14), additional types of analyses were conducted using data recoded into categories. In this case, reported hourly wages were placed in categories: (1) “Less than $5,” (2) “$6 to $15,” (3) “$16 to $25,” “$26 to $35,” and “More than $35.” Based on the wages reported for their current jobs, 78% of the participants indicated that they made between $6 to $15 per hour and 18% indicated they made between “$16 to $25.” The remaining 4% of the sample was equally balanced by those participants who reported earnings of “Less than $5” or between “$26 to $35.” No participant reported a wage of more than $35 per hour.
For the purposes of comparison, hourly wage data was also collected from previous jobs held by participants, which in some cases, included three previous jobs. Recoded into the categories indicated above, Figure 10 shows the change in hourly wages from the participants’ first job, second job, and current job. As shown, a marked increase in the category, “$6 to $15” was observed from the first and second jobs held by participants to the most current. An increase was also noted in the “$16 to $25” category, but to a much lesser degree. As such, when participants made a job change, their hourly wage was more likely to fall in the “$6 to $15” category than any other.

With regard to the number of paid hours per week, aggregated data indicate that participants work an average of 34 hours per week, but with a large degree of variation (SD = 14). When grouped into hourly categories (i.e., “Less than 10,” “11 to 20,” “21 to 30,” “31 to 40,” and “40 or More”), it was found that, in general, participants tend to work more hours with each job change (see Figure 11). However, the number of hours worked do not seem to change appreciably with the most recent job change.
Employment Benefits
Based on the sample of the 85% of participants who indicated they were currently working, the majority (59%) indicated they receive medical and health care benefits. Half (50%) of the participants also indicated they have sick leave and paid vacation benefits and somewhat smaller percentage (45%) indicated they are eligible for personal leave benefits. These data are presented in Figure 12. Approximately 36% of the participants reported that they have no benefits at all in their current jobs.

FIGURE 12 shows the percentages of various benefits reported by currently employed participants.

Status of Participants Not Currently Employed
Of the 15% of the participants who indicated they were not currently employed, five (5) indicated they were currently in school or in a training program; three (3) indicated they are currently looking for work, three (3) reported that there were no jobs available in their area of study, and one (1) participant expressed concern about losing their SSI or disability benefits. None of the participants interviewed reported difficulties in finding a job due to raising a family, not knowing how to find a job, transportation problems, or “Doesn’t Need a Job.”

ACCOMMODATION NEEDS IN THE WORKPLACE
Participants were asked a series of questions in relation to how well their accommodation needs were being met in the workplace and their overall ability to get their needs met. Specifically, they were asked to indicate their level of satisfaction on a scale that included the following options: (1) “Very Satisfied,” (2) “Somewhat Satisfied,” (3) “Somewhat Dissatisfied,” (4) “Very Dissatisfied,” or “Not Applicable.” Table 1 shows each question and how participants responded.

The results shown in Table 1 indicate that most participants are either “Very Satisfied” or “Somewhat Satisfied” with their current accommodations and their ability to identify and advocate for their needs. However, relative to their overall responses, a number of participants seemed indicate some level of dissatisfaction with their ability to
TABLE 1— Satisfaction with Workplace Accommodations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How satisfied are you with your ability to...</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Do your job with the accommodations you are using now?</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Identify your employment accommodation needs?</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Discuss accommodation needs with your employer?</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Negotiate reasonable accommodations with your employer?</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Evaluate the effectiveness of an accommodation?</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Keep your employer informed of your accommodation needs?</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Participate in all aspects of the accommodation request process?</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All results expressed in percentages.*

discuss accommodation needs with their employer as evidenced by the 18% who indicated they were either “Somewhat Dissatisfied” or “Very Dissatisfied.” Although to a lesser extent, similar results were observed on a question in which participants were asked to rate their level of satisfaction with regard to their ability to negotiate reasonable accommodations with their employer. With the exception of the aforementioned two areas that modestly deviated from their other satisfaction ratings, the overall results would seem to reflect an overall high level of satisfaction among participants.

TECHNOLOGY USED IN THE WORKPLACE

When participants were asked “What is the most useful technology you use on the job?” more than half of the participants (53%) indicated a “computer” was the most useful technology used on the job. Approximately 29% indicated that they either “Don’t Use” or that technology was not applicable to their current job. In 5% of the cases, participants indicated a specific type of software (e.g., “Dragon Speak”) and 3% indicated that they found a personal computing device (e.g., “Palm Pilot”) most useful.

With regard to the question, “Who taught you how to use the technology on the job?” 75% of the participants indicated that they taught themselves and 12% indicated that they were taught by a family member. Less frequently mentioned were professional staff serving individuals with disabilities, including postsecondary Disability Support Services (4%) and vocational rehabilitation staff (4%).