2018

Examining impacts of mindfulness in requesting job accommodations for individuals with disabilities

Shengli Dong, Stacy Vance and Amanda Campbell

Article

Hammill Institute on Disabilities

Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin
2018, Vol. 61(2) 78–89

DOI: 10.1177/0034355216683673
rcb.sagepub.com
SAGE

Examining Impacts of Mindfulness in Requesting Job Accommodations for Individuals With Disabilities

Stacy Vance, MS[1], Amanda Campbell, BA[1], and Shengli Dong, PhD, CRC[1]

Abstract

This study aimed to examine the relationship between mindfulness and the request for job accommodations among individuals with disabilities. One hundred fifty individuals with disabilities who needed a job accommodation completed a survey assessing the cognitive, affective, and mindfulness factors involved with requesting job accommodations. Pearson correlations were calculated between scales and subscales measuring mindfulness, positive affect, self-efficacy, outcome expectations, and intentions to request accommodations. The results showed significant correlations between mindfulness and all other scales. In addition, multiple regression and logistic regression analyses were conducted to examine the impacts of cognitive, affective, and mindfulness factors on an individual's intention and decision to request or withhold a request for an accommodation. Mindfulness was not found significant in predicting the intention to request accommodations; however, positive affect, self-efficacy, and outcome expectations accounted for 35% of the variance in intention to request. The interaction between mindfulness and intention to request, along with self-efficacy, was found significant in predicting request behavior. Mindfulness and the interaction between mindfulness and intention to request contributed an additional 8% of the variance in requesting behavior. The results of this study indicate the need for more research into the relationship of mindfulness and the decision to request accommodations.

Keywords

accommodation request, mindfulness, self-efficacy, disability

According to the U.S. Census, there are approximately 56 million people with disabilities living in the United States (U.S. Census Bureau, 2012). Among them, four in 10 individuals with disabilities were participating in the labor market compared with eight in 10 individuals without disabilities (Brault, 2012). Although there have been a number of studies focused on understanding the factors that may influence the hiring of individuals with disabilities who wish to participate in the workforce (Erickson, von Schrader, Bruyère, & VanLooy, 2014; Jans, Kaye, & Jones, 2012), there is a need to understand the factors that may help these individuals in maintaining their current employment (Rumrill, Roessler, Battersby-Longden, & Schuyler, 1998). In addition, maintenance of employment is ranked as the biggest problem faced by persons with disabilities based on the number and nature of discriminatory allegations filed with the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) under Title I of the Americans With Disabilities Act (ADA; 1990; West et al., 2008).

To ensure that persons with disabilities enjoy the same rights as those without disabilities at the workplace, the ADA (1990) mandates the requirement for employers to provide individuals with disabilities with reasonable accommodations, allowing them to perform the essential functions of their job if the accommodation does not cause undue hardship for employers (Crosgrove, Fink, Dillion, & Wedding, 2015). According to the EEOC,

> a reasonable accommodation is any change in the work environment (or in the way things are usually done) to help a person with a disability apply for a job, perform the duties of a job, or enjoy the benefits and privileges of employment. (EEOC, 2015)

By helping individuals perform the duties inherent to their jobs, job accommodations remove barriers and provide the opportunities for individuals to achieve a longer tenure and

[1]Florida State University, Tallahassee, USA

Corresponding Author:
Shengli Dong, Assistant Professor, Department of Educational Psychology and Learning Systems, College of Education, Florida State University, 3206J Stone Building, 1114 W. Call Street, Tallahassee, FL 32306-4453, USA.
Email: sdong3@fsu.edu

career maintenance (Al Dhanhani, Gignac, Beaton, Su, & Fortin, 2014; McDowell & Fossey, 2015).

Retaining employment for individuals with disabilities has implications at the individual, family, and societal levels. On an individual level, maintaining employment may increase psychological well-being by enhancing financial resources, social support, and engagement in meaningful activities (Hogan, Kyaw-Myint, Harris, & Denronden, 2012). In addition, maintaining employment may contribute to growth in both mental (Linn, Sandifer, & Stein, 1985; Turner & Turner, 2004) and physical (Linn et al., 1985) health. On a larger scale, if individuals with disabilities maintain employment, their purchasing power may be positively affected due to their income not being based solely on Social Security Disability Insurance and/or Supplemental Security Income (Imparato, Houtenville, & Shaffert, 2010). The job retention of individuals with disabilities may also help to relieve the financial burden on family members and, possibly, society (Dell Orto & Power, 2007).

Despite ADA mandates and benefits of maintaining employment, an underutilization of job accommodations among individuals with disabilities still exists in the workplace (Allen & Carlson, 2003; Gignac, Cao, & McAlpine, 2015). Thus, there is a need to gain a better understanding of the job accommodation request process and potential interventions that may facilitate individuals with disabilities in taking advantage of their legal rights in this area, which may help them fully engage in work and maintain their employment over time.

While early accommodation literature has focused on environmental and personal variables (Chirikos, 1999; Fesko, 2001; Frank & Bellini, 2005; Friedman, 1993; Gates, 2000) to help explain the underutilization of job accommodations, recent research has brought to light the importance of cognitive processes (such as self-efficacy and outcome expectation) that may also play a role in requesting accommodations (Baldridge & Swift, 2013; Baldridge & Veiga, 2006; Dong, 2011).

The research indicated that individuals with disabilities conducted a cognitive assessment of the perceived risks and the potential benefits of requesting a needed accommodation (Baldridge & Veiga, 2006; Nadler, Ellis, & Bar, 2003). Some of the perceived risks include psychological and social costs, such as the sense of incompetence and dependence (Baldridge & Swift, 2013; Lee, 1997). For example, requesting an accommodation may mean risking one's social standing and public image to improve his or her work performance (Baldridge & Swift, 2013). Thus, the job accommodation request process can be thought of as a "high stakes" behavior in which the perceived risks may often outweigh the perceived benefits (Baldridge & Swift, 2013; Baldridge & Veiga, 2006). In turn, individuals with disabilities may not ask for help when the help is needed and available (Lee, 1997).

Social cognitive career theory (SCCT; Lent, Brown, & Hackett, 1994) offers a framework for understanding the cognitive processes (self-efficacy and outcome expectation) involved with career interest, choice, and performance. In addition, SCCT provides a platform to comprehend the mechanisms and processes of career development and job-related behaviors for individuals with disabilities (Fabian, 2000). Lent et al. (1994) also noted that an individual's affect acts as a filtering mechanism through which self-efficacy and outcome expectation are processed. Dong (2011) found support for the impact of positive affect, self-efficacy, and outcome expectations on requesting workplace accommodations for individuals with disabilities through an accommodation request model. Within the proposed model, *positive affect* refers to a mood state in which an individual experiences positive feelings such as enthusiasm and interest (Watson, Clark, & Tellegan, 1988). *Self-efficacy* refers to one's belief that he or she possesses the necessary skills and abilities to conduct relevant job behaviors and reach a desired work goal (Lent et al., 1994). *Outcome expectation* refers to one's belief that the completion of a specified task will result in the intended outcome (Lent et al., 1994).

Despite the above-mentioned advancements in accommodation research and associations of mindfulness with positive affect (Brown & Ryan, 2003) and self-efficacy (Wei, Tsai, Lannin, Du, & Tucker, 2015) in the psychological literature, no research has been conducted to examine the impact of mindfulness in the workplace accommodation process to the best of our knowledge. Mindfulness is a complex construct with several definitions. Bishop et al. (2004) defined *mindfulness* as a two-component model, involving the "self-regulation of attention" and "a particular orientation towards one's experiences in the present moment . . . that is characterized by curiosity, openness, and acceptance" (p. 232). Bishop et al. suggested that mindfulness is a psychological process that is more closely related to a state rather than a trait. However, Brown and Ryan (2003) found evidence to support the construct of mindfulness to exist as both a state and a trait. Brown and Ryan (2003) referred to mindfulness as an inherent state of consciousness that involves "enhanced attention to and awareness of current experience or present reality" (p. 822). *Awareness* can be thought of as monitoring the internal and external environments, whereas *attention* is focused on an immediate range of experiences. *State mindfulness* refers to the variability of mindfulness within an individual, whereas *trait mindfulness* refers to the general tendency of an individual to act mindfully in his or her daily life. As this study examined the influence of trait mindfulness on the job accommodation request process, Brown and Ryan's definition was used.

Higher levels of trait mindfulness may contribute to the decision to request accommodations in several ways. First, being mindful may allow a person with a disability to balance cognitive assessments and presenting needs, while

fostering an informed and self-aware regulation of his or her behavior (Brown & Ryan, 2003). Mindfulness may assist individuals with disabilities to gain a balanced perspective of their workplace needs and the associated costs and benefits of request accommodations, thus helping them to make an informed decision regarding a job accommodation request. Second, being mindful has been found to share a relationship with behavior intention in past research. For example, Dane and Brummel (2013) found that a higher level of mindfulness was negatively associated with turnover intention in the workplace. In addition, the interaction between mindfulness and intention was found to have a significant impact on whether one engaged in physical exercise behavior (Chatzisarantis & Hagger, 2007). The results may suggest that similar relationships exist in the job accommodation request process. Third, being mindful may assist individuals to cope with the emotional experience of requesting an accommodation or having their requests denied/ignored, by helping the individual to cultivate a nonjudgmental stance to the emotional experience (Erisman & Roemer, 2010). This is especially important as requesting accommodations in the workplace and resolving EEOC accommodation-related charges can be a complex process, which may elicit an individual's strong feelings and emotions (M. B. Miller, n.d.).

Literature on Mindfulness and Study Key Variables

Mindfulness and Positive Affect

Past research has shown mindfulness and positive affect share a positive relationship (Brown & Ryan, 2003). For example, scores on the *Mindful Attention Awareness Scale* (MAAS; Brown & Ryan, 2003) were associated with higher scores of positive affect on the *Positive and Negative Affect Schedule* (PANAS; Watson et al., 1988). Mindfulness was found to decrease emotional reactivity through the cultivation of a nonjudgmental attitude to emotional experiences and led to a greater engagement in experiences of positive emotions (Erisman & Roemer, 2010). Erisman and Roemer (2010) found that a brief mindfulness intervention served to increase positive affect among a college sample. In addition, more recent studies found that mindfulness training promotes positive affect among individuals with depression (Garland, Geschwind, Peeters, & Wichers, 2015). Given the previously mentioned associations between mindfulness and positive affect, we hypothesized that mindfulness would share a positive relationship with positive affect in the job accommodation process.

Mindfulness and Self-Efficacy

Mindfulness has been positively associated with awareness of daily activities and job-seeking self-efficacy, and negatively associated with the symptoms associated with stress (de Jong, Hommes, Brouwers, & Tomic, 2013). Mindfulness also played a role in increasing work-related self-efficacy by decreasing one's self-focused attention on his or her disability and increasing engagement in work-related activities (Shapiro, Oman, Thoresen, Plante, & Flinders, 2008; Wei et al., 2015). Research has found that mindfulness significantly predicted counseling self-efficacy among counseling graduate students (Greason & Cashwell, 2009) and resulted in greater pain management self-efficacy among individuals experiencing chronic pain (Wright & Schutte, 2014). Given the associations between mindfulness and self-efficacy outlined above, we hypothesized that mindfulness would share a positive relationship with self-efficacy in the job accommodation process.

Mindfulness and Outcome Expectations

Past research indicated a relationship between outcome expectation and mindfulness-based treatments. More specifically, Snippe et al. (2015) found that participants' treatment outcome expectations predicted completion of homework during treatments and a decrease in posttreatment depressive symptoms. In addition, C. K. Miller, Kristeller, Headings, and Nagaraja (2014) found significant improvements in participants' outcome expectations (regarding health food choices) following the Mindfulness-Based Eating Awareness Training program. As one of the key concepts of mindfulness is an awareness and attention to the present moment (Brown & Ryan, 2003), it is possible that those who are acting mindfully do not get lost in possibilities of future outcomes and are more likely to make decisions based on present information. Given the associations between mindfulness and outcome expectations, we hypothesized that mindfulness would share a positive relationship with outcome expectations in the job accommodation process.

Mindfulness, Intention to Request, and Request Behavior

The process of successfully translating intention into action is facilitated by an individual's increased attention and awareness to both the internal and external environments (Chatzisarantis & Hagger, 2007). By gaining awareness to environments, an individual has greater self-control over cognitive and emotional responses. Thus, as mindful individuals are more attuned to present reality and demonstrate stronger self-regulation, they are more likely to follow through on their intentions and engage in the desired behavior (Chatzisarantis & Hagger, 2007). Chatzisarantis and Hagger (2007) found that both mindfulness and the interaction between mindfulness and intention had significant impacts on behavior regarding physical exercise. Based on these findings, we hypothesized that mindfulness might

contribute additional variance to the prediction of one's intention to request accommodations, above and beyond that of positive affect, self-efficacy, and outcome expectations. In addition, we hypothesized that mindfulness and the interaction between mindfulness and the intention to request would both contribute additional variance to the prediction of request behavior.

Study Purpose and Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to explore the relationship between mindfulness and the cognitive and affective constructs (i.e., self-efficacy, outcome expectation, and positive affect) found in Dong's (2011) accommodation request framework. In addition, this study aimed to examine the impacts of mindfulness and these cognitive and affective factors on intention to request accommodations and request behavior. Given the purpose of this study, the research questions were as follows:

Research Question 1: What are the relationships between mindfulness and positive affect, self-efficacy, outcome expectations, intention to request, and requesting behavior?
Research Question 2: What are the impacts of mindfulness, positive affect, self-efficacy, and outcome expectations on intentions for requesting accommodations?
Research Question 3: What are the impacts of mindfulness, positive affect, self-efficacy, outcome expectations, and the interaction between mindfulness and intention to request accommodations on request behavior?

Examining these questions may open the possibility for future research and practice into applying mindfulness-based intervention strategies as a way to increase the likelihood of requesting job accommodations, and maintain employment among individuals with disabilities.

Method

Participants

The sample for this study consists of 150 individuals with disabilities. The sample was composed of 101 females (67.3%), 46 males (30.7%), and three individuals who did not provide their gender (2%). Of the included sample, 127 participants self-reported as Caucasian (84.7%), 13 as African American (8.7%), two as Asian American (1.3%), six as Latino/Hispanic (4%), six as Native American (4%), and six as Other (4%). Participants included individuals with different age ranges: 18 to 34 years (29.4%), 35 to 54 years (44%), and ≥55 years (25.4%), with 1.2% not reporting age information. In terms of the level of education, 29 reported having an associate's degree, vocational training, or high school degrees/experiences (19.3%); 118 reported having a bachelor's degree or higher educational levels (78.7%); and three participants did not provide the education information (2%). Nineteen participants reported holding unskilled or semiskilled job positions (12.7%), 127 reported technical or professional job positions (84.7%), and four participants did not supply the information (2.6%). Twenty-seven participants reported working part-time at the time of survey completion (18%), 107 reported working full-time (71.3%), 10 reported not working (6.7%), and six participants did not provide the information (6%). In addition, 21 participants self-reported their disability type(s) as hearing impaired/deaf (14%), 27 reported as visual impaired/blind (18%), 15 reported as psychiatric/mental (10%), 12 reported as cognitive (8%), 34 reported as mobility impairment (22.7%), 63 as physical impairment (42%), and 27 reported as other (18%). Overall, the sample for this study was female, Caucasian, highly educated, and experiencing a physical disability.

Measures

Demographic questionnaire. A demographic questionnaire was used to gather descriptive statistics and included questions on age, gender, race, education, work status, job level, and disability type.

Mindfulness. The MAAS, trait version (Brown & Ryan, 2003), is a 15-item survey that is used to measure the "individual differences in the frequency of mindful states over time" (Brown & Ryan, 2003). The MAAS uses a 6-point Likert-type scale response format ranging from 1 (*almost always*) to 6 (*almost never*). Scores range from 15 to 90, with higher scores indicating higher levels of trait mindfulness. The MAAS demonstrates strong psychometric properties with an internal consistency ranging from .80 to .90, a high test–retest reliability, and strong convergent and discriminant validity (Brown, n.d.). The alpha level for the current study was .88.

Positive affect. The PANAS (Watson et al., 1988) consists of 20 items that assess for two emotional dimensions: positive affect and negative affect. The PANAS demonstrates high reliability (positive affect = .86–.90; negative affect = .84–.87), as well as strong convergent and discriminant validity (Watson et al., 1988). To reduce the response burden on participants, we adopted a revised version from Dong's (2011) study, in which five items from the Positive Affect subscale were used on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*not at all*) to 5 (*extremely*). Scores on the revised version range from 5 to 25, with higher scores indicating a greater level of positive affect. The alpha level for the current study was .86.

Self-efficacy. This scale consisted of two different measures to assess participants' accommodation requests–related self-efficacy and work goal–related self-efficacy.

Accommodation requests–related self-efficacy. The *Situational Self-Efficacy Scale* (Rumrill, 1993) is a seven-item instrument used to measure participant's confidence (self-efficacy) in requesting accommodations. Dong (2011) revised the scale by changing the wording of "my needs" to "my accommodation needs," converting the response format to a 5-point Likert-type scale (1 = *not at all confident* to 5 = *very confident*), and using four items to reduce the participants' response burden. Scores on the revised version ranged from 4 to 20, with higher scores indicating greater levels of accommodation requests–related self-efficacy. The current study adopted the revised scale, with the alpha level of .89.

Work goal–related self-efficacy. This current study adopted Dong's (2011) modified version of Karoly and Ruehlman's (1995) goal self-efficacy instrument. The revised scale was used to assess the extent to which participants felt that they were capable of reaching an important work-related goal. This scale uses a 5-point Likert-type scale response format (1 = *not at all confident* to 5 = *very confident*). Scores on the revised version ranged from 4 to 20, with higher scores indicating greater levels of self-efficacy in setting work-related goals. The alpha level of the scale was .92.

Outcome expectations. The outcome expectation measure consisted of four subscales representing Anticipated Employer Compliance for Accommodations (three items), Perceived Help-Seeking Appropriateness (three items), Perceived Accommodation Usefulness (three items), and Nonpersonal Cost (three items). The items are assessed by asking participants to recall a time in the last 3 months in which they were in need of a job accommodation. The measure uses a 5-point Likert-type scale format that ranges from 1 (*disagree*) to 5 (*agree*). A higher overall score indicates positive outcome expectancy.

The three items that were used to assess anticipated employer compliance came from Dong's (2011) modified version of Baldridge's (2001) five-item measure. Dong modified Baldridge's measure by replacing the word "adjustment" with "accommodation." The alpha level for the current study was .93.

The three items that were used to assess for perceived help-seeking appropriateness came from Dong's (2011) modified version of Florey's (1998) three-item measure. Dong modified Florey's measure by replacing the word "adjustment" with "accommodation." The alpha level for the current study was .95.

The three items that were used to assess for perceived accommodation usefulness came from Dong's (2011) modified version of Baldridge's (2001) five-item scale. Dong modified Baldridge's measure by replacing the word "adjustment" with "accommodation." The alpha level for the current study was .85.

The three items that were used to assess for personal cost came from Dong's (2011) modified version of Baldridge's (2001) measure. Dong modified Baldridge's measure by replacing the word "adjustment" with "accommodation" and reducing the number of items to three from seven. The alpha level for the current study was .74.

Intention to request accommodations. Florey (1998) originally used a two-item measure to assess for readiness and commitment to request job accommodations. The items were as follows: "How do you rate your readiness in asking for adjustments (or job accommodations) in the past 3 months?" and "How do you rate your commitment in asking for adjustment (or job accommodation) in the past 3 months?" Each question is followed by a 5-point Likert-type response format that ranged from 1 (*not at all ready to ask*/*not at all committed to ask*) to 5 (*definitely ready to ask*/*strongly committed to ask*). Florey found a reliability of .94. The alpha level for the current study was .73.

Requesting behavior. To assess whether participants followed through on their intentions to request job accommodations, they were asked to respond (yes or no) to the following question: "Did you ask for the job accommodation(s) in the above-mentioned work situation?"

Procedure

Participants for this study were recruited through email invitations sent to the program directors of the following organizations: the National Mental Health Self-Help Clearinghouse, the Disability and Business Technical Assistance Center (DBTAC), the National Multiple Sclerosis Society, the American Council of the Blind, the National Association of the Deaf, the Association of Assistive Technology Act Program, the national and state centers for independent living, and state vocational rehabilitation divisions. The email invitation included a brief description of the study, the link to the online Qualtrics survey, and a request to share the link with constituents of their organizations.

Upon opening the survey link, the participants were directed to the informed consent page for the study, which briefly discussed the nature of the study, the potential risks and benefits of participation, any costs associated with participation, identification of the researchers, and the rights of human participants. The participants were then asked to "agree" that they had read (or had it read to them) and understood the informed consent before moving forward

with the survey. Participants were asked to recall a workplace situation in the past 3 months in which they needed a workplace accommodation. They were asked to report the level of intention to request accommodation and whether they requested or received accommodations. In addition, they were asked to respond to the survey, which included demographic information, job information, and the measures that assessed mindfulness, positive affect, self-efficacy, outcome expectations, and job accommodation request. Instructions on how to respond to the items of each measure were included. The survey took approximately 20 to 30 min to complete and was active for 5 months.

Data Analysis

Cases that did not complete any items for the PANAS, Self-Efficacy, Outcome Expectations, Intention to Request, and/or MAAS scales or were missing more than half of the items on the subscales for these scales were excluded from the data. There were 150 cases remaining in the data set after the data cleaning process was complete. Missing data within these 150 cases were rectified by taking an average score of the total items completed for each subscale, then replacing missing data with the average (Dodeen, 2003). Once the data were clean, the dependent and independent variables were assessed for normality, outliers, and multicollinearity. Next, descriptive statistics including the range, mean, and standard deviation were examined for each variable. To address the first research question, correlational analyses were run to determine the relationships among all variables of interest. To address the second and third research questions, a multiple linear regression analysis and a logistic regression analysis were used, respectively.

Results

Preliminary Analysis

Of the 150 participants in this study, 138 (92%) of them did request an accommodation(s). Of those who requested, 114 (76%) reported receiving the accommodation(s). No statistically significant differences were found in accommodation request for education level, job level (professional, technical, semiskilled, or unskilled), race (minority and nonminority), age, and gender. However, significant differences ($p < .01$) were found between accommodation request and work status. Individuals who were not employed (at the time of filling out the survey) were lower in terms of requesting accommodations compared with those working either full-time or part-time (during the time of filling out the survey).

The descriptive statistics for the intention to request accommodations, positive affect, self-efficacy, outcome expectations, and trait mindfulness totals and subscales are presented in Table 1. Hopkins and Weeks (1990) and DeCarlo (1997) suggested that normality is achieved if the skewness value does not exceed the absolute value of 1 and kurtosis does not exceed the absolute value of 3. Almost all of the measured variables came close to or met the necessary criteria for achieving normality. However, the subscale of Usefulness in outcome expectations was found to be nonnormally disturbed, with kurtosis of 8.019, and was found to share a very weak relationship with intention to request accommodations and request behavior; thus, the Usefulness subscale was excluded from the data analysis.

Correlational Analysis

Pearson correlation analyses were calculated for the overall scale scores and subscales (see Table 1) of intention to request, request behaviors, positive affect, self-efficacy, outcome expectation, and mindfulness variables. The overall scale scores of all variables appear to share a significant relationship in the positive direction. More specifically, mindfulness was found to have a significant relationship with the following scales: Self-Efficacy ($r = .338$, $p < .01$), Outcome Expectation ($r = .323$, $p < .01$), Positive Affect ($r = .179$, $p < .05$), Intention to Request ($r = .238$, $p < .01$), and Request Behavior ($r = .163$, $p < .05$).

Mindfulness was found to have a significant relationship with the Intention to Request subscales of Readiness ($r = .220$, $p < .01$) and Commitment ($r = .203$, $p < .01$). Significant correlations were found between mindfulness and the Self-Efficacy subscale of Requesting Accommodations ($r = .359$, $p < .01$) and the subscale of Work Goals ($r = .198$, $p < .05$). Mindfulness was found to have a significant correlation with the Outcome Expectations subscale of Nonpersonal Cost ($r = .355$, $p < .01$), and subscales of Compliance ($r = .172$, $p > .05$) and Appropriateness ($r = .178$, $p < .05$).

Intention to request was found to have a significant correlation with request behavior ($r = .360$, $p < .01$), self-efficacy ($r = .515$, $p < .01$), outcome expectation ($r = .475$, $p < .01$), and positive affect ($r = .427$, $p < .01$). See Table 1 for details.

Regression Analysis

We first conducted a hierarchical multiple regression to examine whether positive affect, self-efficacy, and outcome expectation (the first step of the hierarchical regression), and mindfulness (the second step of the hierarchical regression) predicted intention to request accommodations. The results indicated that although positive affect, outcome expectation, and self-efficacy predicted intention to request accommodations ($F = 19.535$, $p < .01$), mindfulness did not add any additional variance to the prediction ($\Delta R^2 = .01$, $p > .05$; see Table 2 for details).

Table 1. Correlations Among the Variables of Interest.

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
1. Inten. req.	—																	
2. Readiness	.908**	—																
3. Commit.	.869**	.583**	—															
4. Self-efficacy	.515**	.466**	.451**	—														
5. Acc. req.	.473**	.444**	.395**	.921**	—													
6. Work goal	.416**	.351**	.394**	.805**	.509**	—												
7. Out. exp.	.475**	.438**	.406**	.565**	.601**	.331**	—											
8. Comp.	.332**	.321**	.265**	.427**	.462**	.239**	.769**	—										
9. App.	.381**	.309**	.374**	.404**	.426**	.244**	.800**	.599**	—									
10. Per. cost	.360**	.353**	.282**	.440**	.465**	.262**	.697**	.203*	.276**	—								
11. Pos. affect	.427**	.307**	.467**	.465**	.447**	.345**	.328**	.171*	.361**	.216**	—							
12. Deter.	.399**	.234**	.499**	.341**	.309**	.283**	.266**	.151	.283**	.173*	.744**	—						
13. Inspired	.383**	.293**	.397**	.319**	.330**	.201*	.256**	.149	.304**	.137	.830**	.547**	—					
14. Enth.	.265**	.194*	.285*	.413**	.419**	.274**	.295**	.205*	.314**	.159	.793**	.418**	.635**	—				
15. Active	.406**	.316**	.416**	.489**	.455**	.386**	.326**	.170*	.321**	.246**	.858**	.614**	.559**	.611**	—			
16. Attentive	.282**	.197*	.314**	.337**	.304**	.282**	.199*	.022	.245**	.178*	.798**	.533**	.545**	.472**	.694**	—		
17. Mindful.	.238**	.220*	.203*	.338**	.359**	.198*	.323**	.172*	.178*	.355**	.179*	.193*	.113	.178*	.188*	.051	—	
18. Re Beh[a]	.360**	.338**	.301**	.372**	.418**	.184*	.324**	.282**	.172**	.270**	.136	.200*	.012	.017	.193*	.176*	.163*	—
Range	2–10	1–5	1–5	15–40	4–20	10–20	13–45	3–15	3–15	3–15	5–25	1–5	1–5	1–5	1–5	1–5	26–90	0–1
M	8.330	4.050	4.270	33.920	16.080	17.840	36.400	12.720	12.930	10.760	16.410	3.910	2.970	2.660	3.380	3.520	64.870	0.920
SD	1.636	0.995	0.843	5.642	3.890	2.560	7.368	3.111	3.024	3.669	4.892	0.972	1.385	1.310	1.222	1.157	12.76	0.272
Skewness	−1.033	−1.060	−1.032	−0.700	−1.036	−0.8220	−0.802	−1.268	−1.340	−0.560	−0.124	−0.656	−0.044	0.1810	−0.484	−0.590	−0.422	−3.130
Kurtosis	1.085	0.858	0.764	−0.212	0.551	−0.387	−0.046	0.602	0.711	−0.687	−0.809	−0.102	−1.203	−1.166	−0.695	−0.376	0.056	7.890

Note. Inten. req. = intention to request; Commit. = commitment; Acc. req. = accommodation request; Out. exp. = outcome expectations; Comp. = compliance; App. = appropriateness; Per. cost = personal cost; Pos. affect = positive affect; Deter. = determined; Enth. = enthusiastic; Mindful. = mindfulness; Re. Beh. = request behavior.

[a]As request behavior is dichotomous, point-biserial correlations were used.

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Table 2. Multiple Regressions on Request Intention.

Factor	R	R^2	β	T	p	F	p	ΔR^2
Model 1	.592	.351		3.532	≤.01	26.295	<.01	
Positive affect			.186	2.953	≤.01			
Self-efficacy			.305	3.083	<.01			
Outcome expectation			.254	3.50	<.01			
Model 2	.593	.351		2.957	<.01	19.535	<.01	.001
Positive affect			.185	2.917	≤.01			
Self-efficacy			.297	3.928	<.01			
Outcome expectation			.248	3.006	≤.01			
Mindfulness			.034	0.485	.628			

We also conducted a logistic regression to examine whether positive affect, self-efficacy, outcome expectation, mindfulness, and interactions between mindfulness and intention to request would have an impact on accommodations request behavior. We first examined the impact of positive affect, self-efficacy, and outcome expectation on request behavior. We then examined the impact of the above-mentioned variables—along with mindfulness and interactions between mindfulness and intention to request—on the dependent variable of request behavior. Self-efficacy was found to be significant in predicting request behavior in the first block of examination, although outcome expectation was found to be approaching statistical significance. When mindfulness and the interaction between mindfulness and intention to request were entered on top of the previous variables, two factors emerged as significant predictors of request behavior: self-efficacy and the interaction between mindfulness and intention to request. With one unit of increase in self-efficacy, the odds of requesting accommodation would increase 3.53 times; with one unit of increase in the interaction between mindfulness and intention, the odds of requesting accommodation would increase 0.28 times. The results of a Nagelkerke R^2 indicated that mindfulness and the interaction between mindfulness and intention to request accounted for 8% of the additional variance in requesting accommodations. The model demonstrated a good model fit (−2 log likelihood = 54.87); Hosmer and Lemeshow, $\chi^2(df = 8) = 8.857$, $p = .354$. See Table 3 for details.

Table 3. Logistic Regression on Request Decision.

Factor	R^{2a}	B	SE	Wald	df	p	Exp(B)
Model 1	.33						
Self-efficacy		1.582	.606	6.803	1	.011	4.863
Outcome expectation		1.056	.549	3.694	1	.050	2.873
Positive affect		−0.306	.401	0.585	1	.444	0.736
Model 2	.41						
Self-efficacy		1.511	.660	5.247	1	.022	4.531
Outcome expectation		0.605	.606	0.998	1	.318	1.832
Positive affect		−0.594	.446	1.776	1	.301	0.562
Mindfulness		−0.576	.558	1.068	1	.301	0.562
Intention to Request × Mindfulness		0.248	.110	5.046	1	.025	1.281

[a]Nagelkerke R^2.

Discussion

The study aimed to explore the relationship between mindfulness and the cognitive and affective constructs of self-efficacy, outcome expectation, and positive affect in the workplace accommodation process. In addition, this study aimed to examine the impact of mindfulness and the cognitive and affective factors on the intention to request accommodations and request behavior.

In this study, mindfulness was found to have a significant and positive relationship with positive affect, self-efficacy, outcome expectations, and intention to request, as well as request behavior. Further exploration of mindfulness in the job accommodation field may be warranted due to the practical and research implications of both this study and previous research findings (de Jong et al., 2013; Erisman & Roemer, 2010; Snippe et al., 2015; Wei et al., 2015). For example, the positive relationship between mindfulness and positive affect in the current study seems to echo with what Erisman and Roemer (2010) found: that a brief mindfulness intervention served to increase the experience of positive affect. They suggested that the facilitation of positive affect through mindfulness-based interventions might help in emotional regulation. As requesting a job accommodation can be a highly emotional process, mindfulness-based interventions could be used to help increase positive affect and overall emotional regulation, and thus increase the likelihood of an individual requesting accommodations. By fostering positive affect, individuals respond to highly emotional experiences in a more adaptive way. When difficult situations arise, mindfulness may help individuals to respond with equanimity, which may reduce emotional reactivity and distress (Erisman & Roemer, 2010). Thus, being mindful on their internal thought processes and environments could be particularly important for individuals with disabilities who filed EEOC claims related to job accommodations that were normally not ruled in their favor (McMahon et al., 2004).

Due to high-stakes nature of requesting accommodations, individuals may experience internal distractions and anxieties while planning and requesting accommodations. Wei et al. (2015) referred to the awareness of this experience as hindering self-focused attention. Several researchers examined the impact of mindfulness on offsetting the

hindering self-focused attention and stress in a variety of domains (Shapiro et al., 2008; Wei et al., 2015). The self-focused attention in the course of requesting accommodations could be attributed to the perceived cost of request and internalized stigma related to disability and requesting. The relatively high relationship between mindfulness and non-personal cost and self-efficacy in the current study indicates that mindful individuals may exhibit less hindering self-focused attention and more task-focused attention; that is, people who are more mindful are more likely to engage themselves in the task at hand (such as requesting a job accommodation) rather than becoming distracted by ruminations over the perceived potential negative consequences of requesting accommodations. Thus, mindfulness-based interventions may help individuals to reduce their internal barriers to requesting job accommodations while also increasing their work accommodation self-efficacy.

The present study found that positive affect, self-efficacy, and outcome expectations accounted for 35% of the variance in intention to request accommodations among individuals with disabilities. This finding partially supports Dong's (2011) finding that a great amount of variance (50.2%) in the intention to request accommodations was accounted for by these variables. Mindfulness and the interaction between mindfulness and intention to request accommodations contributed an additional 8% of variance on accommodations request behavior. Furthermore, self-efficacy and the interaction between mindfulness and intention to request emerged as significant predictors of request behavior within this study. These findings suggest that individuals who reported greater amounts of self-efficacy and mindfulness were more likely to act on their intentions and follow through with requesting accommodations. The findings in the current study seemed to resonate with Chatzisarantis and Hagger's (2007) results in that mindfulness and its interaction with intention to physical exercise were found to be significant in predicting actual physical exercise behavior.

Mindfulness was not found to be significant in the prediction of intention to request job accommodations and request behavior. The current findings are consistent with Chatzisarantis and Hagger's (2007) results in which mindfulness was not found to be a significant predictor of intention to actual behavior (i.e., physical exercise). The findings that mindfulness was not found significant in predicting the intention to request and request behavior directly might be associated with the potential diminished effect of mindfulness due the limitation of the sample as a large percent of them were highly educated and made the accommodation request.

Study Limitations

Several limitations are present within this study. First, the measures used were modified to reduce the response burden on participants. The use of modified versions of the scales might not allow for the full construct to be captured within the response items. Second, self-report measures were used. As the items required participants to reflect both on themselves and their experiences, and to report potentially sensitive information, the responses may not have been objective or accurate. Future research may want to incorporate a mixed-methods approach, incorporating observations and reports from others, such as coworkers and supervisors. Third, the sample is one of convenience, and participants self-selected to participate. The sample was predominately Caucasian, female, and well educated, which may not be representative of all individuals with disabilities. Perhaps one of the biggest limitations of this study is that an overwhelming majority of the participants requested accommodations (92%); thus, only 8% did not request accommodations. Although no statistically significant differences were found in accommodation requests for race, gender, education level, and job level, individuals who do not choose to request accommodations may be inherently different with regard to their trait mindfulness, positive affect, self-efficacy, and outcome expectations. Future research to capture the perspectives and characteristics of individuals who do not request accommodations in the workplace is needed so that the barriers to requesting accommodations can be better understood.

Implications

This is the first study to explore mindfulness within the job accommodation request literature. Although the results indicate that mindfulness may not play a direct role in the decision to request accommodations, there are indications that it had an interactive role through its relation with intention to request accommodations. As mindfulness has been found to be positively associated with cognitive and affective factors (i.e., self-efficacy, outcome expectation, and positive affect), future research may want to examine the relationships between mindfulness and these factors through a more sophisticated approach (e.g., structural equation modeling) to further define the role of mindfulness within the job accommodation request process. In addition, future research should focus on recruiting participants who withhold their accommodation requests to gain a comprehensive understanding of the role of mindfulness in the accommodation request process. Future research may also need to examine potential impact of workplace mindfulness (mindfulness of supervisors, employers, and coworkers) on accommodation request.

Although this study was exploratory in nature, there are a number of practical implications for the findings. In particular, the accommodation intention–behavior relationship may be of interest to professionals who aim to support individuals with disabilities in the workforce. The results of the current study suggest that working with individuals to

enhance their self-efficacy may help to increase the likelihood of following through with an accommodation request. Rehabilitation professionals may provide workshops or trainings to foster self-efficacy in terms of developing skills to identify and communicate accommodation needs, as well as negotiate accommodation requests. Furthermore, rehabilitation professionals may assist individuals with disabilities to understand how their accommodation requests may facilitate them to reach their work goals, and help them gain the skills to communicate the links between accommodation requests and work goals in the accommodation process to their employers. In addition, professionals may need to recognize the interactive impact between mindfulness and the intention to request on accommodation request behavior. Rehabilitation professionals may consider utilizing mindfulness-based interventions (such as deep breathing and relaxation techniques) to help people with disabilities to focus on the present and to approach the task of requesting an accommodation with equanimity, rather than ruminating on the perceived personal costs that may be associated with the accommodation request. It appears that mindfulness may be an underresearched area that could have practical implications for helping individuals with disabilities to take advantage of their right to reasonable job accommodations, which in turn may help them to maintain and/or advance in their employment.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

References

Al Dhanhani, A., Gignac, M., Beaton, D., Su, J., & Fortin, P. (2014). Work factors are associated with workplace activity limitations in systemic lupus erythematosus. *Rheumatology*, *53*, 2044–2052. doi:10.1093/rheumatology/keu242

Allen, S., & Carlson, G. (2003). To conceal or disclose a disabling condition? A dilemma of employment transition. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*, *19*, 19–30.

Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 U.S.C. § 12101 *et seq*. (1990).

Baldridge, D. C. (2001). *The everyday ADA: The influence of requesters' assessments on decisions to ask for needed accommodation* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (No. 304689979)

Baldridge, D. C., & Swift, M. L. (2013). Withholding requests for disability accommodation: The role of individual differences and disability attributes. *Journal of Management*, *39*, 743–762. doi:10.1177/0149206310396375

Baldridge, D. C., & Veiga, J. F. (2006). The impact of anticipated social consequences on recurring disability accommodation requests. *Journal of Management*, *32*, 158–179. doi:10.1177/0149206305277800

Bishop, S. R., Lau, M., Shapiro, S., Carlson, L., Anderson, N. D., Carmody, J., . . . Devins, G. (2004). Mindfulness: A proposed operational definition. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice*, *11*, 230–241. doi:10.1093/clipsy/bph077

Brault, M. W. (2012). *Americans with disabilities: 2010—Household economic studies* (Current population reports). Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau.

Brown, K. W. (n.d.). *Mindful Attention Awareness Scale (MAAS)* (Trait version). Retrieved from http://www.kirkwarrenbrown.vcu.edu/resources

Brown, K. W., & Ryan, R. M. (2003). The benefits of being present: Mindfulness and its role in psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *84*, 822–848.

Chatzisarantis, N. L. D., & Hagger, M. S. (2007). Mindfulness and the Intention-behavior relationship within the theory of planned behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *33*, 663–676. doi:10.1177/0146167206297401

Chirikos, T. N. (1999). Will the costs of accommodating workers with disabilities remain low? *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, *17*, 93–106.

Crosgrove, D. M., Fink, L. S., Dillion, A., & Wedding, D. K. (2015). The Americans With Disabilities Act, telecommuting, and reasonable accommodations. *Journal of Leadership, Accountability and Ethics*, *12*(3), 42–50.

Dane, E., & Brummel, B. J. (2013). Examining workplace mindfulness and its relations to job performance and turnover intention. *Human Relations*, *67*, 105–128. doi:10.1177/0018726713487753

DeCarlo, L. T. (1997). On the meaning and use of kurtosis. *Psychological Methods*, *2*, 292–307.

de Jong, A., Hommes, M., Brouwers, A., & Tomic, W. (2013). Effects of mindfulness-based stress reduction course on stress, mindfulness, job self-efficacy and motivation among unemployed people. *Australian Journal of Career Development*, *22*, 51–62. doi:10.1177/1038416213486095

Dell Orto, A. E., & Power, P. W. (Eds.). (2007). *The psychological and social impact of illness and disability*. New York, NY: Springer.

Dodeen, H. M. (2003). Effectiveness of valid mean substitution in treating missing data in attitude assessment. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *28*, 505–513. doi:10.1080/02602930301674

Dong, S. (2011). *Impact of self-efficacy, outcome expectations and affect on requesting job accommodations among individuals with disabilities* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (No. 3495374)

Erickson, W. A., von Schrader, S., Bruyère, S. M., & VanLooy, S. A. (2014). The employment environment: Employer perspectives, policies, and practices regarding the employment of persons with disabilities. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin*, *57*, 195–208. doi:10.1177/0034355213509841

Erisman, S. M., & Roemer, L. (2010). A preliminary investigation of the effects of experimentally induced mindfulness on emotional responding to film clips. *Emotion*, *10*, 72–82.

Fabian, E. S. (2000). Social cognitive theory of careers and individuals with serious mental health disorders: Implications for psychiatric rehabilitation programs. *Psychiatric Rehabilitation Journal*, *23*, 262–269.

Fesko, S. L. (2001). Workplace experiences of individuals who are HIV+ and individuals with cancer. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin*, *45*, 2–11.

Florey, A. T. (1998). *Decision to make an accommodation request: Theory and evidence from the perspective of employees with disabilities* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (No. 9921872)

Frank, J. J., & Bellini, J. (2005). Barriers to the accommodation request process of the Americans With Disabilities Act. *The Journal of Rehabilitation*, *71*, 28–39.

Friedman, S. (1993). Accommodation issues in the work place for people with disabilities: A needs assessment in an educational setting. *Disability, Handicap & Society*, *8*, 3–23.

Garland, E. L., Geschwind, N., Peeters, F., & Wichers, M. (2015). Mindfulness training promotes upward spirals of positive affect and cognition: Multilevel and autoregressive latent trajectory modeling analyses. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *6*, Article 15. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00015

Gates, L. B. (2000). Workplace accommodation as a social process. *Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation*, *10*, 85–98.

Gignac, M. A. M., Cao, X., & McAlpine, J. (2015). Availability, need for, and use of work accommodations and benefits: Are they related to employment outcomes in people with arthritis? *Arthritis Care & Research*, *67*, 855–864. doi:10.1002/acr.22508

Greason, P. B., & Cashwell, C. S. (2009). Mindfulness and counseling self-efficacy: The mediating role of attention and empathy. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *49*, 2–19. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.2009.tb00083.x

Hogan, A., Kyaw-Myint, S. M., Harris, D., & Denronden, H. (2012). Workforce participation barriers for people with disability. *International Journal of Disability Management*, *7*, 1–9. doi:10.1017/idm.2012.1

Hopkins, K. D., & Weeks, D. L. (1990). Tests for normality and measures of skewness and kurtosis: Their place in research reporting. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *50*, 717–729.

Imparato, A. J., Houtenville, A. J., & Shaffert, R. L. (2010). *Increasing the employment rate of people with disabilities*. Retrieved from http://www.bos.frb.org/commdev/cdevfin-disability-market/63-imparato-houtenville-shaffert.pdf

Jans, L. H., Kaye, H. S., & Jones, E. C. (2012). Getting hired: Successfully employed people with disabilities offer advice on disclosure, interviewing, and job search. *Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation*, *22*, 155–165. doi:10.1007/s10926-011-9336-y

Karoly, P., & Ruehlman, L. S. (1995). Goal cognition and its clinical implications: Development and preliminary validation of four motivational assessment instruments. *Assessment*, *2*, 113–129.

Lee, F. (1997). When the going gets tough, do the tough ask for help? Help-seeking and power motivation in organizations. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *72*, 336–363.

Lent, R. W., Brown, S. D., & Hackett, G. (1994). Toward a unifying social cognitive theory of career and academic interest, choice, and performance. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *45*, 79–122.

Linn, M. W., Sandifer, R., & Stein, S. (1985). Effects of unemployment on mental and physical health. *American Journal of Public Health*, *75*, 502–506.

McDowell, C., & Fossey, E. (2015). Workplace accommodations for people with mental illness: A scoping review. *Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation*, *25*, 197–206. doi:10.1007/s10926-014-9512-y

McMahon, B., Wehman, P., Brooke, V., Habeck, R., Green, H., & Fraser, R. (2004). *Business, disability and employment: Corporate models of success. A collection of successful approaches reported from 20 employers*. Richmond: Virginia Commonwealth University, Rehabilitation Research and Training Center on Workplace Supports & Job Retention.

Miller, C. K., Kristeller, J. L., Headings, A., & Nagaraja, H. (2014). Comparison of a mindful eating intervention to a diabetes self-management intervention among adults with type 2 diabetes: A randomized controlled trial. *Health Education & Behavior*, *41*, 145–154. doi:10.1177/1090198113493092

Miller, M. B. (n.d.). *The reasonable accommodation process: A 10-point checklist*. Retrieved from http://www.millerlaw-group.com/publications/articles/The%20Reasonable%20Accomodation%20Process.pdf

Nadler, A., Ellis, S., & Bar, I. (2003). To seek or not to seek: The relationship between help seeking and job performance evaluations as moderated by task-relevant expertise. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *33*, 91–109.

Rumrill, P. D. (1993). *Increasing the frequency of accommodation requests among persons with multiple sclerosis: A demonstration of the progressive request model* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (No. 9434924)

Rumrill, P. D., Roessler, R. T., Battersby-Longden, J. C., & Schuyler, B. R. (1998). Situational assessment of the accommodation needs of employees who are visually impaired. *Journal of Visual Impairment & Blindness*, *92*, 42–54.

Shapiro, S. L., Oman, D., Thoresen, C. E., Plante, T. G., & Flinders, T. (2008). Cultivating mindfulness: Effects on well-being. *The Journal of Clinical Psychology*, *64*, 840–862. doi:10.1002/jclp.20491

Snippe, E., Schroevers, M. J., Tovote, A., Sanderman, R., Emmelkamp, P. M. G., & Fleer, J. (2015). Patients' outcome expectations matter in psychological interventions for patients with diabetes and comorbid depressive symptoms. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, *39*, 307–317. doi:10.1007/s10608-014-9667-z

Turner, J. B., & Turner, R. J. (2004). Physical disability, unemployment, and mental health. *Rehabilitation Psychology*, *49*, 241–249. doi:10.1037/0090-5550.49.3.241

U.S. Census Bureau. (2012). *Nearly 1 in 5 people have a disability in the U.S., Census Bureau reports*. Retrieved from https://www.census.gov/newsroom/releases/archives/miscellaneous/cb12-134.html

U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. (2015). *Disability discrimination & reasonable accommodation*. Retrieved from http://www.eeoc.gov/laws/types/disability.cfm

Watson, D., Clark, L. A., & Tellegan, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *54*, 1063–1070.

Wei, M., Tsai, P. C., Lannin, D. G., Du, Y., & Tucker, J. R. (2015). Mindfulness, psychological flexibility, and counseling self-efficacy: Hindering self-focused attention as a mediator. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *43*, 39–63. doi:10.1177/0011000014560173

West, S. L., Rumrill, P. D., Roessler, R. T., McMahon, B. T., Hurley, J., Carlson, L., & Chan, F. (2008). ADA Title I allegations related to reasonable accommodations: Characteristics of charging parties. *The Rehabilitation Professional*, *16*, 195–209.

Wright, C. J., & Schutte, N. S. (2014). The relationship between greater mindfulness and less subjective experience of chronic pain: Mediating functions of pain management self-efficacy and emotional intelligence. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, *66*, 181–186. doi:10.1111/ajpy.12041