IMPAIRED WORKERS IN INDUSTRY

The comparative performance of impaired workers and their able-bodied fellow workers.
The necessity of absorbing into our industrial life several hundred thousand permanently impaired veterans in the prime of life has again focused attention on the performance of impaired workers in industry. Many employers learned during the last few years that impaired men and women can be very desirable workers if they are carefully placed so that their impairments do not constitute handicaps. Obviously, a man with one leg cannot perform satisfactorily on a job that requires two good legs; but he can do very well on a job that requires two good hands. It is desirable that the evaluation of impaired workers be based on objective findings rather than solely on an appeal
to the humanitarianism and patriotism of employers. The U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics is now gathering factual reports directly from the records of industrial plants which employed impaired workers in sizable numbers during the last few years. The records of unimpaired and impaired workers were matched on every important point—production, absenteeism, accident hazards, and performance in general—in order to obtain accurate statistical comparison. Further studies are in progress in cooperation with the Veterans’ Administration. This is a report of the survey to date, covering 9 plants where 908 impaired workers were matched with 1,165 unimpaired workers. Only serious impairments were studied.
The average weekly output of impaired workers was 2.8 percent better than that of unimpaired workers on the same job. The performance of impaired workers excelled in every one of the plants which had a careful placement program. It fell below that of unimpaired fellow workers in one of the plants without a placement program.
Impaired workers produced 3.6 percent more for every hour worked than did their unimpaired co-workers on the same jobs. The significance of careful placement is emphasized by the fact that the efficiency of impaired workers was better in each of the four plants which had a careful placement program. In some of the plants without such a program, the reverse was true.
The number of work injuries per month per 100 workers was identical for both impaired and unimpaired workers. Each had 20 such injuries, and practically all of these required only first aid.

In the 5 plants with careful placement programs, the impaired had 20 work injuries against 21 for the unimpaired, with lower rates in 4 plants out of 5. Where there were no careful placement programs, impaired workers averaged 18 work injuries per 100 workers per month against 14 for the unimpaired. The different rates for plants with and without placement programs reflect different types of work hazards.
In absenteeism, the difference between the two groups is negligible. Scheduled work hours lost because workers were absent from work because of illness or other reasons amounted to 3.2 percent for impaired workers and 3.3 percent for unimpaired.
Absenteeism for men workers closely approximated the total group average. Rates for impaired women, of whom comparatively few were engaged, were higher than for unimpaired women, largely because of lack of satisfactory placement programs in certain plants. They lost 8.6 percent of scheduled hours against 7.8 percent for unimpaired women. In plants with good placement programs, however, impaired women lost 5.6 percent of their time, as against 6.6 percent for the unimpaired. In plants without such programs, the time lost by impaired women came to 10.4 percent, and for unimpaired women, 8.5 percent.
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Separation figures given here represent only voluntary quitting by workers and are for an unusual wartime period when labor turnover was very high. For every 4 impaired workers who left their jobs, 10 unimpaired workers quit. Thus, the quit rate for unimpaired workers was $2\frac{1}{2}$ times as high as that of the impaired. Mobility of impaired workers is, of course, not usually as great as for the unimpaired.
These preliminary findings indicate that when impaired workers have been placed into jobs in which their impairment are not handicaps, they do as well—and frequently better—than the so-called “normal” workers: They are as efficient, they produce as well, they lose no more time, they are not injured more frequently, and they stay on the job longer. This report is preliminary because it is based on a small group of workers. More conclusive figures will be available later when many more workers have been studied in a great variety of jobs and industries in the course of an inquiry now being initiated for the Veterans’ Administration.