

The New Inclusive Economy: Literature Review

Contents

Contents	2
Introduction	3
Key terms	4
Roadmap	6
Context	7
Looking at the New Inclusive Economy with an un-siloed lens	7
Current responses to structural barriers to employment	8
Disability exclusion in the workplace	9
Structural barriers that exist outside of employment settings	10
More structural barriers: economic and cultural	11
Some policy responses	13
Positionality - Seeing outside the silos	14
Tla'amin teachings about disability and the economy	14
A diverse economies framework: shedding new light	16
Changing the narrative	18
Employer attitudes and perceptions	18
Non-standard employment	19
Redefining success	20
A detour	22
Experiments in structural change <i>within</i> employment settings	22
Inclusive design	22
Being clear about values	24
Workplace policies	26
Inclusive participation at every level	27
Organizational structure: Spotlight on the social economy	28
Conclusion	31
What is known	31
What we hope to learn	32
Next steps	32
References	33

Note: Helpful tips for employers appear in green font, throughout. (In the audio version, they will be indicated with a sound effect).

Introduction

The purpose of the *New Inclusive Economy* project is to investigate inclusive employment conditions and economic models that show promise in increasing workforce participation across sectors by people with disabilities or other barriers to employment. We will then offer evidence-based recommendations that employers can learn from to address structural barriers in their own environments - contributing to collective movement towards the New Inclusive Economy.

In addition to standard employment settings, we are strategically including in our inquiry innovations and models that might be seen as ‘alternative.’ This is due to evidence that the dominant system is exclusive *by design* (as outlined in the section entitled *Disability exclusion in the workplace*).¹

Beginning with employment that is *already* addressing structural barriers that lead to exclusion from the labour force, we can reveal powerful lessons so that other employers can learn from them and feel empowered to address these challenges. We are interested in nuance, complexity, and depth of learning over large numbers.

The research question guiding this process is: **What are the enabling structural conditions that create meaningful employment for people with disabilities and other barriers to employment? How can these be amplified and mobilized in other employment settings?**

Over the course of two years, the research will explore:

- **Examples** of increased labour market participation by people with disabilities and high barriers to employment;
- **Conditions** conducive to employment, including accessibility and accommodations;
- **Economic models** that demonstrate equity, sustainability, and inclusion;
- **Alternative approaches** to business that center the social benefits of inclusion and equity in the labour market while increasing economic benefits;
- **Supports and Barriers** that increase or decrease labour market participation by people with disabilities and those with barriers to employment.

The first step of the project is to review the current body of literature in order to see a) what is already known about this topic, and b) what we still want to find out through the research.

¹ Grills et al, 2016

Key terms

Some key terms to help orient us to the material include:

Capitalism: Capitalism is “an economic system in which most businesses and the means of production are privately owned and operated for profit.”²

Disability: A social model of disability says that people are disabled by barriers in society, not by their impairment or difference. There is no single definition of disability – there are functional, legal, and subjective definitions.³

The Accessible Canada Act defines disability as “any impairment, including a physical, mental, intellectual, cognitive, learning, communication or sensory impairment — or a functional limitation — whether permanent, temporary or episodic in nature, or evident or not, that, in interaction with a barrier, *hinders a person’s full and equal participation in society.*”⁴

For the purposes of this project, we will use the social model of disability: the experience that results when persons with impairment or a functional limitation encounter attitudes or environments that hinder their full participation in society on an equal basis with others.⁵

Demand-side: Demand-side factors include “socio-political and labour market context and employers’ motivations for hiring.”⁶ In this project, the demand-side refers to employers. (To date, most inclusive employment initiatives have focussed on addressing barriers to employment on the supply side: potential employees.)

Economy: The word ‘economy’ comes from the Greek *oikos*, which means household, combined with *nomos*, which means rules or norms. Thus, *economy* refers to the “art of household management.”⁷ However, the economy is now understood and examined largely in terms of financial growth, as a result of a set of international rules outlined in the United Nations System of Accounts.⁸ This renders other important economic and socially useful activities – such as unpaid household or subsistence labour - invisible.

In this review we highlight diverse economic models as a reminder that the dominant economic structure is one possibility among many that have been used through time and in different places, and it can continue to change in response to the needs of the people.⁹

Employment: Employment is usually understood as the condition of having paid work. *Access* to fairly paid employment is considered a human right according to the UN Declaration on the

² Hinton & Maclurcan, 2017

³ Gronvik, 2009

⁴ Government of Canada, 2019

⁵ Bachrach, 2015

⁶ Lindsay et al, 2019, p. 142

⁷ Raworth, 2017, p. 4.

⁸ Waring, 2018

⁹ Waring, 2018

Rights of Persons with Disabilities.¹⁰ It is worth noting that monetary exchange alone does not ensure equitable employment conditions. What is valuable will vary for different people: pay, enjoyment, purpose, autonomy, choice, and other characteristics are worth considering. In this research we are looking at meaningful employment as different for everyone and defined by the individual.¹¹

Inclusion: Social inclusion is multi-dimensional, and doesn't look the same for everyone. It can be defined as the interaction between two major life domains: interpersonal relationships and community participation.¹² Flexibility and choice are important elements of inclusion. Inclusion in meaningful employment for our purposes could be defined as having equal access to employment opportunities without additional burden of risk or disclosure.

Inclusive Design: The terms Universal, Equity-centered,¹³ Inclusive,¹⁴ and Accessible Design¹⁵ are commonly used, with similar meanings. The movement intends to design “the world with and for people with disabilities’ different capabilities.”¹⁶ Inclusive design is also based on the principle that all people are included in decision-making at all stages.

Inclusive economy: There are studies that define inclusive capitalism¹⁷ and inclusive growth,¹⁸ but a ready definition of ‘inclusive economy’ is not yet available. For our purpose we speak of inclusive economy as one in which everyone has opportunity to participate, benefit, and design, and in which profit or other motives do not take precedence over inclusive participation.

Occupational justice: An occupational justice perspective recognizes that everyone has the right to work, regardless of “age, ability, gender, social class, or other differences” and that this right is limited for some people due to existing “social structures.”¹⁹

Positionality: Positionality refers to how differences in social position and power shape identities and access in society. Our identities “are shaped by socially constructed positions and memberships to which we belong.”²⁰ Positionality is intersectional. This means “inequities are never the result of single, distinct factors”²¹ but are “embedded in society.”²²

Social determinants of health: Social determinants of health include such things as: income and social status, employment and working conditions, education and literacy, childhood

¹⁰ Grills et al, 2016; see also Schmid, 2018

¹¹ Gibson-Graham, Cameron, & Healy, 2013; Gibson et al, 2018

¹² Simplican et al, 2014

¹³ Education First, n.d.

¹⁴ Holmes, 2018

¹⁵ Treviranus, 2014

¹⁶ Luck, 2018, p. 98

¹⁷ Borko, 2016

¹⁸ Pavlova, 2018

¹⁹ Nillson & Townsend, 2014, p. 65

²⁰ Misawa, 2010, p. 26

²¹ Hankivsky, 2014, p. 2

²² Misawa, 2010, p. 26

experiences, physical environments, social supports and coping skills, healthy behaviours, access to health services, biology and genetic endowment, gender, culture, and race/racism.²³ *Access to land is also a determinant of health, which is often overlooked but increasingly highlighted by Indigenous and other scholars.*²⁴ The Government of Canada states that determinants of health are the broad range of personal, social, economic and environmental factors that determine individual and population health.”

Structural conditions: In relation to employment, they can be conditions in which a) the employment setting is embedded (ie. employment setting is accessible by public transit), or b) the conditions created within the employment setting (ie. emotionally safe work environment). Structural conditions are the specific ways political, cultural, social, material, and economic systems are organized. The term ‘social structure’ is sometimes used to describe the way social institutions are created and work together to create a stable society.²⁵

Work: Work includes all the things people do to contribute to their families, their communities, the ecosystem, and themselves. When work is only understood as only something we do for money, it overlooks the vital uncompensated labour that holds up community economies (such as volunteer, household, and other forms of work). This tends to make the contributions of certain groups of people invisible - including people marginalized from formal workplaces on the basis of gender, ethnicity, or ability.²⁶

Roadmap

We begin with the *Context* in which we undertake this research, as well as suggestions for how to engage with this report.

Under the heading *Disability exclusion in the workplace*, we outline how the barriers to employment currently faced by people with disabilities (PWD), impact them on many levels. We look at new legislation and policies that are emerging in BC and elsewhere to support accessibility. Critical disability scholars remind us that rather than (only) seeking inclusion in existing social systems, we might also seek to alter social systems to be more equitable in themselves.²⁷

In the next section, *Positionality – seeing outside the silos*, we learn from Tla’amin writers²⁸ and from global economic geographers.²⁹ Their writing shows us how looking closely at the activities of particular groups of people in certain places and times can highlight important elements sometimes obscured when we view employment in a silo. We then look at how

²³ Government of Canada, 2020

²⁴ de Leeuw, 2015; Waring, 2018

²⁵ Britannica, 2022

²⁶ Waring, 2018

²⁷ Adam, 2018; Rajarshi Mukhopadhyay, 2015

²⁸ Paul, 2014; Washington, 2004

²⁹ Gibson-Graham et al, 2013; Gibson-Graham et al, 2019

thinking about work and disability differently can expand the realm of possibility when it comes to identifying promising practices for inclusive employment.

The section entitled *Changing the Narrative* about disability and employment enables us to see the ways PWD are engaged in meaningful work *already*, and the ways PWD and others who are systematically excluded have found alternative methods of engaging in the economy that create new possibilities for everyone and for the workplace in general. Not only does this section debunk myths, but it allows us to see how conceptual and structural changes can pave the way for a new inclusive economy.

From there, we move to the very concrete ways employers are already taking it upon themselves to enact some of these changes. In the section called *Experiments in structural change within employment settings*, we highlight some promising practices that emerge from the literature. Examples include: inclusive design, centering values, internal workplace policies, inclusive participation at every level, and an organizational structure that aligns with these commitments.

In the *Conclusion*, we outline some of the gaps in the literature, and how they might guide us in our next steps. The intention of this literature review is to expand our understanding of what is possible when it comes to the New Inclusive Economy.

Context

Looking at the New Inclusive Economy with an un-siloed lens

Approaching conversations about inclusive employment by refocusing our understanding of what disability, employment, work, and economies *are and can be* is a helpful starting place. This invites researchers, employers, and others to recognize potential biases and allow for critical and creative thinking about inclusion. Businesses that do so - intentionally or not - also serve to create valuable disruptions in the larger context of oppressive systems in which they operate and can inspire or carve a new way forward.³⁰

It is the responsibility of those currently benefiting to alter the imposed system that privileges them.³¹ Meaningfully addressing workplace inclusion requires a dramatic altering of existing power dynamics. Supply-side solutions are not enough, if we are not also actively and collectively addressing the “socio-political and labour market context” in which employment takes place.³² This requires the active participation of people who are currently often excluded from the conversation and is precisely why new efforts towards accessibility and inclusion – including but not limited to the Accessible British Columbia Act – are so necessary at this time.³³

³⁰ Roth, 2019; see also Solid State Community Industries, n.d.

³¹ Roth, 2019, p. 311

³² Lindsay et al, 2019, p. 142

³³ Government of British Columbia, 2021

This project bridges two bodies of knowledge and practice that have previously not been in dialogue with one another: a) diverse economies and b) disability inclusion.

Current responses to structural barriers to employment

While the pandemic reminds us all of the precariousness of life, wellbeing, and (un)employment, these experiences are felt more heavily by people who are *already* marginalized by current systems.³⁴ This is in part due to the cumulative and “psychological impacts of oppression.”³⁵

The COVID-19 pandemic has mainstreamed conversations about employee rights and mental health. Many people are experiencing declining mental health due to the unstable nature of life and employment. This speaks to the fact that ableness itself comes and goes and societies/economies need to be responsive to fluid and intersectional vulnerabilities.³⁶ All workers can benefit from flexibility in the workplace.³⁷ Pointing to the structural inequities that persist, work-from-home options not previously readily available to PWD have been normalized during the pandemic. Recruitment and retention are challenges that emerged in force during the pandemic and are likely to remain with us.³⁸ The response to these challenges requires us to think about how to best support and nurture our human resources, and to (re)think the values and priorities upon which the entire economy is based.³⁹

The world is currently in the midst of a significant experiment in relation to occupational justice, due to the COVID-19 pandemic. While the COVID-19 crisis itself is expected to be time-limited, it has created an opportunity to consider how collaboration can help us “in addressing other challenges of a more enduring nature,”⁴⁰ making us more resilient in the face of new challenges. “In the COVID-19 environment, savvy employers will utilize UD [universal, or inclusive design] to strengthen the ability of all employees to continue to carry on business as usual in anything but usual times.”⁴¹ Tips on how to learn through this and create more inclusive employment environments can be found in the ‘Inclusive Design’ section, below.

System-level responses to the pandemic suggest that instead of trying to “build back better” we could “build back fairer”⁴² by normalizing a system that addresses “ongoing and structural strains toward building ‘everyday resilience’”.⁴³ This can be pursued with a human

³⁴ Sheppard-Jones, 2020

³⁵ Bates et al, 2017, p.160

³⁶ Kuran et al, 2020

³⁷ Child, 2021; Hick & Murphy, 2020; Larue, 2021; Stuart, Spencer, McLachlan, & Forde, 2021

³⁸ Child, 2021; Hick & Murphy, 2020; Larue, 2021; Stuart, Spencer, McLachlan, & Forde, 2021

³⁹ Government of British Columbia, 2022; Larue, 2021

⁴⁰ Child, 2020, p. 118

⁴¹ Sheppard-Joens, 2020, p. 76

⁴² Jesus et al, 2021, p. 12

⁴³ Jesus et al, 2021, p. 12

rights approach, grounded in a commitment to equity-centered design as well as social and occupational justice perspectives.⁴⁴

Disability exclusion in the workplace

The current, dominant economic system systematically excludes people with disabilities from equitable participation in employment.⁴⁵ Unemployment and lack of access to meaningful work remains a reality the world over,⁴⁶ despite the *United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities* having been signed by 164 countries.⁴⁷ In 2017, “employment rates (including both full- and part-time employment) for approximately 6 million Canadians aged 15 and over who have one or more disabilities [was] 59% compared to an 80% employment rate for those without disabilities.”⁴⁸ High unemployment rates for people with disabilities are observed worldwide.⁴⁹

According to one study, people for whom the disability onset was later in life, and people with physical limitations or multiple limitations, are the *least* likely to be working.⁵⁰ In Canada, as many as 40% of disabilities are invisible, and as our population ages, the number of workers and job seekers with invisible disabilities will continue to grow.⁵¹ People with intellectual disabilities face the greatest barriers to employment.⁵² “As of March 31, 2019, only 24.2% of individuals supported by Community Living BC (CLBC) reported some employment earnings, with 82% of these reporting earnings below \$10,000 a year,”⁵³ despite the fact that research shows workers with intellectual disabilities are typically reliable and capable.⁵⁴ Inclusive workplaces also demonstrate other benefits including low turn-over among staff, profitability, and productivity⁵⁵ as well as higher morale, positive workplace culture, and improved corporate culture overall.⁵⁶

⁴⁴ Jesus et al, 2021; Nilsson & Townsend, 2014; Sheppard-Jones et al, 2020

⁴⁵ Grills et al, 2016

⁴⁶ Grills et al, 2016, p. 338; United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, 2022

⁴⁷ Meltzer, Robinson, & Fisher, 2019; Murfitt, Crosbie, Zammit, & Williams, 2018

⁴⁸ Gupta, Sukhai, & Wittich, 2021, p. 2; see also Prince, 2014 and Prince, 2017

⁴⁹ Baker et al, 2018; Berry & Kymar, 2018; Ferrucchi, 2014; Ramachandra et al, 2017; Mactaggart et al, 2018; Meltzer et al, 2019; Park et al, 2016; Prince, 2017

⁵⁰ Mactaggart et al, 2018

⁵¹ Prince, 2017

⁵² Ramachandra et al, 2017

⁵³ Hole, Reid, and Mudde, 2022, p. 2

⁵⁴ Backrach, 2015

⁵⁵ Backrach, 2015

⁵⁶ Buettgen & Klassen 2020; inclusion Powell River Society, 2021

Structural barriers that exist outside of employment settings

There are proven links between poverty and disability the world over.⁵⁷ The relationship between poverty and disability is described as cyclical: people who live in poverty often experience many forms of exclusion (from health care and education, for instance) as well as high exposure to risk factors (including trauma, poor nutrition, isolation, or mistreatment), which can increase the risk of some disabilities. Conversely, people with disabilities are more likely to be restricted from livelihood opportunities (such as education, work, and social connectedness) which can be a sentence to lifelong poverty. All of this is “shown to negatively impact on psychosocial wellbeing, identity and social inclusion.”⁵⁸ Specific population groups who experience the burden of systemic inequities due to gender, race, ethnicity, age, or socioeconomic status also experience some disabilities at a higher rate. These “systemic inequities (ie. lack of access to healthcare, poor nutrition, housing issues, violence, exposure to environmental hazards) intensify negative health outcomes for [people] with disabilities, and in some cases are causing secondary conditions.”⁵⁹ All of these contribute to the exclusion of people with disabilities from the workforce.

To state more plainly, the major barriers to workforce participation for people with disabilities (PWD) are the compounding effects of exclusion or oppression - not their disabilities. This requires systemic and structural responses, not just individual accommodations, and in more than just the workplace.⁶⁰

“Nearly half of all discrimination complaints in Canada are about disability”⁶¹ and “more than 40% of disability-related complaints were in the area of employment in most jurisdictions.”⁶² Discrimination is identified as a major barrier in many other countries too.⁶³ People in Italy with disabilities state they experience discrimination in their job searches (40.6%) and in the workplace (38%).⁶⁴ An Australian study highlights barriers to *finding* work (such as narrow, dismissive, and discouraging attitudes of both employment support workers and potential employers) and barriers to *maintaining* work (including both subtle and overt discrimination).⁶⁵

The impacts of this are also compounding: Many people with disabilities also experience depression or other mental health challenges. Being wrongfully dismissed, passed over for jobs or promotions, or otherwise discriminated against in the workforce leads to higher rates of depression, suicidality, and family trauma. These barriers also lead to many people simply not

⁵⁷ Mactaggart et al, 2018

⁵⁸ Mactaggart et al, 2018, p. 2

⁵⁹ Sheppard-Jones, 2021, p. 72

⁶⁰ Meltzer et al, 2019

⁶¹ Canadian Human Rights Commission, n.d, p. 1

⁶² Canadian Human Rights Commission, n.d., p. 27

⁶³ Crawford, 2011

⁶⁴ Ferrucci, 2014

⁶⁵ Meltzer et al, 2019

applying to work in a system that repeatedly and actively excludes or mistreats them.⁶⁶ “This structural inequality, which begins in the classroom and continues in the boardroom,” has become a reality to which many people are indifferent, but to which PWDs have been forced to adapt.⁶⁷

More structural barriers: economic and cultural

It is important to make explicit the connection between strategic colonial nation-building and the deliberate marginalization of people with disabilities. In contrast with a social model, a medical model of disability “treats disabilities as defects in need of treatment.”⁶⁸ A medical approach has disproportionately pathologized and institutionalized Indigenous bodies and minds, and separated them from one another and from the land.⁶⁹ Indigenous cultures and perspectives are diverse, and around the world, they challenge “western narratives of disability.”⁷⁰ A strong theme involves community members looking after each other, and people being understood more in terms of their role in community than in terms of what they are able to do or not do physically or otherwise.⁷¹

The collective impacts of colonialism include “loss of land, culture, identity, knowledge base, values and language” – and these are described as far more disabling than individual physical or intellectual impairments.⁷² Traditional teachings emphasize interconnectedness, respect for the whole person, collective wellbeing, and belonging. Things commonly diagnosed as disabilities are seen as gifts: special talents, connections with the spirit world, or power.⁷³

In economic terms, too, many Indigenous authors point to the ways we have lost sight of important connections with the world we inhabit, and that we have fallen out of step with the values embedded in teachings that honour and include the natural world as vital participants in the economic structure.⁷⁴ As the demands of capitalism place great strain on natural and social systems,⁷⁵ we are reminded that the physical world has value and worth beyond what humans allot to it. In order to address this, “language, policies, theories, frameworks” need to be pushed back against and constantly re-imagined.⁷⁶

Colonialism has dispossessed many peoples and communities from the land, which compromises (among other things) the ability to provide for oneself, one’s family, and one’s community. The current economic priorities have led to an undervaluing of the broader range of

⁶⁶ Amoroso, 2020

⁶⁷ Amoroso, 2020, p. 4

⁶⁸ Guevera, 2021, p. 274

⁶⁹ Adam, 2018

⁷⁰ Adam, 2018, p. 13

⁷¹ Adam, 2018

⁷² Adam, 2018, p. 24

⁷³ See also Ludski, 2019

⁷⁴ Mitchell, 2018, p. 88

⁷⁵ Teegee, 2015, p. 121

⁷⁶ de Leeuw, 2015, p. 97-98

activities that keep communities well.⁷⁷ In order to set the balance right, we can exercise the power we have (however limited) to do things differently; and this involves economic restructuring in a way that recognizes ourselves as embedded within all natural systems, not set apart from them.⁷⁸

One in-depth study traces the simultaneous containment of Indigenous people, certain immigrant groups, and people with disabilities in both prisons and asylums, specifically looking at Victoria, BC.⁷⁹ The social construction of categories of ‘unfit’ - supported with the force of both the legal and medical systems – made it possible to remove people from their land.⁸⁰ In the midst of settler-colonialism, which is dominated by a capitalist orientation to land and labour, globalized capitalism is thus experienced as a new form of assimilation and “an expansion of the colonial model.”⁸¹

Colonial systems and practices persist to this day that perpetuate the systemic exclusion of certain groups of people from participation in mainstream economic activities - such as land ownership, education, and the workforce.⁸² Other legitimate economic activities that are inhibited include providing food and other forms of sustenance that are based on living off the land. So, while large economic development projects that involve resource extraction, for instance, may provide Indigenous communities employment, they may simultaneously threaten Indigenous economies by destroying or devaluing the land without recognizing the vital role it plays in sustaining community economies more generally.⁸³ This is why the definition of ‘meaningful employment’ cannot be defined from outside, and why wellbeing cannot be measured in economic terms.⁸⁴ Even though there is enormous pressure for Indigenous communities (and others) to conform to capitalist economies, this does not mean other approaches are not viable.⁸⁵

These broader economic and social conditions are often not recognized in our day-to-day lives or decision-making, but are increasingly being acknowledged for the way they *enable* participation for some groups of people, and present *barriers* for others. Making structural conditions visible by naming them can enable us to see and address the racism, sexism, and ableism built into them, as well as the intersections among these forms of oppression and exclusion.⁸⁶ Underlying cultural norms and values are often unacknowledged but play a significant role in who has access to what. Indeed, neoliberalism and neocolonialism are identified by many as the “two most important structural forces that shaped contemporary life.”⁸⁷

⁷⁷ Richmond, 2015

⁷⁸ Mitchell, 2018

⁷⁹ Roman, et al, 2009

⁸⁰ Roman, et al, 2009

⁸¹ Hernandez, 2013, p. 10; Kuokkanen, 2011

⁸² Roman et al, 2009, p. 20; Hernandez, 2013; Kuokkanen, 2011

⁸³ Kuokkanen, 2011; see for example Tenson, 2017

⁸⁴ Waring, 2018

⁸⁵ Kuokkanen, 2011

⁸⁶ Roman et al, 2009

⁸⁷ de Finney et al, 2011, p, 362-363

For instance, **the design of a building or neighbourhood, the routing of buses, the cost of rent are structural conditions that impact employment.⁸⁸ So are decisions about where investments and divestments are made, legislation, policies, and political priorities.⁸⁹** Partnerships⁹⁰ can provide access to funding or relational supports, and alter conditions that make inclusive employment possible. Whether a biological or architectural metaphor, the term ‘structure’ helps us to see social and economic features that “persist over time, are interrelated, and influence both the functioning of the entity as a whole and the activities of its individual members.”⁹¹ We are beginning to recognize the need to widen the scope of dominant economic indicators and policy responses, and alternative approaches are emerging.

Some policy responses

There is now new legislation to support equity for people with disabilities, based on pre-existing human rights frameworks (ie. Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, the Canadian Human Rights Act, and the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities).⁹² This shift towards a rights-based approach can be felt worldwide, and has far-reaching implications, because it requires that we restructure many aspects of our society, including and extending beyond workplaces.⁹³

The Accessible Canada Act of 2019 sets the target of complete accessibility by 2040 for Canada.⁹⁴ Laws, policies, programs, services, and institutions must be redesigned and developed with the “highest level of accessibility” as a goal. This will require employers and others to quickly acknowledge the barriers that PWD face and then adjust policies and practices towards this aim. This cannot happen without the active involvement of persons with disabilities.⁹⁵

In 2021, the Accessible British Columbia Act set accessibility standards to remove or prevent barriers to full and equal participation in society. It outlines barriers which can be caused by “environments, attitudes, practices, policies, information, communications or technology” and states that they can be “affected by intersecting forms of discrimination.”⁹⁶ The Accessible British Columbia Act also sets out that accessibility standards and related regulations may be established in many areas of civic life – the first of the eight that are listed in the Act is “employment”. Importantly, the Act also sets out the parameters under which the standards will be developed, and this includes equitable representation on an Accessibility Committee by

⁸⁸ Inclusion Powell River Society, 2021

⁸⁹ Baker, et al., 2018; Bates et al., 2017; Beyer, 2012; Crawford, 2011; Ferrucci, 2014; Kuznetsova & Yalcin, 2017; Morrow et al., 2009; Park et al., 2016; Prince, 2016

⁹⁰ Berry & Kymar, 2012; Sulewski, Ciulla Timmons, Lyons, Lucas, Vogt, & Bachmeyer, 2017; Nicholas et al, 2019; Pavlova, 2019

⁹¹ Britannica, 2022

⁹² Government of British Columbia, 2021; Government of Canada, 2019

⁹³ Ebuenyi et al, 2018; Lang et al, 2019; Meltzer et al, 2019; Smith et al, 2018

⁹⁴ Government of Canada, 2019

⁹⁵ Government of British Columbia, 2021

⁹⁶ Government of British Columbia, 2021

people with disabilities, and other people as well as organizations who will be directly impacted.
⁹⁷ This demonstrates a central commitment to Inclusive Design – explored later in this review.

The Stronger BC Economic Plan, released in February 2022, acknowledges that **“if an economy is not working for people, then it’s simply not working.”**⁹⁸ In order for the economy to do well in meeting the needs of a society, more people need opportunities to participate in it. Importantly – as is evident in the discussion above – more people also need opportunities to define it and design it. It also points out that “healthy, inclusive societies where wealth and opportunity are broadly shared are more productive, competitive, and innovative than societies where inequality is high. They are also more resilient.”⁹⁹ **Flexibility is key to successfully adapting** in ever-changing local and global conditions.¹⁰⁰ As identified in BC’s recent Economic Plan, now is the time for such adaptation.¹⁰¹

In this project, we look at employment as part of the broader economy and society. Localized and place-based approaches enable us to shed light on processes and practices that emerge from certain conditions.¹⁰² These may not be replicable universally, or even sustainable in one place indefinitely.¹⁰³ For this reason, we refer to ‘promising practices’ instead of ‘best practices’ in this project.¹⁰⁴

Positionality - Seeing outside the silos

This report is an update of a previous literature review related to inclusive employment.¹⁰⁵ The previous review primarily focused on barriers to employment, conditions *within* a workplace that can improve accessibility, as well as benefits of employment inclusion. The current review focuses on the broader conditions *in which* the workplace operates, as well as creative *responses to* those conditions, both of which are often missing from the conversation.

Tla’amin teachings about disability and the economy

Five members of the research team are living on the traditional and (modern-day) treaty territory of the Tla’amin people at the time of writing. When reviewing the writing of Tla’amin and other Indigenous scholars, the research question itself is immediately striking in two ways:

⁹⁷ Government of British Columbia, 2021

⁹⁸ Province of British Columbia, 2022

⁹⁹ Province of British Columbia, 2022

¹⁰⁰ Child, 2021; Raworth, 2017

¹⁰¹ Government of British Columbia, 2022

¹⁰² Tenson, 2017; Waring, 2018

¹⁰³ Raworth, 2017

¹⁰⁴ Thoms, 2007; Wesley-Esquimaux & Snowball, 2010

¹⁰⁵ Inclusion Powell River Society, 2018

First, inclusion of diverse abilities is integral to community life.¹⁰⁶ Recognizing that each community member is more and less able to do certain things at different moments in life, so everyone in the community has a place, and everyone takes care of each other to the extent that they can – all the time.¹⁰⁷ An inclusive social environment is central to the primary teachings of how to live a good life. In the context of policy and research, this emphasis on creating inclusive social environments is now often called a social model of disability.¹⁰⁸

Second, this inclusive worldview is supported directly by a broader understanding of economy as the running of a household or community for collective wellbeing.¹⁰⁹ The traditional Tla'amin economic system involves many ceremonial and other practices through which knowledge, food, and other assets are regularly redistributed throughout the community.¹¹⁰ The redistribution may take place when a particular family is in a time of need (such as a funeral), or it may take place when a particular family is experiencing abundance. It also occurs in big and small ways on a daily basis, as part of living the ta'ow (teachings). According to this economic system, financial return is not the primary purpose. Work is done to care for your family's needs, to gain an education, share music and culture, entertain, build community, and offer spiritual advancement.¹¹¹ Another important aspect of work is recognizing our relationship with the rest of creation (ie. reciprocal relationships with everything around us, and stewardship of the land to sustain future generations). The humility this fosters ensures we do not take more than we need and encourages us to express thanks for everything that has enabled us to provide for our families through work.¹¹²

Tla'amin's traditional economic and governance structure includes *tlu uh nuck* (potlaching and governance). Within this system, each family has a *heh-goos* (head) and this person manages property and worked for the prosperity of the entire family.¹¹³ Hosting feasts, for instance, is a way of not only providing for people, but also establishing good relations and reputations. Interestingly, economic leadership in this system is not structured around a business, but a family (similar to the Greek definition of economy, above).¹¹⁴ If your family is managing well, then you are capable of contributing to the greater community; if your family is struggling, there are supports around you. Those whose families are well, and who are and do contribute more broadly to their community receive recognition, honour and influence.¹¹⁵

Although many of these teachings and practices have been dramatically disrupted through ongoing colonial imposition,¹¹⁶ Washington maintains that many aspects of the *ums nah*

¹⁰⁶ Adam, 2018

¹⁰⁷ Paul, 2014

¹⁰⁸ Bachrach, 2015

¹⁰⁹ See also Raworth, 2017 and Warning, 2018

¹¹⁰ Washington, 2004

¹¹¹ Paul, 2014

¹¹² Paul, 2014

¹¹³ Washington, 2004, p. 588

¹¹⁴ Raworth, 2017

¹¹⁵ Washington, 2004

¹¹⁶ Adam, 2018; Paul, 2014

motl (Tla’amin traditional laws) that “governed all forms of social, economic, and political relations” are relevant today and there is an obligation to include them in plans for the future.¹¹⁷

In a recent participatory action research project, parents and caregivers of Tla’amin children with disabilities center the importance of cultural safety.¹¹⁸ This includes such things as:

- centering identity, and lifting them up to feel proud of who they are;
- integrating *ta’ow* (teachings) into daily life, which – among other things – teaches to acknowledge and embrace every child/person for their gifts; and
- fostering good and respectful relationships with the child, family, Elders, schools, and professionals.

The study also highlighted systemic barriers faced by children with disabilities and their families - including racism and bureaucratic red tape that interfere with achieving cultural safety and social inclusion. The community’s recommendations for systemic change include:

- centering the child at every step;
- good support for workers and caregivers;
- revitalizing language and culture;
- building up the next generation of leaders; and
- investing in decolonizing and Indigenizing the dominant system.¹¹⁹

In this, we see this ancient wisdom being carried forward by current generations to re-center a Tla’amin orientation to inclusion and belonging. These recommendations can help us when considering inclusive employment.

A diverse economies framework: shedding new light

Although the words ‘economy’ and ‘market’ are often used interchangeably, the broader definition of economy is inclusive of a much wider range of activities that keep households, communities, and countries running well.¹²⁰ A diverse economies framework is a way of making visible *all* of the elements of the economy so we can see those activities that are valuable but marginalized, or discounted/uncounted¹²¹ - not just activities that flow through the market.¹²² Given the systemic exclusion of PWD and others from the mainstream workforce, exploring outside the dominant capitalist system can reveal economic contributions and promising possibilities not immediately recognized when financial growth is the only measure for success.

Using a diverse economies approach that is fluid, experimental, and place-based has proven beneficial.¹²³ It shows how the local and emergent activity of a single person or business

¹¹⁷ Washington, 2004, p. 583

¹¹⁸ Harrop, 2019, p. 4

¹¹⁹ Harrop, 2019

¹²⁰ Gibson-Graham, et al, 2013

¹²¹ Waring, 2018

¹²² Gibson-Graham, Cameron, & Healy, 2013

¹²³ Gibson-Graham, et al, 2013

has political and powerful implications.¹²⁴ Paying attention to everyday economic activity (which sometimes does and sometimes doesn't involve money changing hands) has exciting transformational potential. It helps us see the ways the economic system is created by all of us - even seemingly small, local initiatives contribute to meaningful systemic action.¹²⁵

A case study demonstrates the big and small ways one woman's garden offers community-building and sustenance: people contribute to the production of food; they access and further distribute the food that is grown there; they build important friendships and social networks (through which *other* important needs get met as well), and so forth. These are vital forms of economic activity that would not be recognized as such using dominant indicators for success.¹²⁶ The impact of her garden is described as "liberatory" by not only providing food and social connection, but empowering community members and improving social determinants of health causing a positive ripple effect throughout the community.¹²⁷ This demonstrates how we create the economy through our everyday activities. Incremental changes - such as valuing the activities in this garden as part of the economy - are the active stepping stones of system transformation; small efforts, when examined together, can lead to radical change over time.¹²⁸

Examples from economic geographers the world over abound, including the economic role of gardening,¹²⁹ bicycle-sharing,¹³⁰ food production and distribution,¹³¹ and manufacturing.¹³² These examples include for-profit and non-profit enterprises, and they may involve monetary exchange, trade, and sometimes other forms of remuneration. They show us that local experiments in doing things differently shine new light on what is possible when it comes to a more just, inclusive, and sustainable economy and how we view employment.

Global examples of existing diverse economic activities looked at in relation to each other and the broader economic system, reveals several themes:

- **Economic practices are responsive, adaptive, and flexible and may correspond to various notions of success.**
- **They are hybrid, and responsive to changing conditions and circumstances.**
- **They are not only individual-centered, but provide for the collective care of humans and non-humans.**
- **Surplus generated is generally (re)distributed through some community-based mechanisms, which increases wellbeing, reduces vulnerability, and strengthens resilience.¹³³**

¹²⁴ Hosking & Palomino-Schalscha, 2016

¹²⁵ Schmid, & Smith, 2021

¹²⁶ Hinton & Maclurcan, 2017

¹²⁷ Hosking & Palomino-Schalscha, 2016, p. 1250

¹²⁸ Gopel, 2016

¹²⁹ Hosking & Palomino-Schalscha, 2016

¹³⁰ Zademach & Musch, 2018

¹³¹ Moragues-Faus, Marsden, Adlerova, & Hausmanova, 2020; Rosol, 2019; White, 2013

¹³² Gibson-Graham, Cameron, Healy, & McNeill, 2019

¹³³ Gibson et al, 2018

Examining current activities with an un-siloed lens gives us the opportunity to recognize that the alternatives we seek (in this case, inclusive employment) may already be within reach or in play.

Changing the narrative

When organizations acknowledge the systemic nature of workplace exclusion, and actively redefine *themselves* in a way that aligns with equity and inclusion, the entire corporate culture shifts so that inclusion is inherent to the organizational structure.¹³⁴ This takes the onus off of people who are historically marginalized from the workforce from *having to* self-disclose in order to access assistance or accommodation. Simultaneously this creates an environment that is hospitable to self-disclosure and accommodation. In other words, it relieves pressure to somehow ‘fit in’ to a system or environment that is not designed for or by them.¹³⁵

A social model of disability shifts the responsibility to change from PWDs to potential employers, policy makers and the broader social world.¹³⁶ The social model of disability has effectively informed some policies and legislation in the direction of work inclusion around the world.¹³⁷ However, while it has alleviated some barriers and contributed to the development of accessibility policies and legislation,¹³⁸ exclusion from meaningful work for people with disabilities is still a reality.¹³⁹

Employer attitudes and perceptions

Many employers express positive attitudes about the idea of hiring people with disabilities, but demonstrate a reluctance to do so.¹⁴⁰ They often believe the myth that people with disabilities will perform poorly or cost the company.¹⁴¹ They also voice concerns about safety and productivity, their own knowledge related to hiring and retention, and identifying workplace supports and accommodations.¹⁴² This is particularly the case for small companies.¹⁴³ Despite evidence that these concerns are unfounded,¹⁴⁴ these stigmas contribute to the low employment rates for PWD.

Grassroots or bottom-up approaches to structural change are imperative however the disability inclusion literature also points out that **a motivated leader with an empowering**

¹³⁴ Buettgen & Klassen, 2020, p. 91

¹³⁵ Buettgen & Klassen, 2020; Meltzer et al, 2019

¹³⁶ Backrach, 2015

¹³⁷ Ferrucci, 2014

¹³⁸ McColl, Gitterman, & Goldowitz, 2019

¹³⁹ Kuznetsova & Yalcin, 2017

¹⁴⁰ Fraser, Ajzen, Johnson, Herbert & Chan, 2011; Kocman, Fischer, & Weber, 2018

¹⁴¹ Baker, et al., 2018; Bonaccio, et al, 2020

¹⁴² Bonaccio, et al, 2020; Kocman et al, 2018

¹⁴³ Kuznetsova, 2016

¹⁴⁴ Bonaccio et al, 2020; Kaletta, et al., 2012

attitude at the top of an organization can play a role in setting the tone and conditions for the workplace.¹⁴⁵ Employers who have a personal relationship to disability themselves are the most likely to cultivate inclusive work environments.¹⁴⁶ When employers have received training that addresses biases and have included disability as a focus in their diversity hiring strategies, they are more likely to be inclusive.¹⁴⁷ **Education, knowledge-building and ongoing support are needed** to dispel myths, change practices, and build “disability confidence”.¹⁴⁸ Partnerships between employers and agencies that can help them raise their level of awareness, build connections, and provide employment for people with disabilities have also proven to be important. We must look at both disability and work differently, in order to bring about this change: Organizations or businesses that are recognized by people with disabilities as good places to work celebrate the value of diverse experiences, embodiments, and voices while resisting dominant notions of disability and difference as in any way problematic.¹⁴⁹

Non-standard employment

Even when employment is secured, it can often be precarious, unfulfilling, and even demeaning - especially for people with disabilities or other barriers to employment.¹⁵⁰ As a result, PWD often creatively address the barriers faced by bypassing a discriminatory mainstream labour market and creating “their own disability friendly business or non-profit.”¹⁵¹ Indeed, barriers or unmet needs often lead to significant innovations that benefit the individual and the collective.¹⁵² We can observe many ‘promising practices’ by looking at employment and economic innovations that have emerged in response to some of the exclusive structures and practices discussed already.

Employment described as ‘non-standard’ usually involves atypical hours or contractual relationships. It can include such things as “temporary help and subcontracted business services, independent contracting, ‘on call’ workers and day labourers, part-time work, and self-employment.”¹⁵³ Prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, a massive structural transformation was already in place in the Canadian labour market through intersecting impacts of “innovative technologies, demographic shifts, globalization, and the rise of the gig economy.”¹⁵⁴ Since then, the pandemic has pushed boundaries and further normalized what was once considered non-standard employment.¹⁵⁵

¹⁴⁵ Glade, et al, 2020

¹⁴⁶ Kuznetsova, 2016; Nicholas et al, 2019

¹⁴⁷ Frazer et al, 2011

¹⁴⁸ Murfitt et al, 2018

¹⁴⁹ Buettgen & Klassen, 2020; Ferrucci, 2014

¹⁵⁰ Meltzer et al, 2019

¹⁵¹ Amoroso, 2020, p. 2

¹⁵² Holmes, 2018

¹⁵³ Shuey & Jovic, 2013, p. 176

¹⁵⁴ Anani, 2018, p.167

¹⁵⁵ Glavin, Bierman, & Schieman, 2021

For many non-standard employment is not a choice, while some people choose and prefer it.¹⁵⁶ There is great debate over the implications of the growing gig economy in Canada.¹⁵⁷ Non-standard employment is often insecure, can be short term or cyclical, and lacks access to labour market protections.¹⁵⁸ “Workers with disabilities are nearly twice as likely to be in nonstandard work arrangements” than those without.¹⁵⁹ A Canadian study demonstrates that employees with disabilities who work in non-standard employment settings are “more likely to have unmet accommodation needs”, despite accessibility legislation.¹⁶⁰ As outlined previously, this leads to poverty, isolation, and other compounding challenges for people without access to the workforce. That said, non-standard options may provide much-needed flexibility and autonomy that cannot be found in standard employment settings, and provide valuable alternatives to dominant structures that aren’t serving many people.¹⁶¹ Many people actively choose non-standard options because they are optimal for a wide range of reasons.¹⁶² Some research demonstrates that “we should embrace non-standard employment as an opportunity rather than as a danger” and create institutional protections and supports for non-standard forms of employment¹⁶³ – a recommendation that is also emerging in new research about the labour market in response to the COVID-19 pandemic.¹⁶⁴

This does not preclude employers from the responsibility of implementing recommendations in order to foster inclusive workplaces. It does, however, indicate that by looking both within and *outside* of the mainstream labour market we will find PWD have created meaningful employment opportunities. Including - and even centering - in this research the perspectives of people who have created or found non-standard employment will shed light on possibilities that can support disability inclusion in diverse employment settings and change the dominant narrative about work.

Redefining success

Our current economic, business, and employment models are structured by and for a very small, privileged demographic to the exclusion of others.¹⁶⁵ It is by now abundantly clear that those structures which do not currently work for PWD are also “less than optimal” for most people.¹⁶⁶ We are “in dire need of new disruptive interventions to address global risks and challenges.”¹⁶⁷

¹⁵⁶ Ebuenyi et al, 2018

¹⁵⁷ Glavin, Bierman, & Schieman, 2021

¹⁵⁸ Shuey & Jovic, 2013

¹⁵⁹ Shuey & Jovic, 2013, p. 179

¹⁶⁰ Shuey & Jovic, 2013, p. 174

¹⁶¹ Anani, 2018

¹⁶² Hosking & Palomino-Schalscha, 2016; Solid State Community Industries, n.d.

¹⁶³ Schmid, 2018, p. 31

¹⁶⁴ Child, 2021; Sheppard-Jones, et al, 2020

¹⁶⁵ Waring, 2018

¹⁶⁶ Treviranus, 2014, p. 99

¹⁶⁷ Treviranus, 2014, p. 99

During any transition in which new approaches are being tested, indicators for success should not be imposed from outside, but determined by those most impacted by the intervention.¹⁶⁸ There also needs to be room for the learning that comes when outcomes are different than anticipated.¹⁶⁹ When initiatives are developed by specific people, in specific places, on the basis of specific values, a strong argument is made for the definitions and indicators for success to also be “place-based and culturally relevant” - rather than applying singular standards for success, such as profit-growth.¹⁷⁰

There are many efforts taking place in Canada and around the world towards this aim, with a focus on restructuring for the “next economy”:¹⁷¹

One study redefined success on the basis of the learning and community impacts - not the company’s viability. They found that **experiments in creating different futures require a certain tolerance for risk**.¹⁷² Risk tolerance is important not only on the part of businesses and employees, but it also demands institutional (legal, financial, and organizational) capacities that provide “social protection for people engaging in these risky employment relationships.”¹⁷³

A BC-based example is testing its inclusive employment model thanks to provincial funding and the support of organizational partners during its 18-month pilot phase.¹⁷⁴ The stability these supports offer enables risks to be taken, which has contributed greatly to the social enterprise’s collective learning. As with the bakery, many of the people employed at OneLight identified it as successful due to a wide range of success indicators: employee retention, employee satisfaction, collective learning, productivity, equitable pay, and improved quality of life. They indicated the value of employment on individual well-being as well as at a community level.

Developing internal measures for success expands possibilities substantially because what gets counted is what is deemed important by those most impacted. This is about making the market fit workers, instead of making workers fit the market. When working innovatively in these ways, other recommendations include: **having a “visionary leader”, securing advice, having a solid plan, and ongoing evaluation efforts**.

¹⁶⁸ Carnegie et al, 2019; Waring, 2018

¹⁶⁹ Schmid, 2018

¹⁷⁰ Carnegie et al, 2019, p. 253

¹⁷¹ Center for Social innovation, 2022; see also BC Center for Social Enterprise, 2021; Solid State Community Industries, n.d.

¹⁷² Santana & Paolo Parigi, 2015

¹⁷³ Arias-Loyola, & Vergara-Perucich, 2020, p. 56

¹⁷⁴ Inclusion Powell River Society, 2021

A detour

There is an argument for employment inclusion that is based on evidence that it can increase productivity, profit margins, and shareholder returns.¹⁷⁵

This argument aims to make the labour of people with disabilities or other barriers to employment visible within the existing profit-oriented economy, similarly to the way some economists have estimated the monetary value of “unpaid work,” “environmental services,” and “the free gifts of nature” in order to help us all recognize their value.¹⁷⁶ Evidence does show that the perspectives and experiences of people with diverse ways of engaging in the world physically, mentally, or socially have led to innovations that are not only useful – they are marketable. Inclusive design is smart business.¹⁷⁷ Similarly, research at a social enterprise reveals that it was more financially viable because social needs were being met.¹⁷⁸

While this can be a compelling and impactful argument, it is a slippery slope when understood in dialogue with diverse economies literature. In fact, it ultimately works against pursuing the structural changes needed for genuine and meaningful employment inclusion and other forms of social and ecological justice, by centering financial gain over wellbeing as the purpose of our economic activity.¹⁷⁹

Experiments in structural change *within* employment settings

There are many experiments in structural change already taking place within employment settings. What promising practices does the literature point us towards?

Inclusive design

Employment inclusion is not a burden; it is a benefit.¹⁸⁰ Despite persistent assumptions,¹⁸¹ the truth from employers is that accommodations cost nothing or very little,¹⁸² and the support needed by any new worker usually decreases over time.¹⁸³

In order to foster inclusive employment opportunities, it is critical to break social norms and conditioning to disrupt stereotypes of PWDs or other barriers. When PWD are excluded

¹⁷⁵ Sheppard-Jones, 2020, p. 76

¹⁷⁶ Waring, 2018, p. 18

¹⁷⁷ Holmes, 2018

¹⁷⁸ Bellostas, Lopez-Arceiz, & Mateos, 2016

¹⁷⁹ Waring, 2018

¹⁸⁰ Inclusion Powell River Society, 2021

¹⁸¹ Bonaccio et al, 2020 - also see section entitled ‘Employer attitudes and perceptions’

¹⁸² Lindsay, et al, 2019, p. 149

¹⁸³ Hartnett et al, 2011

from *design* conversations, this is difficult to achieve – but it is never too late to address the systemic exclusion of diverse voices.¹⁸⁴

Tools and roadmaps now exist to guide equity-centered design processes:

- beginning with understanding the problem,
- exploring possible solutions,
- reflecting on their effects,
- implementing an option, and
- ensuring it is equitable.¹⁸⁵

An inclusive design (ID) approach honours natural human diversity, and recognizes that human diversity means no single design is universally accessible.¹⁸⁶ When the right people are involved at each stage of the process, ID is easy to implement, it is not a burden, and it benefits everyone – the positive implications extend to all existing and potential workers.¹⁸⁷

Actively considering how to best accommodate all workers in every stage of employment (ie. recruitment, interviews, and promotion) allows for changes to be addressed easily.¹⁸⁸ **Hiring to people’s strengths and interests, and creating a disability-inclusive recruitment and interview process are strongly recommended.**¹⁸⁹ For instance, demonstrating in job postings and interviews that flexibility and accessibility are prioritized in the workplace can encourage applicants - knowing they will not have to raise the topic and risk being seen as the complainer.¹⁹⁰ In some cases, employers can partner with other organizations in their region to support recruitment and hiring - educational institutions can connect them with students or graduates, or community service organizations can connect them with job-seekers.¹⁹¹

Company-specific policies and practices should attend to the environment as a whole.¹⁹² **Ensuring environments – including architecture, transportation, communications, processes, and digital spaces – are accessible from the beginning will enable all employees to be productive and efficient – as does flexibility.**¹⁹³ Flexibility makes workplaces emotionally and physically safe and accessible for people who have fluctuating physical or mental health. It enables employees to maintain other important commitments in their families and communities, without having to fear losing their jobs.¹⁹⁴ **Ensuring clarity and a shared understanding about the business model** (relationship to profit, ownership structure, and

¹⁸⁴ Zitcer, 2014

¹⁸⁵ Education First, n.d.

¹⁸⁶ Treviranus, 2014

¹⁸⁷ Bonaccio, 2020| Glade et al, 2020; Prince, 2017; Sheppard-Jones, 2020

¹⁸⁸ Lindsay, 2019

¹⁸⁹ Bonaccio et al, 2020

¹⁹⁰ Glade, et al, 2020; MacTaggart, et al, 2018

¹⁹¹ Baker et al, 2018

¹⁹² Baker, et al., 2018; Inclusion Powell River Society, 2021

¹⁹³ Baker et al, 2018

¹⁹⁴ Inclusion Powell River Society, 2021

decision-making mechanisms, for instance) is also important for meaningful inclusion at every level.¹⁹⁵

Many of the strategies listed above will create a more hospitable and flexible workplace, contributing to employee recruitment, job retention, promotion, and innovation.¹⁹⁶ While “accessible design has often been motivated by charity or legal human rights obligations,” it is argued that the most powerful rationale for inclusive design is that it creates concrete quality improvements to both products and practices¹⁹⁷ and improved outcomes for society as a whole. For instance, such things as reading glasses and adjustable desks are all innovations that began by addressing exclusion, and have become ubiquitous in our daily lives and workplaces.¹⁹⁸ Inclusive Design is not only just and effective (and cost-efficient);¹⁹⁹ it has also tended to “spur innovation and cause disruptive leaps forward.”²⁰⁰

In a successful initiative at a large distribution center, three commitments the business made up front included:

- partnering with social service agencies on an ongoing basis,
- building a physical workplace that would be conducive to a range of abilities and needs, and
- creating a welcoming and inclusive culture from day one, with safety as an explicit top priority.²⁰¹

Changes over time at this distribution center have also led to:

- increased attention to matching employees' skills and interests with the job opportunity, as well as
- more thorough training that extends beyond tasks and safety instructions – particularly for employees for whom this is their first work experience.

Being clear about values

Whether acknowledged or even recognized, values underlie the economic and social decisions being made.²⁰² How we understand our ‘bottom line’ alters trajectories and creates or limits possibilities.²⁰³

¹⁹⁵ Hinton, 2021; Zitcer, 2014

¹⁹⁶ Bonaccio et al, 2020; Brown, Kessler, & Toson, 2016; Holmes, 2018; Huang & Chen, 2015; West, Targett, Wehman, Cifu, & Davis, 2015

¹⁹⁷ Treviranus, 2014

¹⁹⁸ Sheppard-Jones, et al, 2020; Treviranus, 2014

¹⁹⁹ Jesus et al, 2021; Sheppard-Jones et al, 2020

²⁰⁰ Treviranus, 2014, p. 95

²⁰¹ Kaletta et al, 2012

²⁰² Waring, 2018

²⁰³ Carnegie, McKinnon, & Gibson, 2019

There is a long and successful history of what is now described as the *social economy*, though many efforts have experienced serious disruption as a result of a more globalized and universalized approach to economic development.²⁰⁴ Currently, the system is structured in a way that makes it difficult for these beneficial and inclusive initiatives to survive and be recognized. Globally there are a myriad of actions, small and large, attempting to bring a more balanced look at the economy to include ecological and human wellbeing as part of the equation.²⁰⁵ Values that underlie economic decisions vary widely:

Ecological sustainability is a value that is now guiding many businesses. The linear economy is one in which material resources are extracted from the earth, used (one or more times), and discarded whereas the circular economy creates a closed loop with limited and/or repurposed ‘waste’.²⁰⁶ The bioeconomy,²⁰⁷ the green economy,²⁰⁸ and sustainable development²⁰⁹ are all slightly different approaches to creating economies that work within natural planetary limits.²¹⁰

Social justice has emerged as another value that is central to many new initiatives, with a focus on justice for workers and ethical products. With this value in mind, many businesses are organizing themselves around equitable participation in decision-making as well as profit share.²¹¹ These have taken many forms, including cooperatives,²¹² social enterprises,²¹³ non-profit organizations,²¹⁴ as well as private enterprises.²¹⁵

Profit is a dominant value underlying many economic decisions, as discussed previously.²¹⁶ Profit is argued by some economists as an end in itself, and others as a means to an end (ie. community benefit); there is no consensus about the economic or social value of profit.²¹⁷

For our purposes, it is important to acknowledge that environmental sustainability, social justice, and profit can be experienced as competing interests, so it is recommended for an

²⁰⁴ Rihter & Zidar, 2018; Qian & Wei, 2019

²⁰⁵ Gibson-Graham, Cameron, & Healy, 2013; Hernandez, 2013; see also Frazo, 2010

²⁰⁶ Bolger & Doyon, 2019; Sedikova, 2019

²⁰⁷ Beluhova-Uzunova, Shishkova, & Ivanova, 2019

²⁰⁸ Horbach & Rammer, 2020

²⁰⁹ Slusariuc, & Nimara, 2020

²¹⁰ Okewale, Adeyemi, Soyemi, & Mieseigha, 2020

²¹¹ Hinton & Maclurcan, 2017

²¹² Klagge & Meister, 2018; Zitcer, 2014; Solid State Community Industries, n.d.

²¹³ Bouchard, Cruz Filho, & Zerdani, 2015; Smith, McVilly, McGillivray, & Chan, 2018

²¹⁴ Buettgen, & Klassen, 2020

²¹⁵ Gibson-Graham, Cameron, Healy, & McNeill, 2019

²¹⁶ Hinton, 2021; Waring, 2018

²¹⁷ See Barauna et al, 2021; del Moral-Espin & Fernandez-Garcia, 2018; Gibson-Graham et al, 2019; Hernandez, 2013; Hinton & Mclurcan, 2017; Kuokkanen, 2011; North, 2016; Rosol, 2019; White, 2013

organization or business to **be explicit about its guiding values and priorities** to help in decision-making and organizational development.²¹⁸

Doughnut economics is a model which holds room for all three of the above values to play a role, with an underlying value of balance.²¹⁹ This model aims to support economic decision-making that is deliberately designed to both respect the natural limits of the planet and consider human wellbeing as a vital bottom line. In this model, profit may be generated, but not at the expense of people or the planet.

Some scholars recommend replacing *efficiency* with *sufficiency* as a fitting guiding value for businesses and organizations.²²⁰ Sufficiency is a particularly valuable concept in terms of inclusive employment, because efficiency is often a value basis upon which employers justify *not* employing people with disabilities. A growth-orientation tends to favour efficiency which often interferes with equity and social justice.²²¹

There are many inherent challenges in the experiential nature of system transformation; there is no pre-existing formula and it is recommended to take stock of the different ways power and profit are organized within the enterprise.²²² A commitment to inclusion can often be trumped by other competing values a company might have.²²³ **Identifying available support and using strategic business or other partnerships can mitigate against that inevitable conflict.**²²⁴ Lessons learned also suggest that **nimbleness is important when navigating the tension between ideals and practice** in order to remain consistent with organizational values over time.²²⁵ Deliberate, transparent, and participatory decision-making about the structure, the values, and the economic model can increase the chances of meeting the particular, place-based aims of the enterprise, and developing indicators for success that make sense for its purpose.²²⁶

Workplace policies

Workplace inclusion is a fundamental condition for an equitable economic landscape for us all. While some observe that focusing on one individual at a time - especially without altering the organizational culture and supportive partnerships - is inefficient,²²⁷ others note that “protecting workers might make more sense than protecting jobs,” given new challenges such as COVID-19 and climate change.²²⁸

²¹⁸ Arias-Loyola & Vergara-Perucich, 2020; Austin-Broos, 2009; Bolger & Doyon, 2019; Hinton & Maclurcan, 2017; Sedikova, 2019; Slusariuc, & Nimara, 2020; Zademach & Musch, 2018

²¹⁹ Raworth, 2017, p. 39 and 25

²²⁰ Krueger, Schulz, and Gibbs, 2018; Unger, 2010

²²¹ Krueger, Schulz, and Gibbs, 2018

²²² del Moral-Espin and Fernandez-Garcia, 2018

²²³ Inclusion Powell River Society, 2021

²²⁴ Berry & Kymar, 2012; Sulewski, Ciulla Timmons, Lyons, Lucas, Vogt, & Bachmeyer, 2017

²²⁵ Oz & Aksoy, 2019

²²⁶ Hinton, 2021

²²⁷ Wehman, Brooke, Green, Hewett, & Tipton, 2008

²²⁸ Larue, 2021, p. 272

Organizations and businesses can work to become “disability confident and have inclusive policies, processes, and facilities.”²²⁹ Recommendations include: **assessing the level of both cultural and physical inclusion**, proceeding to improve “disability awareness and diversity training,” and “developing inclusive policies and procedures, especially for recruitment, and addressing physical barriers in the workplace.”²³⁰ Fear can be a barrier for change, but disability confidence and organizational growth towards equity and justice can be supported, regardless of the starting place.²³¹

Internal workplace policies can continue addressing “the structural and cultural barriers that create/reinforce disadvantage” in the workplace.²³² Companies with targeted corporate policies and sustainability programs in place at a company level are more likely than others to be inclusive employers.²³³ Having policy is imperative; however implementing the policy is equally imperative. This may require a shift in organizational culture, training for all management and staff, and direct involvement of people with disabilities in decision-making.²³⁴ These might be massive foundational changes in some places, or minor adjustments in others. **Fostering any kind of organizational change is a process, not just an outcome, and this process itself should be person-centered as well.**²³⁵

Inclusive participation at every level

Increased inequity is one of the major pitfalls of present-day capitalism.²³⁶ Inclusive capitalism is described as a system that bonds people through interdependency and partnerships (rather than dependency and hierarchy).²³⁷ This means active participation of every member of the system in things like decision-making, ownership, and employment. The argument is that with more equal participation at every level, benefits and harms would be more equitably distributed when the economy ebbs and flows.²³⁸

This approach points to the very important element of having PWD representation in decision-making, ownership, and other leadership positions.²³⁹ As with gender and other forms of inequity, representation at all levels is vital for structural change.²⁴⁰ Structural change that facilitates equitable representation in leadership positions will enable entirely new thoughts and perspectives to arise. Some concrete steps to better reflect a democratic inclusion are: sliding

²²⁹ Murfitt et al, 2018, p. 428

²³⁰ Murfitt et al, 2018, p. 428

²³¹ Murfitt et al, 2018; Vachon, 2018

²³² Kitching, 2006, p. 881; see also Bumble, Carter, McMillan, & Manikas, 2017; Lang et al, 2019

²³³ Kuznetsova & Yalcin, 2017

²³⁴ Bonaccio, et al, 2020; Gunty et al, 2019; Glade et al, 2020

²³⁵ Grills et al, 2016; Gunty, Van Ness, & Nye-Lengerman, 2019, p. 325

²³⁶ Raworth, 2017; Waring, 2018

²³⁷ Borko, 2016, p. 33

²³⁸ See also Government of British Columbia, 2022; Treviranus, 2014

²³⁹ Caldwell, et al, 2018; Grills et al, 2016

²⁴⁰ Meier, Celis, and Huysentruty (2016)

scale equity payments, anti-racism and anti-oppression training, and training for young people.²⁴¹ Others include: **board and leadership diversification, engaging with broader justice movements, and altering communications and signage.** These recommendations, again, do not speak only to disability inclusion, but to inclusive design more generally.²⁴²

People with disabilities are often excluded from the opportunity for career progression.²⁴³ Case studies in Ontario, Alberta, and BC show that this can be addressed by:

- Having a range of products, services, or initiatives within a social enterprise increases the potential for job diversity and enables people to find work that suits their interests and skills.²⁴⁴
- Upward mobility with increased responsibility and pay was another strategy, as was moving to jobs in the mainstream workforce with support from the original social enterprise was another (with varying degrees of success).²⁴⁵
- And in BC the importance of flexibility in scheduling and tasks was identified as a central element of the inclusive employment model. **Flexibility requires attentive and skilled management, so structural support at the management level is also necessary for success.**²⁴⁶

A network of Canadian solidarity economy enterprises called ‘Solid State Community Industries’ (SSCI) demonstrates the wide range of possible forms an enterprise can take when inclusive participation at every level is a central commitment. “Bound together by a commitment to cooperativism and working past extractivism and exploitation,” these enterprises embody shared decision-making, shared ownership, and organizational values that center social benefit.²⁴⁷ This approach leads to meaningful employment, innovation, long-term commitment, and concrete impacts for those employed *and* the communities in which they are embedded.

Organizational structure: Spotlight on the social economy

People are reorganizing, and new responses are emerging – such as worker owned cooperative social enterprises. There is optimism about their ability to offer good working conditions, higher pay and benefits, job satisfaction, opportunities for skills training, and greater job security. A Spanish study found that social enterprises (that were also sheltered workshops for people with disabilities) had a track record of continuing to create jobs even during an economic crisis.²⁴⁸ Similarly, a worker inclusive social enterprise in BC experienced extremely

²⁴¹ Zitcer, 2014

²⁴² Treviranus, 2014

²⁴³ Amoroso, 2020

²⁴⁴ Lysaght, Krupa, & Bouuchard, 2018

²⁴⁵ Lysaght, Krupa, & Bouuchard, 2018

²⁴⁶ Inclusion Powell River Society, 2021

²⁴⁷ Solid State Community Industries, n.d.

²⁴⁸ Bellostas, Lopez-Arceiz, & Mateos, 2016, p. 369

high employee retention and satisfaction during the COVID-19 pandemic when other employers were experiencing labour shortages.²⁴⁹

Sometimes social enterprises are “non-profit organizations that participate in commercial activities to fulfill and even broaden the social missions of their organizations.”²⁵⁰ They can in fact take many forms.²⁵¹ Social enterprises can provide “higher quality work experience compared to sheltered employment, while creating a supportive atmosphere that may be lacking in competitive employment.”²⁵²

The social economy also includes other economic structures – such as cooperatives, which share power through ownership.²⁵³ The social economy is a potential opportunity for disability work inclusion because the social economy encompasses both economic and social aims.²⁵⁴ Ablism is pervasive in Canada, and can be combated by engaging the social economy in disability inclusive initiatives - but there are **important questions that organizations and businesses should ask of themselves, to ensure they do not replicate paternalistic or oppressive patterns in their workplaces.**²⁵⁵

Challenges for social enterprises include: finding start-up funds, generating enough revenue to pay fair wages, balancing economic and social aims,²⁵⁶ and resisting the replication of paternalistic or oppressive patterns in workplaces.²⁵⁷ Another challenge is the fact that given the (often) part-time nature of this work, it may not be enough to lift people out of poverty – exacerbated by the fact that employment beyond a certain level actually interferes with financial aid eligibility for workers with disabilities.²⁵⁸ It is recommended that social enterprises and other employers that center social purpose:

- **ensure the setting integrates employees with and without disabilities,**
- **pay fair wages,**
- **offer choice to employees about their role and how to be paid, and**
- **provide regular skill assessment that leads “to the opportunity for advancement and promotion where appropriate, or, with the skills developed, movement to another job with another employer.”**²⁵⁹

It is also recommended that they:

- have their own management structure,
- are well-supported by their parent organization (if they have one),

²⁴⁹ Inclusion Powell River Society, 2021

²⁵⁰ Hsu, Huang, and Ososkie, 2009, p. 20

²⁵¹ Bouchard et al, 2015

²⁵² Tan, 2009, p. 53

²⁵³ Oz, & Aksoy, 2019

²⁵⁴ Prince, 2014

²⁵⁵ see also Buhariwala, Wilton & Evans, 2015; Lanctot, Corbiere, & Durand, 2012; and Morrow, et al., 2009

²⁵⁶ Cooney, 2016

²⁵⁷ Prince, 2014

²⁵⁸ Buhariwala, Wilton & Evans, 2015

²⁵⁹ Katz, 2014, p. 134

- have a good business plan and competent people to implement it, and
- track both successes and challenges over time (related to economic and social impacts).²⁶⁰

For-profit businesses of various sizes are also demonstrating just and inclusive responses to many of the challenges discussed thus far. Larger organizations are more likely to have formalized disability inclusion policies and practices,²⁶¹ however small and medium sized businesses play an important role.

Looking at the impact of “small and medium enterprises (SMEs) in environmental action” we can see how private sector SMEs are (already) motivated by things beyond profit and growth in their decision-making, even when they are technically structured as for-profit businesses.²⁶² SME owners can also be associated with social purpose, and “can develop better stories about prosperous, sustainable and convivial local economies.”²⁶³ Similarly, rural communities are demonstrating innovations in “production and experimentation of utterly different, more desirable, futures” even though they are “often left out of urban-centric processes of designing the future of industry, economy, development, and society.”²⁶⁴

Research on four manufactures (one shareholder corporation, one family-owned company, one cooperative, and one social enterprise) demonstrates how manufacturing can contribute to both ecological and social wellbeing.²⁶⁵ Environmental care is enacted by: “eliminating waste”, “treating waste as a resource,” and “pushing at the limits of what materials can do.” Social care is enacted through “remuneration rates”, “career progression for employees”, “relationship with casual employees”, and openness to “those at a distance from the labour market.” How each of the featured businesses does these things varies. The most innovative strategies were taken by **leadership who had the long view in mind, rather than making short term decisions to do business as usual in response to immediate pressures or demands.** It involves taking risks, and approaching challenges creatively in order to foster “new cultures of production” and redefining standards of success or goals.²⁶⁶ All of them are financially viable, but they are redefining viability on others terms as well.

“The scope of the social economy movement is in fact quite large.”²⁶⁷ Through the course of this research, we hope to broaden our understanding of which, if any, of these forms shows promise in contributing to the structural conditions to inclusive employment.

²⁶⁰ Katz, 2014

²⁶¹ Lindsay, Cagliostro, Leck, Shen, & Stinson, 2019

²⁶² North, 2016, p. 437

²⁶³ North, 2016, p. 451

²⁶⁴ Spanier, 2021, 121

²⁶⁵ Gibson, Cameron, Healy, and McNeill, 2019

²⁶⁶ Gibson, Cameron, Healy, and McNeill, 2019, pp 11-17

²⁶⁷ Bouchard et al, 2015, p. 56

Conclusion

Once again, the research question guiding this process is: **What are the enabling structural conditions that create meaningful employment for people with disabilities and other barriers to employment? How can these be amplified and mobilized in other employment settings?**

This literature review set out to explore a) what is already known about this topic, and b) what we still want to find out through the research.

What is known

- The barriers to employment faced by people with disabilities are largely structural. This includes broad economic and cultural conditions, as well as the structures of workplaces themselves.
- There is now both federal and provincial legislation that acknowledges and seeks to remedy this by foregrounding accessibility as a central commitment at every level, and in all contexts – including but not limited to employment.
- Legislation alone is not enough: employers need to first understand and then address the structural barriers that interfere with employing PWD.
- There are many known effective strategies that employers can and do take up to recruit, employ, and promote people with disabilities.
- Looking at these practices in context can create new possibilities related to a more integrated inclusive economic structure.
- Enterprises that are guided by social values show promise for creating inclusive employment settings, and centering the perspectives of PWD is important for ensuring structural barriers are addressed, and enablers are adopted.
- Many PWD are working in non-standard employment settings. We can widen our scope to include alternative ways people with disabilities are generating employment opportunities for themselves and/or others, for example as entrepreneurs.
- A social purpose can be compromised by a profit-orientation - being explicit about values is important.
- Rather than seeking a single ‘best’ practice, we are encouraged to consider the collective impact of many seemingly discrete actions over time. Recognizing the actions of small, medium-sized, and large enterprises of various forms in context can help us see the impacts they are having when it comes to both addressing structural barriers and creating structural enablers.
- This means we need not seek one decontextualized replicable model, but we can explore how system transformation occurs through the interplay of many diverse actions in a place.
- System-level transformation requires an appetite for risk, and visionary employers who take the long view are paving the way for exciting possibilities.

What we hope to learn

- Largely missing from the literature are the perspectives of entrepreneurs with disabilities themselves, or other PWD in leadership positions.
- Most of the inclusive employment literature focuses on either social enterprise or private enterprise. The diverse economies literature points to a wider range of possibilities, but doesn't speak specifically to disability inclusion. It would be useful to learn more about inclusive employment possibilities related to different kinds of employment settings such as non-profits, governments, co-operatives, and others.
- We hope to cultivate a richer understanding of these and other promising practices that can address the demand-side barriers to meaningful employment for people with disabilities.
- To gain new insight, we must ask questions about structural barriers that exist both within and outside of the employment setting, as well as the ways people address them.
- Our primary focus is to learn more about creating conditions for inclusive employment. By learning from what is already working well, we can better understand the creative ways people are addressing existing barriers.
- Each story is unique, and spending time with each employer or entrepreneur who chooses to participate will generate rich, localized, qualitative data.

Next steps

- Conducting an environmental scan will help us begin to identify potential research participants. Inventorying inclusive employment that is already taking place in BC will help us see where innovation is happening, as well as where more is needed.
- When it comes to inviting people to participate in this research, an innovative starting place will be 1) employers or entrepreneurs who live with disabilities themselves or in their families, 2) those with PWD in leadership positions, 3) as well as those who are identified *by* PWD as being accessible and inclusive employers.
- Developing the research tools such as invitations to participate, surveys, consent processes, and interview questions will require attention to Inclusive Design processes.
- When ready, we will embark on primary research through interviews, focus groups, and case studies, in order to better understand promising practices for workplace inclusion.
- The final step is to share the knowledge as widely and accessibly as possible through a multimedia microsite, and peer-to-peer/business-to-business sharing.

References

- Adam, C. (2018). Nurturing belonging: (Re)centering Indigenous perspectives on disability. *CYC-Online*, 237, 12-34.
- Amoroso, A. (2020). Moving towards a more inclusive society: Full inclusion for those with disabilities. *International Social Science Review*, 96(2), 1-17.
- Anani, N. (2018). Paving the way for the future of work. *Canadian Public Policy*, 44(S1), S167-176.
- Arias-Loyola, M. & Vergara-Perucich, F. (2020). Co-producing the right to fail: resilient grassroot cooperativism in a Chilean informal settlement. *International Development Planning Review*, 43(1), 34-62.
- Austin-Broos, D. (2009). Capitalism as culture, and economy. *The Australian Journal of Anthropology*, 20, 301-317.
- Backrach, T. (2015). Furthering disability rights through inclusive education and employment. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*, 42, 257-261.
- Baker, P.; Linden, M.; LaForce, S.; Rutledge, J.; & Goughnour, K. (2018). Barriers to employment participation of individuals with disabilities: Addressing the impact of employer (mis)perception and policy. *American Behavioural Scientist*, 62(5), 657-675.
- Bates, K.; Goodley, D.; Runswick-Cole, K. (2017). Precarious lives and resistant possibilities: The labour of people with learning disabilities in times of austerity. *Disability and Society*, 32(2), 160-175.
- BC Center for Social Enterprise. (2021). *Welcome to the BC Center for Social Enterprise*. Retrieved 3 March, 2022 from <https://www.centreforsocialenterprise.com/>
- Bellostas, A.; Lopez-Arceiz, F.; & Mateos, L. (2016). Social value and economic value in social enterprises: Value creation model of Spanish sheltered workshops. *Voluntas*, 27, 367-391.
- Beluhova-Uzunova, R.; Shishkova, M.; & Ivanova, B. (2019). Concepts and key sectors of the bioeconomy. *Trakia Journal of Sciences*, 17(1), 227-233.

- Berry, B. & Kymar, K. (2012). Human resource professionals' perception on disability related barriers to employment of persons with intellectual disability. *The Indian Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 44(2), 21-29.
- Beyer, S. (2012). The impact of agency organisation and natural support on supported employment outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*, 36, 109-119.
- Bolger, K. & Doyon, A. (2019). Circular cities: Exploring local government strategies to facilitate a circular economy. *European Planning Studies*, 27(11), 2184-2205.
- Bonaccio, S.; Connelly, C.; Gellaty, I.; Jetha, A.; & Martin Ginis, K. (2020). The participation of people with disabilities in the workplace across the employment cycle: Employer concerns and research evidence. *Journal of Business Psychology*, 35, 135-158.
- Borko, H. (2016). Inclusive capitalism: Economic development or stagnation? A regional perspective. *TILTAI*, 2, 33-52.
- Bouchard, M. J.; Cruz Filho, P.; & Zerdani, T. (2015). Social enterprise in Quebec: Understanding their 'institutional footprint'. *Canadian Journal of Nonprofit and Social Economy Research*, 6(1), 42-62.
- Britannica. (2022). *Social structure*. Retrieved 13 February, 2022 from <https://www.britannica.com/topic/social-structure>
- Brown, L.; Kessler, K.; Toson, A. (2016). An integrated work skill analysis strategy for workers with significant intellectual disabilities. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*, 44, 73-83.
- Buettgen, A. & Klassen, T. (2020). The role of the nonprofit sector as a site for inclusive employment. *Canadian Journal of Nonprofit and Social Economy Research*, 11(2), 82-96.
- Buhariwala, P.; Wilton, R.; Evans, J. (2015). Social enterprises as enabling workplaces for people with psychiatric disabilities. *Disabilities and Society*, 30(6), 865-879.
- Bumble, J.; Carter, E.; McMillan, E.; & Manikas, A. (2017). Using community conversations to expand employment opportunities of people with disabilities in rural and urban communities. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*, 47, 65-78.
- Caldwell, K.; Parker Harris, S.; & Renko, M. (2018). Inclusive management for social entrepreneurs with intellectual disabilities: "How they act". *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities*, 33, 204-218.
- Canadian Human Rights Commission. (n.d.). *The rights of persons with disabilities to equality and non-discrimination: Monitoring the implementation of the UN Convention of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities in Canada*. Retrieved 2 March, 2022 from https://www.chrc-ccdp.gc.ca/sites/default/files/chrc_un_crpd_report_eng.pdf
- Carnegie, M.; McKinnon, K.; & Gibson, K. (2019). Creating community-based indicators of gender equity: A methodology. *Asia Pacific Viewpoint*, 60(3), 252-266.

- Center for Social Innovation. (2022). *What is social innovation?* Retrieved 3 March, 2022 from <https://socialinnovation.org/about/who-we-are/>
- Child, J. (2021). Organizational participation in post-covid society – its contributions and enabling conditions. *International Review of Applied Economics*, 35(2), 117-146.
- Cooney, K. (2016). Work integration social enterprises in the United States: Operating at the nexus of public policy, markets, and community. *Nonprofit Political Forum*, 7(4), 435-460.
- Crawford, C. (2011). *The employment of people with intellectual disabilities in Canada: A statistical profile*. Toronto, ON: Institute for Research and Development on Inclusion and Society (IRIS).
- de Finney, S.; Dean, M.; Loiselle, E.; and Saraceno, J. (2011). All children are equal, but some are more equal than others: Minoritization, structural inequities, and social justice praxis in residential care. *International Journal of Child, Youth, and Family Studies*, 2(3/4), 361-384.
- de Leeuw, S. (2015). Activating place: Geography as a determinant of Indigenous peoples' health and well-being. In *Determinants of Indigenous peoples' health in Canada: Beyond the social*. (Eds. Greenwood, M.; de Leeuw, S.; Lindsay, N. M.; & Reading, C.). Toronto, ON: Canadian Scholars' Press. pp. 90-103.
- del Moral-Espin, L. & Fernandez-Garcia, M. (2018). Moving beyond dichotomies? The collaborative economy scene in Andalusia and the role of public actors in shaping it. *The Sociological Review Monographs*, 66(2), 401-424.
- Ebuenyi, I. D.; Syurina, E. V.; Bunders, J. F. G.; & Regeer, B. J. (2018). Barriers to and facilitators of employment for people with psychiatric disabilities in Africa: A scoping review. *Global Health Action*, 11, 1-19.
- Education First. (n.d.) Equity-centered design thinking. Retrieved 18 February, 2022 from <https://bsd405.org/wp-content/pdf/equity/equity-centered-design-thinking-roadmap.pdf>
- Ferrucci, F. (2014). Disability and work inclusion in Italy: Between unfulfilled promises and new disability culture. *Modern Italy*, 19(2), 183-197.
- Fraser, R.; Ajzen, I.; Johnson, K.; Herbert, J.; Chan, F. (2011). Understanding employers' hiring intention in relation to qualified workers with disabilities. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*, 35, 1-11.
- Gibson, K.; Astuti, R.; Carnegie, M.; Chalernphon, A.; Dombroski, K.; Ririn Haryani, A.; Hill, A.; Kehi, B.; Law, L.; Lyne, I.; McGregor, A.; McKinnon, K.; McWilliam, A.; Miller, F.; Ngin, C.; Occena-Gutierrez, D.; Palmer, L.; Placino, P.; Rampengan, M.; Lei Lei Than, W.; Isiyana Wianti, N.; & Sarah Wright. (2018). Community economies in Monsoon Asia: Keywords and key reflections. *Asia Pacific Viewpoint*, 59(1), 3-16.

- Gibson-Graham, J.K.; Cameron, J.; & Healy, S. (2013). *Take back the economy: An ethical guide for transforming our communities*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Gibson-Graham, J. K.; Cameron, J.; Healy, S.; & McNeill, J. (2019). Roepke lecture in economic geography – Economic geography, manufacturing, and ethical action in the Anthropocene. *Economic Geography*, 95(1), 1-22.
- Glavin, P.; Bierman, A.; & Glavi, P. (2021). Uber-alienated: Powerless and alone in the gig economy. *Work and Occupations*, 48(4). 399-431.
- Gopel, M. (2016). *The great mindshift: how a new economic paradigm and sustainability transformations go hand in hand*. Springer International Publishing.
- Glade, R.; Koch, L.; Zaandam, A.; Simon, L.; Manno, C.; Rumrill Jr., P.; & Rosen, C. (2020). Recommendations from employees with disabilities for creating inclusive workplaces: Results from a grounded theory investigation. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*, 53, 77-88.
- Government of British Columbia. (2021). *Accessible British Columbia Act*. Retrieve 8 February, 2022 from <https://www.bclaws.gov.bc.ca/civix/document/id/complete/statreg/21019>
- Government of British Columbia. (2022). *Stronger BC Economic Plan 2022*. Retrieved 18 February, 2022 from https://news.gov.bc.ca/files/StrongerBC_Economic_Plan_2022.pdf
- Government of Canada. (2019). *Accessible Canada Act*. Retrieved 14 February, 2022 from <https://laws.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/A-0.6/page-1.html>
- Government of Canada. (2020). *Social determinants of health and health inequities*. Retrieved 14 February, 2022 from <https://www.canada.ca/en/public-health/services/health-promotion/population-health/what-determines-health.html>
- Grills, N.; Varghese, J.; Hughes, N.; Jolly, T.; & Kumar, R. (2016). The success of the Uttarakhand Cluster: A case study of organisational change towards disability inclusive development. *BMC Health Services Research*, 16, 338-347.
- Gronvik, L. (2009). Defining disability: Effects of disability concepts on research outcomes. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 12(1), 1-18.
- Gunty, A.; Van Ness, J.; & Nye-Lengerman, K. (2019). Be a change agent: Tools and techniques to support organizational and individual transformation. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*, 50, 325-329.
- Gupta, S.; Sukhai, M.; & Wittich, W. (2021). Employment outcomes and experiences of people with seeing disability in Canada: An analysis of the Canadian Survey on Disability 2017. *PLoS ONE*, 16(11), 1-17.
- Hankivsky, O. 2014. Intersectionality 101. Vancouver, BC: The Institute for Intersectionality Research and Policy.

- Harrop, C. (2019). *tiwšamstawišt (We will teach each other) Final Report*. Powell River, BC: Vancouver Island University. Unpublished document.
- Hartnett, H.; Stuart, H.; Thurman, H.; Loy, B.; Carter Batiste, L. (2011). Employers' perceptions of the benefits of workplace accommodations: Reasons to hire, retain and promote people with disabilities. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*, 34, 17-23.
- Hernandez, G. (2013). Indigenous perspectives on community economic development: A north-south conversation. *Canadian Journal of Nonprofit and Social Economy Research*, 4(1), 6-24.
- Hick, R. & Murphy, M. (2020). Common shock, different paths? Comparing social policy responses to COVID-19 in the UK and Ireland. *Social Policy Administration*, 55, 312-325.
- Hinton, J. (2021). Five key dimensions of post-growth business: Putting the pieces together. *Futures*, 131, p. 1-13.
- Hinton, J. & Maclurcan, D. (2017). A not-for-profit world beyond capitalism and economic growth? *Ephemera: Theory and politics in organization*, 17(1), 147-166.
- Hole, R.; Reid, C.; & Mudde, L. (2022). *IMPACT: Cohort 2 Report*. University of British Columbia: Canadian Institute for Inclusion and Citizenship.
- Holmes, K. (2018). *Five ways inclusion fuels innovation*. Retrieved 13 February, 2022 from <https://katholmesdesign.com/inclusive-toolkit>
- Horbach, J. & Rammer, C. (2020). Circular economy innovations, growth and employment at the firm level. *Journal of Industrial Economy*, 24, 615-625.
- Hosking, E. N. & Palomino-Schalscha. (2016). Of gardens, hopes, and spirits: Unravelling (extra)ordinary community economic arrangements as sites of transformation in Cape Town, South Africa. *Antipode*, 48(5), 1249-1269.
- Hsu, T.; Huang, Y.; Ososkie, J. (2009). Challenges in transition from sheltered workshop to competitive employment: Perspectives of Taiwan social enterprise transition specialists. *Journal of Rehabilitation*, 75(4), 19-26.
- inclusion Powell River Society. (2018). *Literature review: Employment inclusion and disability*. Retrieved 28 January, 2022 from https://b411ff33-9b1d-44b0-87c6-d6e90d616e3d.filesusr.com/ugd/0fe914_5b7e22b9e38a4bee8d2e9d8d0e4f65f2.pdf
- inclusion Powell River Society. (2021). *qathet Inclusive Manufacturing Pilot Project: A year in review*. Retrieved 20 March, 2022 from <https://www.qimproject.com/phase-two-report>
- Jesus, T. S.; Kamalakannan, S.; Bhattacharjya, S.; Bogdanova, Y.; Arango-Lasprilla, J. C.; Bentley, J.; Landry, M.; Papadimitriou, C.; Refugee Empowerment Task Force; & International Networking Group of the American Congress of Rehabilitation Medicine. (2021). PREparedness, Response and SySTemic transformation (PRE-RE-SyST): A model for disability-inclusive pandemic responses and systemic

- disparities reduction derived from a scoping review and thematic analysis. *International Journal for Equity in Health*, 20(204), p. 1-17.
- Kaletta, J.; Binks, D.I & Robinson, R. (2012). Creating an inclusive workplace: Integrating employees with disabilities into a distribution center environment. *Professional Safety* (June 2012), 62-71.
- Katz, E. (2014). Social enterprise businesses: A strategy for creating good jobs for people with disabilities. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*, 40, 137-142.
- Kitching, J. (2006). Can small businesses help reduce employment exclusion? *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, 24, 869-884.
- Klagge, B. & Meister, T. (2018). Energy cooperatives in Germany – an example of successful alternative economies? *Local Environment*, 23(7), 697-716.
- Krueger, R.; Schulz, C.; Gibbs, D. (2018). Institutionalizing alternative economic spaces? An interpretivist perspective on diverse economies. *Progress in Human Geography*, 42(4), 569-589.
- Kocman, A.; Fischer, L.; & Weber, G. (2018). The employers' perspective on barriers and facilitators to employment of people with intellectual disability: A differential mixed-method approach. *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities*, 31, 120-131.
- Kuokkanen, R. (2011). Indigenous economies, theories of subsistence, and women: Exploring the social economy model for Indigenous governance. *American Indian Quarterly*, 35(2), 215-240.
- Kuran, C.H.; Morsut, C.; Kruke, B. I.; Kruger, M.; Segnestam, L.; Orru, K.; Naevestad, T. O.; Airola, M.; Keranen, J.; Gabel, F.; Hansson, S.; & Torpan, S. (2020). Vulnerability and vulnerable groups from an intersectional perspective. *International Journal of Risk Reduction*, 50, 1-8.
- Kuznetsova, Y. & Yalcin, B. (2017). Inclusion of persons with disabilities in mainstream employment: Is it really all about the money? A case study of four large companies in Norway and Sweden. *Disability and Society*, 32(2), 233-253.
- Lanctot, N.; Corbiere, M.; Durand, M. (2012). Job tenure and quality of work life of people with psychiatric disabilities working in social enterprises. *Journal of Rehabilitation*, 37, 39-48.
- Lang, R.; Schneider, M.; Kett, M.; Cole, E.; & Groce, N. (2019). Policy development: An analysis of disability inclusion in a selection of African Union policies. *Developmental Policy Review*, 37, 155-175.
- Larue, B. (2021). COVID-19 and labor issues: An assessment. *Canadian Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 69, 269-279.

- Lindsay, S.; Cagliostro, E.; Leck, J.; Shen, W.; & Stinson, J. (2019). Employers' perspectives of including young people with disabilities in the workforce, disability disclosure and providing accommodations. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation, 50*, 141-156.
- Luck, R. (2018). Inclusive design and making in practice: Bringing bodily experience into closer contact with making. *Design studies, 54*, 96-119
- Ludski. (2019). *Death becomes us*. Retrieved 19 January, 2022 from <https://cousin.myportfolio.com/dbu-audio>
- Lysaght, R.; Krupa, T.; Bouchard, M. (2018). The role of social enterprise in creating work options for people with intellectual and developmental disabilities. *Journal on Developmental Disabilities, 23*(3), 18-30.
- Mactaggart, I.; Banks, L.; Kuper, H.; Murthy, G.; Sagar, J.; Oye, J.; Polack, S. (2018). Livelihood opportunities amongst adults with and without disabilities in Cameroon and India: A case control study. *PLoS ONE 13*(4), 1-17.
- McColl, M.; Gitternman, A.; & Goldowitz, (2019). Knowledge translation from disability studies to policy makers: Literature review and expert consultation. *Canadian Journal of Disability Studies, 8*(5), 1-17.
- Meier, P.; Celis, K.; Huysentruty, H. (2016). Mainstreaming disability in policies: The Flemish experience. *Disability and Society, 31*(9), 1190-1204.
- Meltzer, A.; Robinson, S.; & Fisher, K. (2019). Barriers to finding and maintaining open employment for people with intellectual disability in Australia. *Social Policy Administration, 54*, 88-101.
- Misawa, M. (2010). Queer Race Pedagogy for Educators in Higher Education: Dealing with Power Dynamics and Positionality of LGBTQ Students of Color. *International Journal of Critical Pedagogy, 3* (1), 26-35.
- Mitchell, S. (2018). *Sacred instructions: Indigenous wisdom for living spirit-based change*. Berkeley, CA: North Atlantic Books.
- Moragues-Faus, A.; Marsden, T.; Adlerova, B.; & Hausmanova, T. (2020). Building diverse, distributive, and territorialized agrifood economies to deliver sustainability and food security. *Economic Geography, 96*(3), 2019-243.
- Morrow, M.; Wasik, A.; Cohen, M.; Elah Perry, K. (2009). Removing barriers to work: Building economic security for people with psychiatric disabilities. *Critical Social Policy, 29*(4), 655-676.
- Murfitt, K.; Crosbie, J.; Zammit, J.; & Williams, G. (2018). Employer engagement in disability employment: A missing link for small to medium organizations – a review of the literature. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation, 48*, 417-431.

- Nicholas, D.; Mitchell, W.; Zulla, R.; & Carolyn, D. (2019). Perspectives of employers about hiring individuals with autism spectrum disorder: Evaluating a cohort of employers engaged in a job-readiness initiative. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*, 50, 353-364.
- Nilsson, I. & Townsend, E. (2014). Occupational Justice—Bridging theory and practice. *Scandinavian Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 21(1), 64-70.
- North, P. (2016). The business of the Anthropocene? Substantivist and diverse economies perspectives on SME engagement in local low carbon transitions. *Progress in Human Geography*, 40(4), 437-454.
- Okewale, J. A.; Adeyemi, A. A.; Soyemi, A. K.; & Mieseigha, E. G. (2020). Human capital accounting and sustainable development goals: Evidence from Nigeria. *Journal of Academic Research in Economics*, 12(1), 59-68.
- Oz, O. & Aksoy, Z. (2019). Challenges of building alternatives: the experience of a consumer food co-operative in Istanbul. *Food, Culture, and Society*, 22(3), 299-315.
- Park, Y.; Gi Seo, D.; Park, J.; Bettini, E.; & Smith, J. (2016). Predictors of job satisfaction among individuals with disabilities: An analysis of South Korea's National Survey of employment for the disabled. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, 53/54, 198-212.
- Paul, E. (2014). *Written as I remember it: Teachings from the life of a Sliammon elder*. Vancouver, BC: UBC Press.
- Pavlova, M. (2018). Fostering inclusive, sustainable economic growth and 'green' skills development in learning cities through partnerships. *International Review of Education*, 64, 339-354.
- Prince, M. (2014). Locating a window of opportunity in the social economy: Canadians with disabilities and labour market challenges. *Canadian Journal of Nonprofit and Social Economy Research*, 5(1), 6-20.
- Prince, M. (2016). Inclusive employment for Canadians with disabilities: Toward a new policy framework and agenda. *IRPP Study*, 60(August 2016), 1-28.
- Prince, M. (2017). Persons with invisible disabilities and workplace accommodation: Findings from a scoping literature review. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*, 46, 75-86.
- Qian, J. & Wei, L. (2019). Development at the edge of difference: Rethinking capital and market relationship from Lugu Lake, Southwest China. *Antipode*, 52(1), 246-269.
- Rajarshi Mukhopadhyay, T. (2015). *Plankton dreams: What I learned in special-ed*. London: UK: Open Humanities Press. Introduction – Chapter 3.
- Ramachandra, S.; Murthy, G.; Shamanna B.; Allagh, K.; Pant, H.; John, N. (2017). Factors influencing employment and employability for persons with disability: Insights from a city in south India. *Indian Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*. 21, 36-41.

- Raworth, K. (2017). *Doughnut economics: 7 ways to think like a 21st century economist*. White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green Publishing.
- Richmond, C. (2015). The relatedness of people, land, and health: Stories from Anishinabe Elders. In *Determinants of Indigenous peoples' health in Canada: Beyond the social*. (Eds. Greenwood, M.; de Leeuw, S.; Lindsay, N. M.; & Reading, C.). Toronto, ON: Canadian Scholars' Press. pp. 47-63.
- Rihter, L. & Zidar, R. (2018). Social entrepreneurship in Slovenia: An opportunity for sustainable development? *Revija Za Socijalnu Politiku*, 25(3), 285-302.
- Roman, L.G., Brown, S., Noble, S., Wainer, R., & Earl-Young, A. (2009). No time for nostalgia!: Asylum-making, medicalized colonialism in British Columbia (1859-97) and artistic praxis for social transformation. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 22 (1), 17-63.
- Rosol, M. (2019). On the significance of alternative economic practices: Reconceptualizing alterity in alternative food networks. *Economic Geography*, 96(1), 52-76.
- Roth, S. (2019). Can capitalism be decolonized? Recentring Indigenous peoples, values, and ways of life in the Canadian art market. *American Indian Quarterly* (43)3, 306-338.
- Santana, J. & Paolo Parigi. (2015). Risk aversion and engagement in the sharing economy. *Games*, 6, 560-573.
- Schmid, G. (2018). *Inclusive growth: The case of Germany*. The IZA Institute of Labor Economics: IZA Policy Paper No. 139.
- Schmid, B. & Smith, T. (2021). Social transformation and postcapitalist possibility: Emerging dialogues between practice theory and diverse economies. *Progress in Human Geography*, 45(2), 253-275.
- Seaman, R.; & Cannella-Malone, H. (2016). Vocational skills interventions for adults with autism spectrum disorder: A review of the literature. *Journal of Developmental and Physical Disabilities*, 28, 479-494.
- Sedikova, I. (2019). Development of conceptual principles of the circular economy. *EKOONOMIKA XAPЧOBOЇ ПPOMИCЛOBOCTI*, 11(2), 47-53.
- Sheppard-Jones, K.; Goldstein, P.; Leslie, M.; Singleton, P.; Gooden, C.; Rumrill, P.; Mullis, L.; & Espinosa Bard, C. (2020). Reframing workplace inclusion through the lens of universal design: Considerations for vocational rehabilitation professionals in the wake of COVID-19. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*, 54, 71-79.
- Shuey, K. & Jovic, E. (2013). Disability accommodation in nonstandard and precarious employment arrangements. *Work and Occupations*, 40(2), 174-205.

- Simplican, S.; Leader, G.; Kosciulek, J.; & Leahy, M. (2014). Defining social inclusion of people with intellectual and developmental disabilities: An ecological model of social networks and community participation. *Research in Developmental Disabilities, 38*, 18-29.
- Slusariuc, G. & Nimara, C. (2020). The impact of bioeconomy on the sustainable development. *Mining Engineering, 21*, 260-267.
- Solid State Community Industries. (n.d.) *We build co-ops, but it's a lot more than that*. Retrieved 8 march, 2022 from <https://www.solidstate.coop/>
- Spanier, J. (2021). Rural futurism: Assembling the future in the countryside. *ACME: An International Journal for Critical Geographies, 20*(1), 120-141.
- Stuart, M.; Spencer, D. A.; McLachlan, C. J.; & Forde, C. (2021). COVID-19 and the uncertain future of HRM: Furlough, job retention, and reform. *Human Resource Management Journal, 31*, 904-917.
- Teegee, T. (2015). Take care of the land and the land will take care of you: Resources, development, and health. In *Determinants of Indigenous peoples' health in Canada: Beyond the social*. (Eds. Greenwood, M.; de Leeuw, S.; Lindsay, N. M.; & Reading, C.). Toronto, ON: Canadian Scholars' Press. pp. 120-133.
- Tenson, M. (2017). Indigenous knowledge systems: A haven for sustainable economic growth in Zimbabwe. *Africology: The Journal of Pan African Studies, 10*(3), 172-186.
- The Universal Design Project. (2022). *What is universal design?* Retrieved 8 February, 2022 from <https://universaldesign.org/definition>
- Thoms, J. M. (2007). *Leading an extraordinary life: Wise practices for an HIV prevention campaign with two-spirit men*. Toronto, ON: Prepared for two-spirit people of the First Nations.
- Treviranus, J. (2014). Leveraging the web as a platform for economic inclusion. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law, 32*94-103.
- Unger, D. (2010). Sufficiency economy and the bourgeois virtues. *Asian Affairs, 36*(3), 139-156.
- United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. (2022). *Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities*. Retrieved 14 February, 2022 from <https://www.un.org/development/desa/disabilities/convention-on-the-rights-of-persons-with-disabilities.html>
- Vachon, W. (2018). Child and Youth Care Fragility. *CYC Online*. Retrieved 14 February, 2022 from <https://cyc-net.org/cyc-online/june2018.pdf>
- Waring, M. (2018). *Still counting: Welling, women's work and policy-making*. New Zealand: BWB Texts

- Washington, S. M. (2004). Bringing traditional teachings to leadership. *American Indian Quarterly*, 28(3/4), p. 583-603.
- Wehman, P.; Brooke, V.; Molinelli Brooke, A.; Ham, W.; Schall, C.; McDonough, J.; Lay, S.; Seward, H.; & Avellone, L. (2016). Employment for adults with autism spectrum disorders: A retrospective review of a customized employment approach. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, 53/54, 61-72.
- Wesley-Esquimaux, C.C., & Snowball, A. (2010). Viewing violence, mental illness and addiction through a wise practices lens. *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction*, 8, 390-407.
- West, M.; Targett, P.; Wehman, P.; Cifu, G.; & Davis, J. (2015). Separation from supported employment: A retrospective chart review study. *Disability and Rehabilitation*, 37(12), 1055-1059.
- White, T. (2013). Growing diverse economies through community supported agriculture. *The Northeastern Geographer*, 5, 1-25.
- White, R. J. & Williams, C. C. (2016). Beyond capitalocentrism: Are non-capitalist work practices 'alternatives'? *Area*: 48(3), 325-331.
- Zademach, H.-M. & Musch, A.-K. (2018). Bicycle-sharing systems in an alternative/diverse economy perspective: A sympathetic critique. *Local Environment*, 23(7), 734-746.
- Zitcer, A. (2014). Food co-ops and the paradox of exclusivity. *Antipode*, 47(3), 812-828.