

**THE SURVEY OF INCOME AND
PROGRAM PARTICIPATION**

**WORKERS WITH DISABILITIES IN
LARGE AND SMALL FIRMS: PROFILES
FROM THE SIPP**

No. 127

**David Drury
Berkeley Planning Associates**

U. S. Department of Commerce BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

This is a longer version of the paper presented at the American Statistical Association Meetings, August 6-9, 1990, Anaheim, CA.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
METHODS AND DEFINITIONS	2
FINDINGS	2
Distribution of Disabled Workers Among Large and Small Firms	2
Demographic Characteristics and Education: Age	3
Sex	3
Race and Ethnicity	3
Formal Education	3
Job-Related Training	4
Type of Disability, and Functional Limitations	4
Number of Years the Person Has Been Work Limited	4
Previous Employment	5
The Current Job Industry	5
Occupation	5
Moonlighting: Second Occupations	5
Hours Worked per Week on the Primary Job	6
Reasons for Working Part Time	6
Current Earnings	6
Union Membership	7
Medical Insurance	7
Work History: Spells of Long Term Non-employment	7
Tenure in the Current Job	8
Onset of Disability in Relation to Work History	8
Separations Over Time	9
CONCLUSION	10
NOTES AND REFERENCES	
SUMMARY TABLES 1, 2, AND 3	

INTRODUCTION

Research on disability management has paid relatively little attention to the special problems posed by the financial and management constraints of smaller companies. The oversight is an important one, as businesses with under 100 workers employ over a third of the American labor force, and those with less than 500 account for fully half of all employment.¹ Anecdotal and survey evidence suggest that small firms are less likely to make work accommodations, to have formal disability management programs or hiring policies for disabled job candidates, or to retain employees after a disabling sickness or injury.² The typical small company faces formidable barriers in dealing with disability. These constraints include limited economies of scale and a lack of specialized personnel or benefits staff to take charge of making work accommodations, limited training facilities and opportunities for shifting disabled employees to alternative jobs within the company, fewer provisions for medical and disability benefits, and weaker financial incentives for controlling disability-related costs.

On the other hand, small businesses remain an important source of work and training opportunities for disabled people. Research on the general labor force has consistently shown that small firms are more likely to hire job candidates considered "high risk" by larger employers, including youth, new labor force entrants, and the long-term unemployed.³ As we will see, this tendency applies to disabled job-seekers as well. Though they provide less formal or job-specific training, small firms do provide a springboard of general training and experience which enables their employees to compete for jobs with better pay and benefits elsewhere.

Even in the area of disability management, small businesses have two important--though often underrated--advantages over large companies. One is the degree of flexibility and informality that is possible in a small-scale operation: there are greater opportunities for flexible or reduced work hours, job sharing, or the redefinition of jobs to accommodate a disabled employee. These informal "common-sensical" practices are not always recognized as accommodations by the employer, and may be far more common than we realize. A second advantage is that the relatively short chains of command in most small firms make it possible for employees with disability problems to discuss their needs directly with those making the ultimate decisions in the company. Once the firm's decision makers are convinced of the value of an intervention, there are fewer organizational barriers to quick, decisive action.⁴

The need to address the special problems of disabled people in smaller firms has drawn attention to the lack of good statistical background information on this population. The need for such information will grow after implementation of the Americans with Disabilities Act, which will require job accommodations by companies with as few as 15 employees. But apart from anecdotal evidence, very little is known about differences in labor force characteristics or job conditions for workers with disabilities in large and small firms.

METHODS AND DEFINITIONS

The findings presented here are taken from a larger report prepared for the National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research (NIDRR).⁵ That report is part of a three-year demonstration project to identify ways of improving job retention for disabled workers in small firms.

This study uses data from the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP) to compare characteristics of disabled workers employed in small and large private sector businesses. In addition, it examines data related to tenure, retention, and job separations over time. Data reported here are from a sample of about 920 cases taken from the Wave 3 of the SIPP's 1984 Panel.⁶ Apart from the findings on job separations, the data refer to the time period April to July 1984. The sample universe is defined as all SIPP respondents who were employed at some point during the Wave 3 reference period and were "work-limited," reporting a health condition that limits the kind or amount of work they can do. This is a relatively inclusive definition of work disability, and includes both severely and non-severely impaired people. However, of those who have not been impaired from birth, 45% do report that they can not do "the same kind of work" that they did before becoming disabled. The terms "work-limited" and "disabled" are used interchangeably in the report.

In most of the analyses, small firms are defined as companies with less than 500 employees at all locations. In interpreting many of the findings, I also draw on data for the general labor force; these data are taken from an earlier analysis of some 17,000 cases from the Wave 3 file, prepared for a report to the Small Business Administration.⁷ Unless specifically noted however, all findings refer to workers with disabilities.

FINDINGS

Distribution of Disabled Workers Among Large and Small Firms

Of the SIPP Wave 3 sample, 50.3% reported working in firms of less than 100 employees at all locations, and 62.8% were in firms with less than 500 workers. (Of the general workforce, about 42% are in businesses with less than 100 workers, according to SIPP Wave 3 estimates.) Apart from normal sampling error, there is reason to believe that these estimates exaggerate the proportion of disabled workers in small firms by one to five percent.⁸ Even so, it is clear that a large percentage of disabled employment is in small firms, and that workers with disabilities are not under-represented in the small business labor force. In absolute terms, the SIPP work-limited sample represents about 2.6 million private sector workers in small firms, 1.5 million in large firms, and another 1.1 million in companies of undetermined size.

Demographic Characteristics and Education: Age

Small businesses have a slightly older disabled workforce on the average. As shown in Table 1, mean age is 44.1 for small and 42.3 for large firms; medians are 45 and 42 years respectively. Though small firms have higher proportions of workers 55 and older, percentages of younger workers (aged 16 to 24) are very similar.

Not surprisingly, people with work limitations tend to be considerably older--eight years older, on average--than the workforce at large. As we will see in later sections, this basic fact has implications for a number of other findings, including education and job training, tenure, and separation rates.

Sex

The distributions by sex are almost identical. Women make up 43.9% of disabled small businesses employees, and 43.1 of those in large firms. The corresponding figures for the general labor force are 46% and 45%.

Race and Ethnicity

Blacks make up 8.1% of small and 8.9% of all large business disabled employees; Asians/Pacific Islanders appear to be concentrated in small firms, making up 3.1% of this labor force as opposed to 0.3% of larger companies. A similar pattern holds for Hispanics, who comprise 3.6% of small business employees and 1.5% of those in large firms. However, it appears that Hispanics as a whole are under-represented in the work-limited sample, as they make up 5% to 6% of both the large and small business labor force in the general population. Though this could be due to normal sampling error, it may also suggest that Hispanics are less likely to report disabilities, or to work after becoming disabled.

Formal Education

Mean years of education for small business employees in this sample is 13.8, and for large business, 14.8. The median and mode for both groups is lower, at 12 years (i.e., high school diploma). Small firms have a higher percentage of workers with only elementary school diplomas, at 12.5, vs. 8.6%. They have an equal number of high school-only workers and fewer college graduates. But it is also worth noting that the smalls have a higher proportion of post-graduate degree holders than large businesses (5.6% vs. 1.9%). A very similar pattern of large-small differences was also found for the general labor force, and is probably linked to the distribution of occupations in each size group. However, overall levels of education are higher for the general labor force, where mean years of schooling for all workers amounts to 15.7 years (vs. 14.3 for the work-limited).

Job-Related Training

People with disabilities in large business are more likely to receive formal job-related training at some point, and more say they actually use it on the job. Altogether, about one-quarter of all small business workers and more than one-third of those in large firms report receiving training in some form, ranging from classroom vocational courses to OJT and apprenticeships. Much of this difference can be traced to the higher incidence of workplace training programs in larger firms: of those reporting training, 15.3% received it through a training program at work, vs. only 6.4% of workers in small firms. A similar pattern holds for the general labor force, and reflects the diseconomies of scale smaller companies experience in providing formal training.

Moreover, the training that small business employees have received appears to be far less relevant to their present work: only 55% report that they actually use their training in the current job, as opposed to 77.5% of workers in large firms. This is also true for the general labor force, though the gap is far greater for work-limited employees. Age may be a factor here, since the disabled sample are much further removed, in time and career terms, from any early classroom or apprenticeship training. Lastly, it appears that disabled workers are more likely than the general labor force to have received some form of job-related training: across all size categories, 29.5% report some training, versus 22.3% in the labor force as a whole. However, work-limited people are slightly less likely to use this training on the job.

Type of Disability, and Functional Limitations

Back and spine problems are the largest single category, cited by about 27% of our cases, small and large firms combined. The next most common categories are heart problems (11.9% for all firms), arthritis/rheumatism (9.5%), lung or respiratory conditions (8.8%), and limb deformity or stiffness (6%). The reported incidence of mental illness and mental retardation in this sample of the working disabled is about half of that recorded for the work-limited population as a whole.⁹ There are no important differences in the pattern of health conditions by firm size.

The most common specific limitations are lifting/carrying (reported by 25.8% of respondents across both firm size groups), walking (22.6%), walking up stairs (21.5%), vision (10.8%), and hearing (7.5%). Here too, there is no evidence that the pattern or severity of functional limitations differs significantly in small and large firms. It should also be kept in mind that this analysis only covers disabilities that specifically effect the kind or amount of work the person can do: respondents may have other disabilities that do not affect their work.

Number of Years the Person Has Been Work Limited

This measure was created by comparing the date of interview to the reported year or month that the person became work-limited. For all private sector employees, mean years disabled are 6.5; means for small and large firm employees are 7.3 and 5.4 respectively. Men

report longer periods of disability, with a mean of 7.0. vs. 5.9 for women (large and small firms combined). Medians for all groups are the same, at four years.

Previous Employment

Small businesses employ greater numbers of new labor force entrants with disabilities. Among workers aged 16 and older currently employed in small firms, fully 12.6% had never held a job for 6 months or more before joining their current employer; this was true for only 8.7% of the large business workforce. To put it another way, about three-quarters of all first-time workers with disabilities were in smaller firms. A very similar pattern is found in the general labor force.

The Current Job: Industry

Disabled employees in large firms are heavily concentrated in manufacturing, which accounts for nearly half (45.4%) of all employment (Table 2). Other important sectors are retail trade (24.8%) and professional services (9.0%). Small-firm employment is much more dispersed: manufacturing jobs account for only 21.8% of the total, with 23.1% in retail trade, 16.3% in professional services, and 7.4% in personal services. Wholesale trade and all the services sectors show higher proportions of employment in small firms. The overall distributions of jobs by industry (combining large and small firms) are similar for the disabled and general labor force, except that the proportions of disabled workers in manufacturing and wholesale and retail trade are slightly higher.

Occupation

Not surprisingly, the occupational differences observed are closely related to patterns of employment by industry. Small firms have fewer workers with disabilities in the machine operator/assembly and administrative/clerical support categories, and a higher percentage of service workers and farming, fishing and forestry occupations. In other respects the distributions of occupations by size are fairly similar. The overall totals for disabled workers are also similar to those for the general workforce. However, differences of about three percentage points do occur in the proportions of professional specialty workers, service workers, and administrative support/clerical staff.

Moonlighting: Second Occupations

Workers whose primary job is in a small firm are more likely to hold down a second job: 9.7% of these workers report a second job, as opposed to 4.8% for large business employees. These proportions are only marginally lower than in the labor force as a whole. In addition, about 3% of disabled wage and salary workers report a self-employed second occupation.

Hours Worked per Week on the Primary Job

For the work-limited population, mean hours worked in the primary job are 35.2 for small and 37.7 for large business workers. Medians and modes are the same for both groups, at 40 hours per week. Women are much more likely than men to work part time: across both size groups, mean hours for women is 32, vs. 39.1 for men. As expected, average hours for disabled workers as a whole are somewhat shorter than for the general labor force, which averages 36.1 hours per week in small firms, and 38.7 in large businesses.

As the averages suggest, disabled workers in small businesses are more-likely to work part time on their primary job. Some 36% of small and 20% of large business employees usually work 35 hours or less per week; 22% and 11% respectively work less than 20 hours. At the same time, slightly more small business employees have usual work weeks of more than 40 hours. This same pattern--more part time work and more 40+ hours work weeks in small firms--also holds for the general labor force.

Reasons for Working Part Time

These show less variation by size than expected. The results do argue against the proposition that the small business labor force is forced into part time work because no other work is available, though small firm employees do show a higher proportion of "could not find full time" cases than do large firm workers. The percentage reporting part time work for health or disability reasons varies little by firm size (averaging around 21%), but that is four times higher than the percentage citing this reason in the general population. In a related SIPP question, a higher percentage of small firm employees (13.2%, vs. 7.6% in large firms) reported that they are not able to work regularly. The percentage is even higher--15.5%--in firms of less than 100 workers. This is undoubtedly related to the shorter average hours of workers in small business, and may in fact point to a sorting or matching process in which those who can not work regularly are sorted into firms with more flexible or intermittent work demand. Such firms will tend to be smaller.

Current Earnings

Monthly gross earnings (based on Month 4 of the reference period) and hourly wage equivalents are presented in Table 2.¹⁰ Mean earnings in small firms stood at \$923 (median \$760); this is considerably less than for large-business employees, who show a mean of \$1475, and a median of \$1324. As expected, women in both size categories earn much less than men, and the wage disparity between large and small is greater for men. In absolute terms, median gross earnings for disabled small business women (including part-timers) are somewhat less than full-time earnings at the minimum wage.

Hourly wage equivalents follow a similar pattern. Means and medians for small firm employees of both sexes are \$6.12 and \$5.00 per hour, and for large businesses, \$8.80 and \$8.00. This, of course, includes employees on monthly or annual salary. The differences in hourly wages for men and women are smaller than the differences in gross earnings, reflecting the greater prevalence of part time work among women. The same patterns of wage differences appear for

the general population.

Significantly, this work-limited sample shows average earnings that are a good deal lower than for the labor force as a whole. Gross monthly earnings for all workers with disabilities average \$1133, with a median of \$895 (large and small firms combined); comparable figures for all workers 21 and over on the SIPP are \$1442 and 1200 respectively. Mean and median hourly earnings for the work-limited are \$7.11 and \$5.50; for all workers, \$8.56 and \$7.00.

Union Membership

Union participation rises steadily with firm size. Union membership is reported by 6.2% of workers in firms of less than 100 employees, 8.2% in firms of less than 500, and 31% in those with over 500 workers. At 16.9%, overall membership is slightly higher than for the general labor force (15.2%), perhaps reflecting the higher proportion of employment in manufacturing.

Medical Insurance

The Wave 3 Core questions distinguish medical insurance provided under the worker's own name, and that provided through another's (usually family member's) policy. These two items do not distinguish employer-subsidized from other coverage, nor do they ask about the quality or extent of coverage.

As shown in Table 3, small business employees are much less likely to have policies in their own name, or to have any coverage at all. Less than half of the disabled workers in firms of less than 100 report coverage under their own name, and for 28% no medical insurance of any kind is indicated. The findings are in line with those of the SBA's 1987 study of health insurance, as well as BPA's earlier SIPP findings for the general labor force.¹¹

Unfortunately, the findings clearly do not support the hypothesis that disabled workers will tend to sort themselves into jobs that offer good health benefits. The lack of medical insurance is a serious problem for small business employees generally, but it is especially dangerous for those with work-limiting health conditions.

Work History: Spells of Long Term Non-employment¹²

Small businesses employ more disabled workers who have had significant interruptions in their work histories in the previous ten years. The median number of long-term spells is 0 for large business employees, and 1 for those in small firms. Small business employs more workers with career interruptions in the general labor force as well. Not surprisingly however, the disabled group is far more likely than the general workforce to have experienced long-term non-employment: at least one spell is reported by 53.9% of people with disabilities in small firms and 48.8% of those in large firms, versus 35.6% of employees in the labor force as a whole.

Tenure in the Current Job

Work-limited small business employees show much shorter average tenure than their counterparts in larger firms, with means of 6.7 and 11.6 years respectively; at 3 and 10 years, medians for the two groups show even larger differences. Men account for most of the difference between large and small, though the mean differences for women are also considerable, on the order of two years. The most obvious differences are found at the extremes of the distribution; the small business workforce has much higher proportions in the 0 to 3 years range, and much smaller proportions with 15 or more years tenure. It should also be kept in mind that this is a right-truncated measure of tenure, since employees were still in these jobs at the time of interview.

The pattern of differences in tenure for large and small, men and women, are parallel to those found for the labor force at large. However, in absolute terms, tenures for all categories of disabled worker are longer. Undoubtedly, most of the difference observed is due to the disabled sample being older, since tenure is strongly correlated with age. But it is also possible that the disabled--particularly in large firms--are less likely to change jobs because they do not want to risk losing medical coverage, or because they believe it will be difficult to find work elsewhere.

Onset of Disability in Relation to Work History

Although direct measures of job retention or loss after a disability are not available from the 1984 SIPP, it is possible to construct a rough measure of the onset of disability in relation to the person's work history. This indicator combines data from several SIPP items¹³ to determine whether the worker became work-limited: (1) before working age; (2) during a period of unemployment or withdrawal from the labor force; (3) while employed in a previous job; or (4) during his or her tenure on the current job. Though an imperfect measure, it is useful in two ways: the total of categories (1) through (3) tell us the proportion of current employees who were by large or small firms after they had already become work limited. Category (4) tells us what percentage of workers became work limited while on the current job and were retained up to the time of interview.

As shown in Table 3, a much larger proportion of the disabled small business workforce was hired after it had already become work-limited; this proportion amounts to 65.5%, as opposed to 39.9% for large firms.

This lends strong support to the notion that smaller firms are at least as willing as large firms to hire work-limited job seekers. Yet the reasons probably have less to do with small-business paternalism than with the normal operation of labor markets: in the aggregate, smaller employers tend to pay lower wages and offer shorter hours; they provide fewer benefits and opportunities for advancement, and the jobs themselves may be time-limited in nature. That (and the inability or unwillingness to spend large sums on recruitment) makes small firms less competitive in attracting workers, forcing them to relax their entry requirements and take on workers who might be considered "risky" for any number of reasons. On the other hand, small companies are often willing to offer job terms which are attractive to certain kinds of workers, including part time or flexible hours, general (i.e. non-firm specific) training, or simply a chance to

work when no one else is hiring. Thus, in this view small employers find themselves hiring work-limited job seekers for many of the same reasons that they take on a higher proportion of non-disabled youth, the elderly, new entrants to the labor force, and those returning to employment after a long absence.

On the other hand, employees in large firms are much more likely to remain with their employers after becoming work limited. Just over 60% of the employees in large firms became work limited during their tenure at these jobs, a proportion far higher than the 34.5% recorded for small firms. On the face of it, this substantial difference suggests that large companies do a better job of retaining their people after they become disabled.

Though that is probably the case, other factors do account for part of the difference. Mean length of time disabled is longer for small business employees, and average tenure in large firms is longer. The longer a person has been with a disability, the more likely it is that he or she will have changed jobs since that time, even if there are no differences in employers' disability management practices. Similarly, longer tenure is associated with higher wages, full-time hours, and other factors which are related to firm size but are not necessarily to effective disability management. However, logit analyses of this data (not shown) do indicate that employment in a larger firm contributes to retention after a disability even when the effects of tenure, time disabled, age, sex, earnings and working hours are held statistically constant. The effect is strongest where small firms are defined as those with less than 100 employees.

Separations Over Time

Lastly, Table 3 breaks out separation rates by firm size and the type of separation involved. This is a one-year separation measure, created by linking employment data for Month 4 of Waves 3 and 6.¹⁴

The overall separation rate of disabled workers from small firms (33%) is higher than from large firms (26%); this pattern also holds true for the general labor force. Job changes--where the respondent is still working in Wave 6, but with a new employer--were recorded for about 16% of all disabled small firm cases and 12% of those in large companies. The finding of higher separation rates for small business is in accord with the findings on tenure, which show shorter average stays for small business employees.¹⁵

Combining across firm size, the overall separation rate for disabled workers is about 30%; this is much higher than the 19.6% rate found for the general labor force. However, the breakout by type of separation reveals that most of the difference is due to disabled people becoming unemployed or withdrawing from the labor force at a higher rate. While moves to a new employer occurred in 14.2% of the disabled sample and 10.4% of the general workforce, separations leading to non-employment show a much larger discrepancy, at 15.9% and 9.2% respectively. This pattern is precisely what we would expect from an older population (such as the disabled) whose attachment to the labor force is further weakened by a work-limiting health condition. Even those who want to keep working may find it difficult to find another job after being laid off, discharged, or quitting.

CONCLUSION

Many of the large firm-small firm differences found for the SIPP's work limited population are also true--in pattern if not in magnitude--for the American labor force as a whole. Disabled or not, the typical small business employee works shorter hours, earns lower wages, has less education, receives less formal training on the job, and is less likely to stay with the employer for a long period of time. The image of small businesses as relative "risk takers" in hiring is also confirmed by these findings. Small employers are at least as likely as large companies to hire workers with disabilities, and within this population they are more willing to hire new labor force entrants and those with major interruptions in their work histories.

The findings on health insurance coverage for small business employees are especially sobering, though not surprising. It would have been encouraging to find evidence for a "self-sorting" effect, where workers with disabilities gravitate toward companies offering medical benefits. That does not appear to be happening, at least in the aggregate; if the SIPP data are representative, one out of four small business employees--disabled and non-disabled alike--remain without private medical coverage of any kind.

There are important differences between work-limited employees and the general labor force as well. As a group, disabled workers are older and more experienced at what they do; though they have higher separation rates at the margin (often leaving labor force entirely), they have been with the present employer far longer than other workers.

The age factor is thus a double-edged sword. People at this stage of their careers may be extremely valuable to their employers, and in such cases the company may have a strong bottom-line business motivation to retain them if only the right means can be found. We did find, for example, that disabled professional, managerial, and other skilled workers had below average separation rates from small employers, though not necessarily from large firms.

On the other hand, the middle-aged or older worker with a health condition may be seen as a liability by the employer. Such situations are not uncommon, particularly in low-skilled jobs with normally high turnover. At present, offers of technical assistance alone are unlikely to change the employer's behavior in these cases. The balance of incentives may soon change however, as the reasonable accommodations provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act come to bear on smaller firms. But we must remember that enforcing the law in a constructive, positive way will be no small task: there are at least three million people with work disabilities in smaller firms, and the numbers are likely to grow. Small business has shown its willingness to hire these people, but it will need new forms of technical help to keep them.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. U.S. Small Business Administration, The State of Small Business: A Report to the President, 1988 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1988).
2. International Center for the Disabled (ICD) and Louis Harris Associates, The ICD Survey II: Employing Disabled Americans. New York: ICD/Harris, 1987; Edward Hester and P. Decelles, The Effect of Employer Size on Disability Benefits and Cost-Containment Practices. Topeka, KS: Menninger Foundation, 1990.
3. Berkeley Planning Associates, Labor Turnover and Worker Mobility in Small and Large Firms: Evidence from the SIPP. Final Report to the U.S. Small Business Administration, December 1988; Charles Brown and James Medhoff, "The Employer Wage Size Effect." Working Paper, National Bureau of Economic Research, August 1988; Michael Keeley, "Hiring, Retention and Wages: Differences between Small and Large Businesses." Manuscript, July 1983.
4. See, for example, Berkeley Planning Associates, Analysis of Policies of Private Employers Toward The Disabled: Final Report. Berkeley, CA: Berkeley Planning Associates, November 1981; Berkeley Planning Associates, A Study of Accommodations Provided to Handicapped Employees by Federal Contractors, Final Report, Volume 1: Study Findings. Berkeley, CA: Berkeley Planning Associates, June 1982.
5. Berkeley Planning Associates, The Disabled Workforce and Job Retention in Small and Large Firms: Evidence from the SIPP 1984 Panel. Report to the National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research, Washington DC, March 1989. (Grant No. H133-A80014.) The full report includes analyses of private sector workers not covered in this paper, as well as chapters on government employees and the self-employed.
6. Wave 3 cross-sectional weights were used for the runs reported in this paper; comparisons with unweighted runs generally showed only marginal differences in results. Imputed values were defined as missing, since the SIPP imputation procedure for many labor force variables does not specify that the "hot deck" donor for a missing response must also be work-limited. Cases where disability status was imputed were also dropped. Analysis of separations over time used calendar year 1985 longitudinal weights. 239 cases had to be dropped from the original sample of 1156, due to missing or imputed firm size information.
7. Berkeley Planning Associates, Labor Turnover and Worker Mobility in Small and Large Firms: Evidence from the SIPP. Final Report to the U.S. Small Business Administration, December 1988.
8. These are probably "high side" estimates of the proportion of small business employees. Because vimpuation rates for the SIPP multiple-location and company size items were higher than for the establishment size question, more putative "large business" cases were lost when cases with imputed firm size information were removed. Secondly, workers in single-establishment firms of more than 500 workers had to be counted as small business

employees due to SIPP categories being collapsed in the Public Use Files. It is also likely that some SIPP respondents under-estimated the total size of their employers, especially for multi-establishment companies.

9. Cf. "Disability, Functional Limitation, and Health Insurance Coverage, 1984-85" Current Population Reports, Series P-70, Number 8. Bureau of the Census, 1986. Table 9.
10. Though the SIPP's measure of monthly before-tax earnings is subject to some seasonality and short-term variation due to temporary unpaid leaves of absence, it provides a reasonable comparative measure of gross income which reflects differences in hours and weeks worked. Table 2 also presents an hourly wage equivalent measure which adjusts for differences due to part time and part-month employment. This adjustment is based on items reporting the number of weeks in the month for which earnings were received, usual hours worked per week, and usual hourly wage (for hourly-paid workers).
11. ICF Incorporated, Health Care Coverage and Costs in Small and Large Firms. Final Report to the U.S. Small Business Administration, 1987; Berkeley Planning Associates, op. cit., 1988.
12. The 1984 Panel's work history items do not distinguish well between unemployment (on layoff or looking for work) and being out of the labor force. I have used the term non-employment here to distinguish the SIPP's rougher measure from unemployment as it is usually defined.
13. Disability onset before working age or while not working is picked up directly from Wave 3 Topical Module variable TM8454; time of onset appears in TM8456 and TM8458; tenure on the current job (in relation to the date of interview) is calculated from TM8176 or TM8178. For a detailed explanation of how the measure was constructed, see Berkeley Planning Associates, The Disabled Workforce and Job Retention, op. cit. 1989.
14. With the SIPP, as with any worker-based data set, we are measuring aggregate separation rates for segments of the labor force, rather than establishment or firm-based rates. Separations are measured as the fraction of the workforce that is employed at a given point in time (Wave 3 Month 4), and which leaves this "baseline" employer during the next twelve months. Separations were identified using SIPP employer numbers and Employment Status Recode (ESR) variables. Unfortunately, voluntary and involuntary separations can not be distinguished in the 1984 Panel. For more information of methods used, see Berkeley Planning Associates, The Disabled Workforce and Job Retention, op. cit. 1989.
15. For a "textbook" labor force in perfect equilibrium, average tenure will equal the reciprocal of the separation rate. That is far from the case in this sample, because workers with disabilities are not an equilibrium population: people tend to develop disabilities toward the end of their working lives.

SUMMARY TABLE 1

**Work-Limited Private Sector Employees, Aged 16-72
Demographic Characteristics by Size of Firm**

<u>Characteristics</u>	<u>Small Firm (1-499 Employees)</u>	<u>Large Firm (500+ Employees)</u>	<u>All Wk-Ltd.</u>	<u>General Labor Force*</u>
Age				
Mean	44.1	42.3	43.4	35.5
Median	45.0	42.0	44.0	32.5
Sex (%)				
Men	56.1	56.9	56.4	54.6
Women	43.9	43.1	43.6	45.4
Race/Ethnicity (%)				
Black/African-American	8.1	8.9	8.4	9.4
Asian/Pac. Islander	3.1	0.3	2.1	2.4
Hispanic	3.6	1.5	2.8	5.6
Highest Grade Completed				
Mean	13.8	14.8	14.3	15.7
Median	12.0	12.0	12.0	12.0
Job-Related Training (%)				
Ever Received Job Training	25.1	36.4	29.5	22.3
Training Used on Current Job	55.3	77.5	66.0	70.1
Training Program at Work	6.4	15.3	9.8	8.3
No. Years Work--Limited				
Mean	7.3	5.4	6.5	---
Median	4.0	4.0	4.0	---
Never Held Previous Job Lasting 6 Months or More	12.6	8.7	11.6	15.0

*Data on currently-employed workers from Wave 3, 1984 Panel.
N = approximately 17,000 cases. Reported in Berkeley Planning
Associates, Labor Turnover and Worker Mobility in Small and Large
Firms, Final Report to the Small Business Administration, 1988.

SUMMARY TABLE 2
Work-Limited Private Sector Employees, Aged 16-72
Job Characteristics by Size of Firm

<u>Characteristics</u>	<u>Small Firms</u> (1-499 <u>Employees)</u>	<u>Large Firms</u> (500+ <u>Employees)</u>	<u>All</u> <u>Wk-Ltd. Force*</u>	<u>General</u> <u>Labor</u>
Industry, Primary Job (%)				
Construction	5.4	1.5	3.9	5.3
Manufacturing	21.8	45.4	30.6	27.5
Transp. Comm. & Utilities	3.8	6.9	4.9	6.8
Wholesale & Retail Trade	29.0	27.3	28.4	25.6
Finance, Ins. & Real Estate	7.0	4.7	6.1	7.1
Business & Repair Services	4.1	2.0	3.4	4.9
Personal Services	7.4	0.9	5.0	3.9
Prof. & Other Related Services	16.3	9.0	13.6	14.5
Other**	5.2	2.4	4.2	4.4
Occupation, Primary Job (%)				
Executive, Admin. Management	8.7	9.0	8.8	9.1
Professional Specialty	5.4	3.7	4.8	7.8
Technicians & Related	2.4	4.5	3.2	3.1
Sales-Related	13.1	14.3	13.5	12.7
Admin. Suppt. & Clerical	12.5	15.5	13.6	16.5
Service Workers	20.4	12.0	17.2	14.3
Precision Prod/Craft	12.0	13.8	12.7	12.8
Machine Op/Assemblers	9.9	18.2	12.9	10.7
Transportation/Movers	5.4	3.6	4.7	4.5
Handlers, Cleaners	6.5	4.9	5.9	6.0
Farming, Fishing, Forestry	3.9	0.7	2.7	2.3
Usual Hours Worked Per week				
Mean	35.2	37.7	36.1	37.4
Median	40.0	40.0	40.0	40.0
Reason for Working Part-Time (%)				
Could not find full-time work	8.9	3.8	7.5	8.9
Wanted part-time job	30.6	30.9	30.6	40.0
Health/disability reason	21.8	20.0	21.3	5.3
Part time Is Normal Working Hour	21.9	21.1	21.7	19.5
Other reasons	16.9	24.2	18.9	26.4
Monthly Gross Earnings***				
Mean, All	923	1474	1133	1442
Median	760	1324	895	1200
Mean, Men	1172	1828	1421	1801
Median, Men	1000	1860	1250	1600
Mean, Women	609	982	748	992
Median, Women	550	869	640	872
Hourly Wage Equivalents (%)****				
Mean, All	6.12	8.80	7.11	8.56
Median	5.00	8.00	5.50	7.00
Mean, Men	6.99	10.71	8.34	10.19
Median, Men	5.50	10.25	7.06	8.99
Mean, Women	5.07	6.29	5.54	6.54
Median, Women	4.06	5.56	4.44	5.60

*Reported In Berkeley Planning Associates, op.cit. 1988.

**Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing, Mining, Entertainment and Recreation.

***Reported for Month 4 of the Reference Period.

****Adjusted for usual hours worked.

SUMMARY TABLE 3

Work-Limited Private Sector Employees, Aged 16-72 Work History and Insurance Measures by Size of Firm

<u>Characteristics</u>	<u>Small Firms (1-499 Employees)</u>	<u>Large Firms (500+ Employees)</u>	<u>All Wk-Ltd.</u>	<u>General Labor Force*</u>
Medical Insurance Reported (%)				
Coverage in Own Name	51.2	79.6	61.8	65.0
Covered Under Other Person's Policy Only	23.5	11.6	19.0	20.9
No Coverage Indicated	25.3	8.8	19.1	14.1
Previous Spells of Nonemployment 6 Months or More (%)				
None	46.1	51.2	48.0	64.4
One	37.7	33.7	36.2	27.8
Two or More	16.2	15.2	15.9	7.8
Years Tenure in the Current Job				
Mean	6.7	11.6	8.6	6.5
Median	3.0	10.0	5.0	3.0
Onset of Disability				
Disabled Before Working Age	14.2	12.6	13.6	--
Disabled When Not Employed	16.1	8.5	13.2	--
Disabled in Earlier Job	35.3	18.8	29.2	--
Disabled in Current Job	34.5	60.1	44.0	--
Separations After One Year**				
Total Separated	33.0	26.0	30.2	19.6
Moved to New Employer	15.8	11.9	14.2	10.4
Not Employed	17.2	14.1	16.0	9.2
Not Separated	67.0	74.0	69.8	80.4

* Data on currently-employed workers from Wave 3, 1984 Panel.
N = approximately 17,000 cases. Reported in Berkeley Planning Associates,
Labor Turnover and Worker Mobility in Small and Large Firms, Final Report
to the U.S. Small Business Administration, 1988.

** Separations occurring between Wave 3 Month 4, and Wave 6 Month 4,
Work-limited n = 552; General Labor Force n = approximately 10,000.