Employment for Persons with and without Disabilities in California

Edward Yelin and Laura Trupin

Institute for Health Policy Studies

University of California, San Francisco

[+]The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant from the U.S. Social Security Administration (SSA) funded as part of the Disability Research Institute (DRI). The opinions and conclusions expressed are solely those of the authors and should not be construed as representing the opinions or policy of SSA or any agency of the Federal Government.

Correspondence in regards to this article can be addressed to Edward Yelin or Laura Trupin, UCSF Box 0920, San Francisco, CA 94143-0920., or by phone (415-476-9027), fax (415-476-9030) or email (yelin2@itsa.ucsf.edu or trupin@itsa.ucsf.edu).

Abstract

The present report uses a new data source, the California Work and Health Survey (CWHS), to assess the impact of working conditions and individuals' medical and demographic characteristics on employment outcomes of persons with and without disabilities. The results indicate that persons with disabilities were much less likely than those without to be employed; were more likely to report job losses, part-time, part-year; episodic; involuntary part-time; and, after adjustment for demographic characteristics, contingent employment; and had a much higher probability of poverty despite their employment. However, when persons with and without disabilities were employed, they did not differ significantly in the size of their firms, the mix of their occupations and industries, or in any individual working condition, with the exception that such persons were more likely to report serious problems in their workplace environments. The results of these analyses suggest that persons with disabilities have weaker ties to employment but similar working conditions when employed than those without disabilities. Thus, persons with disabilities face similar job demands but have less security of employment to buffer those demands.

Introduction

The present report uses a new data source, the California Work and Health Survey (CWHS), to assess the impact of working conditions and individuals' medical and demographic characteristics on employment outcomes of persons with and without disabilities.

Low rates of employment among persons with disabilities are not a new problem. Indeed, fear that this nation faced a pandemic of work disability associated with chronic disease -- a fear buttressed by the experience of workers compensation and private disability insurance companies -- delayed passage of the Social Security Disability Insurance (SSDI) Program from the time Social Security retirement benefits were passed in 1935 until the mid-1950s (Berkowitz, 1987; Starr, 1982). And, when initially passed, the circumstances under which an individual was eligible to receive disability benefits were quite narrow (Stein, 1980).

The fears about a pandemic of work disability have proven to be well-founded. The number of persons applying for SSDI (and later Supplemental Security Income or SSI benefits) typically flows with a downturn in the economy, but never ebbs sufficiently to allow the system to fully recover from recessions (Mashaw & Reno, 1996; Rupp & Stapleton, 1998; Stone, 1984; Wunderlich & Rice, 2002; Yelin, 1989).

Indeed, several researchers have recently observed that, despite the strong labor market in the U.S. during most of the past decade, employment rates among persons with disabilities did not increase (Levine, 2000) and may have even declined (Burkhauser, Daly, & Houtenville, 2001; Kruse & Schur, 2001).[1] Additionally, the number of persons applying for SSDI benefits

[1]Hale (2001) argues that the measures of disability used in the foregoing studies are insufficiently reliable to permit the authors to conclude that employment rates have worsened. Kaye (2001) argues that

has remained high, despite an extraordinarily tight labor market (Wunderlich & Rice, 2002). Although several researchers argue that the passage of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 may have retarded growth in employment among persons with disabilities by increasing the cost of hiring such individuals (Acemoglu & Angrist, 1998; Burkhauser, et al., 2001), even before the ADA took effect, people with disabilities had employment rates a fraction of those among persons without disabilities (Yelin & Katz, 1994a; Yelin & Katz, 1994b). Clearly, many factors in effect prior to the passage of the ADA affect the employment situation of persons with disabilities.

These factors include changes in the demographic structure of American society and concomitant changes in the nature of the morbidities associated with work disability (Chirikos, 1995; Wunderlich & Rice, 2002); changes in the incentives affecting the decision to withdraw from work as a result of dynamics in earnings, income from sources other than work, and social welfare programs, including SSDI (Autor & Duggan, 2001; Boskin & Hurd, 1978; Bound, 1989; Burtless, 1986; Bound, 1989; Parsons, 1991); macroeconomic factors, including the overall demand for labor at any one point as well as changes in the demand for labor in different sectors of the economy over time (Berkowitz, Johnson, & Murphy, 1976; Levitan & Taggart, 1977; Stapleton, Coleman, Dietrich, & Livermore, 1998, Yelin, 1992); changes in the racial and gender composition of the labor force (Yelin & Katz, 1994a), and changes in the kind of employment available and in the ways that work is organized (Yelin & Trupin, 2002).

If one assumes that the physical or mental impairments are the principal reasons that

---

employment rates among persons with disabilities may not actually have declined.

persons with disabilities do not work, one would have expected their labor force participation rates to have increased over the last couple of decades due to improvements in the care of many of the chronic conditions associated with impairment and, more importantly, to the decline in the physical demands of jobs. However, studies have long shown that the physical demands of jobs are but one of many factors affecting the decision to stop working. Indeed, employment of persons with disabilities would appear to be more closely tied to the extent to which the workplace accommodates the needs of such persons through flexibility in scheduling and the provision of an accessible environment (Daly & Bound, 1996; Krause, Dasinger, & Neuhauser, 1998; Murphy, 1991; Yelin, Nevitt & Epstein, 1980;).

The erosion in the physical demands of jobs and growth of the services sector have occurred in tandem with other profound changes in the nature of work. Historically, work was organized in two tiers: a group of workers who designed and supervised production processes, were paid on a salaried basis, and provided security of employment ("white collar workers") and another who carried out those processes and who were paid hourly wages and subjected to periodic lay-offs ("blue collar workers"). In the interim, there has been a substantial merging of the working conditions in which blue collar workers are asked to contribute to the improvement of production processes while white collar workers are no longer shielded from lay-offs (Osterman, 1999). In fact, an increasing amount of both blue and white collar work is often completed by independent contractors or those hired for short-term assignments (Belous, 1989; Polivka, 1996). As a corollary of these changes in the way individual jobs are organized, a high proportion of workers have short job tenures with their current employers. Many others are forced to cobble together multiple part-time or part-year jobs (Benner, Brownstein, & Dean,

1999).

Due to the growth of many service sector jobs as well as of the increasing use of computerized technologies to design and run production in manufacturing, the cognitive demands of jobs have been increasing rapidly (Hecker, 2001). Due to the flattened workplace hierarchies, a higher proportion of workers must be able to communicate with other workers and perform well in group interactions (Hirshhorn, 1991).

What do we know about how persons with disabilities are faring in the emerging workplace? Most analyses of the employment prospects of groups traditionally disadvantaged in work, members of racial or ethnic minorities, the young, the old, and women, rely upon data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, particularly the Current Population Survey (CPS) and its principal supplements. However, because the CPS does not collect information on all working conditions in one place, it is not possible to assemble a complete picture of how individuals experience the sum total of the changes in the organization of employment from the latter data source. In this report, we rely on a new data source, the CWHS, to describe the employment situation of persons with disabilities. In the CWHS, respondents report on their entire employment situation. California would appear to be in the forefront of many of the labor market practices that are emerging nationally because of the prominence of technology-based industry and its young and mobile labor force (Benner, 2000; Yelin & Trupin, 1999). Nevertheless, the State is a good laboratory for employment research since the working conditions described above are becoming increasingly common around the nation (Osterman, 1999).

In the next section of the report, we summarize the design of the CWHS; the measures of disability, health, demographic characteristics, employment status, and working conditions used

in the analysis; and the specific statistical techniques used to evaluate the impact of disability on employment outcomes. Subsequent sections describe the impact of disability on employment status and alternate employment outcomes, including: job displacement, part-time-part-year, episodic, contingent, and poorly remunerated work, and jobs with short tenure, and then synthesize the findings and discuss some of the policy implications.

Data Source and Analytic Methods

Overview

This report is based on analyses of the (CWHS), a telephone survey designed to be representative of the adult California population, beginning in 1998 and conducted annually for three years. The CWHS combines the features of Federal labor market surveys, such as the CPS and its supplements, and such health surveys as the National Health Interview Survey (NHIS), allowing the integration of the two kinds of information in a single data source. Although limited to California residents, the CWHS provides data not available in any single survey in the U.S. covering the entire working age population. In this report, we analyzed responses from all participants between the ages of 18 and 64 who were interviewed in 1999 as well as those who were added to the survey in 2000: a total of 2,417 individuals.

Data Source

The CWHS was initiated in June 1998 with 1,771 respondents, interviewed in English or Spanish. Respondents were selected from a random-digit dialing sample of Californians age 18 or over, with oversamples of person with disabilities, African-Americans, and Asian/Pacific Islanders. The 1999 CWHS included interviews with 2,040 California adults, of whom 909 were part of the 1998 CWHS and another 1,131 were new respondents, including oversamples of

African-Americans, Asian/Pacific Islanders, persons with disabilities, and persons ages 45 to 70. The 2000 CWHS included interviews with a total of 2,168 California adults, of whom 627 were part of the 1998 and 1999 CWHS, 638 were part of the 1999 CWHS, and another 903 were new respondents. The new respondents included oversamples of African-Americans, Asian/Pacific Islanders and Hispanics. Over the three years, the survey has had 3,805 respondents, of whom 1,551 were interviewed at least twice.

To account for the oversampling methods, and to ensure that the reported results are representative of the California adult population, all estimates presented here make use of proportionate sampling weights. These weights are developed in two stages: the first stage adjusts for differences in the probability of selection of different types of individuals attributable to the sampling design (i.e., oversampling of certain populations); the second stage adjusts for differences in contact and response rates of different sub-populations, defined by age, gender, race/ethnicity, household size, and region of the State. The weighting targets are based on California Department of Finance annual population estimates. The use of proportional weights ensures that we do not artificially inflate the total sample size. The Appendix Table includes weighted and unweighted sample sizes for the principal variables, outlined below, used in the analyses.

Variable Definitions

Disability Measurement

There are two measures of disability used in this report. For most of the analyses, a respondent is considered to have a disability if he or she answered the following question affirmatively, "Are you limited in any way in any activities because of a long-term physical or

mental impairment or medical condition?" If necessary, a long-term condition is defined for the respondent as "one which has already lasted three months, or if it began less than three months ago, can be expected to last that long." This measure is based on the National Health Interview Survey (NHIS; Adams & Marano, 1995) activity limitation status variable, and is consistent with the definition of disability established by the Americans with Disabilities Act.

The other measure is closer to the "work disability" variable used in many of the Federal labor market surveys, including the CPS. Respondents are considered to have a work disability if they answer either of these questions affirmatively: "Does any long-term physical or mental impairment or medical condition now keep you from working at a job or business?" or "Are you limited in the kind or amount of work you can do because of any long-term impairment or health problem?" This variable has received a great deal of well-deserved criticism for, on the one hand, providing an overly conservative estimate of disability prevalence, and on the other hand, setting up a tautology when used to measure employment status among persons with disabilities (Hale, 2001). We include it here not to defend its use, but as a tool for comparing the results of the two measures, and for comparing CWHS results to other labor market surveys.

In the CWHS, 14.9% of respondents reported activity limitation based on the National Health Interview (NHIS) measure and 11.1% reported work disability based on the CPS measure. For comparison purposes, in 2000, 9.6% of NHIS respondents, 18 through 64 years of age, reported activity limitation, whereas 7.6% of CPS respondents of the same ages reported work disability in that year. The analogous rates may be higher in the CWHS as a result of the sampling universe for the survey which included as respondents adults at home at the time of contact or upon up to six follow-up calls. Persons with disabilities are more likely to be home

than persons without disabilities, increasing the share of the total sample with disabilities than would be the case if the follow-up had entailed a greater number of calls conducted over a longer period and/or sampling from every possible household by a door to door enumeration which would capture respondents in households without telephones.

Health Measures

In addition to measuring disability status, we also disaggregated the respondents according to physical and mental health status, and the presence or absence of chronic illness. Overall health status was measured by the response to the question, "In general, would you say your health is excellent, very good, good, fair or poor?" This widely-used measure of self-perceived health has been shown to be related to functional status, morbidity, and mortality (Idler, 1994). Mental health was measured by the Short Geriatric Depression Scale (S-GDS), a 15-item battery which has been validated for use with general adult populations (Cwikel & Ritchie, 1989; Sheikh & Yesavage, 1986; Rule, Harvey, & Hobbs,, 1989). We use a score of 7 or higher as a cut-point; such high levels of depressive symptoms are considered to be indicative of clinical depression (Cwikel & Ritchie, 1989). Respondents were asked if a doctor had ever diagnosed them with any of a list of 12 major chronic conditions. For this report, we show results for the two most common categories of chronic illness: circulatory conditions, including hypertension and heart disease; and musculoskeletal conditions, including arthritis, back problems, and repetitive strain injuries.

Labor Market Outcomes

The labor market section of the CWHS included information on current employment situation, such as employment status, self-employment, number of jobs, hours of work per week,

and weeks of work per year. Respondents who were not working were asked about job seeking activities, reasons for not working, and work history. Respondents who were working were asked about job characteristics (e.g. occupation, industry, tenure, size of firm, union status, benefits), work arrangements (e.g. work schedule and flexibility, contingent employment, working from home), and the physical and psychological demands of work.

In the first section of the report, we describe the employment status of persons with or without disabilities, focusing on whether or not an individual is employed for pay during the week prior to interview. Subsequently, in order to focus on a number of labor market outcomes, we restrict the analyses to those with current or recent employment. Among those individuals who have worked within the past year, we define the following variables: involuntary job loss in the past year, defined as having been laid off from a job, or having left a job due to expectations of being laid off; part-time/part-year employment, defined as working fewer than 50 weeks per year and fewer than 35 hours per week; and episodic employment, defined as working fewer than 40 weeks in the past year. For those participants who report working in the past week, we are able to describe an additional set of labor market outcomes, including involuntary part-time employment, defined as working fewer than 35 hours per week due to slack business conditions or the inability to find full-time work; contingent employment, defined as a job that is not expected to last more than 12 months; poverty despite employment, defined as being currently employed for pay, but nonetheless having a household income below 125% of the Federal Poverty Level; and job tenure of one year or less.

Working Conditions

For currently employed participants, we examined a number of characteristics of employment, including occupation and industry, self-employment, work shift, supervisory status, union membership, having flexible work hours, working from home, having conditions of high demands and low autonomy at work, having a job involving physical labor, and perceiving aspects of the workplace environment as problematic (such as access to public transportation, noise, safety, and conveniences in the area). In addition, we defined a synthetic measure of working conditions, *traditional employment*, designed to capture the characteristics of old economy jobs: What one might call the typical "9 to 5" job. These characteristics include working full time for the full year, being an employee (i.e., not self-employed or an independent contractor) paid by the firm where one works, having only one job, working day shifts, having a permanent (not contingent, that is expected to last a year or more) job, and not working from home.

Demographic and Socioeconomic Variables

In addition to the employment and health measures, the CWHS includes basic demographic and socioeconomic characteristics. Many of the results presented are stratified or adjusted by the following variables: age (18-24, 25-44, 34-54, 55-64), gender, nativity, race/ethnicity (non-Hispanic White, non-Hispanic African American, Asian American, and Hispanic), education (some high school or less, high school graduate, some college/vocational education, college graduate, and graduate degree), marital status (married/partnered, widowed/separated/divorced, never married), urban or rural residence, and region of the state (Los Angeles, other Southern California, San Francisco Bay Area, and other).

Analyses

In this report, we examine the relationship of disability status to the eight labor market outcomes defined above: current employment status, job loss, part-time/part-year employment, episodic employment, involuntary part-time employment, contingent employment, poverty despite employment, and short job tenure. We present the proportion of persons with and without disabilities who have each outcome, stratified by health status measures and by demographics, with and without adjustment for demographic variables. Additionally, we look at the relative frequency of individual working conditions and the synthetic traditional employment measure among persons with and without disabilities. Among all participants with a work history, we also consider the occupation, industry, and tenure of their longest job as a potential explanatory variable in the relationship between disability status and current employment status. Finally, we examine how disability and traditional employment relate to one of the key labor market outcomes: poverty despite employment.

In the unadjusted results, we present proportions of persons with and without disability in each outcome, along with 95% confidence intervals (CI) to indicate the reliability of the estimates. We also calculate a ratio of those proportions for persons with disabilities compared to those without. These results are stratified first by the health characteristics, including self-perceived health status, depressive symptoms, musculoskeletal conditions, and circulatory conditions. Subsequent tables show the results for each outcome stratified by the demographic variables listed above.

In order to adjust for the different characteristics of persons with and without disabilities, we developed multivariate logistic regression models in which each outcome is a function of

disability status and a set of independent variables. For the results stratified by health characteristics, those independent variables include the entire set of demographic/socioeconomic variables described above, and one health variable at a time. For the results stratified by demographic and socioeconomic characteristics, all the models contain the entire set of those variables. In addition, we investigated models that included an interaction term for disability and one of the demographic or socioeconomic variables at a time. Whenever that term had at least a moderate effect ($p < .20$), it was included in the model. In these instances, it would appear that the relationship between disability status and the given outcome was dependent upon another demographic or socioeconomic characteristic of the individual. Such models are indicated with an asterisk (*) in the tables.

In order to have comparable presentations for both the unadjusted and adjusted results, we calculated the adjusted proportions and 95% confidence intervals from the logistic regression results, along with the ratio of these proportions for persons with and without disabilities. For each cell in the tables, we developed the adjusted proportion by calculating the predicted probability of the outcome for all observations, but setting the covariates that defined a given cell to the value corresponding to that cell, as if, for example, all participants were males with no disability (for a detailed explanation of this method see Pasta, Cisternas, & Williamson, 1998). The variance associated with the adjusted proportion was calculated using a Taylor series approximation (Rutten-van Molken, van Doorslaer, & van Vliet, 1994).

Limitations

The principal limitation of the CWHS is that the health and disability measures were based on self-report. Accordingly, those reporting disability or poor health may have done so to

legitimize the withdrawal from employment. Moreover, such persons may not meet the definition of disability to qualify for Social Security Disability Insurance (SSDI) or Supplemental Security Income (SSI), both of which require diagnostic certainty and proof of an inability to engage in substantial gainful activity. However, the definitions of disability in this report are those used in most disability and employment research.

Another limitation of the CWHS is that the survey was conducted in California. There is evidence that many of the emerging labor market practices may be used more frequently in California than in the remainder of the country, particularly contingent forms of employment and short job tenures in fast growth, high wage industries (Benner, 2000). Nevertheless, there is also evidence that these practices are becoming more widespread throughout the nation (Osterman, 1999).

Findings

Employment Status

In 1999-2000, reflecting the strong labor market in California during those years, 66.2% of the State's adult population reported being employed[2]. However, persons with disabilities as defined by activity limitation were only 58% as likely as those without to be working (42%.6 and 73.2% of the two groups were employed, respectively) (Table 1). After adjustment for demographic characteristics,[3] persons with disabilities were still 56% as likely as those without to report being employed. Thus, in contrast to many studies in the literature (e.g. Berkowitz,

[2] The Appendix includes a table of the distribution of demographic, health, and employment characteristics of the CWHS sample, by disability status.

[3] The demographic characteristics included in the statistical adjustment included gender, age,

Johnson, & Murphy, 1976; Yelin & Katz, 1994a), the low employment rates of persons with disabilities in the CWHS did not appear to be principally the result of their demographic characteristics.

In addition to displaying the overall employment rates among persons with and without disabilities, Table 1 also shows the impact of various measures of health status on the employment of the two groups. For two of the health status measures (overall health status and the presence of circulatory conditions), there is evidence that poor health interacts with disability status to further reduce the employment of persons with disabilities. Accordingly, among persons in excellent, very good, or good health, those with disabilities were 75% as likely to be employed as those without (55.7% and 74.6% of the two groups reported employment, respectively), whereas among persons in fair or poor health, those with disabilities were only 41% as likely to be employed (24.6 vs. 60.3%, respectively). Similarly, the ratio of the employment rates of persons with and without disabilities without circulatory conditions was 64%, but among those with such conditions, the ratio was only 47%.

Recall from above that adjustment for demographic characteristics had little effect on the relative employment rates of persons with and without disabilities. However, for every measure of health status, adjustment for demographic characteristics increased the gap in employment rates between persons with and without disabilities in *better health*. The implication is that persons with disabilities in better health actually have higher employment rates than one would expect based on the combination of their disability and demographic characteristics.

---

nativity, race/ethnicity, marital status, urban/rural residence, region of the State, and education.

Table 2 shows the employment rates of persons with and without disabilities, defined by work limitation that is either an inability to work or having a limitation in the amount or kind of work.[4] Overall, persons with disability defined by work limitation were only 46% as likely as those without to be employed (the employment rates of the two groups were 33.3% and 73.0%, respectively). As with the activity limitation definition of disability, adjustment for demographic characteristics did not substantially alter the ratio of the employment rates of persons with and without disabilities defined by work limitation, reducing it only from 46% to 43%. For three of the four measures of health status, persons with disabilities in poorer health had particularly low employment rates. Among persons with disabilities, only 21.8% of those reporting fair or poor health were employed, as were only 24.1% of those reporting high levels of depressive symptoms, and 22.9% of those with circulatory conditions. The absence of this effect among persons with musculoskeletal conditions may be an artifact of the high prevalence of these conditions, since conditions of high prevalence tend to have milder severity (Verbrugge et al., 1989).

The impact of disability on employment is decidedly more pronounced on members of racial and ethnic minorities, foreign-born residents, older workers, and residents of rural areas (Table 3). For example, employment rates (57.1% and 58.3%, respectively) were almost identical among persons with and without disabilities for persons 18 to 24 years of age. However, among persons 25 to 44, those with disabilities were only about two-thirds as likely to

[4] Disability defined by activity limitation – the definition used in all but Table 2 – is more common than disability defined by work limitation: after weighting, 14.9 percent of the CWHS respondents report the former kind of disability while 11.1% percent report the latter.

be employed (49.6% vs. 77.1%, for a ratio of 64%), while among those 45 to 54, persons with disabilities were less than half as likely to be employed (38.7% vs. 82.0%), and among those 55 to 64, the former group was only about 40% as likely to be employed as the latter (25.7% vs. 61.3%).

In a similar vein, among rural residents, persons with disabilities were about a third as likely to be employed as those without, but among urban residents the analogous ratio was 61%.

Disability status also accentuated regional differences in employment that existed at the time of the CWHS in 1999 and 2000. During those years, the economy of the San Francisco Bay Area was particularly strong due to the growth of computer-related and biotech industry, while in the labor market in Los Angeles, dependent on older manufacturing sectors, and the Central Valley, dependent on agricultural industries, was considerably weaker (Levy, 2001). Persons without disabilities fared almost as well in the weaker labor markets as in the Bay Area, while persons with disabilities in Los Angeles and the Central Valley were much less likely to find work than in the Bay Area.

In 1999 and 2000, African-American and Asian-Americans with disabilities had especially low employment rates relative to such persons without disabilities and especially in comparison to Whites without disabilities. African-Americans with disabilities were less than half as likely to be employed as such persons without disabilities (31.7% vs. 69.9%), while Asian-Americans with disabilities were only slightly more than a third as likely to be employed as such persons without disabilities (27.4% vs. 74.4%). Perhaps as an artifact of the relative youthfulness of Hispanics, Hispanics with disabilities had higher employment rates than African or Asian-Americans with disabilities and, overall, such persons were 56% as likely to be

employed as Hispanics without disabilities (38.2% vs. 68.5%).

Persons with disabilities with low levels of education would appear to be particularly vulnerable to employment problems: only about a quarter of such persons with less than a high school education reported employment, while less than a third of persons with disabilities who had graduated from high school were employed. However, the ratio of the employment rates of persons with and without disabilities increases, indicative of improvement, with each increment in educational level. Thus, among persons with less than a high school education, those with disabilities were only 45% as likely to be employed as those without; the ratio was 46% among those who completed high school, 53% among those with some college, 77% among college graduates, and 79% among those with at least some post-graduate schooling. Although persons with disabilities with high levels of education do not achieve equality of employment with those without disabilities, they come much closer to doing so. As a consequence, the returns from each increment in education in terms of employment are actually greater for persons with disabilities than those without: among persons with disabilities, those who had some post-graduate education were more than 2.6 times as likely to be employed as those with less than a high school degree (68.3% vs. 26.2%), while among persons without disabilities, those with post-graduate schooling were about 1.5 times more likely (87.0 vs. 58.1%). The finding that persons with disabilities experience a greater return from education is consistent with the results of a previous analysis using the CPS, a national data source (Yelin, 1996).

Women with disabilities fare as well as men with disabilities in their employment rates (43.1% and 42.1%, respectively), but women without disabilities have much lower employment rates than men without them (64.8% vs. 81.0%, respectively). As a result, the ratio of the

employment rates of women with and without disabilities. 67%, is much higher than the ratio among the two groups of men, 52%.

In Table 4, we show the results of three multivariate models of the impact of disability and various sets of covariates on the employment status of the persons 18 through 64 with a work history. Persons with and without disabilities reported employment rates of 44.1% and 76.2% (for a ratio of 58%) when unadjusted. With adjustment for demographics, persons with and without disabilities had employment rates of 42.7% and 74.8%, respectively, for a ratio of about 57%. Adjusting for health status, demographic characteristics, and depression, narrowed the difference somewhat, with persons with and without disabilities having employment rates of 48.0% and 73.8%, for a ratio of 65%. Adjustment for the specific job history had essentially no additional effect, with persons with and without disabilities having employment rates of 47.9% and 73.8%, respectively (a ratio of 64%). Thus, disability itself would seem to account for most of the employment gap between persons with and without disabilities, although the poorer health status of persons with disabilities also contributes to the gap.

Alternative Employment Outcome Measures

Earlier we described some of the profound ways that employment has changed, in particular the severing of long-term ties between workplaces and employees, resulting, in turn, in the growth of contingent forms of employment. In prior eras, success in the labor market could be demarcated by whether or not an individual worked. By that measure, historically high employment rates as the last decade ended would indicate that a large proportion of the working age population had achieved success. The increase in employment rates was due to three distinct phenomena: the entrance of an increasing fraction of women into the labor force over the past

several decades; welfare reform in the mid-1990s resulted in an increase in employment among the poor; and the strength of the labor market in the latter part of the 1990s and first year of the present decade propelled millions of Americans from all walks of life into work.

However, with short job tenures and contingent forms of employment, the lines between employment and unemployment have been blurred, with increasing fractions of the workforce experiencing both some time employed and some time unemployed and, when employed, not having a traditional relationship to a single workplace. In turn, labor market analysts have developed new measures to gauge employment outcomes of vulnerable populations, including frequency of job loss, involuntary part-time employment, episodic employment, meeting a formal definition of contingent employment, having short job tenures, and remaining in poverty despite employment. In this section of the report, we report on the extent to which persons with disability experience these alternative measures of employment outcome.

Job Loss

In 1999-2000, despite the strength of California's economy during those years, 9.7% of the State's adults who had worked in the 12 months prior to interview reported experiencing job loss during that time frame. Table 5 displays the conjoint impact of disability and health status on rates of job loss in the year prior to interview among persons who have worked during this time frame. Overall, about one in six persons with disabilities experienced job loss in the year prior to interview while fewer than one in ten persons without disabilities reported such job loss. Adjustment for demographic characteristics had no substantial effect on the ratio of the job loss rates of persons with and without disabilities, suggesting that disability itself accounts for the difference between these two groups. The finding that persons with disabilities experience

significantly higher rates of job loss, an elevated risk of 1.92, is consistent with prior work by the authors using national data (Yelin, 1992; Yelin & Trupin, 2000); (about 2.3) in the more recent of these two studies.

After adjustment, the impact of disability status on job loss was greater for those reporting fair or poor health status than for those in better health status. Thus, among persons in excellent, very good, or good health, persons with disabilities were 1.61 times as likely as those without to report job loss, but among those in fair or poor health, the analogous ratio was 2.17.

Among persons with disabilities, absolute rates of job loss in 1999 and 2000 were much higher among younger persons, men, those not born in the U.S., members of racial and ethnic minorities, those with less than a high school education, the unmarried, rural residents, and those living outside of the San Francisco Bay Area (Table 6). After adjustment for demographic characteristics, the impact of disability on rates of job loss was elevated among workers 44 years of age or less and those 55 to 64, African-Americans and Hispanic-Americans, those with a high school education or less, and the unmarried. However, after adjustment, the impact of disability on rates of job loss was roughly equivalent between the genders, those born in the U.S. and elsewhere, and among those resident in the various regions of the State. The finding that the impact of disability on job loss is disproportionately concentrated among young and old workers, members of racial and ethnic minorities, and the poorly educated is consistent with the observation that these groups are the ones vulnerable to job loss in the absence of disability and that disability accentuates those vulnerable on the basis of these other characteristics (Trupin, Sebesta, & Yelin, 1997; Yelin, 1992).

Part-Time, Part-Year Employment

In 1999-2000, 8.2% of adult Californians who worked at any point in time during the year prior to the interview were employed part-time and part-year, defined as fewer than 35 hours of work per week for fewer than 50 weeks a year. Consistent with the findings presented above for employment status and rates of job loss, persons with disabilities were considerably more likely than those without to report part-time, part-year employment (11.6% vs. 6.9%, for a ratio of 1.68) (Table 7). On an unadjusted basis, the impact of disability on the frequency of part-time, part-year employment was greater for those in poorer health on two of the four health measures (overall health status and the presence of musculoskeletal conditions). Accordingly, among persons in fair or poor health, those with disabilities were 7.58 times as likely to report part-time, part-year employment, while the analogous ratio among those in excellent, very good, or good health was only 1.41; similarly, among those with and without musculoskeletal conditions the ratios were 2.48 and 0.53, respectively. After adjustment for demographic characteristics, for three of the health status measures (overall health status and the presence of musculoskeletal and circulatory conditions), the ratio of employment of persons with and without disabilities was higher for those in poor health status.

Table 8 shows the impact of select demographic characteristics on the proportion of persons with and without disabilities working part-time, part-year schedules. On both an unadjusted and adjusted basis, the impact of disability on this kind of work is especially pronounced among persons 45 to 54, the prime earning years. Gender and regional differences in the impact of disability status on part-time, part-year employment also were relatively unaffected by adjustment for other demographic characteristics, with men and those living outside the San Francisco Bay Area continuing to experience larger impacts of disability. However, adjustment

for other demographic characteristics moderated differences in the impact of disability on this kind of employment on the basis of nativity, race and ethnicity, education, marital status, and urban/rural residence.

Episodic Employment

In 1999-2000, 22.1% of adult Californians who were employed at some point in the year prior to interview reported episodic employment, defined as working fewer than 40 weeks in that year. Persons with disabilities were much more likely to experience episodic employment than those without (Table 9). On an unadjusted basis, 29.4% of persons with disabilities, but only 19.6% of those without reported episodic employment, a ratio of 1.50. Adjustment for demographic characteristics actually widened the gap between persons with and without disabilities in this measure slightly (not to a statistically significant degree) to 1.65.

On an unadjusted basis, for three of the four measures of health, the gap in rates of episodic employment between persons with and without disabilities was greater for those in poorer health. For example, among persons in excellent, very good, or good health, those with disabilities were 1.23 times more likely to report episodic employment, while among those in fair or poor health, the analogous ratio was 1.79. Similarly, the gap was greater for persons with musculoskeletal or circulatory conditions than without. On the other hand, the gap in employment between persons with and without disabilities was actually smaller among those reporting high levels of depressive symptoms than those without (1.23 vs. 1.39, respectively).

On an unadjusted basis, the effect of disability on rates of episodic employment was greater among persons 45 to 54 than among persons in younger or older age groups, primarily because episodic employment is uncommon among those without disabilities in this age group

(Table 10). The impact of disability status on rates of episodic employment was more pronounced among men than women, again primarily because episodic employment is relatively uncommon among men without disabilities; it was also more pronounced among members of racial and ethnic minorities, the non-married, rural residents (probably because agricultural employment is inherently seasonal), and residents of Los Angeles (dominated by many sectors using project-related employment, including the garment and entertainment industries) and the Central Valley (because of agricultural employment). Interestingly, the impact of disability status on rates of episodic employment was actually smaller among those with a high school education or less than among those with some college or more, apparently because rates of episodic employment decline with increments in education level to a relatively greater extent for persons without disabilities than for those with.

Adjustment for demographic characteristics did not have a consistent effect on the impact of the individual demographic variables on the gap between persons with and without disabilities in rates of episodic employment. Thus, adjustment had little impact on the relationship among age, gender, marital status, region of the State and disability status and episodic employment, but did reduce differences on the basis of nativity and residence in urban and rural environments. It had little effect on the difference in episodic employment by disability status among Caucasians, African-Americans, and Hispanics, while reducing the difference among Asian-Americans.

Involuntary Part-Time Employment

In 1999-2000, 4.0% of adult Californians who were employed reported working part-time involuntarily. As with most of the alternative employment measures included in the analysis for this report, persons with disabilities were much more likely to report involuntary part-time

employment than those without (6.3% and 3.8% of the two groups reported such employment, respectively, for a ratio of 1.66) (Table 11). Adjustment for demographic characteristics reduced the ratio of the rates of involuntary employment of persons with and without disabilities slightly, to 1.44.

Involuntary part-time employment was most common among persons with disabilities in fair or poor health (9.7%) and among such persons with depressive symptoms (10.0%). Interestingly, higher proportions of persons with disabilities without musculoskeletal or circulatory conditions experienced involuntary part-time employment (9.1% and 7.7%, respectively) than such persons with the aforementioned two conditions (4.8% and 3.0%, respectively).

The relatively low rates of involuntary part-time employment overall limited the reliability of estimates among demographic sub-groups (Table 12), but it would appear that workers with disabilities in the youngest and oldest age groups and men had particularly high rates of this kind of employment, especially relative to such workers without disabilities. Adjustment for demographic characteristics accounted for much of the higher rate among younger and older workers with disabilities relative to those without. However, even after adjustment, men with disabilities were more than three times as likely to report involuntary part-time work.

Contingent Employment

Contingent employment, defined as a job not expected to last for more than the ensuing 12 months, is said to be one of the fastest growing phenomena in the labor market as firms seek to reduce their long-term liabilities by hiring individuals on a project by project basis, by

bringing in temporary workers actually employed by personnel supply companies, or by using consultants (Belous, 1989; Benner, 2000).

In 1999-2000, 10.5% of California's labor force met the definition of contingent employment (Table 13). In contrast to the results for most of the measures of employment status presented above, on an unadjusted basis, persons with disabilities were not more likely to report contingent jobs than those without (11.6 and 10.8% of the two groups reported contingent employment, respectively). Interestingly, after adjustment for demographic characteristics, persons with disability did have a substantially higher rate of contingent employment than those without (14.2 and 10.1%, respectively, a ratio of 1.41). Apparently, persons with disabilities have demographic characteristics associated with low rates of contingent work and this, rather than disability status per se, accounts for the relatively low rates of such work they experience.

Among persons with disabilities, those with musculoskeletal and circulatory conditions and high levels of depressive symptoms reported significantly higher rates of contingent employment in comparison to those without these problems; this remained true after adjustment for demographic characteristics.

Although small sample sizes limit the inference about the association among disability status, demographic characteristics, and rates of contingent employment, among persons with disabilities, two demographic subgroups with disabilities would appear to have particularly high rates of contingent employment: African-Americans (37.0%) and persons who reported being separated or divorced (23.2%) (Table 14).

Household in Poverty, Despite Respondent's Employment.

A higher screen was used in the CWHS for household poverty, 125% of the Federal

poverty level for a specific household size, than most other surveys in order to account for the high cost of living in the State. Overall, in 1999-2000, 13.9% of California's workers were in households with income insufficiently high enough to be above poverty level, *despite the workers' earnings* (Table 15). On an unadjusted basis, persons with disabilities were slightly, albeit not significantly, more likely than those without to report incomes insufficient to lift their families above poverty (16.3% vs. 13.4%, a ratio of 1.22); after adjustment, however, persons with disabilities had substantially higher rates of such low incomes relative to those without disabilities (22.4% vs. 13.1%, a ratio of 1.71). Thus, persons with disabilities were actually less likely to report household incomes below poverty than one would expect given their demographic characteristics.

Among persons with disabilities, more than one in five of those in the prime working ages of 45 through 54 -- when individuals can expect to have the highest earnings of their lives -- reported incomes insufficient to lift their households out of poverty, a much higher rate than persons without disabilities in this age range (21.9% vs. 5.9%, a ratio of 3.71) (Table 16). All racial and ethnic minorities with disabilities experienced a relatively high probability of having incomes insufficient to lift their households out of poverty, as did those with less than a high school education, those who were separated or divorced, and those living in Los Angeles or the Central Valley of California.

Table 17 shows the proportion of persons with and without disabilities who have worked in the past year whose incomes failed to lift their households above poverty despite their employment, stratified by whether the kinds of jobs they have held during this time period met

the criteria for "traditional employment"[5], and with and without adjustment for demographic characteristics, as well as occupation, industry, and firm size[6]. In the absence of "traditional employment", persons with disabilities have a substantially higher probability of household incomes below poverty than those without disabilities; with adjustment, this reached statistical significance. Although small numbers severely limit the analysis of the impact of disability status among those with "traditional employment", the point estimates are consistent with the hypothesis, untestable with a survey the size of the CWHS, that "traditional employment" may protect persons with disabilities from the risk of having incomes insufficient to lift one's household above poverty.

Job Tenure of One Year or Less.

Californians have short job tenures. In 1999-2000, almost one in five of the State's employed adults had been in their current job for one year or less (Table 18), while another 40% had been in their current job for five or fewer years. Perhaps because short job tenures course throughout the contemporary labor force, there was no difference in the proportion of persons with and without disabilities that being in their current job for a year or less. This was still true after adjustment for demographic characteristics.

In general, job tenures of a year or less are more common among younger than older workers, among those with lower levels of education, and among those who have never been

---

[5] Traditional employment is defined as holding a single, full-time (35 hours a week or more), year-round (50 weeks or more a year) job, working on a day shift, being paid by the firm for which the work is done, and not working frequently from home or as an independent contractor.

[6] Table 16 displays rates of Californians having earnings of less than 125 percent of the Federal poverty level adjusted for demographic characteristics. Additionally, Table 17 also adjusts for occupation, industry, and firm size. Accordingly, the adjusted rates in the two tables vary slightly.

married or are widowed (Table 19). Interestingly, persons with disabilities were more likely to report short job tenures than those without in the prime earning years of 25 through 44 and 45 through 54, but were less likely to do so among workers 18 through 24 and 55 through 64. Although men with disabilities were more likely than those without to report having job tenures of a year or less, women with disabilities were actually less likely than those without to do so.

Working Conditions

Table 20 shows the relationship between disability status and various working conditions among employed California adults in 1999-2000. We have seen that disability status has a strong impact on whether or not individuals work as well as influencing other employment outcomes: job loss; part-time, part-year employment, episodic work, involuntary part-time employment, and having low household incomes despite employment. However, among employed California adults, persons with and without disabilities did not differ significantly in the size of the firms in which they work, in the mix of their occupations and industries, or in most working conditions. Thus, similar proportions of the two groups work in small, medium, and large firms; in highly (e.g. professional/managerial) and poorly (e.g. unskilled laborers/agricultural workers) remunerated occupations; and in the various industrial sectors However, it should be noted that there was a slight trend, not reaching statistical significance, for a greater proportion of persons with disabilities to be in the government, non-profit, and educational sector and for a smaller proportion to be in the manufacturing, utilities, and transportation industries. Persons with and without disabilities did not differ significantly in the proportion self-employed (although there was a trend toward a higher proportion of persons with disabilities reporting self-employment), regularly working a day shift, with flexible hours of employment, working partially or entirely

from home, supervising other workers, belonging to a union, having high psychological demands and low control over work to deal with such demands, or having physically-demanding jobs.

We developed the "traditional employment" variable (described above) to synthesize many of the major developments that analysts have noted in the labor market over the last several decades. Persons with and without disabilities did not differ significantly in the proportion with traditional employment, although there was a slight trend to suggesting that persons with disabilities may be a little less likely to have this form of employment. Indeed, of the 13 work characteristics analyzed in Table 20, persons with disabilities differed significantly from those without in only one: the former group was substantially more likely to report problems in the workplace environment[7] than the latter (32.3% vs. 23.8%, respectively). Although the 1999-2000 CWHS is a larger survey, these results with respect to working conditions are broadly consistent with the findings from an earlier small-scale survey of the State's adult population (Trupin & Yelin, 1999).

Summary and Conclusions

The CWHS was designed to incorporate a wider range of employment outcomes than traditional surveys, permitting the analysis of a full matrix of the changes that have occurred in California's labor market. We have observed that persons with disabilities differ in fundamental ways from those without in employment status and in measures of the degree of their involvement in work activities, but not systematically in their working conditions once employed. Specifically, we found that:

[7] The CWHS asked respondents if they had serious problems with crime, excessive noise, trash/litter, lighting, access to public transit, and access to shops in their workplace environments.

- persons with disabilities were slightly less than 60% as likely to be employed as those without;
- persons with disabilities in poorer health fared more poorly in employment than those in better health;
- having a disability would appear to accentuate the impact of other characteristics that jeopardize employment, including race/ethnicity, age, nativity, rural residence, and residence in regions with varying economic strengths;
- among persons who had worked in the year prior to interview, those with disabilities were almost twice as likely as those without disabilities to report job losses; adjustment for demographic characteristics did not reduce the magnitude of this heightened risk for displacement;.
- persons with disabilities were more likely to report part-time, part-year; episodic; involuntary part-time; and, after adjustment for demographic characteristics, contingent employment;
- persons with disabilities had a much higher probability of poverty despite their employment than those without disabilities and adjustment for demographic characteristics actually widened the gap; and,
- persons with and without disabilities who were employed did not differ significantly in the size of their firms, the mix of their occupations and industries, or in any individual working condition, with the exception that the former group was more likely to report serious problems in their workplace environments.

Labor market analysts have noted two principal sets of changes in the labor market over

the last several decades. First, most workplace organizations have flattened hierarchies, melding the conditions traditionally thought as "white" or "blue" collar, with the former group of employees no longer provided security of employment and with the latter asked to be involved in the process of improving workplace processes (Benner, et al., 1999; Osterman, 1999). Secondly, in an attempt to loosen their long-term ties to the workforce, workplace organizations both have a smaller permanent group of employees and, in tandem, have increasingly procured services formerly done within the firm by using temporary workers or consultants or by hiring firms other than their own to accomplish some functions, for example personnel and accounting services.

We have found that, once employed, persons with disabilities do not have systematically different working conditions than persons without. Indeed, the only condition for which persons with and without disabilities differed – having serious problems in the environment surrounding the workplace -- is the exception that proves the rule, in so far as it concerns the *external* environment of the workplace, not the *internal* nature of work itself. Most importantly, persons with disabilities were no less nor more likely to report having flexible working conditions, to be involved in supervision, to have jobs with high demands and low levels of control, or to meet criteria for traditional employment and non-traditional employment, all hallmarks, for better or worse, of the changes taking place within firms.

On the other hand, persons with disabilities are systematically less likely than those without to be employed at any one time and to maintain that employment. Accordingly, we found that such persons had higher rates of job loss, and higher rates of several measures of tenuous employment, including part-time, part-year; episodic; involuntary part-time, and, after adjustment for demographic characteristics, contingent employment. Perhaps because of their

more tenuous employment situations, despite their employment, their households were more likely to have total incomes below 125% of the Federal poverty level.

Title I of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 covers both those who experience discrimination within jobs and those who experience discrimination in gaining access to employment in the first place (Jones, 1991). Although our results in no way address the issue of whether persons with disabilities face discrimination within jobs, nevertheless the results indicate that, at the very least, objective conditions within jobs would appear to be similar for persons with and without disabilities. In contrast, we have provided ample evidence that persons with disabilities have not achieved equity in access to employment, and even when they do have some access to work, they would appear to be disproportionately relegated to more tenuous forms of employment. This is not due to such demographic characteristics as gender, race/ethnicity, age, and marital status, nor to their educational levels. Indeed, even persons with disabilities with post-graduate training lag behind those without disabilities with the same educational level in employment rates, have higher rates of job loss, and substantially higher rates on most measures of the strength of connection to employment.

With the passage of The Ticket to Work and Work Incentives Improvement Act (Public Law 106-170) in 1999, Social Security is endeavoring to increase the proportion of disabled beneficiaries who return to substantial gainful employment by enlarging the choices in vocational rehabilitation services and expanding coverage of health insurance by extending Medicare coverage into the period of initial employment and allowing former beneficiaries to buy into Medicaid coverage. Although a laudable goal, the results presented in this report provide ample evidence of how difficult it will be to improve the probability of return to work

for persons with disabilities by showing that persons they are disproportionately relegated to more tenuous forms of employment, the kinds that are less likely to provide the benefits such persons need when the extended health care benefits under the Ticket to Work program expire, and that entail substantial risks of subsequent job loss. Nevertheless, with current return to work rates so low, any effort to improve the probability of securing new employment is welcome.

Overall, it would appear that Californians with disabilities have a much tougher time establishing and maintaining a toe-hold in employment, but those who do obtain jobs and then hold them do not differ systematically from persons without disabilities in the working conditions they experience. Because the CWHS is unique in its coverage of employment measures, we have no way of knowing whether this dynamic affecting Californians with disabilities has worsened over time. However, at this juncture, we can conclude that the *external* labor market, that is the process by which persons not employed by workplaces obtain and hold jobs, is especially problematic for such persons.

References

Acemoglu, D., & Angrist, J. (1998). *Consequences of employment protection? The case of the Americans with Disabilities Act.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 6670.

Adams, P, & Marano, M. (1995). Current estimates from the National Health Interview Survey, 1994. National Center for Health Statistics. Vital Health Stat 10(193).

Autor, D., & Duggan, M. (2001). *The rise in disability rolls and the decline in unemployment.* Paper presented at Conference on The Persistence of Low Employment Rates for People with Disabilities: Causes and Policy Implications of the RRTC on Economic Research on Employment Policy for Persons with Disabilities, Washington, DC

Belous, R. (1989). *The contingent economy: The growth of the temporary, part-Time, and subcontracted workforce*. Washington, DC: National Planning Associates.

Benner, C., Brownstein, B., & Dean, A. (1999*). Walking the lifelong tightrope: Negotiating work in the new Economy.* San Jose, California: Working Partnerships.

Benner, C. (2000). California's new economy and the older workforce: Issues, prospects, and problems. In I. Yen, D. Rice, & E. Yelin (Eds.), *Employment and health policies for Californians over 50.* San Francisco: Institute for Health and Aging, University of California, San Francisco.

Berkowitz, E. (1987). *Disabled policy: America's programs for the handicapped.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Berkowitz, M., Johnson, W., & Murphy E. (1976). *Public policy toward disability*. New York: Praeger.

Boskin, M., & Hurd, M. (1978). The effect of Social Security on early retirement. *Journal of Public Economics*, 10, 361-377.

Bound, J. (1989). The health and earnings of rejected disability insurance applicants. *American Economic Review, 79*, 482-503.

Burkhauser R, Daly M, Houtenville A. (2001). How working age people with disabilities fared over the 1990s business cycle. In P. Budetti, R. Burkhauser, J. Gregory, & H. Hunt (Eds.), *Ensuring health and income security for an aging workforce*. Kalamazoo, Michigan: W. E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research.

Burtless, G. (1986). Social Security, unanticipated benefit increases, and the timing of retirement. *Review of Economic Studies*, *53,* 781-805.

Chirikos, T. (1995). An analysis of compositional trends in Social Security Disability Insurance Awards, 1960-1991. *Journal of Disability Policy Studies, 6*, 1-22.

Cwikel, J., & Ritchie, K. (1989). Screening for depression among the elderly in Israel: An assessment of the short Geriatric Depression Scale (S-GDS). Israel Journal of Medical Sciences 25:131-137.

Daly, M., & Bound, J. (1996). Worker adaptation and employer accommodation following the onset of a health impairment. *Journal of Gerontology 51*B, S53-S60.

Hale, T. (2001). The lack of a disability measure in today's Current Population Survey. *Monthly Labor Review, 124*, 38-40.

Hecker, D. (2001). Occupational employment. *Monthly Labor Review, 124,* 57-84.

Hirshhorn, L. (1991). Stresses and patterns of adjustment in the postindustrial factory. In G. Green & F. Baker (Eds.), *Work, health, and productivity*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Idler, E. (1994). Self-ratings of health: Mortality, morbidity, and meaning. In: S. Schechter (Ed.), Proceedings of the 1993 NCHS conference on the cognitive aspects of self-reported health status. Hyattsville, Maryland: US Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, CDC, National Center for Health Statistics, 36-59 NCHS working paper; series no. 10, 36-59.

Jones, N. (1991). Essential requirements of the Act: A short history and overview. In J. West (Ed.), The Americans with Disabilities Act: From policy to practice. New York: Milbank Fund.

Kaye, S. (2001, October 18-19). Improved employment opportunities for people with disabilities. Paper Presented at Conference on The Persistence of Low Employment Rates for People with Disabilities: Causes and Policy Implications of the RRTC on Economic Research on Employment Policy for Persons with Disabilities. Washington, DC.

Krause, N., Dasinger, L., & Neuhauser, F. (1998). Modified work and return to work: A review of the literature. *Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation, 8*, 113-139.

Kruse, D., & Schur, L. (2001, January). *Employment of people with disabilities following the ADA.* Paper prepared for Industrial Relations Research Association Conference, New Orleans.

Levine, L. (2002, August 15). *The employment of people with disabilities in the 1990s*. Congressional Research Service Order Code RL 30653.

Levitan, S., & Taggart, R. (1977). *Jobs for the disabled*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press.

Levy, S. (2001). The California economy: Outlook and issues for the next ten years. In D. Rice, E. Yelin, & I. Yen (Eds.), *Employment and health policies for Californians over 50*. San Francisco: Institute for Health and Aging, University of California, San Francisco.

Mashaw, J., & Reno, V. (1996). Overview. In J. Mashaw, V. Reno, R. Burkhauser, & M. Berkowitz (Eds.), *Disability, work, and cash benefits* . Kalamazoo, MI: W. E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research.

Murphy, L., (1991). Job dimensions associated with severe disability due to cardiovascular disease. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology, 44*, 155-166.

Osterman, P. (1999). *Securing prosperity: The American labor market: How it has changed and what to do about it.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Pasta, D. J., Cisternas, M. G., & Williamson, C. L. (1998). *Estimating standard errors of treatment effects for probit models and for linear models of log-transformed variables using PROC IML*. Proceedings of the 65th Annual Western Users of SAS Software Regional Users Group Conference.

Polivka, A. (1996). Contingent and alternative work arrangements. *Monthly Labor Review*, 119, 3-9.

Rule, B., Harvey, H., & Dobbs, A. (1989). Reliability of the Geriatric Depression Scale for younger adults. *Clinical Gerontology, 9*, 37-43.

Rupp, K., & Stapleton, D. (1998). Introduction. In K. Rupp, & D. Stapleton (Eds.), *Growth in disability benefits*. Kalamazoo, MI: W. E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research.

Rutten-van Molken, M., van Doorslaer, E. A. & van Vliet, R. (1994). Statistical analysis of cost outcomes in a randomized controlled clinical trial. *Health Economics, 3*, 333-45.

Parsons D. 1991. Self-Screening in Targeted Public Transfer Programs. Journal of Political Economy 99: 859-976.Sheikh, J., & Yesavage, J. (1986). Geriatric Depression Scale (GDS): Recent evidence and development of a shorter version. *Clinical Gerontology, 5,* 165-173.

Stapleton, D., Coleman, K., Dietrich, K., & Livermore, G. (1998). Empirical analyses of DI and SSI application and award growth. In *Growth in disability benefits.* Kalamazoo, MI: W. E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research.

Starr, P. (1982). *The social transformation of American medicine*. New York: Basic Books.

Stein, B. (1980). *Social Security and pensions in transition: Understanding the American retirement system*. New York: The Free Press.

Stone, D. (1984). *The disabled State*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Trupin, L., Sebesta, D., & Yelin, E. (1997). Racial disparity in employment status among persons with disabilities, 1990-1994. Paper presented at the American Public Health Association Annual Meeting, Indianapolis.

Trupin, L., & Yelin E. (1999). *The employment experience of persons with limitations in physical functioning: An analysis of the 1996 California Work and Health Survey*. Disability Statistics Report 12. National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research (NIDRR).

Verbrugge, L., Lepkowski, J., & Imanaka, Y. (1989). Comorbidity and its impact on disability. *Milbank Quarterly, 67,* 450-484

Wunderlich, G., & Rice, D., (Eds.), (2002). *Report of the Committee to Review the Social Security Administration's Disability Decision Process Research*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Yelin, E. (1989). Displaced concern: The social context of the work disability problem. *Milbank Quarterly, 67,* 114-165.

Yelin, E. (1992). *Disability and the displaced worker.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Yelin, E. (1996, October 31-Nov1). *The labor market and persons with and without disabilities: Analysis of the 1993 through 1995 Current Population Surveys*. Paper presented at Employment and Return to Work for Persons with Disabilities Conference, NIDRR and Social Security Administration, Washington, DC.

Yelin, E., & Katz, P. (1994a). Labor force trends of persons with and without disabilities. *Monthly Labor Review, 117*, 36-42.

Yelin, E., & Katz, P. (1994b). Making work more central to work disability policy. *Milbank Quarterly, 72*, 593-620.

Yelin, E, Nevitt, M., & Epstein, W. (1980). Toward an epidemiology of work disability. *Milbank Quarterly, 58,* 386-415.

Yelin, E., & Trupin, L. (1999). Who succeeds and who fails in the new world of work. Results from the 1999 California Work and Health Survey. http://medicine.ucsf.edu/programs/cwhs/1999/dayone/toc.html/

Yelin, E., & Trupin, L. (2000). Successful labor market transitions for persons with disabilities: Factors affecting the probability of entering and maintaining employment. In B. Altman & S. Barnartt (Eds.), *Expanding the scope of social science research on disability*. Stamford, CT: JAI Press.

Yelin, E., & Trupin, L. (2002). Persons with disabilities and demands of the contemporary labor market. In G. Wunderlich & D. Rice (Eds.), *Report of the Committee to Review the Social Security Administration's Disability Decision Process Research*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Yelin, E., Trupin, L. (2003, Feb.). Employment for Persons with and without Disabilities in California.

Table 1: Unadjusted and Adjusted[1] Employment Rates and 95% Confidence Intervals (CI) among Persons 18-64, by Disability[2], Health, and Comorbidity Status, CWHS 1999-2000

	Unadjusted Employment Rates						Adjusted Employment Rates					
	All Persons	Disability		No Disability			Disability		No Disability			
Health Characteristics	%	%	95% CI	%	95% CI	Ratio	%	95% CI	%	95% CI	Ratio	
Total	68.6	42.6	(37.8-47.4)	73.2	(71.2-75.1)	0.58	40.1	(35.6-44.7)	71.5	(69.6-73.4)	0.56	
Health status						*						*
Excellent/very good/good	72.7	55.7	(49.2-62.3)	74.6	(72.6-76.6)	0.75	50.6	(44.3-56.8)	72.1	(70.0-74.1)	0.70	
Fair/poor	45.3	24.6	(18.4-30.9)	60.3	(53.7-66.9)	0.41	27.1	(20.9-33.4)	67.7	(61.7-73.7)	0.40	
Depressive symptoms												
No	70.6	47.1	(41.7-52.5)	74.0	(72.0-76.0)	0.64	43.1	(38.2-48.0)	72.2	(70.3-74.1)	0.60	
Yes	43.6	26.3	(16.7-36.0)	56.8	(47.0-66.5)	0.46	28.9	(22.3-35.5)	58.3	(50.9-65.6)	0.50	
Musculoskeletal conditions												
No	70.1	43.7	(34.7-52.7)	72.2	(69.9-74.5)	0.61	37.3	(32.0-42.7)	70.4	(68.2-72.7)	0.53	
Yes	65.5	42.1	(36.4-47.8)	75.9	(72.3-79.4)	0.55	41.7	(36.8-46.6)	74.1	(70.9-77.3)	0.56	
Circulatory conditions						*						*
No	70.0	46.9	(40.6-53.2)	73.0	(70.9-75.2)	0.64	45.3	(39.4-51.2)	71.4	(69.2-73.5)	0.63	
Yes	62.5	35.0	(27.6-42.3)	73.8	(69.2-78.5)	0.47	32.2	(25.2-39.1)	72.3	(67.7-76.9)	0.45	

All results are weighted to the 1999-2000 California adult population.

* Ratio of employment rates of persons with and without disabilities differs by categories of health status variables.

[1] Adjusted for gender, age, nativity, race/ethnicity, marital status, rural residence, region of the state, and education.

[2] Disability status is defined by activity limitation; see methods for detailed description.

Yelin, E., Trupin, L. (2003, Feb.). Employment for Persons with and without Disabilities in California.

Table 2: Unadjusted and Adjusted[1] Employment Rates and 95% Confidence Intervals (CI) among Persons 18-64, by Work Disability[2], Health, and Comorbidity Status, CWHS 1999-2000

	Unadjusted Employment Rates						Adjusted Employment Rates				
	All Persons	Work Disability		No Work Disability			Work Disability		No Work Disability		
Health Characteristics	%	%	95% CI	%	95% CI	Ratio	%	95% CI	%	95% CI	Ratio
Total	68.6	33.3	(28.1-38.5)	73.0	(71.1-74.9)	0.46	31.1	(26.2-36.0)	71.5	(69.7-73.4)	0.43
Health status						*					*
Excellent/very good/good	72.7	45.8	(37.6-54.0)	74.5	(72.5-76.5)	0.61	38.9	(31.5-46.3)	72.1	(70.1-74.1)	0.54
Fair/poor	45.3	21.8	(15.5-28.0)	60.1	(53.7-66.5)	0.36	24.0	(17.7-30.2)	67.5	(61.7-73.4)	0.36
Depressive symptoms											
No	70.6	36.6	(30.5-42.8)	73.9	(71.9-75.8)	0.50	33.6	(28.3-39.0)	72.1	(70.2-74.0)	0.47
Yes	43.6	24.1	(14.5-33.7)	56.4	(46.9-66.0)	0.43	23.4	(17.2-29.6)	61.0	(53.6-68.3)	0.38
Musculoskeletal conditions											
No	70.1	26.1	(15.8-36.5)	72.0	(69.7-74.3)	0.36	27.1	(21.7-32.4)	69.9	(67.6-72.1)	0.39
Yes	65.5	35.8	(29.7-41.8)	75.7	(72.3-79.1)	0.47	32.7	(27.6-37.9)	75.3	(72.1-78.4)	0.43
Circulatory conditions						*					*
No	70.0	39.4	(32.3-46.5)	72.8	(70.7-74.9)	0.54	37.7	(31.1-44.3)	71.3	(69.2-73.4)	0.53
Yes	62.5	22.9	(15.7-30.1)	74.0	(69.5-78.4)	0.31	21.7	(14.9-28.5)	72.5	(68.1-76.9)	0.30

All results are weighted to the 1999-2000 California adult population.

* Ratio of employment rates of persons with and without disabilities differs by categories of health status variables.

[1] Adjusted for gender, age, nativity, race/ethnicity, marital status, rural residence, region of the state, and education.

[2] Disability status is defined by activity limitation; See methods for detailed description.

Yelin, E., Trupin, L. (2003, Feb.). Employment for Persons with and without Disabilities in California.

Table 3: Unadjusted and Adjusted[1] Employment Rates and 95% Confidence Intervals (CI) among Persons 18-64, by Disability Status[2] and Demographic Characteristics, CHWS 1999-2000

	Unadjusted Employment Rates						Adjusted Employment Rates				
	All persons	Disability		No Disability			Disability		No Disability		
Demographic Characteristics	%	%	95% CI	%	95% CI	Ratio	%	95% CI	%	95% CI	Ratio
Total	68.6	42.6	(37.8-47.4)	73.2	(71.2-75.1)	0.58	40.1	(35.6-44.7)	71.5	(69.6-73.4)	0.56
Age						*					*
18-24	58.2	57.1	(35.2-79.0)	58.3	(53.1-63.5)	0.98	48.6	(29.0-68.3)	63.3	(57.8-68.8)	0.77
25-44	73.6	49.6	(41.1-58.2)	77.1	(74.3-79.9)	0.64	50.5	(42.4-58.5)	76.6	(73.9-79.3)	0.66
45-54	72.7	38.7	(30.7-46.6)	82.0	(78.6-85.4)	0.47	37.8	(30.2-45.4)	77.7	(73.8-81.5)	0.49
55-64	52.8	25.7	(17.3-34.1)	61.3	(55.7-67.0)	0.42	26.2	(18.4-34.1)	57.5	(51.7-63.3)	0.46
Gender						*					*
Male	75.3	42.1	(35.0-49.3)	81.0	(78.5-83.5)	0.52	41.2	(34.4-48.0)	79.7	(77.2-82.2)	0.52
Female	61.5	43.1	(36.6-49.7)	64.8	(61.9-67.7)	0.67	38.5	(32.3-44.7)	63.8	(61.0-66.7)	0.60
Nativity											
Foreign born	65.2	29.4	(17.6-41.3)	68.7	(65.1-72.4)	0.43	35.8	(29.9-41.8)	67.7	(63.6-71.8)	0.53
US born	70.0	45.4	(40.2-50.6)	75.1	(72.9-77.4)	0.60	41.9	(37.0-46.8)	73.1	(70.7-75.4)	0.57
Race/ethnicity											
White, non-Hispanic	70.2	45.8	(39.7-51.8)	75.7	(73.0-78.5)	0.61	42.0	(36.9-47.0)	73.1	(70.2-76.0)	0.57
African-American, non-Hispanic	62.1	31.7	(20.7-42.7)	69.9	(64.2-75.7)	0.45	34.6	(28.1-41.1)	66.4	(61.2-71.7)	0.52
Asian-American, non-Hispanic	72.3	27.4	(0.6-55.5)	74.4	(69.6-79.2)	0.37	36.6	(29.1-44.0)	68.4	(62.8-73.9)	0.54
Hispanic	65.5	38.2	(25.5-50.9)	68.5	(64.4-72.6)	0.56	41.6	(35.0-48.3)	72.8	(68.9-76.8)	0.57
Education											*
Less than high school	53.5	26.2	(12.7-39.8)	58.1	(52.0-64.2)	0.45	26.4	(13.8-39.0)	57.0	(50.1-63.8)	0.46
High school graduate	63.4	32.0	(22.4-41.6)	70.0	(65.4-74.6)	0.46	26.9	(18.2-35.7)	70.5	(66.0-74.9)	0.38
Some college	67.8	38.8	(31.2-46.3)	73.1	(69.8-76.5)	0.53	37.6	(33.3-44.9)	70.7	(67.4-74.0)	0.53
College graduate	76.4	60.4	(48.1-72.6)	78.5	(74.7-82.3)	0.77	52.2	(40.3-64.1)	75.4	(71.4-79.4)	0.69
Post-graduate	84.0	68.3	(54.2-82.5)	87.0	(82.7-91.4)	0.79	69.0	(55.8-82.3)	85.7	(81.0-90.4)	0.81

Yelin, E., Trupin, L. (2003, Feb.). Employment for Persons with and without Disabilities in California.

	Unadjusted Employment Rates						Adjusted Employment Rates				
	All persons	Disability		No Disability			Disability		No Disability		
Demographic Characteristics	%	%	95% CI	%	95% CI	Ratio	%	95% CI	%	95% CI	Ratio
Marital status						*					*
Married/partner	69.1	50.7	(43.8-57.5)	71.8	(69.1-74.5)	0.71	47.0	(40.5-53.5)	70.3	(67.6-73.0)	0.67
Separated/divorced/widowed	71.2	37.1	(28.3-46.0)	81.9	(77.6-86.2)	0.45	40.3	(31.7-49.0)	80.6	(76.4-84.9)	0.50
Never married	66.4	36.1	(25.8-46.5)	71.1	(67.5-74.8)	0.51	30.0	(21.0-38.9)	68.0	(63.8-72.2)	0.44
Residence						*					*
Rural	59.1	23.1	(9.1-37.2)	68.6	(60.5-76.8)	0.34	30.4	(15.7-45.2)	73.1	(65.1-81.0)	0.42
Urban	69.4	44.9	(39.8-50.0)	73.5	(71.5-75.5)	0.61	41.2	(36.3-46.0)	71.4	(69.4-73.4)	0.58
Region						*					*
Los Angeles	67.9	37.6	(28.8-46.5)	72.2	(68.6-75.7)	0.52	38.6	(30.0-47.2)	70.9	(67.4-74.4)	0.54
Central Valley/Other	65.6	26.3	(17.3-35.2)	70.9	(66.6-75.3)	0.37	28.9	(19.9-37.8)	71.2	(66.7-75.7)	0.41
Bay Area	71.9	51.6	(41.7-61.6)	75.8	(71.9-79.7)	0.68	48.6	(39.3-57.9)	72.5	(68.4-76.6)	0.67
Other Southern California	70.5	52.1	(41.9-62.3)	73.9	(70.0-77.7)	0.71	44.7	(35.4-54.0)	71.6	(67.8-75.4)	0.62

All results are weighted to the 1999-2000 California adult population.

* Ratio of employment rates of persons with and without disabilities differs by categories of demographic characteristics.

[1] Adjusted employment rates for each demographic characteristic are also adjusted for the remainder of the demographic characteristics. Asterisks indicate that the model also includes an interaction term for disability and the demographic variable indicated.

[2] Disability status is defined by activity limitation; See methods for detailed description.

Yelin, E., Trupin, L. (2003, Feb.). Employment for Persons with and without Disabilities in California.

Table 4: Employment Rates and 95% Confidence Intervals (CI) among Persons 18-64 with a Work History, by Disability Status[1], with and without Adjustment for Demographics[2], Health Status, Depressive Symptomotology, and Job History[3], CWHS 1999-2000

	Employment Rates (from Hierarchical Regression Models)							
	Disability Status Only		Disability Status & Demographics		Disability Status, Demographics, Health Status & Depression		Disability Status, Demographics, Health Status, Depression, & Job History	
			%	95% CI	%	95% CI	%	95% CI
Disability status								
Yes	44.1	(39.1-49.1)	42.7	(37.9-47.6)	48.0	(42.6-53.3)	47.9	(42.6-53.2)
No	76.2	(74.3-78.1)	74.8	(72.8-76.7)	73.8	(71.8-75.7)	73.8	(71.8-75.7)

All results are weighted to the 1999-2000 California adult population.

[1] Disability status is defined by activity limitation; see methods for detailed description.

[2] Adjusted for gender, age, nativity, race/ethnicity, marital status, rural residence, region of the state, and education.

[3] Including occupation, industry, and tenure of longest job.

Yelin, E., Trupin, L. (2003, Feb.). Employment for Persons with and without Disabilities in California.

Table 5: Unadjusted and Adjusted[1] Rates and 95% Confidence Intervals of Job Loss in Past Year
among Persons 18-64 Who Have Worked in This Time Frame, by Disability[2], Health, and Comorbidity Status, CWHS 1999-2000

	Percent with Job Loss in Past Year										
	Unadjusted						Adjusted				
	All persons	Disability		No Disability			Disability		No Disability		
Health Characteristics	%	%	95% CI	%	95% CI	Ratio	%	95% CI	%	95% CI	Ratio
Total	10.1	17.5	(12.8-22.2)	9.1	(7.8-10.5)	1.92	16.9	(12.1-21.6)	8.7	(7.4-10.0)	1.94
Health status											*
Excellent/very good/good	8.6	11.6	(6.6-16.5)	8.3	(6.9-9.7)	1.40	13.7	(8.2-19.1)	8.5	(7.2-9.9)	1.61
Fair/poor	21.5	30.1	(20.6-39.7)	17.6	(11.7-23.4)	1.71	22.3	(13.7-30.9)	10.3	(5.9-14.7)	2.17
Depressive symptoms											
No	9.2	13.6	(9.0-18.2)	8.8	(7.4-10.1)	1.55	15.2	(10.5-20.0)	8.5	(7.2-9.8)	1.79
Yes	23.4	33.9	(19.3-48.5)	17.5	(9.1-26.0)	1.94	22.4	(14.1-30.7)	13.1	(7.7-18.4)	1.71
Musculoskeletal conditions											
No	9.5	16.0	(8.0-24.0)	9.1	(7.5-10.7)	1.76	14.6	(9.7-19.5)	8.1	(6.7-9.5)	1.80
Yes	11.3	18.4	(12.6-24.2)	9.2	(6.7-11.8)	2.00	18.5	(13.1-23.9)	10.6	(7.9-13.2)	1.75
Circulatory conditions											
No	9.7	16.6	(11.0-22.1)	9.0	(7.5-10.5)	1.84	16.2	(11.4-21.0)	8.5	(7.1-9.9)	1.91
Yes	11.8	19.7	(10.8-28.5)	9.9	(6.4-13.3)	1.99	19.0	(12.3-25.7)	10.2	(6.8-13.5)	1.86

All results are weighted to the 1999-2000 California adult population.

* Ratio of rates of job loss of persons with and without disabilities differs by categories of health status variables.

[1] Adjusted for gender, age, nativity, race/ethnicity, marital status, rural residence, region of the state, and education.

[2] Disability status is defined by activity limitation; See methods for detailed description.

Yelin, E., Trupin, L. (2003, Feb.). Employment for Persons with and without Disabilities in California.

Table 6: Unadjusted and Adjusted[1] Rates and 95% Confidence Intervals of Job Loss in the Past Year, among Persons 18-64 Who Have Worked in the Past Year, by Disability Status[2] and Demographic Characteristics, CHWS 1999-2000 (n=1,987)

	Percent with Job Loss in Past Year										
	Unadjusted						Adjusted				
	All persons	Disability		No Disability			Disability		No Disability		
Demographic Characteristics	%	%	95% CI	%	95% CI	Ratio	%	95% CI	%	95% CI	Ratio
Total	10.1	17.5	(12.8-22.2)	9.1	(7.8-10.5)	1.92	16.9	(12.1-21.6)	8.7	(7.4-10.0)	1.94
Age											*
18-24	17.2	22.9	(1.4-44.4)	16.7	(12.4-21.0)	1.37	33.0	(11.3-54.7)	15.4	(10.5-20.3)	2.14
25-44	9.5	19.1	(11.2-27.1)	8.3	(6.4-10.3)	2.30	18.4	(10.9-25.8)	8.0	(6.1-10.0)	2.30
45-54	8.6	15.2	(7.6-22.8)	7.4	(5.0-9.9)	2.05	11.4	(4.7-18.1)	7.8	(5.1-10.4)	1.46
55-64	5.6	11.8	(2.8-20.8)	4.4	(1.7-7.1)	2.68	8.1	(0.5-15..8)	4.3	(1.5-7.1)	1.88
Gender											
Male	10.2	20.2	(13.0-27.3)	9.0	(7.1-10.8)	2.24	17.4	(12.2-22.7)	9.1	(7.3-10.8)	1.91
Female	10.0	14.6	(8.6-20.7)	9.4	(7.4-11.4)	1.55	16.2	(11.2-21.3)	8.4	(6.6-10.1)	1.93
Nativity											
Foreign born	11.3	28.0	(12.1-43.9)	10.2	(7.6-12.8)	2.75	17.5	(11.0-24.0)	9.1	(6.4-11.8)	1.92
US born	9.6	15.6	(10.8-20.4)	8.7	(7.1-10.3)	1.79	16.6	(11.8-21.5)	8.6	(7.0-10.2)	1.93
Race/ethnicity						*					*
White, non-Hispanic	8.9	13.3	(8.2-18.3)	8.2	(6.3-10.1)	1.62	14.2	(8.5-20.0)	9.1	(6.8-11.3)	1.56
African-American, non-Hispanic	12.5	20.3	(6.5-34.1)	11.4	(7.1-15.7)	1.78	21.5	(7.9-35.2)	9.5	(5.6-13.4)	2.26
Asian-American, non-Hispanic	6.2	0.0	-	6.4	(3.5-9.2)	-	0.0	-	5.5	(2.9-8.2)	-
Hispanic	13.6	35.3	(19.2-51.5)	11.7	(8.5-14.9)	3.02	29.5	(15.3-43.7)	10.0	(7.0-13.1)	2.95
Education											*
Less than high school	17.0	34.0	(12.5-55.5)	14.9	(9.8-20.1)	2.28	29.9	(11.6-48.3)	13.3	(8.3-18.4)	2.25
High school graduate	10.1	18.0	(7.1-28.9)	9.0	(5.9-12.1)	2.00	19.4	(9.2-229.5)	6.8	(4.3-9.2)	2.85
Some college	8.9	17.7	(10.1-25.2)	7.7	(5.6-9.9)	2.30	15.9	(8.5-23.4)	8.5	(6.3-10.7)	1.87
College graduate	10.6	11.4	(1.8-21.1)	10.5	(7.5-13.5)	1.09	11.0	(1.1-20.8)	9.0	(6.0-12.1)	1.22
Post-graduate	5.6	11.4	(0.8-22.0)	4.6	(1.8-7.4)	2.48	10.2	(0.0-20.8)	7.9	(3.6-12.2)	1.29

Yelin, E., Trupin, L. (2003, Feb.). Employment for Persons with and without Disabilities in California.

	Percent with Job Loss in Past Year										
	Unadjusted						Adjusted				
	All persons	Disability		No Disability			Disability		No Disability		
Demographic Characteristics	%	%	95% CI	%	95% CI	Ratio	%	95% CI	%	95% CI	Ratio
Marital status						*					*
Married/partner	8.0	9.0	(4.1-13.8)	7.8	(6.1-9.6)	1.15	10.0	(4.7-15.3)	7.3	(5.5-9.1)	1.37
Separated/divorced/widowed	11.1	23.5	(13.2-33.9)	8.4	(5.1-11.7)	2.80	22.3	(11.6-33.0)	10.8	(6.8-14.9)	2.06
Never married	12.8	25.8	(13.4-38.2)	11.4	(8.7-14.2)	2.26	26.5	(15.0-38.0)	9.9	(7.2-12.7)	2.68
Residence											
Rural	9.9	25.0	(5.8-44.1)	7.1	(2.1-12.0)	3.52	16.8	(7.5-26.1)	8.7	(3.7-13.6)	1.93
Urban	10.1	16.7	(11.9-21.5)	9.3	(7.9-10.7)	1.80	16.9	(12.1-21.7)	8.7	(7.4-10.1)	1.94
Region						*					
Los Angeles	10.4	17.4	(8.2-26.7)	9.7	(7.1-12.2)	1.79	17.0	(11.6-22.4)	8.8	(6.9-10.8)	1.93
Central Valley/Other	11.2	29.2	(17.2-41.1)	8.7	(5.8-11.7)	3.36	16.9	(12.1-21.7)	8.8	(7.4-10.1)	1.92
Bay Area	10.4	8.1	(1.4-14.7)	10.7	(7.7-13.7)	0.76	16.8	(12.0-21.6)	8.7	(7.3-10.2)	1.93
Other Southern California	8.9	16.7	(7.3-26.2)	7.7	(5.1-10.3)	2.17	16.7	(11.3-22.1)	8.6	(6.5-10.7)	1.94

All results are weighted to the 1999-2000 California adult population.

* Ratio of rates of job loss of persons with and without disabilities differs by categories of demographic characteristics.

[1] Adjusted employment rates for each demographic characteristic are also adjusted for the remainder of the demographic characteristics. Asterisks indicate that the model also includes an interaction term for disability and the demographic variable indicated.

[2] Disability status is defined by activity limitation; see methods for detailed description.

Yelin, E., Trupin, L. (2003, Feb.). Employment for Persons with and without Disabilities in California.

Table 7: Unadjusted and Adjusted[1] Rates and 95% Confidence Intervals (CI) of Part-Time, Part-Year Employment[2] among Persons 18-64 Who Have Worked in the Past Year, by Disability[3], Health, and Comorbidity Status, CWHS 1999-2000

	Percent Working Part-Time, Part-Year										
	Unadjusted						Adjusted				
	All persons	Disability		No Disability			Disability		No Disability		
Health Characteristics	%	%	95% CI	%	95% CI	Ratio	%	95% CI	%	95% CI	Ratio
Total	7.4	11.6	(7.4-15.8)	6.9	(5.7-8.1)	1.68	12.3	(8.0-16.7)	7.6	(6.4-8.9)	1.62
Health status						*					*
Excellent/very good/good	7.7	10.4	(5.4-15.3)	7.4	(6.1-8.7)	1.41	10.2	(5.3-15.1)	7.9	(6.6-9.2)	1.29
Fair/poor	5.5	14.4	(6.4-22.4)	1.9	(0.0-4.1)	7.58	16.9	(8.5-25.3)	4.6	(1.2-7.9)	3.67
Depressive symptoms											
No	7.3	11.9	(7.2-16.6)	6.8	(5.6-8.1)	1.75	13.2	(8.5-18.0)	7.8	(6.5-9.0)	1.69
Yes	9.6	10.5	(0.4-20.6)	9.2	(2.6-15.7)	1.14	8.9	(3.1-14.8)	5.1	(1.6-8.6)	1.75
Musculoskeletal conditions						*					*
No	7.0	3.8	(0.0-8.4)	7.2	(5.7-8.6)	0.53	6.2	(0.4-12.0)	7.6	(6.1-9.1)	0.82
Yes	8.4	15.6	(9.9-21.3)	6.3	(4.1-8.4)	2.48	15.0	(9.4-20.6)	7.5	(5.1-9.9)	2.00
Circulatory conditions											*
No	7.9	10.6	(5.7-15.5)	7.6	(6.2-9.0)	1.39	11.5	(6.5-16.4)	8.0	(6.6-9.5)	1.44
Yes	5.1	13.8	(5.5-22.1)	3.1	(1.1-5.1)	4.45	14.1	(5.8-22.4)	5.3	(2.5-8.1)	2.66

All results are weighted to the 1999-2000 California adult population.

* Ratio of rates of part-time, part-year employment of persons with and without disabilities differs by categories of health status variables.

[1] Adjusted for gender, age, nativity, race/ethnicity, marital status, rural residence, region of the state, and education.

[2] Part-Time, Part-Year Employment defined as <35 hrs per week and <50 weeks per year.

[3] Disability status is defined by activity limitation; see methods for detailed description.

Yelin, E., Trupin, L. (2003, Feb.). Employment for Persons with and without Disabilities in California.

Table 8: Unadjusted and Adjusted[1] Rates and 95% Confidence Intervals of Part-Time, Part-Year[2] Employment among Persons 18-64 Who Have Worked in the Past Year, by Disability Status[3] and Demographic Characteristics, CHWS 1999-2000 (n=1,886)

	Percent Working Part-Time, Part-Year										
	Unadjusted						Adjusted				
	All persons	Disability		No Disability			Disability		No Disability		
Demographic Characteristics	%	%	95% CI	%	95% CI	Ratio	%	95% CI	%	95% CI	Ratio
Total	7.4	11.6	(7.4-15.8)	6.9	(5.7-8.1)	1.68	12.3	(8.0-16.7)	7.6	(6.4-8.9)	1.62
Age						*					*
18-24	14.8	10.8	(0.0-27.3)	15.1	(10.8-19.3)	0.72	13.2	(0.0-30.1)	18.0	(11.9-24.2)	0.73
25-44	6.2	9.8	(3.3-16.2)	5.8	(4.1-7.5)	1.69	7.7	(2.2-13.1)	6.4	(4.6-8.2)	1.20
45-54	5.8	18.4	(9.7-27.1)	3.8	(2.0-5.6)	4.84	17.8	(9.6-26.1)	4.6	(2.6-6.5)	3.87
55-64	6.3	5.7	(0.0-13.0)	6.4	(3.1-9.8)	0.89	4.0	(0.0-9.4)	6.7	(3.4-10.1)	0.60
Gender						*					*
Male	4.5	11.8	(5.6-18.1)	3.7	(2.4-4.9)	3.19	12.0	(5.7-18.2)	4.6	(3.2-5.9)	2.61
Female	11.1	11.4	(5.6-17.1)	11.0	(8.8-13.3)	1.04	13.7	(7.3-20.0)	11.1	(8.9-13.3)	1.23
Nativity											
Foreign born	5.1	12.7	(8.1-17.4)	7.7	(6.2-9.2)	1.65	11.6	(6.0-17.3)	7.1	(4.5-9.8)	1.63
US born	8.3	4.9	(0.0-13.6)	5.1	(3.1-7.0)	0.96	12.6	(8.1-17.1)	7.8	(6.3-9.3)	1.62
Race/ethnicity											
White, non-Hispanic	7.9	10.5	(5.6-15.3)	7.5	(5.7-9.4)	1.40	12.6	(8.0-17.1)	7.7	(5.9-9.5)	1.64
African-American, non-Hispanic	10.9	21.0	(5.8-36.2)	9.6	(5.6-13.7)	2.19	12.4	(8.1-16.7)	7.6	(6.4-8.9)	1.63
Asian-American, non-Hispanic	5.8	16.0	(0.0-52.5)	5.5	(2.8-8.3)	2.91	12.2	(7.4-17.0)	7.5	(5.8-9.1)	1.63
Hispanic	6.1	12.2	(0.0-24.6)	5.6	(3.3-7.9)	2.18	12.0	(6.3-17.7)	7.4	(4.8-9.9)	1.62
Education											*
Less than high school	3.2	0.0	-	3.5	(0.8-6.2)	-	0.0	-	3.8	(0.9-6.7)	-
High school graduate	7.3	8.1	(0.0-16.6)	7.2	(4.3-10.1)	1.13	10.9	(2.0-19.8)	7.1	(4.4-9.7)	1.54
Some college	9.2	17.7	(9.6-25.8)	8.2	(5.9-10.4)	2.16	14.4	(7.1-21.8)	8.4	(6.2-10.6)	1.71
College graduate	7.7	13.7	(2.6-24.9)	7.1	(4.6-9.7)	1.93	15.9	(4.6-27.3)	8.4	(5.5-11.4)	1.89
Post-graduate	6.1	7.6	(0.0-16.9)	5.9	(2.7-9.1)	1.29	12.1	(1.3-22.9)	8.2	(3.9-12.4)	1.48

Yelin, E., Trupin, L. (2003, Feb.). Employment for Persons with and without Disabilities in California.

	Percent Working Part-Time, Part-Year										
	Unadjusted						Adjusted				
	All persons	Disability		No Disability			Disability		No Disability		
Demographic Characteristics	%	%	95% CI	%	95% CI	Ratio	%	95% CI	%	95% CI	Ratio
Marital status						*					
Married/partner	5.8	6.7	(2.1-11.3)	5.7	(4.1-7.2)	1.18	11.6	(7.0-16.1)	7.1	(2.3-8.8)	1.63
Separated/divorced/widowed	7.3	21.1	(10.6-31.6)	4.6	(2.1-7.2)	4.59	12.5	(8.1-16.8)	7.6	(6.4-8.9)	1.64
Never married	10.0	10.3	(1.0-19.5)	10.0	(7.4-12.6)	1.03	13.4	(8.1-18.8)	8.3	(6.1-10.5)	1.61
Residence											
Rural	9.9	19.2	(0.0-39.4)	8.4	(2.9-13.9)	2.29	14.2	(5.4-23.0)	8.8	(3.6-14.1)	1.61
Urban	7.3	10.9	(6.7-15.2)	6.8	(5.6-8.1)	1.60	12.2	(7.9-16.5)	7.5	(6.2-8.8)	1.63
Region						*					*
Los Angeles	7.6	16.8	(6.8-16.8)	6.8	(4.6-9.0)	2.47	18.7	(8.1-29.3)	7.5	(5.2-9.9)	2.49
Central Valley/Other	5.3	16.8	(5.7-27.9)	4.0	(1.9-6.1)	4.20	10.9	(2.2-19.6)	5.6	(2.9-8.2)	1.95
Bay Area	9.9	3.7	(0.0-8.4)	10.7	(7.7-13.7)	0.35	6.8	(0.5-13.1)	9.0	(6.2.-11.9)	0.76
Other Southern California	6.8	11.0	(2.7-19.3)	6.2	(3.8-8.6)	1.77	13.5	(5.0-22.0)	8.1	(5.4-10.8)	1.67

All results are weighted to the 1999-2000 California adult population.

* Ratio of part-time, part-year employment rates of persons with and without disabilities differs by categories of demographic characteristics.

[1] Adjusted employment rates for each demographic characteristic are also adjusted for the remainder of the demographic characteristics. Asterisks indicate that the model also includes an interaction term for disability and the demographic variable indicated.

[2] Part-Time, Part-Year Employment Defined as <35 hrs per week and <50 weeks per year.

[3] Disability status is defined by activity limitation; see methods for detailed description.

Yelin, E., Trupin, L. (2003, Feb.). Employment for Persons with and without Disabilities in California.

Table 9: Unadjusted and Adjusted[1] Rates and 95% Confidence Intervals of Episodic Employment[2]
among Persons 18-64 Who Have Worked in the Past Year, by Disability[3], Health, and Comorbidity Status, CWHS 1999-2000,

	Percent with Episodic Employment										
	Unadjusted						Adjusted				
	All persons	Disability		No Disability			Disability		No Disability		
Health Characteristics	%	%	95% CI	%	95% CI	Ratio	%	95% CI	%	95% CI	Ratio
Total	20.6	29.4	(23.4-35.4)	19.6	(17.7-21.5)	1.50	33.8	(27.7-40.0)	20.5	(18.7-22.4)	1.65
Health status						*					*
Excellent/very good/good	19.6	23.7	(16.8-30.6)	19.2	(17.2-21.2)	1.23	28.7	(21.4-36.1)	20.8	(18.8-22.8)	1.38
Fair/poor	28.8	42.0	(30.8-53.3)	23.4	(16.8-30.0)	1.79	43.2	(32.6-53.8)	18.8	(13.2-24.4)	2.30
Depressive symptoms											
No	19.6	26.3	(20.0-32.7)	18.9	(17.0-20.8)	1.39	32.1	(25.8-38.4)	20.2	(18.3-22.1)	1.59
Yes	36.7	41.9	(25.7-58.1)	34.1	(23.3-44.8)	1.23	41.1	(31.1-51.1)	27.2	(19.6-34.8)	1.51
Musculoskeletal conditions						*					*
No	20.0	23.5	(13.1-34.0)	19.8	(17.5-22.1)	1.19	25.4	(15.2-35.6)	20.4	(18.1-22.6)	1.25
Yes	22.0	32.4	(25.0-39.8)	19.0	(15.5-22.5)	1.71	37.6	(30.1-45.1)	21.0	(17.4-24.6)	1.79
Circulatory conditions						*					*
No	20.6	25.8	(18.8-32.7)	20.1	(18.0-22.2)	1.28	30.9	(23.8-38.1)	20.8	(18.8-22.9)	1.49
Yes	20.8	37.7	(26.1-49.3)	16.9	(12.5-21.2)	2.23	40.4	(29.1-51.7)	19.0	(14.4-23.7)	2.13

All results are weighted to the 1999-2000 California adult population.

* Ratio of episodic employment rates of persons with and without disabilities differs by categories of health status variables.

[1] Adjusted for gender, age, nativity, race/ethnicity, marital status, rural residence, region of the state, and education.

[2] Episodic employment defined as working fewer than 40 weeks in the past year.

[3] Disability status is defined by activity limitation; see methods for detailed description.

Yelin, E., Trupin, L. (2003, Feb.). Employment for Persons with and without Disabilities in California.

Table 10: Unadjusted and Adjusted[1] Probability and 95% Confidence Intervals of Having Episodic Employment[2] among Persons 18-64 Who Have Worked in the Past Year, by Disability Status[3] and Demographic Characteristics, CHWS 1999-2000 (n=1,886)

	Percent with Episodic Employment										
	Unadjusted						Adjusted				
	All persons	Disability		No Disability			Disability		No Disability		
Demographic Characteristics	%	%	95% CI	%	95% CI	Ratio	%	95% CI	%	95% CI	Ratio
Total	20.6	29.4	(23.4-35.4)	19.6	(17.7-21.5)	1.50	33.8	(27.7-40.0)	20.5	(18.7-22.4)	1.65
Age						*					*
18-24	37.8	23.1	(7.4-45.4)	39.0	(33.2-44.9)	0.59	28.5	(6.9-50.1)	41.4	(34.2-48.6)	0.69
25-44	17.9	27.0	(17.4-36.7)	16.9	(14.2-19.6)	1.60	29.8	(20.2-39.3)	17.9	(15.1-20.6)	1.66
45-54	18.0	38.4	(27.5-49.3)	14.6	(11.3-18.0)	2.63	37.2	(26.5-47.9)	14.7	(11.3-18.2)	2.53
55-64	14.9	25.6	(12.0-39.2)	13.1	(8.5-17.7)	1.95	23.9	(10.6-37.3)	15.5	(10.4-20.6)	1.54
Gender						*					*
Male	16.0	29.3	(20.5-38.1)	14.5	(12.2-16.8)	2.02	30.8	(22.2-39.4)	16.2	(13.9-18.6)	1.90
Female	26.4	29.5	(21.2-37.8)	26.0	(22.9-29.1)	1.13	37.7	(29.0-46.5)	25.4	(22.5-28.4)	1.48
Nativity						*					
Foreign born	22.1	45.7	(25.6-32.9)	20.7	(17.1-24.3)	2.21	34.6	(26.6-42.6)	21.1	(17.2-25.0)	1.64
US born	20.1	26.6	(20.4-32.9)	19.1	(16.9-21.4)	1.39	33.5	(27.3-39.8)	20.3	(18.0-22.7)	1.65
Race/ethnicity											*
White, non-Hispanic	18.1	24.2	(17.4-31.0)	17.2	(14.5-19.8)	1.41	27.8	(20.6-35.0)	18.0	(15.1-20.9)	1.54
African-American, non-Hispanic	28.4	48.0	(29.3-66.6)	25.9	(19.9-31.9)	1.85	50.5	(33.3-67.8)	25.4	(19.6-31.3)	1.99
Asian-American, non-Hispanic	16.3	41.1	(0.0-90.3)	15.7	(11.3-20.1)	2.62	25.8	(0.0-57.5)	20.6	(15.3-26.0)	1.25
Hispanic	25.9	42.3	(23.5-61.0)	24.7	(20.3-29.0)	1.71	41.3	(24.2-58.3)	22.7	(18.2-27.2)	1.82
Education						*					*
Less than high school	28.9	22.4	(1.7-43.0)	29.6	(22.8-36.3)	0.76	22.0	(3.9-40.0)	26.8	(19.9-33.6)	0.82
High school graduate	26.0	30.4	(15.9-44.9)	25.4	(20.6-30.2)	1.20	35.6	(21.5-49.7)	22.2	(17.9-26.6)	1.60
Some college	21.4	40.6	(30.2-51.0)	19.1	(15.8-22.3)	2.13	40.8	(30.8-50.7)	19.9	(16.8-23.1)	2.05
College graduate	15.3	20.8	(7.7-34.0)	14.8	(11.3-18.3)	1.41	31.4	(16.8-46.1)	18.0	(14.1-22.0)	1.74
Post-graduate	12.3	18.3	(4.9-31.8)	11.3	(7.0-15.6)	1.62	22.0	(7.7-36.3)	17.5	(11.8-23.1)	1.26

Yelin, E., Trupin, L. (2003, Feb.). Employment for Persons with and without Disabilities in California.

	Percent with Episodic Employment										
	Unadjusted						Adjusted				
	All persons	Disability		No Disability			Disability		No Disability		
Demographic Characteristics	%	%	95% CI	%	95% CI	Ratio	%	95% CI	%	95% CI	Ratio
Marital status						*					
Married/partner	20.3	21.6	(14.1-29.1)	20.1	(17.5-22.8)	1.07	28.8	(20.7-36.9)	21.5	(18.7-24.3)	1.34
Separated/divorced/widowed	19.4	38.8	(26.2-51.3)	15.6	(11.3-20.0)	2.49	40.6	(28.6-52.7)	19.1	(14.3-24.0)	2.13
Never married	21.8	33.0	(18.8-47.3)	20.8	(17.2-24.3)	1.59	37.7	(24.3-51.1)	19.8	(16.2-23.4)	1.90
Residence						*					
Rural	24.0	60.1	(35.0-85.1)	18.4	(10.8-26.0)	3.27	35.7	(24.3-47.1)	21.9	(14.4-29.4)	1.63
Urban	20.4	26.7	(20.6-32.8)	19.7	(17.7-21.6)	1.36	33.7	(27.6-39.9)	20.5	(18.5-22.4)	1.64
Region						*					*
Los Angeles	20.3	38.9	(25.9-52.0)	18.6	(15.2-22.0)	2.09	39.4	(27.1-51.8)	20.2	(16.8-23.5)	1.95
Central Valley/Other	24.4	53.3	(38.5-68.1)	21.3	(16.9-25.6)	2.50	47.4	(33.1-61.8)	21.1	(16.5-25.6)	2.25
Bay Area	22.3	18.0	(8.2-27.7)	22.9	(18.8-27.0)	0.79	28.6	(17.5-39.8)	21.6	(17.5-25.6)	1.32
Other Southern California	17.1	18.4	(8.1-28.7)	16.9	(13.3-20.6)	1.09	22.6	(12.0-33.2)	19.7	(15.9-23.5)	1.15

All results are weighted to the 1999-2000 California adult population.

* Ratio of episodic employment rates of persons with and without disabilities differs by categories of demographic characteristics.

[1] Adjusted employment rates for each demographic characteristic are also adjusted for the remainder of the demographic characteristics. Asterisks indicate that the model also includes an interaction term for disability and the demographic variable indicated.

[2] Episodic employment defined as working fewer than 40 weeks in the past year.

[3] Disability status is defined by activity limitation; see methods for detailed description.

Yelin, E., Trupin, L. (2003, Feb.). Employment for Persons with and without Disabilities in California.

Table 11: Unadjusted and Adjusted[1] Rates and 95% Confidence Intervals of Involuntary Part-Time Employment among Persons 18-64 Who Are Currently Employed, by Disability[2], Health, and Comorbidity Status, CWHS 1999-2000

	Percent with Involuntary Part-Time Employment										
	Unadjusted						Adjusted				
	All persons	Disability		No Disability			Disability		No Disability		
Health Characteristics	%	%	95% CI	%	95% CI	Ratio	%	95% CI	%	95% CI	Ratio
Total	4.0	6.3	(2.6-10.0)	3.8	(2.8-4.7)	1.66	5.9	(2.3-9.6)	4.1	(3.1-5.1)	1.44
Health status											*
Excellent/very good/good	39.5	5.2	(1.2-9.3)	3.8	(2.8-4.9)	1.37	4.9	(1.1-8.8)	4.1	(3.0-5.2)	1.20
Fair/poor	4.3	9.7	(0.8-18.6)	2.8	(0.0-5.6)	3.46	8.6	(0.5-16.8)	3.6	(0.5-6.7)	2.39
Depressive symptoms											
No	3.8	5.7	(2.0-9.5)	3.6	(2.6-4.6)	1.58	5.7	(2.1-9.2)	4.0	(3.0-5.0)	1.43
Yes	7.9	10.0	(0.0-26.6)	7.2	(0.3-14.1)	1.39	7.8	(0.6-15.0)	5.5	(0.8-10.2)	1.42
Musculoskeletal conditions											
No	4.0	9.1	(0.9-17.2)	3.8	(2.6-5.0)	2.39	6.5	(2.1-10.9)	4.3	(3.0-5.5)	1.51
Yes	3.9	4.8	(0.8-8.8)	3.7	(1.9-5.5)	1.30	5.6	(2.0-9.2)	3.7	(2.0-5.4)	1.51
Circulatory conditions						*					*
No	3.7	7.7	(2.7-12.6)	3.4	(2.3-4.4)	2.26	6.7	(2.2-11.3)	4.0	(2.9-5.1)	1.68
Yes	5.5	3.0	(0.0-7.8)	6.0	(3.0-9.0)	0.50	4.0	(0.0-9.5)	4.4	(1.8-7.0)	0.91

All results are weighted to the 1999-2000 California adult population.

* Ratio of involuntary part-time employment rates of persons with and without disabilities differs by categories of health status variables.

[1] Adjusted for gender, age, nativity, race/ethnicity, marital status, rural residence, region of the state, and education.

[2] Disability status is defined by activity limitation; see methods for detailed description.

Yelin, E., Trupin, L. (2003, Feb.). Employment for Persons with and without Disabilities in California.

Table 12: Unadjusted and Adjusted[1] Rates and 95% Confidence Intervals of Involuntary Part-Time Work among Persons 18-64 Who Are Currently Employed, by Disability Status[2] and Demographic Characteristics, CHWS 1999-2000 (n=1,589)

	Percent with Involuntary Part-Time Employment										
	Unadjusted						Adjusted				
	All persons	Disability		No Disability			Disability		No Disability		
Demographic Characteristics	%	%	95% CI	%	95% CI	Ratio	%	95% CI	%	95% CI	Ratio
Total	4.0	6.3	(2.6-10.0)	3.8	(2.8-4.7)	1.66	5.9	(2.3-9.6)	4.1	(3.1-5.1)	1.44
Age						*					
18-24	2.2	15.9	(0.0-43.5)	1.2	(0.0-2.7)	13.25	7.3	(1.9-12.6)	5.0	(2.5-7.6)	1.46
25-44	4.2	5.2	(0.0-10.7)	4.2	(2.6-5.7)	1.24	6.3	(2.4-10.2)	4.4	(3.1-5.6)	1.43
45-54	4.4	4.1	(0.0-9.3)	4.4	(2.4-6.4)	0.93	5.5	(2.0-9.0)	3.8	(2.6-4.9)	1.45
55-64	4.1	7.5	(0.0-17.2)	3.6	(0.8-6.4)	2.08	4.8	(1.0-8.5)	3.3	(1.4-5.1)	1.45
Gender						*					*
Male	3.1	8.4	(2.0-14.8)	2.6	(1.5-3.7)	3.23	9.1	(2.7-15.5)	2.9	(1.7-4.1)	3.14
Female	5.2	4.2	(0.0-8.4)	5.3	(3.6-7.1)	0.79	3.4	(0.0-7.3)	5.5	(3.7-7.2)	0.62
Nativity											
Foreign born	4.3	6.1	(2.2-10.0)	3.6	(2.4-4.7)	1.69	6.5	(1.4-11.7)	4.5	(2.1-6.9)	1.44
US born	3.9	7.8	(0.0-22.0)	4.2	(2.3-6.1)	1.86	5.7	(2.1-9.3)	3.9	(2.7-5.2)	1.46
Race/ethnicity											
White, non-Hispanic	3.7	7.7	(2.9-12.5)	3.2	(1.9-4.5)	2.41	5.8	(2.0-9.6)	4.0	(2.5-5.5)	1.45
African-American, non-Hispanic	2.3	0.0	-	2.6	(0.1-5.0)	-	5.9	(2.3-9.5)	4.1	(3.0-5.1)	1.44
Asian-American, non-Hispanic	2.4	25.2	(0.0-85.4)	2.0	(0.2-3.8)	12.60	6.1	(2.1-10.0)	4.2	(2.9-5.5)	1.45
Hispanic	5.6	0.0	-	5.9	(3.3-8.5)	-	6.2	(1.5-10.9)	4.3	(2.2-6.4)	1.44
Education											
Less than high school	6.0	0.0	-	6.4	(2.3-10.5)	-	8.4	(2.3-14.5.)	5.7	(2.9-8.5)	1.47
High school graduate	7.4	14.0	(0.0-28.7)	6.8	(3.7-9.8)	2.06	7.1	(2.6-11.7)	4.8	(3.2-6.4)	1.48
Some college	2.8	5.2	(0.0-10.9)	2.5	(1.1-4.0)	2.08	6.0	(2.4-9.7)	4.0	(3.0-5.1)	1.50
College graduate	2.4	7.5	(0.0-16.8)	1.9	(0.5-3.4)	3.95	5.1	(1.7-8.5)	3.4	(2.2-4.6)	1.50
Post-graduate	3.9	2.5	(0.0-8.1)	4.1	(1.4-6.9)	0.61	4.3	(0.9-7.7)	2.9	(1.3-4.4)	1.48

Yelin, E., Trupin, L. (2003, Feb.). Employment for Persons with and without Disabilities in California.

	Percent with Involuntary Part-Time Employment										
	Unadjusted						Adjusted				
	All persons	Disability		No Disability			Disability		No Disability		
Demographic Characteristics	%	%	95% CI	%	95% CI	Ratio	%	95% CI	%	95% CI	Ratio
Marital status											*
Married/partner	4.1	6.1	(1.2-11.0)	3.9	(2.6-5.3)	1.56	5.4	(0.8-10.0)	3.7	(2.4-5.0)	1.46
Separated/divorced/widowed	6.6	6.3	(0.0-13.8)	6.6	(3.4-9.8)	0.95	7.6	(0.0-15.8)	7.1	(3.6-10.5)	1.07
Never married	2.3	6.7	(0.0-16.7)	1.9	(0.6-3.2)	3.53	8.0	(0.0-18.6)	2.9	(1.1-4.7)	2.76
Residence											
Rural	3.3	0.0	-	3.6	(0.0-7.5)	-	4.8	(0.0-10.3)	3.3	(0.0-6.6)	1.45
Urban	4.0	6.7	(2.7-10.6)	3.8	(2.7-4.8)	1.76	6.0	(2.4-9.7)	4.1	(3.1-5.2)	1.46
Region											*
Los Angeles	3.1	7.7	(0.0-16.1)	2.8	(1.2-4.4)	2.75	10.1	(0.7-19.5)	3.3	(1.6-5.0)	3.06
Central Valley/Other	5.0	4.8	(0.0-13.3)	5.0	(2.5-7.5)	0.96	3.8	(0.0-11.2)	5.5	(2.6-8.3)	0.69
Bay Area	3.2	7.6	(0.0-15.0)	2.6	(0.9-4.3)	2.92	5.1	(0.0-10.7)	3.3	(1.3-5.2)	1.55
Other Southern California	4.8	5.1	(0.0-11.8)	4.8	(2.5-7.0)	1.06	4.1	(0.0-9.8)	4.6	(2.5-6.8)	0.89

All results are weighted to the 1999-2000 California adult population.

* Ratio of rates of involuntary part-time employment of persons with and without disabilities differs by categories of demographic characteristics.

[1] Adjusted employment rates for each demographic characteristic are also adjusted for the remainder of the demographic characteristics. Asterisks indicate that the model also includes an interaction term for disability and the demographic variable indicated.

[2] Disability status is defined by activity limitation; see methods for detailed description.

Yelin, E., Trupin, L. (2003, Feb.). Employment for Persons with and without Disabilities in California.

Table 13: Unadjusted and Adjusted[1] Rates and 95% Confidence Intervals of Contingent Employment[2] among Persons 18-64 Who Are Currently Employed, by Disability[3], Health, and Comorbidity Status, CWHS 1999-2000

	Percent with Contingent Employment										
	Unadjusted						Adjusted				
	All persons	Disability		No Disability			Disability		No Disability		
Health Characteristics	%	%	95% CI	%	95% CI	Ratio	%	95% CI	%	95% CI	Ratio
Total	10.9	11.6	(6.7-16.5)	10.8	(9.2-12.4)	1.07	14.2	(8.7-19.8)	10.1	(8.6-11.7)	1.41
Health status											
Excellent/very good/good	10.4	10.6	(5.0-16.2)	10.4	(8.7-12.0)	1.02	13.1	(7.6-18.7)	9.8	(8.2-11.4)	1.34
Fair/poor	15.4	14.8	(4.4-25.2)	15.6	(9.3-22.0)	0.95	16.7	(9.0-24.5)	12.7	(7.5-17.9)	1.31
Depressive symptoms						*					*
No	11.0	10.4	(5.5-15.4)	11.0	(9.4-12.7)	0.95	13.4	(7.5-19.2)	10.3	(8.7-11.9)	1.30
Yes	8.5	19.5	(0.0-40.5)	4.7	(0.0-10.3)	4.15	19.7	(2.1-37.4)	6.0	(0.2-11.7)	3.28
Musculoskeletal conditions						*					*
No	11.2	3.9	(0.0-9.5)	11.6	(9.6-13.5)	0.34	6.0	(0.0-12.6)	10.2	(8.4-12.1)	0.59
Yes	10.1	15.7	(9.0-22.4)	8.8	(6.1-11.4)	1.78	18.2	(10.7-25.6)	9.8	(6.9-12.8)	1.86
Circulatory conditions						*					*
No	10.0	6.8	(2.1-11.4)	10.3	(8.5-12.0)	0.66	11.0	(5.1-16.9)	9.6	(7.9-11.2)	1.15
Yes	15.2	23.3	(11.4-35.2)	13.7	(9.3-18.0)	1.70	22.4	(10.2-34.5)	12.8	(8.4-17.2)	1.75

All results are weighted to the 1999-2000 California adult population.

* Ratio of contingent employment rates of persons with and without disabilities differs by categories of health status variables.

[1] Adjusted for gender, age, nativity, race/ethnicity, marital status, rural residence, region of the state, and education.

[2] Contingent employment defined as employment not expected to last 12 months or more.

[3] Disability status is defined by activity limitation; see methods for detailed description.

Yelin, E., Trupin, L. (2003, Feb.). Employment for Persons with and without Disabilities in California.

Table 14: Unadjusted and Adjusted[1] Rates and 95% Confidence Intervals of Contingent Employment[2], among Persons 18-64 Who Are Currrently Employed, by Disability Status[3] and Demographic Characteristics, CHWS 1999-2000 (n=1,599)

	Percent with Contingent Employment										
	Unadjusted						Adjusted				
	All persons	Disability		No Disability			Disability		No Disability		
Demographic Characteristics	%	%	95% CI	%	95% CI	Ratio	%	95% CI	%	95% CI	Ratio
Total	10.9	11.6	(6.7-16.5)	10.8	(9.2-12.4)	1.07	14.2	(8.7-19.8)	10.1	(8.6-11.7)	1.41
Age											
18-24	13.4	0.0	-	14.4	(9.4-19.4)	-	19.8	(11.0-28.6)	14.3	(10.1-18.5)	1.38
25-44	11.6	15.2	(6.2-24.1)	11.3	(8.9-13.7)	1.35	15.5	(9.4-21.5)	11.0	(9.2-12.8)	1.41
45-54	8.2	9.5	(1.9-17.1)	8.0	(5.3-10.7)	1.19	11.9	(6.9-17.0)	8.4	(6.6-10.3)	1.42
55-64	8.6	10.3	(0.0-21.5)	8.3	(4.3-12.4)	1.24	9.1	(4.2-14.0)	6.4	(3.8-8.9)	1.42
Gender											
Male	10.6	11.0	(3.8-18.1)	10.5	(8.4-12.7)	1.05	14.6	(8.6-20.7)	10.4	(8.3-12.5)	1.40
Female	11.3	12.3	(5.5-19.2)	11.1	(8.7-13.5)	1.11	13.7	(8.0-19.5)	9.7	(7.6-11.9)	1.41
Nativity											
Foreign born	12.0	12.5	(7.2-17.9)	12.3	(9.2-15.5)	1.02	17.1	(9.0-25.1)	12.3	(8.4-16.1)	1.39
US born	10.4	5.1	(0.0-16.7)	10.2	(8.3-12.0)	0.50	13.2	(7.9-18.5)	9.3	(7.5-11.2)	1.42
Race/ethnicity											*
White, non-Hispanic	10.1	9.9	(4.5-15.3)	10.1	(7.9-12.3)	0.98	11.4	(5.2-17.6)	10.0	(7.5-12.6)	1.14
African-American, non-Hispanic	15.1	37.0	(14.5-59.6)	12.6	(7.6-17.7)	2.94	41.1	(19.7-62.4)	13.1	(7.8-18.5)	3.14
Asian-American, non-Hispanic	11.4	8.0	(0.0-45.8)	11.5	(7.3-15.6)	0.70	15.7	(0.0-45.4)	7.9	(4.4-11.5)	1.99
Hispanic	11.5	10.3	(0.0-24.9)	11.6	(8.1-15.1)	0.89	4.9	(0.0-14.4)	10.5	(6.8-14.2)	0.47
Education											
Less than high school	11.0	3.1	(0.0-14.7)	11.6	(6.2-17.1)	0.27	13.5	(7.0-20.0)	9.6	(6.3-12.8)	1.41
High school graduate	11.7	9.4	(0.0-21.7)	11.9	(8.0-15.9)	0.79	13.8	(8.0-19.6)	9.8	(7.6-12.0)	1.41
Some college	10.5	14.2	(5.4-22.9)	10.2	(7.5-12.9)	1.39	14.2	(8.6-19.7)	10.1	(8.5-11.6)	1.41
College graduate	11.0	7.1	(0.0-16.0)	11.4	(8.0-14.8)	0.62	14.5	(8.6-20.4)	10.3	(8.3-12.4)	1.41
Post-graduate	10.2	18.7	(4.4-33.0)	9.0	(5.0-12.9)	2.08	14.9	(7.9-21.8)	10.6	(7.3-13.9)	1.41

Yelin, E., Trupin, L. (2003, Feb.). Employment for Persons with and without Disabilities in California.

	Percent with Contingent Employment										
	Unadjusted						Adjusted				
	All persons	Disability		No Disability			Disability		No Disability		
Demographic Characteristics	%	%	95% CI	%	95% CI	Ratio	%	95% CI	%	95% CI	Ratio
Marital status						*					
Married/partner	10.3	8.4	(2.7-14.0)	10.5	(8.3-12.6)	0.80	13.8	(8.1-19.4)	9.7	(7.6-11.7)	1.42
Separated/divorced/widowed	9.2	23.2	(10.3-36.2)	7.2	(4.0-10.5)	3.22	14.5	(8.8-20.2)	10.2	(8.6-11.8)	1.42
Never married	12.8	7.0	(0.0-17.0)	13.3	(9.9-16.6)	0.53	15.2	(8.5-22.0)	10.8	(8.0-13.6)	1.41
Residence											
Rural	8.0	12.1	(0.0-36.7)	7.7	(2.2-13.2)	1.57	11.1	(2.1-20.2)	7.8	(2.0-13.6)	1.42
Urban	11.1	11.6	(6.6-16.7)	11.0	(9.3-12.7)	1.05	14.4	(8.8-20.0)	10.2	(8.6-11.8)	1.41
Region											
Los Angeles	10.5	16.8	(5.2-28.5)	10.1	(7.2-12.9)	1.66	14.1	(8.0-20.2)	10.0	(7.6-12.4)	1.41
Central Valley/Other	9.3	10.1	(0.0-21.9)	9.3	(6.0-12.6)	1.09	14.2	(8.6-19.9)	10.1	(8.4-11.7)	1.41
Bay Area	12.5	16.6	(6.2-27.1)	11.9	(8.5-15.3)	1.39	14.3	(8.7-20.0)	10.1	(8.4-11.9)	1.42
Other Southern California	11.0	5.6	(0.0-12.5)	11.7	(8.4-15.1)	0.48	14.4	(8.3-20.6)	10.2	(7.7-12.7)	1.41

All results are weighted to the 1999-2000 California adult population.

* Ratio of contingent employment rates of persons with and without disabilities differs by categories of demographic characteristics.

[1] Adjusted employment rates for each demographic characteristic are also adjusted for the remainder of the demographic characteristics. Asterisks indicate that the model also includes an interaction term for disability and the demographic variable indicated.

[2] Contingent employment defined as employment not expected to last 12 months or more.

[3] Disability status is defined by activity limitation; see methods for detailed description.

Yelin, E., Trupin, L. (2003, Feb.). Employment for Persons with and without Disabilities in California.

Table 15: Unadjusted and Adjusted[1] Rates and 95% Confidence Intervals of Poverty Despite Employment[2] among Persons 18-64 Who Are Currently Employed, by Disability[3], Health, and Comorbidity Status, CWHS 1999-2000

	Percent with Poverty-Level Income Despite Employment										
	Unadjusted						Adjusted				
	All persons	Disability		No Disability			Disability		No Disability		
Health Characteristics	%	%	95% CI	%	95% CI	Ratio	%	95% CI	%	95% CI	Ratio
Total	13.7	16.3	(10.6-22.0)	13.4	(11.6-15.3)	1.22	22.4	(16.3-28.5)	13.1	(11.6-14.6)	1.71
Health status											
Excellent/very good/good	10.8	10.8	(5.1-16.6)	10.8	(9.1-12.6)	1.00	19.2	(13.1-25.3)	12.1	(10.5-13.7)	1.59
Fair/poor	40.4	33.0	(19.1-47.0)	42.8	(33.7-51.8)	0.77	28.0	(20.2-35.9)	18.9	(14.3-23.6)	1.48
Depressive symptoms											
No	12.5	14.4	(8.6-20.1)	12.3	(10.5-14.1)	1.17	20.8	(14.7-26.9)	12.7	(11.2-14.2)	1.64
Yes	38.3	29.1	(4.1-54.1)	41.5	(28.1-54.8)	0.70	30.0	(20.0-39.9)	19.7	(12.9-26.4)	1.52
Musculoskeletal conditions						*					*
No	15.0	12.2	(2.9-21.5)	15.2	(12.9-17.4)	0.80	11.8	(3.7-19.9)	13.6	(11.8-15.4)	0.87
Yes	10.8	18.5	(11.2-25.8)	8.9	(6.1-11.7)	2.08	27.8	(20.1-35.5)	11.6	(8.6-14.6)	2.40
Circulatory conditions											
No	13.5	15.4	(8.6-22.1)	13.4	(11.4-15.4)	1.15	21.5	(15.4-27.6)	12.7	(11.1-14.3)	1.69
Yes	14.3	18.5	(7.5-29.6)	13.5	(9.1-17.9)	1.37	25.3	(17.6-33.1)	15.5	(11.5-19.5)	1.63

All results are weighted to the 1999-2000 California adult population.

* Ratio of rates of poverty despite employment of persons with and without disabilities differs by categories of health status variables.

[1] Adjusted for gender, age, nativity, race/ethnicity, marital status, rural residence, region of the state, and education

[2] Poverty despite employment defined by respondents who are employed, but with household income below 125% of the Federal Poverty Level and is equivalent to the term working poor.

[3] Disability status is defined by activity limitation; see methods for detailed description.

Yelin, E., Trupin, L. (2003, Feb.). Employment for Persons with and without Disabilities in California.

Table 16: Unadjusted and Adjusted[1] Rates and 95% Confidence Intervals of Poverty Despite Employment[2] among Persons 18-64 Who Are Currently Employed, by Disability Status[3] and Demographic Characteristics, CWHS 1999-2000

	Percent with Poverty-Level Income Despite Employment										
	Unadjusted						Adjusted				
	All persons	Disability		No Disability			Disability		No Disability		
Demographic Characteristics	%	%	95% CI	%	95% CI	Ratio	%	95% CI	%	95% CI	Ratio
Total	13.7	16.3	(10.6-22.0)	13.4	(11.6-15.3)	1.22	22.4	(16.3-28.5)	13.1	(11.6-14.6)	1.71
Age						*					*
18-24	25.2	3.3	(0.0-17.8)	27.0	(20.4-33.6)	0.12	13.1	(0.0-33.4)	24.4	(18.5-30.4)	0.54
25-44	14.5	18.3	(8.6-28.0)	14.2	(11.5-16.9)	1.29	19.0	(10.6-27.4)	14.2	(11.8-16.5)	1.34
45-54	7.7	21.9	(11.0-32.7)	5.9	(3.5-8.2)	3.71	25.3	(15.2-35.4)	6.2	(3.8-8.5)	4.08
55-64	6.0	5.8	(0.0-14.5)	6.1	(2.4-9.7)	0.95	10.2	(0.0-24.7)	7.6	(3.4-11.8)	1.34
Gender											*
Male	12.5	18.2	(9.2-27.2)	11.9	(9.6-14.3)	1.53	21.7	(13.3-30.1)	11.0	(9.0-12.9)	1.97
Female	15.3	14.4	(7.0-21.8)	15.4	(12.6-18.3)	0.94	23.7	(14.9-32.6)	15.8	(13.3-18.2)	1.50
Nativity											*
Foreign born	28.6	34.6	(9.4-59.8)	28.4	(23.9-32.8)	1.22	24.7	(9.2-40.2)	17.9	(14.4-21.5)	1.38
US born	8.1	13.7	(8.1-19.4)	7.3	(5.7-9.0)	1.88	20.0	(13.3-26.7)	10.2	(8.2-12.3)	1.96
Race/ethnicity											*
White, non-Hispanic	4.9	8.6	(3.5-13.8)	4.3	(2.8-5.9)	2.00	13.3	(6.0-20.6)	6.8	(4.4-9.1)	1.96
African-American, non-Hispanic	16.6	32.4	(10.5-54.2)	14.7	(9.1-20.2)	2.20	29.7	(13.2-46.2)	18.0	(12.5-23.6)	1.65
Asian-American, non-Hispanic	12.7	25.2	(0.0-85.4)	12.5	(8.0-16.9)	2.02	35.2	(0.0-79.2)	14.5	(9.5-19.5)	2.43
Hispanic	33.5	44.3	(19.7-68.9)	32.8	(27.4-38.1)	1.35	30.6	(14.5-46.7)	17.6	(13.9-21.2)	1.74
Education											
Less than high school	52.0	62.7	(28.6-96.8)	51.1	(42.2-60.1)	1.23	46.2	(34.6-57.7)	29.3	(23.4-35.2)	1.58
High school graduate	19.5	17.3	(1.0-33.6)	19.8	(14.8-24.8)	0.87	32.7	(23.5-41.8)	18.6	(15.9-21.3)	1.76
Some college	12.3	23.1	(12.5-33.7)	11.1	(8.3-14.0)	2.08	21.2	(14.0-28.4)	10.8	(9.1-12.6)	1.96
College graduate	3.2	2.9	(0.0-8.9)	3.3	(1.4-5.2)	0.88	12.6	(7.0-18.2)	5.9	(4.2-7.6)	2.14
Post-graduate	0.9	0.0	-	1.0	(0.0-2.4)	-	7.0	(2.9-11.1)	3.0	(1.7-4.4)	2.33

Yelin, E., Trupin, L. (2003, Feb.). Employment for Persons with and without Disabilities in California.

	Percent with Poverty-Level Income Despite Employment										
	Unadjusted						Adjusted				
	All persons	Disability		No Disability			Disability		No Disability		
Demographic Characteristics	%	%	95% CI	%	95% CI	Ratio	%	95% CI	%	95% CI	Ratio
Marital status											*
Married/partner	13.1	12.6	(5.7-19.4)	13.2	(10.8-15.6)	0.95	17.4	(10.0-24.8)	12.4	(10.2-14.7)	1.40
Separated/divorced/widowed	18.8	31.1	(16.7-45.6)	17.0	(12.1-21.9)	1.83	42.4	(29.2-55.5)	20.2	(15.4-24.9)	2.10
Never married	11.6	9.3	(0.0-21.2)	11.8	(8.5-15.1)	0.79	17.3	(4.1-30.4)	11.0	(8.3-13.8)	1.57
Residence											
Rural	8.2	0.0	-	9.0	(2.8-15.1)	-	20.4	(9.0-31.7)	11.6	(4.9-18.4)	1.76
Urban	14.1	17.2	(11.1-23.2)	13.7	(11.8-15.6)	1.26	22.6	(16.4-28.7)	13.2	(11.6-14.7)	1.71
Region											
Los Angeles	17.0	30.6	(16.1-45.2)	16.0	(12.4-19.6)	1.91	23.6	(16.8-30.4)	14.2	(11.9-16.6)	1.66
Central Valley/Other	15.4	25.6	(7.6-43.6)	14.7	(10.5-18.8)	1.74	22.4	(16.3-28.6)	13.4	(11.8-15.0)	1.67
Bay Area	9.5.	7.2	(0.0-14.6)	9.8	(6.6-13.0)	0.73	21.3	(15.3-27.3)	12.6	(10.9-14.3)	1.69
Other Southern California	12.6	11.6	(1.7-21.4)	12.7	(9.2-16.3)	0.91	20.2	(14.0-26.5)	11.8	(9.4-14.2)	1.71

All results are weighted to the 1999-2000 California adult population.

* Ratio of rates of poverty despite employment of persons with and without disabilities differs by categories of demographic characteristics.

[1] Adjusted employment rates for each demographic characteristic are also adjusted for the remainder of the demographic characteristics. Asterisks indicate that the model also includes an interaction term for disability and the demographic variable indicated.

[2] Poverty despite employment defined by respondents who are employed, but with household income below 125% of the Federal Poverty Level and is equivalent to the term working poor.

[3] Disability status is defined by activity limitation; see methods for detailed description.

Yelin, E., Trupin, L. (2003, Feb.). Employment for Persons with and without Disabilities in California.

Table 17: Unadjusted and Adjusted[1] Rates and 95% Confidence Intervals of Poverty Despite Employment[2] among Persons 18-64 Who Are Currently Employed, by Disability Status[3] and Traditional Employment Status[4], CWHS 1999-2000

	Percent with Poverty Level Income Despite Employment										
	Unadjusted						Adjusted				
	All persons	Disability		No Disability			Disability		No Disability		
	%	%	95% CI	%	95% CI	Ratio	%	95% CI	%	95% CI	Ratio
Total	13.7	16.3	(10.6-22.0)	13.3	(11.4-15.1)	1.23	22.0	(16.1-28.0)	12.9	(11.4-14.4)	1.71
Traditional employment											*
Yes	5.4	3.0	(0.0-8.4)	5.6	(3.5-7.7)	0.54	3.7	(0.0-10.1)	5.5	(3.4-7.6)	0.67
No	17.8	21.9	(14.4-29.4)	17.3	(14.8-19.8)	1.27	27.0	(20.0-34.0)	15.7	(13.8-17.7)	1.72

All results are weighted to the 1999-2000 California adult population.

* Ratio of rates of poverty despite employment of persons with and without disabilities differs by categories of health status variables.

[1] Adjusted for gender, age, nativity, race/ethnicity, marital status, rural residence, region of the state, education and occupation, industry, and firm size of current job.

[2] Poverty despite employment defined by respondents who are employed, but with household income below 125% of the Federal Poverty Level.

[3] Disability status is defined by activity limitation; see methods for detailed description.

[4] Traditional employment is defined as working 50 or more weeks per year, 35 hours or more per week, not self-employed, works one job, during the day, and rarely works from home.

Yelin, E., Trupin, L. (2003, Feb.). Employment for Persons with and without Disabilities in California.

Table 18: Unadjusted and Adjusted[1] Rates and 95% Confidence Intervals of Having Current Job Tenure of One Year or Less among Persons 18-64 Who Have Worked in the Past Year, by Disability[2], Health, and Comorbidity Status, CWHS 1999-2000

	Percent with Job Tenure of One Year or Less										
	Unadjusted						Adjusted				
	All persons	Disability		No Disability			Disability		No Disability		
Health Characteristics	%	%	95% CI	%	95% CI	Ratio	%	95% CI	%	95% CI	Ratio
Total	19.4	20.1	(14.0-26.3)	19.3	(17.3-21.3)	1.04	18.9	(12.9-25.0)	18.4	(16.5-20.3)	1.03
Health status											*
Excellent/very good/good	18.8	16.9	(10.1-23.7)	18.9	(16.8-21.1)	0.89	16.4	(9.7-23.1)	18.4	(16.4-20.4)	0.89
Fair/poor	25.1	30.3	(16.8-43.8)	23.6	(16.2-31.0)	1.28	25.7	(13.3-38.1)	18.4	(11.8-25.0)	1.40
Depressive symptoms											
No	18.6	18.8	(12.5-25.1)	18.6	(16.5-20.6)	1.01	18.2	(12.2-24.2)	18.2	(16.2-20.1)	1.00
Yes	35.2	28.7	(4.7-52.7)	37.5	(24.5-50.4)	0.77	23.7	(13.3-34.1)	23.7	(14.8-32.6)	1.00
Musculoskeletal conditions											
No	18.8	18.4	(7.4-29.4)	18.8	(16.4-24.6)	0.98	15.6	(9.9-21.2)	16.8	(14.7-18.9)	0.93
Yes	20.8	21.0	(13.6-28.5)	20.7	(16.9-24.6)	1.01	21.3	(14.6-28.0)	22.9	(19.0-26.8)	0.93
Circulatory conditions						*					*
No	20.4	18.5	(11.3-25.7)	20.6	(18.3-22.9)	0.90	18.7	(11.8-25.7)	18.7	(16.6-20.8)	1.00
Yes	14.2	24.1	(12.1-36.1)	12.3	(8.1-16.4)	1.96	19.4	(7.6-31.2)	16.8	(11.7-21.9)	1.15

All results are weighted to the 1999-2000 California adult population.

* Ratio of rates of job tenure of one year or less of persons with and without disabilities differs by categories of health status variables.

[1] Adjusted for gender, age, nativity, race/ethnicity, marital status, rural residence, region of the state, and education.

[2] Disability status is defined by activity limitation; see methods for detailed description.

Yelin, E., Trupin, L. (2003, Feb.). Employment for Persons with and without Disabilities in California.

Table 19: Unadjusted and Adjusted[1] Rates and 95% Confidence Intervals of Having Current Job Tenure of One Year or Less among Persons 18-64 Who Have Worked in the Past Year, by Disability Status[2] and Demographic Characteristics, CWHS 1999-2000

	Percent with Job Tenure of One Year or Less										
	Unadjusted						Adjusted				
	All persons	Disability		No Disability			Disability		No Disability		
Demographic Characteristics	%	%	95% CI	%	95% CI	Ratio	%	95% CI	%	95% CI	Ratio
Total	19.4	20.1	(14.0-26.3)	19.3	(17.3-21.4)	1.04	18.9	(12.9-25.0)	18.4	(16.5-20.3)	1.03
Age						*					*
18-24	48.8	29.1	(0.0-63.4)	50.3	(43.2-57.4)	0.58	30.4	(1.6-59.3)	47.7	(38.8-56.6)	0.64
25-44	17.7	24.0	(13.4-34.7)	17.1	(14.2-20.0)	1.40	22.4	(12.3-32.5)	18.8	(15.8-21.9)	1.19
45-54	12.7	16.5	(6.9-26.1)	12.2	(8.9-15.5)	1.35	12.4	(4.2-20.6)	11.6	(8.3-14.8)	1.07
55-64	2.2	1.7	(0.0-6.5)	2.3	(0.1-4.5)	0.74	2.9	(0.0-8.7)	3.8	(1.0-6.7)	0.76
Gender						*					*
Male	17.4	25.0	(15.1-35.0)	16.8	(14.1-19.4)	1.49	22.7	(13.4-31.9)	16.5	(14.1-19.0)	1.38
Female	21.9	15.3	(7.8-22.8)	22.7	(19.5-25.9)	0.67	16.0	(8.0-23.9)	20.8	(17.8-23.7)	0.77
Nativity											*
Foreign born	21.2	23.6	(1.1-46.1)	21.1	(17.2-25.0)	1.12	22.9	(4.2-41.5)	19.3	(15.1-23.5)	1.19
US born	18.7	19.7	(13.2-26.1)	18.6	(16.2-21.0)	1.06	18.1	(11.8-24.5)	18.1	(15.6-20.5)	1.00
Race/ethnicity						*					
White, non-Hispanic	18.4	17.4	(10.6-24.2)	18.5	(15.7-21.4)	0.94	19.5	(13.1-25.9)	18.9	(15.9-21.9)	1.03
African-American, non-Hispanic	19.0	10.5	(0.0-24.8)	19.9	(13.9-26.0)	0.53	19.1	(13.1-25.1)	18.5	(16.6-20.4)	1.03
Asian-American, non-Hispanic	20.9	0.0	-	21.3	(15.9-26.7)	-	18.7	(12.4-25.0)	18.1	(15.8-20.5)	1.03
Hispanic	21.0	38.7	(15.3-62.1)	19.9	(15.6-24.3)	1.94	18.3	(11.3-25.3)	17.8	(14.1-21.4)	1.03
Education											
Less than high school	21.0	42.5	(9.7-75.3)	19.4	(12.7-26.1)	2.19	19.5	(12.2-26.7)	18.9	(14.6-23.2)	1.03
High school graduate	21.9	16.5	(0.8-32.1)	22.4	(17.3-27.5)	0.74	19.3	(12.9-25.6)	18.6	(15.9-21.4)	1.04
Some college	22.1	24.3	(13.5-35.0)	21.9	(18.2-25.6)	1.11	19.0	(13.0-25.1)	18.4	(16.5-20.3)	1.03
College graduate	15.9	13.8	(1.8-25.9)	16.1	(12.2-20.0)	0.86	18.8	(12.6-25.1)	18.2	(15.7-20.8)	1.03
Post-graduate	14.0	14.3	(1.5-27.1)	14.0	(9.2-18.8)	1.02	18.6	(11.6-25.6)	18.0	(14.1-22.0)	1.03

Yelin, E., Trupin, L. (2003, Feb.). Employment for Persons with and without Disabilities in California.

	Percent with Job Tenure of One Year or Less										
	Unadjusted						Adjusted				
	All persons	Disability		No Disability			Disability		No Disability		
Demographic Characteristics	%	%	95% CI	%	95% CI	Ratio	%	95% CI	%	95% CI	Ratio
Marital status						*					
Married/partner	15.6	10.0	(3.9-16.1)	16.1	(13.6-18.7)	0.62	17.9	(11.8-24.0)	17.3	(14.6-19.9)	1.03
Separated/divorced/widowed	15.1	21.5	(8.9-34.1)	14.2	(9.7-18.6)	1.51	19.2	(13.1-25.4)	18.6	(16.7-20.6)	1.03
Never married	28.2	39.7	(20.4-59.0)	27.2	(22.8-31.6)	1.46	20.7	(13.6-27.8)	20.0	(16.6-23.4)	1.04
Residence											
Rural	15.3	23.7	(0.0-55.8)	14.5	(7.2-21.8)	1.63	15.9	(6.8-25.1)	15.5	(8.1-22.8)	1.03
Urban	19.7	19.9	(13.6-26.2)	19.6	(17.5-21.8)	1.02	19.1	(13.1-25.2)	18.6	(16.6-20.6)	1.03
Region											*
Los Angeles	19.3	18.7	(6.5-30.8)	19.4	(15.6-23.2)	0.96	15.7	(4.1-27.4)	17.3	(13.9-20.7)	0.91
Central Valley/Other	15.4	27.3	(9.7-44.9)	14.5	(10.5-18.5)	1.88	34.8	(16.4-53.2)	16.1	(11.5-20.7)	2.16
Bay Area	21.6	18.7	(7.8-29.7)	21.9	(17.6-26.3)	0.85	19.4	(8.5-30.2)	21.2	(17.0-25.3)	0.92
Other Southern California	20.4	19.3	(7.3-31.3)	20.6	(16.3-24.8)	0.94	14.4	(4.9-24.0)	18.8	(14.9-22.7)	0.77

All results are weighted to the 1999-2000 California adult population.

* Ratio of rates of job tenure of one year or less of persons with and without disabilities differs by categories of demographic characteristics.

[1] Adjusted employment rates for each demographic characteristic are also adjusted for the remainder of the demographic characteristics. Asterisks indicate that the model also includes an interaction term for disability and the demographic variable indicated.

[2] Disability status is defined by activity limitation; see methods for detailed description.

Yelin, E., Trupin, L. (2003, Feb.). Employment for Persons with and without Disabilities in California.

Table 20: Working Conditions among Persons 18-64 Who Are Currently Employed, by Disability Status[1], CWHS 1999-2000

Characteristic	Total (n=1,544) %	Disability (n=164) %	No Disability (n=1,380) %
Firm size			
Small (<50 people)	38.1	34.4	39.0
Medium (50-999 people)	30.9	31.0	31.9
Large (1000+ people)	31.0	34.7	29.1
Occupation			
Professional/managerial	33.6	35.3	33.1
Technical/sales	15.7	16.0	16.6
Administrative	20.9	19.1	19.2
Service (not protective)	11.5	10.7	11.6
Skilled trade/protective service	8.4	8.7	8.9
Unskilled laborers/agriculture	10.0	10.3	10.6
Industry			
Professional,finance, real estate	30.9	27.2	31.3
Manufacturing,utilities,trans.	15.7	12.7	17.5
Government,non-profit,education	25.2	29.9	21.5
Wholesale/retail,entertainment/ recreation	18.7	21.4	20.1
Other	9.5	8.8	9.6
% Self-employed	13.3	14.5	11.9
% Works regular day shift	78.3	74.8	78.6
% Have flexible work hours	56.5	55.6	56.3
% Works at least some or all at home	6.4	8.6	5.4
% Supervise others at work	50.5	47.5	51.9
% Member of a union	26.7	26.1	24.8
% High demands and low control at work	13.8	12.6	14.0
% Physical labor is a part of work	45.9	50.4	48.2
% Problems in workplace environment[2]	24.5	32.3	23.8 †
% Traditional employment[3]	33.4	30.5	34.6

All results are weighted to the 1999-2000 California adult population.

[1] Disability status is defined by activity limitation; see methods for detailed description.

[2] Includes serious problems with crime, excessive noise, trash/litter, lighting, access to public transit, and access to shops/stores.

[3] Traditional employment is defined as working 50 or more weeks per year, 35 hours or more per week, not self-employed, works one job, during the day, and rarely working from home.

† $p<.05$

Yelin, E., Trupin, L. (2003, Feb.). Employment for Persons with and without Disabilities in California.

Appendix Table: Unweighted and Weighted Sample Sizes and Disability Rates, by Health, Demographic, and Employment Characteristics, CWHS 1999 - 2000

	Unweighted			Weighted		
Characteristic	n	col. %	% with disability	n	col. %	% with disability
All persons	2,417	100.0	17.0	2,466	100.0	14.9
Health characteristics						
Fair/poor health						
Yes	402	16.6	46.3	367	14.9	42.2
No	2,015	83.4	11.2	2,099	85.1	10.2
Depressive symptoms						
Yes	186	7.7	45.2	183	7.4	43.2
No	2,231	92.3	14.7	2,284	92.6	12.7
Musculoskeletal conditions						
Yes	863	35.7	33.7	794	32.2	30.8
No	1,554	64.3	7.7	1,672	67.8	7.4
Circulatory conditions						
Yes	512	21.8	32.4	453	18.4	29.1
No	1,905	78.8	12.86	2,014	81.6	11.8
Demographics						
Age						
18-24	375	15.5	6.1	381	15.5	7.4
25-44	1,012	41.9	13.2	1,321	53.6	12.8
45-54	634	26.2	23.0	475	19.2	21.4
55-64	396	16.4	27.3	290	11.7	24.1
Male	1,163	48.1	16.1	1,266	51.4	14.6
Female	1,254	51.9	17.9	1,200	48.7	15.3
Foreign born	685	28.3	8.8	711	28.8	9.0
U.S. born	1,732	71.7	20.3	1,755	71.2	17.4
Race/ethnicity						
White, non-Hispanic	1,203	49.8	22.1	1,395	56.6	18.6
African-American, non-Hispanic	321	13.3	22.4	152	6.2	20.4
Asian-American, non-Hispanic	336	13.9	3.9	239	9.7	4.5
Hispanic	557	23.1	10.8	679	27.5	9.9
Education						
Less than high school	298	12.3	14.8	336	13.6	14.4
High school graduate	479	19.8	19.6	467	18.9	17.4
Some college	847	35.0	19.2	865	35.1	15.6
College graduate	516	21.4	12.6	535	21.7	11.5
Post-graduate	277	11.5	16.3	234	10.7	16.1
Marital status						
Married/partner	1,303	53.9	15.9	1,243	50.4	12.7
Separated/divorced/widowed	427	17.7	27.6	430	17.5	23.9
Never married	687	28.4	12.5	793	32.1	13.6

Yelin, E., Trupin, L. (2003, Feb.). Employment for Persons with and without Disabilities in California.

	Unweighted			Weighted		
Characteristic	n	col. %	% with disability	n	col. %	% with disability
Rural residence	167	6.9	22.8	180	7.3	21.0
Urban residence	2,250	93.1	16.6	2,286	92.7	14.5
Region						
Los Angeles	736	30.5	16.0	722	29.3	12.3
Central Valley/Other	518	21.4	18.7	507	20.6	16.5
Bay Area	569	23.5	17.6	519	21.0	16.1
Other Southern California	594	24.6	16.2	719	29.1	15.6
Employment Outcomes						
Any employment in past year						
Yes	1,987	82.2	13.0	2,078	84.3	11.4
No	430	17.8	35.6	388	15.8	33.7
Job loss in past year						
Yes	193	9.7	20.2	210	10.1	19.8
No	1,794	90.3	12.2	1,868	89.9	10.5
Episodic work						
Yes	416	22.1	16.6	408	20.6	15.0
No	1,470	77.9	10.6	1,570	79.4	9.4
Hours and weeks of work						
Part-time, part-year	154	8.2	17.5	147	7.4	16.5
Full-time and/or full-year	1,732	91.8	11.4	1,831	92.6	10.1
Current employment						
Yes	1,599	66.2	10.5	1,692	68.6	9.3
No	818	33.8	29.7	774	31.4	27.3
Involuntary part-time work						
Yes	68	4.3	14.7	67	4.0	14.7
No	1,521	95.7	10.3	1,616	96.0	9.1
Contingent employment						
Yes	168	10.5	13.1	184	10.9	9.9
No	1,431	89.5	10.2	1,508	89.1	9.2
Poverty despite employment						
Yes	212	13.9	12.3	221	13.7	11.3
No	1,318	86.1	10.4	1,393	86.3	9.2
Job tenure $\leq$ 1 year						
Yes	294	18.5	9.2	326	19.4	9.7
No	1,297	81.5	10.9	1,355	80.6	9.3