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Key Points

Non-modifiable personal characteristics such as: being male and Caucasian, younger at injury; with a longer duration of injury (20-30 years); with higher pre-injury education; being less severely injured; and being employed at injury in a low-intensity job increase the likelihood of employment post-SCI.

Modifiable personal characteristics such as: being highly educated post-SCI; limiting the occurrence of health complications; having a higher level of independence (including wheelchair skills); and having the trait of valuing work can increase the likelihood of employment post-SCI.

Environmental facilitators include having access to various assistive devices, using transportation independently, having social support (including being married), and having the possibilities of job accommodation including reduced work hours.

Environmental barriers to employment are social or physical and include financial disincentives, discrimination associated to negative attitudes toward people with disabilities and difficulties with physical access to workplace.

A single environmental factor can be perceived either as a barrier or a facilitator to employment based on its presence/absence in one’s environment and its impact on effective returning to work.

People with SCI may benefit from vocational rehabilitation in the process of job placement and work reintegration.

There is a dearth of high quality research in vocational (re) training. Consequently, conclusions are mostly based on evidence from observational studies or case studies.

Continuous support to the employee and employer before and after vocational placement may lead to a successful return to work and job retention.
This review has been prepared based on the scientific and professional information available in 2013. The SCIRE information (print, CD or web site www.scireproject.com) is provided for informational and educational purposes only. If you have or suspect you have a health problem, you should consult your healthcare provider. The SCIRE editors, contributors and supporting partners shall not be liable for any damages, claims, liabilities, costs or obligations arising from the use or misuse of this material.
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**Abbreviations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACSCI</td>
<td>Asylum Center Spinal Cord Injury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALSP</td>
<td>adult lifestyle support package</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICF</td>
<td>International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPS</td>
<td>individual placement and support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIAROC</td>
<td>Spinal Cord Injury Association of the Republic of China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>supported employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF-36</td>
<td>Short Form 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SISI</td>
<td>Spinal Injuries Survey Instrument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRFIM</td>
<td>self-reported Functional Independence Measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAU</td>
<td>treatment as usual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VR</td>
<td>vocational (re)training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Work and Employment Following Spinal Cord Injury

1.0 Introduction

Work and employment are terms that are used interchangeably in the literature and in this chapter and would include remunerative and non-remunerative employment regardless of work status, type of industry, and type of occupation. The International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF) of the World Health Organization defines employment as “engaging in all aspects of work, as an occupation, trade, profession or other form of employment, for payment or where payment is not provided, as an employee, full or part time, or self-employed” (World Health Organization, 2001). Employment remains one of the most important topics to have been studied since the early 50’s when the importance of returning to work after SCI was recognized (Guttmann, 1959). Not only does gainful employment help to achieve economic self-sufficiency but it is considered a source of personal growth (Ville and Ravaud 1998), disability adjustment (Krause 1992) and is associated with social integration, life and financial satisfaction and better health (Vogel et al, 1998; Anderson et al. 2007). Exact employment figures in published studies are difficult to capture due to variations in sample characteristics such as the participant’s age, duration of injury, and work experience prior to injury, as well as differences in the definition of the concept of employment (Ottomanelli and Lind 2009). Although variation is observed in the employment rate (2 – 80%) (Ottomanelli and Lind 2009), it is likely that the most accurate overall figure since the 70’s is between 30-50%. It does vary based on the severity of injury in addition to regional disparities. Recent data from the U.S. Spinal Cord Injury Model Systems database suggests that 35% of people with SCI are employed 20 years post-injury (https://www.nscisc.uab.edu) compared to an average unemployment rate of the US general population of 6.1% for a 20-year period (1993-2013).

There is a tangible need to explain why involvement in employment is significantly lower in a population with disabilities than observed in those without disabilities despite a significant proportion of unemployed people with SCI judging themselves able to work (Tomassen et al. 2000). Today, the development of environmental features (technology, robotics, environmental controls, universal design) and the attenuation of prejudices and the opportunity for job accommodation are making positive change. However, it is astonishing that the employment rate has not evolved much over the past decades to an extent that this could have counteracted the detrimental effect of non-modifiable consequences of SCI.

On the other hand, this reveals the complexity of the process of returning to work. Given that work disability results from the interaction of some personal and environmental characteristics (Fougeyrollas et al. 2002; Chan and Man 2005), it remains inappropriate to state that people with SCI experience low employment rate only because of intrinsic or personal characteristics (Fougeyrollas et al., 2002). To ensure a higher likelihood of success in return to work, interventions must target several factors including work retraining and other types of environmental interventions. A major domain to explore is vocational (re)training, which includes vocational rehabilitation. A condensed definition has recently been published, referring to vocational rehabilitation as “a multi-professional evidence-based approach through various settings and interventions and is provided to working age individuals with health-related impairments, limitations, or restrictions with work functioning, and whose primary aim is to optimize work participation” (Escorpizo et al. 2011). Another goal of vocational rehabilitation is early and sustained participation in employment in any form- either remunerative (paid) or non-remunerative (nonpaid).

The objective of this chapter is to identify modifiable and non-modifiable factors related to contextual factors, namely the personal/activity and participation and the environmental factors based on the ICF
framework that influence employment and to evaluate the evidence of interventions designed to promote return to work post-SCI. Similar to the other SCIRE chapters that have a focus on an area relevant to community reintegration, the methods used for the development of this review expanded upon the traditional SCIRE methods (see SCIRE Methods). Specifically, two new databases with a focus on the social sciences were searched (Social Sciences Abstracts and Social Work Abstracts), and the inclusion criteria were broadened to include any relevant qualitative studies.

2.0 Personal Factors Associated with Employment Post-SCI

Several personal characteristics have been identified as factors which may interfere with the ability to return to the labor market (Anderson et al. 2007; Lidal et al. 2007, Ottomanelli and Lind 2009). Some of these characteristics cannot be modified (e.g. level of injury) while others such as level of education, health status, and work skills can be modified with appropriate and targeted interventions. Tables 1 and 2 identify the non-modifiable personal factors and the modifiable personal and activity/participation factors, respectively, which influence employment after SCI. All of these studies are Level 5 evidence.

Table 1: Non-Modifiable Personal Factors Influencing Employment after SCI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal factors</th>
<th>Impact on employment</th>
<th>Study (N)</th>
<th>Study reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Employment tends to increase with age up to 30 and remain the same up to middle 40's</td>
<td>195 167 20143 234 181</td>
<td>Anderson and Vogel 2002 Conroy and McKenna 1999 Pflaum et al. 2006 Tomassen et al. 2000 Rowell and Connelly 2010 (labor market participation may decrease with age)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal factors</td>
<td>Impact on employment</td>
<td>Study (N)</td>
<td>Study reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment is lower in individuals aged 55-64 compared to those aged 45-54</td>
<td>620 149</td>
<td>Hirsh et al. 2009 Blauwet et al. 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The rate of employment increases with duration of injury (20-30 years)</td>
<td>167 20143 2986</td>
<td>Conroy and McKenna 1999 Pflaum et al. 2006 Tsai et al. 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Being employed at injury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Returning to pre-injury job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Lower physical demands of job pre-injury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal factors</td>
<td>Impact on employment</td>
<td>Study (N)</td>
<td>Study reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-injury chronic conditions</td>
<td>Negatively impacts post-injury employment</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>Lin et al. 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These studies are based on data from the National Spinal Cord Injury Statistical Center (NSCISC) in the United States. In general, two different types of analyses are undertaken (1) retrospective analysis of data in the database (2) a cross-sectional survey that is sent out to individuals identified from the database. Given that the same eligibility criteria are often used for studies relating to work and employment, it is likely that the data from the same individuals are being used for multiple studies.

Discussion

Several personal characteristics cannot be modified but must be taken into consideration in the assessment of potential (re-)employment after SCI as summarized in table 1. These factors can be divided into 4 categories: 1) demographics, 2) time-related, 3) injury-related and 4) work/education factors. The evidence of the influence of these factors (level 5) is based on observational studies. Being Caucasian is a demographic factor that favors employment. Male gender has been a strong demographic predictor of employment, but a number of recent studies have shown no significant difference between males and females. However, 3 of the 6 studies showing no significant difference come from the same data source. The interaction between age, age at injury and the duration of injury is very complex making it difficult to determine their individual influence on employment. While the proportion of employed people tends to increase with age (increases up to about 30 years of age and is maintained up to 40 years), younger age at injury and longer duration of injury (up to 20 years post-injury) are better predictors of being employed than age alone. Due to a non-linear effect of age on labor market participation, it is likely that work participation may decrease with increasing age at some point after 40. Hirsch et al. (2009) reports that individuals aged 45-54 were significantly more likely to be employed than those aged 55-64. A more severe injury tends to decrease the probability of employment. A higher level of education seems to be a factor in increasing the probability of employment. Factors related to pre-injury work such as being employed at injury, returning to pre-injury job or holding a job requiring a lower physical intensity tend to positively influence employment.

Conclusions

*There is level 5 evidence (see Table 1) that being male, Caucasian, and younger at time of injury; having a longer duration of injury, higher education pre-injury; and having a low-intensity pre-injury job are non-modifiable personal factors that positively influence employment opportunities after SCI.*

*There is level 5 evidence (Hirsch et al. 2009) that the severity of injury is a non-modifiable personal factor that negatively influences employment opportunities after SCI.*

Non-modifiable personal characteristics such as being male and Caucasian, younger at injury, with a longer duration of injury (20-30 years), with higher pre-injury education, being less severely injured, and being employed at injury in a low-intensity job increase the likelihood of employment post-SCI.
Table 2: Modifiable Personal/Activity and Participation Factors Influencing Employment after SCI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal</th>
<th>Impact on employment</th>
<th>Study (N)</th>
<th>Study reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Education / training post-injury | Positive influence on employment:  
- higher level of education (high school or above)  
- vocational retraining | 114 | Castle 1994  
167 | Conroy and McKenna 1999  
152 | Gunduz 2010  
169 | Jang et al. 2005  
259 | Krause 2003  
1362 | Krause and Reed 2009*  
1398 | Krause et al. 2010*  
1329 | Krause et al. 2012*  
192 | Kurtaran et al. 2009  
559 | Marti et al. 2012  
5925 | Meade et al. 2004  
459 | Murphy et al. 2003  
20143 | Pflaum et al. 2006  
234 | Tomassen et al. 2000  
118 | van Velzen et al. 2009  
181 | Rowell and Connelly 2010 |
| Secondary health conditions | In 10 papers, secondary health conditions are a barrier to employment (e.g., medical complications, bowel incontinence, pain, depression)  
**Exception:**  
Hirsch et al. 2009 (N=620; pain, fatigue, sleep)  
Krause et al. 2011 (N=781; health status)  
Meade et al. 2011 (N=5925; secondary health conditions)  
Matthew et al. 2013 (N=108; pressure ulcers)  
Ramakrishnan et al. 2011 (N=84; medical co-morbidities.) | 195 | Anderson and Vogel 2002  
1013 | Botticello et al. 2012  
781 | Hirsch et al. 2009 (psych functioning)  
403 | Franceschini 2012  
559 | Marti et al. 2012 (pain)  
103 | Mann et al. 2013 (pain)  
234 | Wehman et al. 2000  
83 | Burns et al. 2010 (depression)  
219 | Lin et al. 2009 (depression)  
2986 | Tsai et al. 2014 (catheter indwelling in bladder, pain) |
| Functional independence | Functional independence increases the likelihood of being employed  
Independence in bladder emptying is positively associated with return to work | 195 | Anderson and Vogel 2002  
1013 | Botticello et al. 2012  
14620 | Cohen et al. 2012  
169 | Jang et al. 2005  
72 | Murphy et al. 2009*  
109 | Ramakrishnan et al. 2011 (personal care)  
234 | Tomassen et al. 2000  
2986 | Tsai et al. 2014  
192 | Kurtaran et al. 2009  
2986 | Tsai et al. 2014 |
| Psychological component (locus of control, values placed on work, expectations) | Positive influence on employment:  
- endorsement of gender norms  
- internal locus of control  
- valuing work  
- positive expectations toward work  
- positive attributional style (the individual’s propensity to “internalize” positive employment) | 83 | Burns et al. 2010  
459 | Murphy et al. 2003  
57 | Schonherr et al. 2004  
109 | Wehman et al. 2000  
181 | Rowell and Connelly 2010  
60 | Murphy et al. 2011 |
### Personal Impact on employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study (N)</th>
<th>Study reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Wheelchair skills**

- People with better wheelchair skills are more likely to return to work.
- Manual wheelchair users have higher employment rates than power wheelchair users

**Activity / participation factor**

- Participation in organized sports was associated with increased likelihood of employment.

* These studies are based on data from the National Spinal Cord Injury Statistical Center (NSCISC) in the United States. Generally speaking, two different types of analyses are undertaken (1) retrospective analysis of data in the database (2) a cross-sectional survey that is sent out to individuals identified from the database. Given that the same eligibility criteria are often used for studies relating to work and employment, it is likely that the data from the same individuals are being used for multiple studies.

**The definition of employment varies among different studies. These studies consider full-time students to be unemployed while others include students within the definition of employment.**

### Discussion

Several factors can be modified in the post-injury period to prevent deleterious effects or to increase the likelihood of employment after SCI. These factors are categorized as: 1) education / training, 2) health status, 3) functional independence, 4) psychological issues, 5) wheelchair skills and 6) participation. Secondary health conditions such as pain, depression, spasticity, pressure ulcers, severe urinary tract infections and respiratory problems are likely to limit employment opportunities but this finding should be considered in conjunction with the severity of injury. For example having tetraplegia leads to a higher occurrence of secondary health complications due to larger extent of affection than paraplegia. The level of education or pursuit of training after SCI remains a key factor that can offset other factors such as the severity of injury. Specifically, a professional degree and work that is not physically demanding increases the likelihood of employment. Some psychological attributes such as an internal locus of control, positive values and expectations regarding work including internalization of positive work outcomes are likely to favor employment. Participation in organized sports may facilitate employment through the building of mentorship/relationships, socialization and self-confidence (Blauwet et al. 2013).

### Conclusion

There is level 5 evidence (see Table 2) that being married, having education post-injury, having fewer secondary health conditions and higher functional independence, having better work related values and a higher internal locus of control, and better wheelchair skills are modifyable personal factors that positively influence employment opportunities after SCI.

Modifiable personal characteristics such as being highly educated post-SCI, limiting the occurrence of health complications, having a higher level of independence (including wheelchair skills), and having the trait of valuing work can increase the likelihood of employment post-SCI.
3.0 Environmental Factors Associated with Employment Post-SCI

Based on the ICF, the environment includes products and technology (e.g. assistive devices), the natural environment and human-made changes to the environment (e.g. geographic location), support and relationships from others (e.g. support from employer), attitudes (e.g. discrimination due to disability), and services, systems and policies (e.g. healthcare provided) (World Health Organization, 2001). When thinking about the SCI population the most obvious barriers and facilitators are related to the physical environment, particularly for those individuals who have difficulty with mobility. Social, attitudinal, and cultural environment can also been seen to create barriers when one considers the economic disincentives faced, not only by the employers, but also employees with SCI. For instance, the reluctance of an employer to hire an individual with a disability on the belief that they will be less productive or will require costly work accommodations, despite evidence to the contrary is an example of an attitudinal barrier (McFarlin et al. 1991). Moreover the attitudes of other employees can also negatively influence the worksite acceptance of individuals with SCI. In the following section, barriers and facilitators are presented separately. In different contexts a single environmental factor can be perceived to be a barrier and/or a facilitator to employment based on its presence/absence in one’s environment and its impact on effective return to work.

The influence of environmental factors associated with employment post-SCI is based on observational studies with level 5 evidence, and are summarized in tables 3 and 4.

Table 3: Environmental Facilitators Influencing Employment Post-SCI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Factors</th>
<th>Impact on Employment</th>
<th>Study N</th>
<th>Study reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to use transportation independently</td>
<td>Those with the ability to independently use transportation are more likely to be employed/return to work.</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>Jang et al. 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Driving a modified vehicle is associated with increased odds of being employed.</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>Conroy and McKenna 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Exception:</strong></td>
<td>403</td>
<td>Franceschini 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3726</td>
<td>Norweg et al. 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Ramakrishnan et al. 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2986</td>
<td>Tsai et al. 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistive technology</td>
<td>Having access to general assistive technology services</td>
<td>3514</td>
<td>Arango-Lasprilla 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ability to use a computer shortens the time to employment post-SCI.</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>Kruse et al. 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational rehabilitation</td>
<td>Job search assistance, job placement assistance, on-the-job support and training, and maintenance services are associated with successful employment outcomes</td>
<td>3514</td>
<td>Arango-Lasprilla 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job accommodations and adaptations</td>
<td>Identification of appropriate necessary accommodations alleviates work-related problems and facilitates employment</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>McNeal et al. 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work modifications including job adaptations and decreased work hours are associated with return to work</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Chapin and Kewman 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Schonherr et al., 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Support</td>
<td>Social support favours employment</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Burns et al. 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Being married favours employment</td>
<td>11424</td>
<td>Arango-Lasprilla 2009*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Environmental Factors | Impact on Employment | Study N | Study reference
--- | --- | --- | ---
Surrounding area | Higher socioeconomic status of surrounding area is positively associated with employment; suburban areas were associated with a better employment rate compared with urban areas | 1013 | Botticello 2012

**Discussion**

Being an independent driver was positively associated with returning to work post-injury. Reduced dependence on the inflexible, inaccessible, or unreliable options of public transport was likely to be the main reason for this finding (Conroy and McKenna 1999). People with SCI who have computer skills tend to return to work faster after suffering their injury, and to have higher earnings, than otherwise similar workers who lack computer skills (Kruse et al. 1996). Studies specific to persons who experience SCI reported that of those who return to work, the majority were able to do so, in part, because of modifications to the work including job adaptations and decreased work hours. A mentorship or peer support program may also provide a facilitative environment to an individual post-SCI. For example, it was found that those with SCI who completed a mentorship program also improved their functioning, independence, and participation (Shem et al 2010) which may have contributed to their favorable return to work outcomes. However, it was not clear from the study whether or not participation and successful completion of the mentorship program was directly related to employment post-SCI.

**Table 4: Environmental Barriers Influencing Employment Post-SCI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Factors</th>
<th>Impact on Employment</th>
<th>Study (N)</th>
<th>Study reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial disincentives</td>
<td>Decrease in government benefits deter individuals with SCI from returning to work.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Chan and Man 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>191</td>
<td>Hedrick et al. 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>357</td>
<td>Jongbloed et al. 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>143</td>
<td>Pflaum et al. 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial incentives</td>
<td>Those who are entitled to compensation are less likely to be engaged in the labour force.</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>Wehman et al. 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3514</td>
<td>Arango-Lasprilla 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Engel et al.1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>403</td>
<td>Franceschini 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ottomanelli et al. 2011 (238) (receiving social security benefits was a disincentive for employment but receiving Veterans disability benefits is not)</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>Ottomanelli et al. 2011 (social security disability benefit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>118</td>
<td>Paul et al. 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health insurance</td>
<td>Being insured by Medicaid (US) was associated with reduced training and lower employment rates</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>Phillips et al. 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Companies tend to discriminate against individuals with SCI by offering</td>
<td>2228</td>
<td>Ravaud et al. 1992</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Environmental Factors | Impact on Employment | Study (N) | Study reference |
--- | --- | --- | ---
‘Disability’ discrimination (negative attitudes towards those with disabilities) | interviews less frequently when a SCI was disclosed.
Negative employer attitudes
Perceived discrimination was associated with current unemployment. | 83
167 | Engel et al. 1998
Conroy and McKenna 1999 |
Inaccessibility of the workplace | Physical inaccessibility is a reason for not returning to work. | 231 | Krause and Anson 1996 |

Discussion

Financial disincentives are gaining support as having a detrimental effect on return to work post-injury. For example, in British Columbia, Canada, social assistance deters recipients from returning to work because once more than $400/month is earned, benefits received while on social assistance such as dental care and prescription medication, are lost (Jongbloed et al. 2007). This also appears to be the case in Australia as the perceived disadvantages of losing social security benefits (which would lead to exclusion from accessing government funded equipment and medical supplies) seemed to deter people from seeking employment post-SCI (Conroy and McKenna 1999). Health insurance benefits which are considered threatened for abolishment or reduction with an increase in work-related income could be a deterrent for people with SCI considering going back to work.

Workplace discrimination can be further classified into ‘disability discrimination’ and ‘racial discrimination’, the latter being addressed in the personal factor section. Disability discrimination is due largely to negative or naïve employer perceptions about the potential productivity of individuals with SCI. Ravaud et al. (1992) found that companies tend to discriminate against individuals with SCI by offering interviews less frequently when the injury was disclosed. Similarly, 80% of Canadians agreed with the statement that “Canadians with disabilities are less likely to be hired for a job than those without disabilities, even if they are equally qualified” (Social Development Canada 2004). Not surprisingly, Jongbloed et al. (2007) found that individuals with SCI viewed the negative attitudes of employers regarding people with disabilities as a barrier to employment. The lack of physical accessibility to the workplace has also been found to hinder return to work.

Conclusions

*There is level 5 evidence (see Table 4) that financial disincentives has a negative effect on employment post-SCI but financial incentives has a positive effect on employment except for when receiving social security benefits.*

*There is level 5 evidence (see Table 4) that health insurance, ‘disability discrimination’ and inaccessibility of the workplace are environmental barriers negatively influencing employment after SCI.*

*There is level 5 evidence (see Table 3) that ability to use transportation independently, ability to use technological devices, and having access to job accommodations positively influencing employment after SCI.*
Environmental facilitators include having access to various assistive devices, using transportation independently, having social support (including being married), and having the possibilities of job accommodation including reduced work hours.

Environmental barriers to employment are social or physical and include financial disincentives, discrimination associated to negative attitudes toward people with disabilities and difficulties with physical access to workplace.

A single environmental factor can be perceived either as a barrier or a facilitator to employment based on its presence/absence in one’s environment and its impact on effective returning to work.

4.0 Interventions for Enhancing Employment Post-SCI

Access to vocational counselling, educational or job training has often been mentioned as a key issue in enabling return to work after SCI (Jang et al. 2005; Jongbloed et al. 2007; Lidal et al. 2007). However very few studies have empirically tested strategies to increase job opportunities and most reports we found were either case series or observational studies. Various strategies were described through case studies that had successful return to work and job retention. These individualized strategies addressed activities of daily living and mobility needs, job accommodation including workplace support, and employers’ needs and concerns. In this section we reviewed intervention studies examining strategies which lead to return to work.

Table 5: Interventions for Enhancing Employment Post-SCI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author Year; Country Score Research Design Total Sample Size</th>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen and Blascovich 1996; USA PEDro=6 RCT N=48</td>
<td>Population: All individuals were classified as having severe ambulatory disabilities. Experimental: n=24 (SCI: n = 11, 7M 4F) Control n=24 (SCI= 11, 7M 4F) Treatment: Experimental group members received trained service dogs 1 month after the study began. Wait-list control group received dogs in month 13. Participants included individuals who had expressed interest in a service dog and who required substantial personal assistance. Data was collected for 2 years Outcome measure: Spheres of Control Scale (to assess internal locus of control), Rosenberg Self-esteem Scale, Affect Balance Scale (to assess psychological wellbeing), Community Integration Questionnaire, and data regarding the number of received paid and unpaid assistance.</td>
<td>1. The experimental group had significant improvements on all psychosocial status tests at months 6 and 12 when compared to the control group. 2. The experimental group had a significant decrease in hours of assistance needed at months 6 and 12 when compared to the control group. 3. After receiving a service dog, there were no significant differences between the groups at the same relative data points (months 0, 6 and 12 for the control group, months 12, 18 and 24 for the wait-list control groups. 4. After 12 months, the presence of the service dog was associated with a decrease of 68% of biweekly paid assistance hours. 5. After receiving a service dog, all participants reported substantial increases in terms of school attendance, part time employment, increased levels of social interaction and use of public transportation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottomanelli et al. 2013; USA PEDro=5 RCT N=157</td>
<td>Population: Veterans with SCI between the ages of 18 and 65 who received health care services in the SCI Centers at one of six participating Veterans Affairs Medical Centers. Experimental: n=81 (mean age 48.7) Control: n=76 (mean age 49.8). Treatment: Experimental group members Employment: Among the 157 participants, 33 participants (21.0%) accounted for 88 total jobs.</td>
<td>1. 24 participants in the SE group accounted for 60/88 jobs (68.2%). The rate of employment for SE participants was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author Year; County Score Research Design Total Sample Size</td>
<td>Methods</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillips et al. 2012; United States Retrospective Cohort Study</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1. Individuals in the SE group were 2.5 times more likely than individuals receiving TAU-IS and 11.4 times more likely than individuals receiving TAU-OS to obtain competitive employment. 2. The rate of employment for SE subjects was significantly greater than that of either the TAU-IS group or the TAU-OS group. 3. Intent to treat analysis found that subjects in the SE group earned significantly more per week than the TAU-OS group. Subjects in the SE group earned significantly more per week than subjects in both the TAU-IS and TAU-OS groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shem et al. 2011; USA Prospective study</td>
<td>N=39</td>
<td>1. 7 (24%) participants returned to school; 2. 2 (6.9%) participants returned to work 3. 1 (3.4%) participant returned to school part-time. 4. For mentees who successfully completed the program, there was a trend for improvement in cognitive independence and occupation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ottomanelli et al. 2012; USA PEDro=5 RCT N=201**

**Population:** 201 veterans with SCI (192M 9F) between the ages of 18 and 65 who received medical and/or rehabilitation care at 1 of 6 participating centers.

Experimental: n=81 (mean age 48.7)  
Control: n=76 at intervention site (mean age 49.8); n=44 at observational site (mean age 45.1)

**Treatment:** Experimental group members received a supported employment (SE) intervention based on an Individual Placement and Support (IPS) model. There were two control groups: one at the intervention sites through which individuals were randomly assigned to the control group – treatment as usual – intervention site (TAU-IS) and 1 at sites were the SE intervention was not available. All individuals at these observational sites received treatment as usual - TAU (TAU-OS). Data was collected for 12-months.

**Outcome measure:** Competitive employment in the community (paying job earning at least minimum wage).

**Population:** Newly injured individuals at an Atlanta rehabilitation. Mean(SD) age: 35(11.8) years; 78% male; 76% white.

**Treatment:** Video-based telerehabilitation intervention (9 weeks); telephone-based telerehabilitation intervention (9 weeks); standard follow-up care.

**Outcome Measures:** Time to productive activities (attending school, VR, working as a homemaker, volunteering) from injury. Time to employment from injury date among individuals employed prior to injury.

**Shem et al. 2011; USA**

**Population:** 39 individuals with SCI (28M 11F); age 16–26 years. Average(SD) age of mentees was 19.8(3.0) years. 17 employed mentors. In total, 29 participants were matched with mentors, and 10 participants (34%) completed the program

1. Being in one of the intervention groups (either phone- or video-based telerehabilitation) trended towards a longer time to return to productive activities.
2. Being in one of the intervention groups did not have a significant impact on the time to return to employment for individuals that were employed prior to injury.

**Outcome:** Significantly greater (29.6%) than the control (11.8%). 2. SE participants accounted for 50 of 72 (69.4%) jobs (competitive employment) and were significantly more likely to achieve employment (25.9%) compared to control (15.5%). 3. SE participants worked significantly more hours per week (22.0 vs. 17.0), averaged significantly fewer wages ($233.9 vs. $267.3), and missed fewer hours per week (0.3 vs. 1.8).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author Year; Country Score Research Design Total Sample Size</th>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rowell and Connelly, 2010; Australia</strong>&lt;br&gt;Matched sampling pilot study&lt;br&gt;N=181&lt;br&gt;(SCI n=109)</td>
<td><strong>Treatment:</strong> Each mentee with SCI was matched with a community-based mentor, with or without a disability. The mentoring relationship was planned for 2 years. Participants were evaluated with standardized questionnaires at intake, 3 months after entry, every 3 months thereafter, at the time of post-secondary education or employment entry and 4 months post entry. <strong>Outcome measures:</strong> return to school, return to work.</td>
<td>measures of Craig Handicap Assessment and Reporting Technique, and statistically significant improvements were found with Participation Index of the Mayo-Portland Adaptability Inventory-Version 4, Disability Rating Scale and Supervision Rating Scale, but not with the Satisfaction with Life Scale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hansen, 2007; India</strong>&lt;br&gt;Observational N= 46</td>
<td><strong>Population:</strong> 181 respondents: 73.5% male; mean age: 44 years; 61% unmarried; mean time since injury: 18 years; 39% in labour force and 26% employed.&lt;br&gt;<strong>Treatment:</strong> no treatment per se but examines the impact of a publicly funded set of services to enable return to work i.e. Adult Lifestyle Support Packages e.g. support with activities of daily living Spinal Injuries Survey Instrument (SISI) developed and administered, Short Form-36 (SF-36) and modified SF-36 administered. <strong>Outcome Measures:</strong> Labour market outcomes, exposure to the Adult Lifestyle Support Packages (ALSP), clinical and demographic covariates</td>
<td>1. No statistically significant effect of either the ALSP or support packages from private insurance sources (i.e. PPSP) on labour market participation was found.&lt;br&gt;2. A number of other factors are significantly correlated with labour market participation:&lt;br&gt;- individuals who undertook education or training post-SCI were more likely to be labour market participants&lt;br&gt;- females were less likely to be labour market participants&lt;br&gt;- a positive attributional style is associated with a higher likelihood of labour market participation&lt;br&gt;- a weak non-linear age effect was detected, which suggests that the probability of labour market participation is decreasing in age&lt;br&gt;3. The marginal effects for the ALSP are statistically insignificant. Thus, the hypothesis that the ALSP has a zero effect on labour market participation cannot be rejected.&lt;br&gt;4. The strongest marginal effect is for post-SCI education, which is statistically significant at the 1% level and for which the 95% confidence interval is 0.108–0.503. This suggests that post-SCI training and education has an important effect on labour market participation. The probability of labour market participation is increasing in the ln (Attributional Style index, positive scenario). The higher the individual’s propensity to “internalize” positive employment outcomes to his/her own attributes (or “capabilities and functionings”), the more likely he/she is to be a labour market participant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population:</strong> 46 subjects with SCI (40M 6F). No other demographics given. <strong>Treatment:</strong> Participation in the work rehabilitation program with the Center for Rehabilitation of the Paralyzed. Program includes physical conditional, vocational training and work placements. <strong>Outcome measure:</strong> Vocational status.</td>
<td>1. 23 individuals returned to work: 18 subjects were employed in a job similar to their pre-injury job; 5 were employed in a different occupation than what they were doing pre-injury.&lt;br&gt;2. Of the 23 individuals that returned to work 4 used a wheelchair, and 5 used crutches.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author Year; Country</td>
<td>Score Research Design</td>
<td>Total Sample Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jongbloed et al. 2007; Canada</td>
<td>Observational</td>
<td>N=357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jang et al. 2005; Taiwan</td>
<td>Observational</td>
<td>N=169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King et al. 2004; USA</td>
<td>Case series</td>
<td>N = 174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang et al. 2002; Taiwan</td>
<td>Observational</td>
<td>N=91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

This review suggests that there is a profound lack of high-level evidence studies which have a focus on work and employment-related interventions. Three randomized controlled studies were found, with Allen and Blaskovich (1996) examining access to trained service dogs, and suggesting an improvement in psychosocial status including self-esteem, internal locus of control, and overall psychological well-being. Other benefits of having trained service dogs were a decrease in assistance time by either a professional assistant or family and friends, an increase in school attendance and part-time employment, and an increase in social participation and community (Allen and Blascovich 1996).

The second randomized trial by Ottomanelli et al. (2012) found that a supported employment (SE) intervention was more effective at returning veterans to work than treatment as usual (TAU). Those receiving SE were 2.5 times more likely than those receiving TAU at the intervention sites (offering both SE and TAU) and 11.4 times more likely than those receiving TAU at the observation sites (offering only TAU) to achieve employment over the 12 month follow-up period. However, subjects in the SE group earned significantly less per week than those in the TAU intervention site group. This study was followed up by a third randomized trial (Ottomanelli et al. 2013) which reported that the supported employment (SE) intervention participants had a significantly higher rate of employment than the control, worked significantly more hours per week and missed significantly fewer hours of work.

There was one prospective study by Shem et al. (2010) which found that participants who completed a mentorship program improved their functioning, independence, and participation, which may have contributed to their favorable return to work (or return to school) outcomes. However, it was not clear from the study whether or not participation in the mentorship program was directly related to employment post-SCI; hence existence of evidence is uncertain in this case. Other studies included case series and observational studies. These studies examined employment outcomes of people with SCI who received various vocational rehabilitation services. One study (Inge et al. 1998) suggests that people enrolled in a program using person-centered planning tools to identify needs and to direct the job search might gain employment but the workplace support greatly varied- from minor to intensive support. Another study (King et al. 2004) described a modified case management approach to return people with SCI to work. Comparing their preliminary results with those of the U.S. Model Systems, it appears that the program is successful for increasing return to educational training but not to work. Marini et al. (2007) suggest that people with SCI registered in state vocational rehabilitation agencies and receiving job placement services are likely to have a higher employment rate. Likewise, Jellinek and Harvey (1982) supported the conclusion of higher employment rate in individuals with SCI who had access to on-site professional counsellors for vocational / educational rehabilitation in addition to state vocational rehabilitation agency, compared to the state vocational rehabilitation agency only. They concluded that the vocational or educational placement was as high as 78% among those who had on-site vocational or educational services. In their sample of 169 people (49% engaged in gainful employment), Jang et al. (2005) found that fifty percent of the employed had received vocational training, compared with only 28% of the unemployed. Jongbloed (2007) also
found that employment re-training and education were identified as important contributors to success. However, the participants stated that services and information were perceived as difficult to access. Another observational study examined whether a publicly funded set of support services such as help with activities of daily living is associated with labour market participation. The authors found no effect of these services on labour market participation compared to support packages from private insurance sources (Rowell and Connelly 2010). Hence, evidence cannot be ascertained in this case. However, the same study found that an individual's propensity to internalize positive employment outcomes in relation to his or her capabilities may contribute to returning to work.

Two other studies examine vocational interventions. Wang et al. (2002) compared a group of persons with SCI receiving a multimodal 6-month training course to a group without specific training. They found that individuals with paraplegia had higher employment rate which indicated an association between level of injury and employment. Hansen et al. (2007) interviewed male participants with SCI in a work rehabilitation program which included physical conditioning, vocational training, and work placements. Less than half were employed in a similar or identical job as their previous employment and only about a quarter of those who used a wheelchair returned to work. Overall, the studies included in this review investigated different types of interventions and used different measures to assess the interventions. Although this may limit the generalizability of the outcomes, there is evidence in general supporting the use of interventions to enhance employment post-SCI.

One study evaluated a telerehabilitation intervention and included employment as an outcome (Phillips et al. 2012). The intervention arm included a nine week telephone or video-based telerehabilitation intervention (not focused on employment) compared with care as usual. Return to employment was analyzed in those that were employed pre-injury; with those receiving the intervention not returning to work any faster than those receiving standard care.

Conclusions

*There is level 1b evidence (Allen and Blascovich 1996) that suggests a service dog improves integration and participation in school and employment and decrease the number of hours of paid assistance after the first year.*

*There is level 2 evidence from two studies (Ottomanelli et al. 2012; Ottomanelli et al. 2013) that suggests that a supported employment intervention improves employment rates compared with treatment as usual over a one-year period, increases the number of hours worked per week and decreases the number of missed hours of work.*

*There is level 5 (Jellinek and Harvey 1982) and level 4 evidence (Marini et al. 2008) that on-site vocational rehabilitation counselling during inpatient rehabilitation can increase employment rates.*

*There is level 4 evidence (Marini et al. 2008) that use of job placement services may help individuals with SCI find employment.*

*There is level 4 evidence (Inge et al. 1998) suggesting that person-centred planning tools facilitate employment.*

*There is level 4 evidence (King et al. 2004) that case management programs increase return to educational training, but not to work.*

*There is level 5 evidence from 4 studies (Wang et al. 2002; Jang et al. 2005; Jongbloed et al. 2007; Hansen 2007) that receiving vocational training increases the likelihood of employment.*
There is level 5 evidence (Rowell and Connelly 2010) that an individual’s propensity to internalize positive employment outcomes in relation to his or her capabilities may contribute to returning to work.

People with SCI may benefit from vocational rehabilitation in the process of job placement and work reintegration.

There is a dearth of high quality research in vocational (re) training. Consequently, conclusions are mostly based on evidence from observational studies or case studies.

Continuous support to the employee and employer before and after vocational placement may lead to a successful return to work and job retention.

5.0 Summary

Effective work reintegration for individuals with SCI is essential because despite their disability, many of these individuals possess the potential to remain or become productive members of society while deriving positive psychosocial benefits at the same time. Many factors that could facilitate return to work are at a level that is beyond the realm of health care. These include changing employer and societal perceptions and attitudes, and lobbying for social change that would include improved transportation (Conroy and McKenna 1999). Eliminating policies to reduce financial disincentives are key to eliminating barriers for those who return to work. Policy change requires a strong lobbying voice and a social will to overcome attitudes and arguments from opponents who may otherwise see provision of funding for personal care attendants and/or worksite modification as a poor investment of resources.

There is level 5 evidence (see Table 1) that being male, Caucasian, and younger at time of injury; having a longer duration of injury, higher education pre-injury; and having a low-intensity pre-injury job are non-modifiable personal factors that positively influence employment opportunities after SCI.

There is level 5 evidence (Hirsch et al. 2009) that the severity of injury is a non-modifiable personal factor that negatively influences employment opportunities after SCI.

There is level 5 evidence (see Table 2) that being married, having education post-injury, having fewer secondary health conditions and higher functional independence, having better work related values and a higher internal locus of control, and better wheelchair skills are modifiable personal factors that positively influence employment opportunities after SCI.

There is level 5 evidence (see Table 4) that financial disincentives has a negative effect on employment post-SCI but financial incentives has a positive effect on employment except for when receiving social security benefits.

There is level 5 evidence (see Table 4) that health insurance, ‘disability discrimination’ and inaccessibility of the workplace are environmental barriers negatively influencing employment after SCI.

There is level 5 evidence that (see Table 3) ability to use transportation independently, ability to use technological devices, and having access to job accommodations positively influencing employment after SCI.
There is level 1b evidence (Allen and Blascovich 1996) that suggests a service dog improves integration and participation in school and employment and decrease the number of hours of paid assistance after the first year.

There is level 2 evidence from two studies (Ottomanelli et al. 2012; Ottomanelli et al. 2013) that suggests that a supported employment intervention improves employment rates compared with treatment as usual over a one-year period, increases the number of hours worked per week and decreases the number of missed hours of work.

There is level 5 (Jellinek and Harvey 1982) and level 4 evidence (Marini et al. 2008) that on-site vocational rehabilitation counselling during inpatient rehabilitation can increase employment rates.

There is level 4 evidence (Marini et al. 2008) that use of job placement services may help individuals with SCI find employment.

There is level 4 evidence (Inge et al. 1998) suggesting that person-centred planning tools facilitate employment.

There is level 4 evidence (King et al. 2004) that case management programs increase return to educational training, but not to work.

There is level 5 evidence from 4 studies (Wang et al. 2002; Jang et al. 2005; Jongbloed et al. 2007; Hansen 2007) that receiving vocational training increases the likelihood of employment.

There is level 5 evidence (Rowell and Connelly 2010) that an individual’s propensity to internalize positive employment outcomes in relation to his or her capabilities may contribute to returning to work.
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