



ELSEVIER

Disponible en ligne sur [www.sciencedirect.com](http://www.sciencedirect.com)

ScienceDirect

et également disponible sur [www.em-consulte.com](http://www.em-consulte.com)



Research Paper

# Labour market inclusion of young people with mental health problems in Norway

## *L'insertion sur le marché du travail de jeunes adultes présentant des troubles psychiques en Norvège*

Vegar Bjørnshagen\*, Elisabeth Ugreninov

Norwegian Social Research, Oslo Metropolitan University, Pb. 4St. Olavs plass, 0130 Oslo, Norway



### INFO ARTICLE

*Historique de l'article :*

Reçu le 27 juin 2019

Accepté le 16 juin 2020

Disponible sur Internet le 6 July 2020

*Keywords :*

Disability

Mental health

Recruitment

Inclusion policy

Employment

### ABSTRACT

People with mental health problems face barriers to labour market inclusion. In this study, we investigate the extent to which employers are attentive and willing to include young people with mental health problems. The study contributes to existing knowledge by exploring contextual factors that shape employers' hiring behaviour. The findings show that taking on a social responsibility to contribute to an inclusive working life (as indicated by having entered the Norwegian Inclusive Working Life Agreement) and the degree to which recruitment practices are formalised (as indicated by labour market sector) is positively associated with enterprises' inclusiveness towards young people with mental health problems. However, the general tendency is that few enterprises focus on including young people with mental health problems. Likewise, only a few enterprises would invite a qualified applicant with such problems to a job interview. Thus, our study supports research suggesting that employer reluctance towards hiring persons with mental health problems contributes to the latter's labour market disadvantages.

© 2020 Les Auteurs. Publié par Elsevier Masson SAS au nom de Association ALTER. Cet article est publié en Open Access sous licence CC BY-NC-ND (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

\* Corresponding author.

Adresses e-mail : [vegar.bjornshagen@oslomet.no](mailto:vegar.bjornshagen@oslomet.no) (V. Bjørnshagen), [elisabeth.ugreninov@oslomet.no](mailto:elisabeth.ugreninov@oslomet.no) (E. Ugreninov).

## R É S U M É

---

*Mots clés :*

Handicap  
Santé mentale  
Recrutement  
Politique d'inclusion  
Emploi

Les personnes présentant des troubles psychiques rencontrent des difficultés à s'insérer sur le marché du travail. Dans cette étude, nous évaluons dans quelle mesure les employeurs se préoccupent de l'accès des jeunes adultes qui présentent des troubles psychiques au travail salarié. Nous mettons l'emphase notamment sur les facteurs contextuels qui influencent les jugements et les comportements des employeurs durant le processus de l'embauche. Les résultats montrent que l'adhésion à l'Accord Norvégien sur la Vie Professionnelle Inclusive et le degré de formalisation des procédures d'embauche vont de pair avec l'adoption de mesures inclusives en matière de recrutement de jeunes adultes qui présentent des troubles psychiques. Cependant, malgré cet accord, peu d'entreprises norvégiennes embauchent de jeunes adultes ainsi classés. De même, seul un petit nombre d'entreprises invitent à un entretien d'embauche un candidat qualifié présentant ces troubles. Notre étude concorde ainsi avec les recherches suggérant que les réticences ou les préjugés des employeurs au recrutement des personnes avec des troubles psychiques contribuent à leurs difficultés sur le marché du travail.

© 2020 Les Auteurs. Publié par Elsevier Masson SAS au nom de Association ALTER. Cet article est publié en Open Access sous licence CC BY-NC-ND (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

---

## 1. Introduction

A 2011 meta-analysis estimates that every year, 38.2% of the European population has a diagnosable mental disorder (Wittchen et al., 2011). Mental health problems have a negative impact on labour market participation (Frijters, Johnston, & Shields, 2010). Some studies suggest that individuals with psychological disabilities have the lowest probability of being employed compared with people with other types of disabilities (e.g., Boman, Kjellberg, Danermark, & Boman, 2015). Research indicates that employers' reluctance to hire someone with mental health problems contributes to these disparities (Stuart, 2006).

Many studies have documented the mental health benefits of employment (van der Noordt, Ijzelenberg, Droomers, & Proper, 2014) and, conversely, the negative effects of unemployment on mental health (Paul & Moser, 2009; van der Noordt et al., 2014). Young people with mental health problems are at particular risk of marginalisation and unemployment; therefore, they have been the target of recent employment strategies in Norway and in other countries (Eurofund, 2012; Halvorsen & Hvinden, 2018). Despite controlling access to employment opportunities, the extent to which employers are willing to include young persons with mental health problems is not well understood.

A main objective of Norwegian labour market and welfare policies has been to promote an inclusive working life. In 2001, the Norwegian government and the social partners (i.e., employer organisations and trade unions) signed the Inclusive Working Life Agreement (*IA-avtalen* or the IA Agreement). The IA Agreement was an appeal to employers to take on a greater social responsibility, in part by including disabled people in the labour market, in exchange for economic and advisory support to attain its goals. However, the employment rate of disabled people has not increased since the agreement was introduced (Tøssebro & Wik, 2015). Recent statistics show that only 44% of disabled people are employed compared with 74% of the general population (AKU, 2018). In the absence of results, the

second objective, namely, increasing the employment rate of disabled people, was removed in the 2019 amendment to the IA Agreement.<sup>1</sup>

In this article, we investigate whether employers are willing to provide employment opportunities for young people with mental health problems. To do so, we use data on 1501 Norwegian enterprises, collected from a survey conducted in 2017. Since signing the IA Agreement was voluntary, we distinguish between enterprises according to whether or not they have entered the IA Agreement as an indication of taking on a social responsibility to employ disabled people. Moreover, because differences in formal rules and procedures between public and private sector employment processes might influence employers' decision-making, we further differentiate the enterprises according to the labour market sector. Thus, we distinguish among three types of Norwegian enterprises: *public IA* (all public enterprises in the dataset have signed the IA Agreement, reflecting that the majority of public enterprises were IA enterprises, see e.g., Mastekaasa, 2016), *private IA* and *private non-IA enterprises* (those that did not sign the IA Agreement). By examining contextual factors that might be of importance for the labour market inclusion of people with mental health problems, the study is relevant for the further development of employer-targeted policies aimed at securing employment for groups that face barriers in accessing the labour market.

## 2. Theoretical perspectives

From the employers' perspective, hiring is characterised by uncertainty resulting from the limited information they have about the job applicants; thus, it is a process that is associated with risk (Stinchcombe, 1990). According to theories of statistical discrimination, employers use observable group characteristics as indicative of an individual applicant's productivity (Arrow, 1973; Phelps, 1972). To reduce risk, employers may be reluctant to hire applicants whose productivity they are uncertain about, such as applicants who disclose mental health problems. Thus, statistical discrimination is made more likely due to the uncertainty employers express about hiring disabled people (Schur et al., 2017).

Employers report concerns about disabled people's performance, productivity and accommodation costs (Burke et al., 2013; Kaye, Jans, & Jones, 2011; Lengnick-Hall, Gaunt, & Kulkarni, 2008). Several studies show that mental disabilities are viewed more negatively than physical disabilities in terms of performance expectations, employability and hiring decisions, indicating that productivity concerns might be particularly salient in employers' evaluations of applicants with mental health problems (Brohan et al., 2012; Ren, Paetzold, & Colella, 2008). Furthermore, research has documented negative stereotypes, stigma and prejudice towards disabled people among employers (Burke et al., 2013; Scheid, 2005), indicating that multiple factors may negatively affect their hiring preferences. By contrast, company size and prior experience in employing disabled people generally, as well as persons with mental health problems specifically, have been identified as factors that positively influence employers' attitudes and hiring behaviour (Brohan et al., 2012; Fraser, Ajzen, Johnson, Hebert, & Chan, 2011; Ju, Roberts, & Zhang, 2013).

Whether individual-level factors, such as stereotypes, productivity concerns and risk aversion are translated into discriminatory behaviour is likely to depend on the contexts in which employers make hiring decisions (Midtbøen, 2015; Reskin, 2003). A debate in the discrimination literature concerns the degree to which formalisation of recruitment procedures can reduce labour market inequality (Bielby, 2000; Pager & Shepherd, 2008; Reskin, 2003). Given that formalised recruitment practices require that employers make decisions based on relevant, objective criteria, such practices should reduce the scope for individual discretion and, consequently, the influence of irrelevant criteria, such as disability status, on hiring decisions. Moreover, Bielby (2000) and Reskin (2003) emphasise that reduction of discrimination also necessitates transparency and mechanisms for holding decision makers accountable for their decisions, including the process and the criteria that they have applied (see also Kalev, Dobbin, & Kelly, 2006; Reskin, 2000). However, evidence also indicates that increased bureaucratisation does

<sup>1</sup> After the second objective of the IA Agreement was removed, the Inclusion Dugnad (*Inkluderingsdugnaden* in Norwegian) represents the main national public initiative that encourages employers to include disabled people in the labour market.

not always reduce discrimination and that formalisation in some contexts may have negative consequences (Jewson & Mason, 1986). Therefore, whether and under which circumstances formalised procedures limit discrimination is still an open question.

The theoretical perspectives on discrimination and the mechanisms aimed at minimising its impact presuppose to some extent that employers will discriminate if they are able to do so. By contrast, other perspectives consider employers that take more proactive measures and implement policies aimed at facilitating labour market inclusion. Such initiatives and activities that ‘appear to further some social good, beyond the interests of the firm and that which is required by law’ (McWilliams & Siegel, 2001: 117) have been conceptualised as corporate social responsibility (CSR). While constituting a field of research, CSR is also an essential part of business language and practice. Despite the numerous definitions and interpretations of CSR, a consensus among different perspectives is that it entails businesses’ environmental and social awareness and concerns (Dahlsrud, 2008; McWilliams, Siegel, & Wright, 2006). According to Fasciglione (2015), the hiring of disabled people is increasingly being recognised as part of the CSR philosophy (see also Markel & Barclay, 2009; Thuesen, Holt, Jensen, & Thomsen, 2010).

### 3. Norwegian context

Some contextual factors may be particularly relevant for explaining potential variations in Norwegian employers’ willingness to include people with mental health problems. In this study, we focus on the social responsibility to which Norwegian enterprises commit by entering the IA Agreement and the differences in the formalisation of employment procedures in the Norwegian private and public sectors.

#### 3.1. Inclusive working life agreement

Based on the tradition of tripartite cooperation between the Norwegian government and the social partners, the Letter of Intent regarding a more inclusive working life was introduced in 2001. Until 2019, it was voluntary for enterprises to sign the IA Agreement. The 2019–2022 IA Agreement covers Norwegian working life in general, without distinguishing between IA and non-IA enterprises. The 2019 amendment to the IA Agreement also excludes the objective of increasing the employment rate of disabled people, which has been one of the main objectives in the agreement. The 2014–2018 IA Agreement required IA enterprises to make systematic efforts to implement three national objectives:

- reduce the sick leave rate;
- prevent the withdrawal and increase the employment of disabled people (with a targeted focus on young people);
- raise the average age of people leaving the labour force.<sup>2</sup>

To achieve the goal of increasing the employment rate of disabled people, IA enterprises received certain advantages in terms of access to advisory services and financial support, including wage and accommodation subsidies and supported employment practices, through the regional Norwegian Labour and Welfare Administration (NAV) offices. Nonetheless, previous research suggests that employers have been more committed to reducing sick leave rates and making accommodations for their current employees rather than increasing the employment rate of disabled people (Ose et al., 2009, 2013).

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.regjeringen.no/globalassets/departementene/asd/dokumenter/2016/ia-agreement.-2014.18.pdf>.

### 3.2. Public versus private hiring processes

In Norway, the Working Environment Act<sup>3</sup> prohibits discrimination based on various grounds, including disability (regulated by the Equality and Anti-Discrimination Act since 2018<sup>4</sup>, previously by the Anti-Discrimination and Accessibility Act<sup>5</sup> enacted in 2008). The requirements of the anti-discrimination legislation apply to all aspects of the hiring process. Besides the requirements of the Working Environment Act and the anti-discrimination legislation that apply to businesses in both the private and the public sectors, there are no direct formal requirements on employment procedures and outcomes in the private sector. By contrast, employment procedures in the public sector are subject to additional regulations, such as those stipulated by the Civil Service Act<sup>6</sup> (Statsansatteloven<sup>7</sup> as of July 2017) and the Public Administration Act.<sup>8</sup> In public employment processes, employers are required to publicly advertise all job vacancies, which must also be reported to the NAV. After the closing date of each advertisement, the list of all applicants should be made public as soon as possible.

However, the central factor in public hiring processes is that employers must follow the *qualification principle*. This means that given the qualifications stated in the advertisement, the most qualified applicant based on his or her educational attainment and other formal credentials, work experience and personal suitability must be hired. To comply with the qualification principle, the recruitment process in the public sector consists of two steps.<sup>9</sup> First, a nominating committee evaluates the applicants based on an assessment of the job description, the job applications, the interviews and the control of references before recommending the most qualified candidates for the position. Second, an appointment committee makes the employment decision based on the nominating committee's recommendation. When the appointment committee has made its decision, all applicants shall be informed of the decision as soon as possible. Moreover, applicants who believe themselves to have been passed over may demand to be informed in writing by the employer of the education, work experience and other qualifications of the person appointed. Thus, the employer has a duty to provide information and must be able to document the process and the grounds underlying the hiring decision. In sum, public employment procedures are characterised as more formalised and transparent than those in the private sector.

## 4. Hypotheses

The topic of this study pertains to companies' social responsibility in terms of their inclusiveness towards persons with mental health problems. Norwegian enterprises commit to including disabled people by entering the IA Agreement. However, the IA Agreement consists of several operative goals and it is not evident that entering the agreement implies a commitment to implementing all of its objectives (cf. Ose et al., 2013). It is also possible that entering the IA Agreement is more about constructing a public impression of taking action rather than solving actual problems (Bredgaard, 2004; Mandal & Ose, 2015). However, Mandal and Ose (2015) argue that this description is likely inaccurate for IA enterprises because signing the IA Agreement is voluntary, indicating that those that did sign it were probably motivated to contribute to inclusive employment. Moreover, a higher proportion of IA enterprises report that they have disabled employees and specific objectives to increase the recruitment of disabled people compared with enterprises that have not entered the IA Agreement (Svalund & Skog Hansen, 2013). Hence, we formulate our first hypothesis:

**H<sub>1</sub>.** IA enterprises will be more attentive to labour market inclusion of young people with mental health problems compared with non-IA enterprises.

<sup>3</sup> <https://lovdata.no/dokument/NLE/lov/2005-06-17-62>.

<sup>4</sup> <https://lovdata.no/dokument/NLE/lov/2017-06-16-51>.

<sup>5</sup> <https://lovdata.no/dokument/LTI/lov/2008-06-20-42>.

<sup>6</sup> <https://lovdata.no/dokument/NLO/lov/1983-03-04-3>.

<sup>7</sup> <https://lovdata.no/dokument/NL/lov/2017-06-16-67>.

<sup>8</sup> <https://lovdata.no/dokument/NLE/lov/1967-02-10>.

<sup>9</sup> There are certain adjustments in the two-step procedure for state employees based on the legislative amendment in July 2017 (Statsansatteloven).

Further, we assume that the preceding reasoning also applies to the enterprises' recruitment practices. Thus, our second hypothesis is as follows:

**H<sub>2</sub>.** IA enterprises will be more willing to invite qualified applicants with mental health problems to a job interview compared with non-IA enterprises.

Furthermore, we expect differences in inclusiveness between enterprises in the public and in the private sector. In Norway, as well as in other countries, there is an expectation that the public sector should "lead the way" in the inclusion of marginalised groups (Midtbøen & Rogstad, 2012). The majority of Norwegian public enterprises had entered the IA Agreement (e.g., Mastekaasa, 2016) and public sector employers might feel that they have a higher-than-average social responsibility to employ disabled people (Andreassen, 2012; Holt, 1998). Furthermore, while few Norwegian employers report that they are focused on recruiting disabled people and exerting efforts in this regard, it is more common among public than private employers (Svalund & Skog Hansen, 2013).

Notwithstanding the potential differences in social responsibility, the public sector has been viewed as the model for fair employment because it more commonly follows formalised recruitment procedures compared with the private sector (Byron, 2010). Field experiments have documented more discrimination in the private sector than in the public sector (Zschirnt & Ruedin, 2016). The assumption that such differences are due to formalisation of employment procedures is supported by qualitative interviews with employers (Midtbøen, 2015). Conversely, there will be greater scope for making discretionary decisions when recruitment occurs under less formalised conditions that are more common in the private sector. Nevertheless, formal recruitment procedures may be insufficient in securing fairness in employment. For instance, public employment processes involve assessments of 'personal suitability', which is a subjective and discretionary criterion that is difficult to verify. In a 2010 survey, one-fifth of Norwegian public employers reported that 'personal suitability' was the most important criterion they applied when hiring (Tronstad, 2010). Thus, employers in both labour market sectors might discriminate against persons with mental health problems, for instance, because they are uncertain about their productivity. However, competition and profit maximisation possibly intensify such discrimination in the private sector (Byron, 2010; Krupa, Kirsh, Cockburn, & Gewurtz, 2009). Thus, because public enterprises, in addition to taking on a social responsibility by entering the IA Agreement, are subject to recruitment procedures that are comparatively characterised by formalisation and accountability structures, we expect them to be more inclusive than private enterprises. Hence, our third hypothesis is as follows:

**H<sub>3</sub>.** Public enterprises will be more willing to invite qualified applicants with mental health problems to a job interview compared with private enterprises.

## 5. Data, measurement and method

We used data on 1501 Norwegian enterprises collected from a survey conducted from 13 September to 15 October 2017. The purpose of the survey was to obtain information on attitudes and practices towards the inclusion and recruitment of young people with mental health problems. Interviews with the enterprises' general, human resources (HR) or personnel managers were conducted by telephone. A random selection of enterprises, none of which had less than five employees, under the six industries/sectors<sup>10</sup> in which most young people in Norway work<sup>11</sup> ensured a representative sample of the enterprises that usually employ the group of interest. After adjusting for non-response due to lack of contact and enterprises outside the target group, the sample consisted of 4316 enterprises, among which 2815 refused to participate. Representatives from the remaining 1501 enterprises were interviewed, corresponding to a response rate of 34.7%. Non-response bias is a concern due to the low response rate. However, there is a high degree of correspondence between the optimal selection

<sup>10</sup> The included industries/sectors were (1) manufacturing, (2) construction, (3) domestic trade, (4) accommodation and food service, (5) human health and social work (excluding kindergarten) and (6) kindergarten.

<sup>11</sup> <https://www.ssb.no/en/statbank/table/09315/>.

of enterprises under the chosen industries/sectors and the obtained distribution of the enterprises in this sample (Appendix A). Still, there could be differences in other unobserved characteristics that are relevant to enterprises' inclusiveness towards young people with mental health problems. We, therefore, interpret the results from the following analyses with caution.

We used measures of the enterprises' focus on the inclusion of young people with mental health problems and their willingness to invite such candidates to a job interview as our two dependent variables. The first measure was based on this question: 'To what extent is the enterprise focused on including young people with mental health problems?'<sup>12</sup> The question had the following response options: 'to a large extent', 'to some extent', 'to a small extent', 'not at all' and 'do not know'. Moreover, the question was preceded by information about how work inclusion has received increased attention in recent decades and that through the IA Agreement, the government and the social partners work towards a more inclusive working life. In other words, 'inclusion' was not defined in the survey but may have been interpreted as referring to whether inclusion of young people with mental health problems specifically is an objective of the enterprise's policies or strategies. The second measure was based on the question that asked the respondents to consider how likely it would be for them to invite an applicant possessing the qualifications indicated on the job advertisement to a job interview if he or she noted a period, as indicated in his or her CV [curriculum vitae], when he or she was not working or studying due to prior mental health problems.<sup>13</sup> The question had the following response options: 'very likely', 'moderately likely', 'less likely' and 'not likely'.

The dependent variables were organised as dummies, so the 'to a large extent' and the 'very likely' responses were coded as 1 (else = 0). Focusing on the most affirming response options might enable us to distinguish the respondents in enterprises that would actually include young people with mental health problems in the labour market from those whose answers might be motivated by social desirability or acquiescence (i.e., answering 'to some extent' and 'moderately likely').

Our main interest was to explore how the combinations of committing to social responsibility by signing the IA Agreement and different levels of formalised employment procedures as indicated by labour market sector would be associated with enterprises' focus on the inclusion of young people with mental health problems and willingness to invite such candidates to a job interview.

The information on whether an enterprise had entered the IA Agreement was initially a dichotomous variable, so IA enterprises and non-IA enterprises were coded as 1 or 0, respectively. The sector variable was also dichotomous, so private and public enterprises were coded as 1 and 0, respectively. Based on these variables, we constructed three dummies:

- public IA enterprises;
- private IA enterprises;
- private non-IA enterprises.

We included several control variables, which were assumed to influence employers' hiring preferences:

- absence, accommodation and performance expectations;
- experience;
- company size..

The respondents were asked to consider statements pertaining to the uncertainty employers express about employing disabled people. This included questions about the extent to which an applicant between 18 and 30 years old who specified in the job application that he or she has had mental health problems would:

<sup>12</sup> *I hvilken grad er virksomheten opptatt av å inkludere unge med psykiske helseproblemer?* in Norwegian.

<sup>13</sup> *Hvis du får en jobbsøker med kvalifikasjonene som etterspørres i en utlysning, hvor sannsynlig er det at denne jobbsøkeren blir innkalt til intervju hvis personen har følgende? Hull i CVen med en forklaring om at dette skyldes tidligere psykiske helseproblemer* in Norwegian.



- ‘have more work absence than other employees’;
- ‘have extra need for accommodation’;
- ‘perform the job satisfactorily’.

The questions had the following response options: ‘to a large extent’, ‘to some extent’, ‘to a small extent’, ‘not at all’ and ‘do not know’. The variables were recoded as dummy variables, so the ‘to a large extent’ response to the first and the third questions and the ‘not at all’ response to the second question were coded as 1 (else = 0). Similar to the operationalisation of the dependent variables, we used the extreme response categories to ensure that we focused on the respondents who expressed clear expectations towards potential employees with mental health problems.

The variable that measured whether the enterprise had experience in hiring persons with mental health problems originated from this question: ‘Over the past two years, has the enterprise employed young persons under the age of 30 with mental health problems?’ The variable was recoded into a dichotomous variable (‘yes’ = 1; ‘no’, ‘do not know’ = 0).

Company size was organised as a continuous variable. The enterprises with five employees were coded as 0, those with six employees were coded as 1 and so on. A second polynomial of company size was included. We also conducted separate analyses, with company size included as dummy variables, operationalised as follows: ‘5–9’, ‘10–19’, ‘20–49’ and ‘50 and above’ employees. The results are available on request.

Given the dichotomous nature of the outcomes of interest (1 or 0), we estimated logistic regression models. The model is provided by the following equation:

$$\ln[p/(1-p)] = \alpha + \beta \text{Enterprise\_type}_{ij} + x\lambda$$

The dependent variables, denoted by  $p$ , indicate the probability of reporting that the enterprise is attentive to including young people with mental health problems and that they would invite a qualified candidate from this group to a job interview. The subscript  $i$  refers to IA enterprises,  $j$  signifies the sector (public = 1),  $x$  is a vector of the control variables (expectations, experience and company size),  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are regression coefficients and  $\lambda$  is a vector of the coefficients. The results are presented as odds ratios (OR) that measure the association between explanatory and outcome variables. An OR represents the odds that an outcome will occur, given a particular characteristic, compared with the odds of the outcome’s occurrence in the absence of that characteristic. An OR greater than one represents higher odds of the outcome’s occurrence. Conversely, an OR smaller than one signifies lower odds. We report robust standard errors, which are preferable when using cross-sectional data where heteroscedasticity is the norm (White, 1980). Measures of model fit are less reliable in logistic regression than in linear regression analysis and explained variance is generally low in logistic regression. However, we report goodness-of-fit in terms of Pseudo  $R^2$ .

It is important to point out that the data and the method used do not allow any identification of causal effects and that various selection effects may influence the results. The most obvious selection effect may be that employers that are more inclusive of people with mental health problems are selected into both the public sector and the private IA enterprises. Furthermore, enterprises’ experience in hiring people with mental health problems may be correlated with the employers’ general inclusiveness. In the analyses, only employers who are *aware* of having employed a young person with mental health challenges are represented as having such an experience. People with invisible disabilities such as mental health problems can choose whether and when to disclose such information to their employers (Lindsay, Cagliostro, & Carafa, 2018; Norstedt, 2019; Prince, 2017). The employers who report that they have hired someone with mental health problems are possibly more preoccupied with creating an inclusive working environment, which is an important factor for disclosure. The results, therefore, need to be interpreted with caution.

## 6. Results

Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics on all the variables used in the logistic regression analyses by type of enterprise: public IA enterprises (column 1), private IA enterprises (column 2) and private



**Table 1**

Descriptive statistics for dependent and independent variables by enterprise type. Percent.

	Public IA enterprises	Private IA enterprises	Private non-IA enterprises
Focus on including young people with mental health problems	16	17	10
Invite qualified job applicant with mental health problems to job interview	31	28	27
Expectations concerning potential employees with mental health problems			
Higher levels of absence from work	8	16	17
Need more accommodation	10	16	17
Does not perform the job satisfactorily	3	8	7
Experience			
Have hired a young person w/mental health problems (last two years)	17	19	17
Company size			
Number of employees (mean)	45	36	24
Total (n)	334	373	794

non-IA enterprises (column 3). Generally, only a minority of the enterprises are attentive to inclusion of young people with mental health problems. However, both types of IA enterprises tend to be more focused on including this group (16% of public IA and 17% of private IA enterprises) compared with private non-IA enterprises (10%). Three out of ten enterprises would invite a qualified applicant with mental health problems to a job interview. In terms of the willingness to do so, there are no clear differences among the three types of enterprises. However, public IA enterprises report slightly more often that they would invite a candidate with mental health problems (31%) compared with private IA (28%) and non-IA enterprises (27%).

Regarding work expectations of employees with mental health problems, clear differences exist between respondents in public and private enterprises. The percentage of private companies reporting that such an applicant would have higher levels of absence from work compared with other employees is approximately twice as high as that of public enterprises (16–17% versus 8%). The respondents from private enterprises also more often report the belief that people with mental health problems have an extra need for accommodation (16% of private IA and 17% of private non-IA enterprises) compared with the respondents from public enterprises (10%). Few respondents answer that people with mental health problems would not perform the job satisfactorily, but there are differences between public (3%) and private (IA: 8%, non-IA: 9%) enterprises. Concerning company size, the mean number of employees is highest in public enterprises (45), lower in private IA enterprises (36) and lowest in private non-IA enterprises (24).

The results of two separate logistic regressions are reported in their respective columns in [Table 2](#). Column 1 presents the results of the analysis testing the first hypothesis ( $H_1$ ) by measuring the association between the types of enterprises and having a focus on including young people with mental health problems, including the control variables.

As shown in column 1 ([Table 2](#)), the coefficients for private and public IA enterprises are both positively associated with reporting that the enterprise is attentive to inclusion of young people with mental health problems. If we turn to the coefficients for the variables that are used to measure employers' expectations of potential employees with mental health problems, only the coefficient for absence from work is statistically significant and negative. This finding shows that a respondent who answers that a potential employee with mental health problems will have higher rates of absence from work than other employees is less likely to regard the enterprise as being attentive to inclusion of young people with mental health problems. The dummy variable for having an experience in hiring young people with mental health problems over the last two years is positively associated with reporting that the enterprise has a focus on including this group. Column 1 also shows that the coefficient for company size is not statistically significant. Overall, the results presented in column 1 support our first

**Table 2**

Logistic regression. Column 1: focus on inclusion of young people with mental health problems. Column 2: willingness to invite a candidate with mental health problems to a job interview. OR, robust standard errors in parentheses.

	Column 1		Column 2	
	Focus on inclusion		Willingness to invite	
Enterprise type (IA Agreement/sector)				
Private non-IA enterprises	ref.		ref.	
Private IA enterprises	1.81 (0.335)	**	1.17 (0.177)	
Public IA enterprises	1.65 (0.335)	*	1.39 (0.220)	*
Expectations concerning potential employees w/mental health problems				
Higher levels of absence from work	0.57 (0.152)	*	0.45 (0.102)	***
Need more accommodation	1.04 (0.245)		1.01 (0.192)	
Does not perform the job satisfactorily	0.76 (0.281)		0.79 (0.223)	
Experience				
Have hired young persons with mental health problems	2.16 (0.385)	***	1.74 (0.264)	***
Company size				
Number of employees	1.00 (0.002)		1.00 (0.002)	
Number of employees (squared)	1.00(3.53e-06)		1.00(2.94e-06)	
Constant	0.11 (0.148)	***	0.263 (0.280)	***
Pseudo R2	0.0330		0.0244	

\*\*\*  $p < 0.001$ .

\*\*  $p < 0.01$ .

\*  $p < 0.05$

hypothesis that IA enterprises will be more attentive to the inclusion of young people with mental health problems compared with non-IA enterprises.

Column 2 (Table 2) presents the results of the analysis testing the second ( $H_2$ ) and the third hypotheses ( $H_3$ ) by measuring the association between the types of enterprises and their willingness to invite a qualified applicant with mental health problems to a job interview, including the control variables.

Column 2 shows a positive coefficient for public IA enterprises, indicating their higher probability of reporting that they would invite a qualified candidate with mental health problems to a job interview compared with private non-IA enterprises. There is no statistically significant difference between private enterprises, regardless of whether they have signed the IA Agreement, in reporting that they would invite a qualified applicant with mental health problems to a job interview. Further tests show no difference between public and private IA enterprises in their willingness to invite such a candidate (the results are available on request). Moreover, column 2 shows a negative association between expecting a potential employee with mental health problems to have higher rates of work absence than other employees and being likely to invite a qualified candidate with mental health problems to a job interview. The coefficients for the other control variables measuring accommodation and performance expectations are not statistically significant. Column 2 also shows that the coefficient for having hired a person with mental health problems over the last two years is positively associated with reporting that the enterprise would invite a qualified applicant with mental health problems to a job interview. The results presented in column 2 do not support the second and the third hypotheses. Regarding the willingness to invite a qualified candidate with mental health problems to a job interview, the only statistically significant difference is between private non-IA and public IA enterprises. Private IA enterprises did not differ from the other two types of enterprises in this regard.

## 7. Discussion

In this study, we have examined the extent to which employers are attentive and willing to include young people with mental health problems in the labour market. To investigate this, we distinguished between enterprises according to contextual factors relevant to employers' inclusiveness towards persons with mental health problems, that is, having assumed social responsibility to contribute to an inclusive working life and the degree to which recruitment practices are formalised.

We found that both public and private IA enterprises are more likely to focus on the inclusion of young people with mental health problems than non-IA enterprises. This indicates that entering the IA Agreement reflects an actual commitment to taking social responsibility for the labour market inclusion of disabled people. Nonetheless, the IA Agreement has been unsuccessful in increasing the employment rate of disabled people in Norway; our results support the assumption that this objective has not been prioritised (Ose et al., 2013). Despite the differences between IA and non-IA enterprises, the general tendency is that few enterprises are attentive to the inclusion of young people with mental health problems. Furthermore, the negative association between expecting higher levels of work absence and inclusiveness towards young people with mental health problems, is consistent with studies showing that concerns about health-related absence is a barrier to the employment of disabled people (Burke et al., 2013). Indeed, it has been proposed that the IA Agreement's objective of reducing sick leave may have acted as a disincentive to hiring disabled people if employers expect that their health-related absence will be higher (Arnardóttir, Hotvedt, Nousiainen, & Ventegodt, 2018).

Contrary to our expectations, we found that while public enterprises are more willing to invite a candidate with mental health problems to a job interview than private non-IA enterprises, private IA enterprises do not differ from the other two types of enterprises in this regard. There may be several explanations for the difference between public enterprises and private non-IA enterprises. For instance, it might reflect individual-level differences between employers in the two types of enterprises. Compared to private employers, public employers express less concern about factors that are central to statistical discrimination theories, of which only beliefs about work absence were associated with a reduced willingness to invite the hypothetical applicant to an interview. Moreover, employers might also differ in their 'distaste' (Becker, 1957) for persons with mental health problems, which could be connected to their beliefs in various ways. Our data do not allow us to investigate such variations. In general, employers' motivations to discriminate are difficult to measure<sup>14</sup> and, thus, to control for (Reskin, 2003).

Turning now to contextual factors, public IA enterprises might be more willing to invite an applicant with mental health problems to a job interview because they take a greater social responsibility to include disabled people and because they follow formal rules and procedures in recruitment. This interpretation is consistent with the expectation that the public sector should 'lead the way' in creating an inclusive working life and with research suggesting that the public sector is more socially responsible than the private sector (Holt, 1998). Moreover, formal rules in the public sector require that employers base their hiring decisions on objective criteria, i.e., on qualifications, and not on irrelevant characteristics such as mental health problems. Thus, it is possible that because Norwegian public employers must adhere to the qualification principle when hiring, they are more willing to invite the hypothetical applicant to a job interview because he or she is qualified for the advertised position. By contrast, employers in private non-IA enterprises may be more prone to act on the uncertainty associated with hiring persons with mental health problems because formalised procedures do not restrict them from doing so, which increases the scope for discretionary decisions and, thus, for discrimination (cf. Midtbøen, 2015). To the extent that this explains the observed difference between public enterprises and private non-IA enterprises, our findings support the idea that formal and transparent recruitment procedures reduce the probability of discriminatory outcomes (Bielby, 2000; Reskin, 2003). In line with this, the intermediate position of private IA enterprises might suggest a more heterogeneous organisation of employment procedures when it comes to formalisation.

Having discussed the statistically significant difference between public IA and private non-IA enterprises, the difference might nevertheless be considered substantially insignificant. Overall, the differences between the enterprises are small and few would invite a qualified applicant with mental health problems to a job interview. This confirms previous research findings that employers are generally reluctant towards persons with such problems (Stuart, 2006). Moreover, the fact that only about 30% of public enterprises would invite the hypothetical applicant to a job interview suggests that

---

<sup>14</sup> For instance, theories of implicit prejudice and forms of bias that operate without individuals' conscious awareness but influence their behaviour contrast the notion that cognition, affect and behaviour are guided solely by explicit beliefs and conscious intentions to act (Greenwald & Krieger, 2006).

the formalised recruitment procedures do not completely eliminate bias in the employers' decision-making (cf. Jewson & Mason, 1986). Despite the qualification principle's emphasis on education and work experience, the less verifiable 'personal suitability' criterion leaves room for discretion and might become more salient when public employers evaluate candidates that they are uncertain about, such as someone with mental health problems.

As mentioned earlier, prior studies have reported a relationship between company size and the extent to which enterprises are inclusive towards and recruit disabled people (Burke et al., 2013; Ju et al., 2013), as well as people with mental health problems in particular (Brohan et al., 2012; Shankar et al., 2014). That we found no such association in the present study was, therefore, somewhat unexpected (but see Mandal & Ose, 2015 for similar results in a study of Norwegian IA enterprises). On the other hand, the positive association between experience with hiring persons with mental health problems and reporting that the enterprise is attentive to inclusion and that they would invite a qualified candidate from this group to a job interview is consistent with previous research (e.g., Brohan et al., 2012; Gustafsson, Peralta, & Danermark, 2014). The finding resonates with studies showing that direct contact with someone with mental health problems is associated with lower levels of stigma and prejudice (Pescosolido, 2013). Furthermore, research indicates that employers who have experience in hiring disabled people are less uncertain about their work capacity and health-related absence (Svalund & Skog Hansen, 2013). As discussed, however, unless employees disclose their mental health problems, which often also presuppose that enterprises are attentive to creating an inclusive working environment, employers will most likely be unaware of having hired someone with such problems (Lindsay et al., 2018; Prince, 2017). Nonetheless, the association between experience and inclusiveness towards young people with mental health problems suggests potential positive effects of the initial employment of persons with such problems (cf. Gustafsson et al., 2014). If such experiences reduce employers' uncertainty about the productivity of persons with mental health problems, it will likely increase their employment opportunities.

### 7.1. Limitations

A limitation of this study is the survey's low response rate. This might have biased the estimations of the enterprises' focus on inclusion and willingness to invite applicants with mental health problems to a job interview. However, based on similar results in research on Norwegian employers and employment of disabled people more generally (e.g., Svalund & Skog Hansen, 2013), we do not believe that the study participants were more negative concerning labour market inclusion than those who refused to participate. Instead, since we rely on general, HR or personnel managers' self-reported perceptions of their respective enterprises as focusing on inclusion and evaluations on whether they would invite an applicant with mental health problems to an interview, social desirability bias might be an issue. Studies indicate that employers' expressed willingness to invite disabled applicants exceeds actual hiring (Burke et al., 2013). Thus, the rate at which the applicant would be invited to job interviews in actual hiring processes might be lower. By using the most affirming response options, we may nevertheless have reduced some of the effect of social desirability on the estimates.

The survey did not include any examples or definition of 'mental health problems.' Studies show that different diagnostic labels are accompanied by different beliefs and levels of stigmatising reactions (Sadler, Meagor, & Kaye, 2012). Thus, the meanings the respondents have associated with 'mental health problems' might have affected their answers in various ways. If so, this would likely have affected their expectations concerning an employee with mental health problems, which we have controlled for. Moreover, referring to mental ill-health as 'mental health problems' is common and, in the present study, we were interested in the respondents' evaluations based on this specific label.

Another aspect to consider is the measure of enterprises' willingness to invite an applicant with mental health problems to a job interview. The measure is based on a question that asks respondents to consider an applicant that discloses such problems to explain an unemployment period. Thus, it is impossible to distinguish whether the respondents may have reacted negatively to the unemployment period or the mental health problems or both. To partly clarify how the respondents evaluated applicants with mental health problems specifically, we conducted the same analysis using a similar question as the basis for the dependent variable but where the applicant does not explain the

unemployment period. The results show no differences among the three types of enterprises, indicating that mental health problems independently contribute to how applicants are evaluated (Appendix B). Furthermore, the measure we used is valid in representing a realistic scenario for persons with mental health problems, as this sometimes involves non-participation in the labour force.

Finally, although we distinguished between the private and the public sector, the employment rates of disabled people vary within parts of the two sectors (Andreassen, 2012). While we could not conduct heterogeneity analyses by industry or occupation with sufficient statistical power, studies suggest that for persons with mental health problems, the differences could be associated with industry variations in employer concerns about hiring persons with such problems (Brohan et al., 2012).

Setting these limitations aside, the study supports research indicating that persons with mental health problems are particularly disadvantaged in the labour market (e.g., Boman et al., 2015; Ren et al., 2008; Stuart, 2006).

## 8. Conclusion

In this study, we have examined employers' inclusiveness towards young people with mental health problems. The findings add to the literature suggesting that employer reluctance towards persons with mental health problems is a barrier to their labour market inclusion. The study contributes to existing knowledge by exploring contextual factors that might mitigate the effects of employer uncertainty. While taking a social responsibility to create an inclusive working life seems to matter in terms of whether enterprises have a focus on including young people with mental health problems, few are attentive to the inclusion of this group. Furthermore, the small differences between the enterprises' willingness to invite a qualified applicant with mental health problems to a job interview are insufficient grounds from which to conclude whether or not formalised recruitment procedures might increase the employment opportunities of persons who disclose such problems. Future research could further investigate such contextual factors that are likely to shape employers' hiring assessments concerning persons with mental health problems by observing actual hiring processes and more directly measure the degree to which they are formalised.

## Disclosure of interest

The authors declare that they have no competing interest.

## Acknowledgements

The authors acknowledge financial support from the The Research Council of Norway, grant number 273745. An earlier version of the article was presented at an expert workshop with participants from organisations for disabled people, employee organisations and trade unions. 18 June 2019. We would like to thank the workshop participants for their valuable comments.

## Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary data associated with this article can be found, in the online version, at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.alter.2020.06.014>.

## Références

- AKU. (2018). *Disabled people, Labour force survey, 2nd quarter 2018*. (Retrieved from <http://www.ssb.no/akutu/>)
- Andreassen, T. A. (2012). Disability as an asset? Reflections on employment patterns in the health and social care sector. *Disability Studies Quarterly*, 32(3) <http://dx.doi.org/10.18061/dsq.v32i3.3278>
- Arnardóttir, O. M., Hotvedt, M. J., Nousiainen, K., & Ventegodt, M. (2018). Nordic disability employment laws and policies in a human rights perspective. In R. Halvorsen, & B. Hvinden (Eds.), *Youth, diversity and employment* (pp. 150–177). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Arrow, K. J. (1973). *The theory of discrimination*. In O. Ashenfelter, & A. Rees (Eds.), *Discrimination in labor markets* (pp. 15–42). Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Becker, G. (1957). *The economics of discrimination*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Bielby, W. T. (2000). Minimizing workplace gender and racial bias. *Contemporary Sociology*, 29(1), 120–129.
- Boman, T., Kjellberg, A., Danermark, B., & Boman, E. (2015). Employment opportunities for persons with different types of disability. *Alter*, 9(2), 116–129.
- Bredgaard, T. (2004). Corporate social responsibility between public policy and enterprise policy. *Transfer: European Review of Labour and Research*, 10(3), 372–392.
- Brohan, E., Henderson, C., Wheat, K., Malcolm, E., Clement, S., Barley, E. A., et al. (2012). Systematic review of beliefs, behaviours and influencing factors associated with disclosure of a mental health problem in the workplace. *BMC Psychiatry*, 12(1), 11.
- Burke, J., Bezyak, J., Fraser, R. T., Pete, J., Ditchman, N., & Chan, F. (2013). Employers' attitudes towards hiring and retaining people with disabilities: A review of the literature. *The Australian Journal of Rehabilitation Counselling*, 19(1), 21–38.
- Byron, R. A. (2010). Discrimination, complexity, and the public/private sector question. *Work and Occupations*, 37(4), 435–475.
- Dahlsrud, A. (2008). How corporate social responsibility is defined: An analysis of 37 definitions. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 15(1), 1–13.
- Eurofund. (2012). *Active inclusion of young people with disabilities or health problems*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
- Fasciglione, M. (2015). Corporate social responsibility and the right to employment of persons with disabilities. In V. Della Fina, & R. Cera (Eds.), *Protecting the rights of people with autism in the fields of education and employment: International, European and national perspectives* (pp. 171–193). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Fraser, R., Ajzen, I., Johnson, K., Hebert, J., & Chan, F. (2011). Understanding employers' hiring intention in relation to qualified workers with disabilities. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*, 35(1), 1–11.
- Frijters, P., Johnston, D. W., & Shields, M. A. (2010). *Mental health and labour market participation: Evidence from IV Panel Data Models*. IZA Discussion Paper No. 4883.
- Greenwald, A. G., & Krieger, L. H. (2006). Implicit bias: Scientific foundations. *California Law Review*, 94(4), 945–967.
- Gustafsson, J., Peralta, J. P., & Danermark, B. (2014). The employer's perspective: Employment of people with disabilities in wage subsidized employments. *Scandinavian Journal of Disability Research*, 16(3), 249–266.
- Halvorsen, R., & Hvinden, B. (2018). *Youth, diversity and employment*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Holt, H. (1998). *En kortlægning af danske virksomheders sociale ansvar*. Copenhagen: The Danish National Institute of Social Research.
- Jewson, N., & Mason, D. (1986). Modes of discrimination in the recruitment process: Formalisation, fairness and efficiency. *Sociology*, 20(1), 43–63.
- Ju, S., Roberts, E., & Zhang, D. (2013). Employer attitudes toward workers with disabilities: A review of research in the past decade. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*, 38(2), 113–123.
- Kalev, A., Dobbin, F., & Kelly, E. (2006). Best practices or best guesses? Assessing the efficacy of corporate affirmative action and diversity policies. *American Sociological Review*, 71(4), 589–617.
- Kaye, H. S., Jans, L. H., & Jones, E. C. (2011). Why don't employers hire and retain workers with disabilities? *Journal of occupational rehabilitation*, 21(4), 526–536.
- Krupa, T., Kirsh, B., Cockburn, L., & Gewurtz, R. (2009). Understanding the stigma of mental illness in employment. *Work*, 33, 413–425.
- Lengnick-Hall, M. L., Gaunt, P. M., & Kulkarni, M. (2008). Overlooked and underutilized: People with disabilities are an untapped human resource. *Human Resource Management*, 47(2), 255–273.
- Lindsay, S., Cagliostro, E., & Carafa, G. (2018). A systematic review of workplace disclosure and accommodation requests among youth and young adults with disabilities. *Disability and Rehabilitation*, 40(25), 2971–2986.
- Mandal, R., & Ose, S. O. (2015). Social responsibility at company level and inclusion of disabled persons: The case of Norway. *Scandinavian Journal of Disability Research*, 17(2), 167–187.
- Markel, K. S., & Barclay, L. A. (2009). Addressing the underemployment of persons with disabilities: Recommendations for expanding organizational social responsibility. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 21(4), 305–318.
- Mastekaasa, A. (2016). Sykefravær i offentlig og privat sektor. *Søkelys på arbeidslivet*, 33(4), 311–326.
- McWilliams, A., & Siegel, D. (2001). Corporate social responsibility: A theory of the firm perspective. *The Academy of Management Review*, 26(1), 117–127.
- McWilliams, A., Siegel, D. S., & Wright, P. M. (2006). Corporate social responsibility: Strategic implications. *Journal of Management Studies*, 43(1), 1–18.
- Midtbøen, A. H. (2015). The context of employment discrimination: Interpreting the findings of a field experiment. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 66(1), 193–214.
- Midtbøen, A.H., & Rogstad, J. (2012). Diskriminerings omfang og årsaker. Oslo, Institutt for samfunnsforskning.
- Norstedt, M. (2019). Work and invisible disabilities: Practices, experiences and understandings of (non)disclosure. *Scandinavian Journal of Disability Research*, 21(1), 14–24.
- Ose, S. O., Bjerkan, A. M., Pettersen, I., Hem, K.-G., Johnsen, A., Lippestad, J., et al. (2009). *Evaluering av IA-avtalen (2001–2009)*. Trondheim, Norway: SINTEF Teknologi og samfunn.
- Ose, S. O., Dyrstad, K., Slettebak, R., Lippestad, J., Mandal, R., Brattlid, I., et al. (2013). *Rapport: Evaluering av IA-avtalen (2010–2013)*. Trondheim, Norway: SINTEF Teknologi og samfunn.
- Pager, D., & Shepherd, H. (2008). The sociology of discrimination: Racial discrimination in employment, housing, credit, and consumer markets. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 34(1), 181–209.
- Paul, K. I., & Moser, K. (2009). Unemployment impairs mental health: Meta-analyses. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 74(3), 264–282.
- Pescosolido, B. A. (2013). The public stigma of mental illness: What do we think; what do we know; what can we prove? *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 54(1), 1–21.
- Phelps, E. (1972). The statistical theory of racism and sexism. *American Economic Review*, 62(4), 659–661.
- Prince, M. J. (2017). Persons with invisible disabilities and workplace accommodation: Findings from a scoping literature review. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*, 46(1), 75–86.
- Ren, L. R., Paetzold, R. L., & Colella, A. (2008). A meta-analysis of experimental studies on the effects of disability on human resource judgments. *Human Resource Management Review*, 18(3), 191–203.



- Reskin, B. F. (2000). The proximate causes of employment discrimination. *Contemporary Sociology*, 29(2), 319–328.
- Reskin, B. F. (2003). Including mechanisms in our models of ascriptive inequality. *American Sociological Review*, 68(1), 1–21.
- Sadler, M. S., Meagor, E. L., & Kaye, K. E. (2012). Stereotypes of mental disorders differ in competence and warmth. *Social Science & Medicine*, 74(6), 915–922.
- Scheid, T. L. (2005). Stigma as a barrier to employment: Mental disability and the Americans with Disabilities Act. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, 28(6), 670–690.
- Schur, L., Han, K., Kim, A., Ameri, M., Blanck, P., & Kruse, D. (2017). Disability at work: A look back and forward. *Journal of occupational rehabilitation*, 27(4), 482–497.
- Shankar, J., Liu, L., Nicholas, D., Warren, S., Lai, D., Tan, S., et al. (2014). Employers' perspectives on hiring and accommodating workers with mental illness. *SAGE Open*, 4(3) (2158244014547880).
- Stinchcombe, A. L. (1990). *Information and organizations*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Stuart, H. (2006). Mental illness and employment discrimination. *Current Opinion in Psychiatry*, 19(5), 522–526.
- Svalund, J., & Skog Hansen, I. L. (2013). *Inkludering av personer med nedsatt funksjonsevne i arbeidslivet [Inclusion of persons with disabilities in working life]*.
- Thuesen, F., Holt, H., Jensen, S., & Thomsen, L. B. (2010). *Virksomheders sociale engagement. Årbog 2010*. Copenhagen: The Danish National Centre for Social Research.
- Tronstad, K. R. (2010). *Mangfold og likestilling i arbeidslivet (Fafo-rapport 2010:39)*. Oslo: Fafo.
- Tøssebro, J., & Wik, S. E. (2015). *Funksjonshemmedes tilknytning til arbeidslivet: En kunnskapsoversikt*. Oslo: Norges forskningsråd.
- van der Noordt, M., Ijzelenberg, H., Droomers, M., & Proper, K. I. (2014). Health effects of employment: A systematic review of prospective studies. *Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 71(10), 730.
- White, H. (1980). A heteroskedasticity-consistent covariance matrix estimator and a direct test for heteroskedasticity. *Econometrica*, 48(4), 817–838.
- Wittchen, H. U., Jacobi, F., Rehm, J., Gustavsson, A., Svensson, M., Jönsson, B., et al. (2011). The size and burden of mental disorders and other disorders of the brain in Europe 2010. *European Neuropsychopharmacology*, 21(9), 655–679.
- Zschirnt, E., & Ruedin, D. (2016). Ethnic discrimination in hiring decisions: A meta-analysis of correspondence tests 1990–2015. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 42(7), 1115–1134.