

How Disabled and Non-Disabled Health Care Workers Feel About Working from Home and Being Happy With Their Jobs

Dr. Anamika Chaudhry¹ & Saurabh Srivastav²

¹Professor, Dr. Shakuntala Mishra National Rehabilitation University Lucknow

²Research Scholar, Dr. Shakuntala Mishra national Rehabilitation University Lucknow

Received: 21 August 2026 Accepted & Reviewed: 25 August 2026, Published: 31 August 2026

Abstract

Even though people are becoming more aware of diversity and inclusion in the workplace, disabled workers are still not as satisfied with their jobs as their non-disabled peers. Not only are these differences caused by obvious problems like unequal pay and unfair hiring practices, but they are also caused by more subtle problems within the company, like a lack of support, an unwillingness to include everyone, and tense relationships between coworkers. This study looks into whether working from home, which has become more public in the job market since the pandemic, can help close these job happiness gaps. We use survey data from a wide range of medical professionals and multivariable regression models to look at how disability and working from home affect a number of job satisfaction indicators, such as plans to leave the job, commitment to the company, feeling supported, and the social atmosphere at work. Our research shows that disabled workers are much less satisfied with their jobs across almost all of the measures we looked at, and they also say they want to leave their jobs more often. While working from home is linked to small increases in job satisfaction, the benefits are much bigger for people who don't have disabilities. This means that while online work may be good for most people, it doesn't help people with disabilities get ahead. These results call into question the idea that general accommodations are good for everyone. They also show how important it is for organizations to have specific plans to deal with the systemic and interpersonal problems disabled workers face.

Keyword- *Multivariable regression, disabilities. Non-disabled peers*

Introduction

Even though India has laws like the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016 (RPwD Act) that try to make things better, people with disabilities are still routinely kept out of the official workforce. Social stigma, negative stereotypes, and hostile work environments all make it harder for people with disabilities (PwDs) to get jobs and improve their health. These are the main reasons for job hurdles that go beyond simple infrastructure. The RPwD Act says that businesses must not discriminate and make reasonable accommodations, but in fact, many businesses don't know about these rules or can't make their practices more inclusive. Because of this, disabled workers in India often are less satisfied with their jobs, get paid less, and have fewer opportunities to move up in their careers.

It is common for both employers and coworkers to think that disabled workers are less skilled or effective, which makes these unfair situations even worse. Because of this,

There aren't many standards for people with disabilities, and they are often put in low-status, low-skilled jobs despite their real skills or credentials. People with disabilities (PwD) face a persistent pay gap and limited access to effective professional development chances, even when their educational and professional credentials are similar. Because of these systemic injustices, people are

less Satisfied with their jobs, which have an effect on their quality of life and their ability to find work in the long run

Anecdotal evidence and smaller-scale studies have proven this. One of the major reasons for this difference is that people don't get enough respect and recognition at work.

This problem has to do with how society sees disabled people in general. People with disabilities are often seen as needy or weak instead of as equal contributors to the economy it's possible that workplace accommodations could be very important in this situation. Flexible work arrangements, especially the option to WFH, have become an important way for disabled employees to be more productive, have easier commutes (which are especially bad in India because of the country's poorly designed urban infrastructure), and have more freedom. But before the COVID-19 pandemic, Indian companies were often hesitant to make these kinds of exceptions. This was especially true in traditional industries and the public sector, where problems with organizational culture, productivity, and coordination were given as reasons.

This was not the case before the COVID-19 pandemic, which required many public to WFH in many fields, such as healthcare, education, management, and information technology. The time frame in question was a natural test that proved many job duties could be done successfully from home. Some global studies found that people with disabilities were more expected to WFH before the pandemic. However, Indian data stayed limited. It is clear, though, that the sudden acceptance of remote work opened up new job opportunities for everyone, especially disabled people who couldn't do certain jobs before because of physical or logistical issues. However, not everyone got the chance. In India, most disabled workers have low-paying or illegal jobs that don't let them work from home. During the outbreak, many people also couldn't use remote work opportunities because they didn't know how to use technology or didn't have access to it. As a result, WFH has a lot of potential as a reasonable accommodation under the RPwD Act. However, not much is known about how it is actually used and how it benefits the job satisfaction of PwDs in India.

This study focusses on the healthcare business and checks to see if working from home can help close the gap in job satisfaction between Indian workers who have and don't have disabilities. Using information from a large healthcare company, we look into the following ideas:

Employees with disabilities have less positive work experiences and are less satisfied with their jobs than their coworkers who don't have disabilities. When employees work from home, their views of their work environment and job satisfaction improve for everyone. Working from home can help close the gap in job happiness between people with and without disabilities. In addition to a direct measure of job satisfaction, our method looks at 10 different aspects of work experience, such as job autonomy, how inclusive employees think their boss is, and interactions with peers and superiors. This is why we focus on the healthcare industry. For starters, a big part of its workforce is disabled, mostly in entry-level and support roles. Second, we could look at how different types of disability affect people at work, since the field is very diverse in terms of age, gender, caste, and education. Third, the COVID-19 pandemic showed that the skills, diversity, and resilience of the healthcare workforce are directly linked to public health. This study adds to ongoing efforts to make workplaces more accessible, fair, and inclusive by putting our research in the context of India's larger trend towards flexible work after the pandemic. This also brings focus to how important it is to go beyond compliance and towards true inclusion, where people with disabilities are seen, helped, and given the tools they need to do well at work.

2-Methods- We worked with a big university and affiliated health coordination across the whole state to create and run a new survey. The poll was for healthcare workers with and without disabilities, and it mostly asked about their experiences with how their employers handle working from home. We used the Qualtrics platform to do the poll, and 1405 employees filled it out between May 26 and July 31, 2023. The poll tool was based on Schurz et al. (2014; 2020) and used scales that are common in studies of organizational behavior. 13, 14 these grades are explained in the online Appendix. The final dataset had 993 participants after answers with missing information were taken out. Appendix Table-1 and Table-2 show the sample means for all factors all respondents gave their permission after being fully informed. We used the data to make summary statistics about disability status, working from home, and how people felt about things at work that were linked to job satisfaction, like how accessible the workplace was, how people with disabilities were treated, and how they got along with managers and coworkers. Then, we used multiple regressions to see if being able to WFH changes the link between disability and job happiness, while keeping all other factors the same. The full list of model specs is:

$$\text{Outcome} = b_0 + b_1 \text{Disabi} + b_2 \text{WFH} + b_3 (\text{Disabi} \times \text{WFH}) + b_4 X_i + \epsilon_i$$

Now you have a list of ten signs, which indicate how someone feels about their job and whether they are happy with it. The variable 'Disabi' is Dummy; it doesn't show if someone has a disability. The variable how much someone could work from home is shown by their WFH. WFH is used as a set of fake factors to show how often people work from home never, less than three days a week, or three days a week or more. WFH is also based on the reason why people work from home: not at all, because of the pandemic, for the good of the company, and for the good of the person. You can find this second set of facts in the online supplement. The writing Some of the things that determine X_i are the number of children living at home, marital status, schooling, income above 25,000, career as a boss, full-time work, and length of time at job. Ten of the questions in the poll are about experiences at work, and one of them directly asks about job happiness. Some of these are job autonomy, 15–17 plans to leave the company, 18 organizational commitment, 19 organizational citizenship behaviors, 20 perceived organizational support, 21, 22 employer openness to differences, the climate for inclusion, 23 treatment of people with disabilities, and relationships with one's manager (also called leader-member exchange) and coworkers (also called coworker exchange). 25 The six standard Census questions are used to find out if someone has a disability. It asks two more questions about long-term problems and things that can't be done just yet.

First, "Are you deaf or do you have serious trouble hearing?" Second, "Are you blind or do you have serious trouble seeing even when you wear glasses?" Third, "Do you have serious trouble focusing, remembering, or making decisions?" (4) "Do you really have trouble walking or going up and down stairs?" (5) "Are you having trouble getting dressed or bathing?" (6) "Do you find it hard to run errands by yourself, like going to the doctor or shopping?" (7) "Do you find it hard to interact and/or communicate with others?" and (8) "Do you have a long-term health problem or impairment that makes it hard for you to do work, housework, school, parenting, play, or other things?" People could choose more than one answer because these questions did not contradict each other. If a person answered "yes" to any of these questions, they are considered to have a condition. We might not have counted all the people with disabilities who really exist. The questions on the Census are meant to find people with more severe functional problems. 26 The questions might not cover mental health, long-term pain, or neurodivergent people who have problems because of what used to be called learning disorders, such as ADHD, autism, and a number of other unusual connections. So, to try to include some of these people, our poll has two extra questions about long-term disabilities and problems with social interactions. Still,

because of the persistent stigma surrounding disability, some people may be hesitant to say in a survey that they have trouble with tasks or social interactions. Estimates of requests for accommodations because of a disability are also limited to people who know they have a disability or have been diagnosed with one. This means that people who have not been identified or are unaware of their disability may not be included. People with a diagnosed disability who want to request accommodations for working from home may be put off by the need to show medical proof, especially if they are not currently getting care for their condition. Because telling their bosses about their needs lets them meet those needs and give everyone an equal chance to succeed, employees who do this may be happier with their jobs. So, our analyses use two different types of disability samples: (1) those who answered the question with one or more disability conditions ($n = 228$) and (2) those who told their employers they had a disability ($n = 114$). In both cases, there are a total of 993 people in the analytical group. This paper has the results for people who said they had a disability in the survey. The results for people who told their boss they had a disability are in the online appendix and are not included here because of space issues.

3-Results

3.1. Health Impairments statics-Out of a group of 993 people, 228 (23.3%) said they had a disability and 765 (77.0%) said they did not. This rate is a lot higher than what India's government says it is. The Census of India (2011) found that only 2.2% of the people living in the country had a disability. But data from all over the world shows that the number of disabled people changes depending on how the survey is done and what terms are used. In 2023, the WHO said that 16.1% of the world's population has a major disability. Self-identification questions don't always show as high of a prevalence as practical limitation-based questions, like the Washington Group Short Set. So, the 23% rate found in this poll makes sense, especially if you count impairments that are hard to see or have to do with health.

Out of the 228 disabled people surveyed, 49.6% said they had trouble concentrating or choosing what to do. 46.5% said they had a long-term health problem, which was right behind this. The results show how common functional limits linked to health and thinking are. These kinds of limitations are often called "invisible disabilities." Other issues included failing to walk or climb stairs (25%), getting along with others (20.6%), or having someone run errands for you (17.2%). People in this group were less likely to have common sense problems, like being deaf or having trouble hearing (14.5%) and blind or having trouble seeing (4.4%). There are a lot of mental and health problems, which is in line with growing data around the world that mental illness and long-term illness are major causes of disability at work (Shakespeare et al., 2019).

Patterns of disclosure show even more clearly the problems that workers with disabilities face. Just over half of the people who answered (51.8%) told their employer they had a disability, while 25.2% chose not to, and 23.0% said "it's complicated." Additionally, 16.7% said they didn't tell their employer because they were afraid of the stigma. International studies have shown that confession depends on the situation and is affected by things like the work environment, the fear of being judged, and the belief that help is available (Lindsay et al., 2018). Non-disclosure can protect workers from racism, but it can also make it harder for them to get accommodations at work, which can make the cycle of disadvantage stronger.

The results show how important it is to have practices in the workplace that are accessible to people with both obvious and invisible disabilities. Employers should make anti-stigma programs stronger, support private ways to talk about problems, and be open with accommodations, especially for health- and cognitive-related

problems that made up most of the disabilities in this study. Clear rules, manager training, and employee resource groups are thought to be the best ways to improve both the rate of disclosure and the number of people who feel welcome at work (ILO, 2021). By addressing stigma and creating supportive environments, businesses can help reduce social isolation and unfair treatment, which will make disabled workers happier at work and more likely to stay with the company

TABLE-1

Category	Number	Percent
Sample	993	100.0
Without Disability	765	77.0
With Disability	228	23.0

TABLE-2

Type	Number	Percent
Deaf	33	14.5
Blind	10	4.4
Difficulty concentrating	113	49.6
Difficulty walking / climbing stairs	57	25.0
Difficulty dressing / bathing	7	3.1
Difficulty doing errands alone	39	17.2
Difficulty interacting with others	47	20.6
Long-term health impairment	106	46.5

TABLE-3

Indicator	Number	Percent
Health condition has affected ability to complete work duties with moderate	32	14.0
Disclosure of condition to employer		
– Yes	117	51.8
– No	57	25.2
– It's complicated	52	23.0
– Did not respond	2	0.9

Sometimes unfairly treated because of condition	34	14.9
Feel socially isolated at work because of condition	35	15.4
Did not disclose due to fear of stigma	38	16.7

Patterns of disclosure further illuminate the challenges faced by employees with disabilities. Just over half of respondents (51.8%) disclosed their disability to their employer, while 25.2% chose not to disclose, and a notable 23.0% responded that “it’s complicated.” Additionally, 16.7% reported withholding disclosure specifically due to fear of stigma. This mixed pattern reflects findings from international studies showing that disclosure is highly context-dependent and influenced by organizational climate, anticipated stigma, and perceived availability of accommodations (Lindsay et al., 2018). Non-disclosure can protect employees from bias but may also limit access to workplace accommodations, reinforcing the cycle of disadvantage.

The results underscore the importance of adopting inclusive workplace practices that address both visible and invisible disabilities. Employers should strengthen anti-stigma interventions, promote confidential disclosure mechanisms, and provide flexible accommodations, particularly for cognitive and health-related impairments that dominate the disability profile in this study. Global best practices suggest that clear policies, manager training, and employee resource groups improve both disclosure rates and workplace inclusion (ILO, 2021). By addressing stigma and fostering supportive environments, organizations can mitigate social isolation and unfair treatment, thereby enhancing job satisfaction and retention among employees with disability

3.2. Work Experiences Job and Satisfaction -Job satisfaction and work experiences are described by numbers. Table 2 shows that there is no statistically significant difference in job happiness between people with and without disabilities. This comes from one poll question about being happy with your job. But Table 2 shows that there is stronger proof that people with disabilities have more negative views of events at work that make them unhappy with their job. In this study, the table shows the group means for the 10 ways that people talked about how they felt about their jobs. The poll had different sets of questions that were used to make these indices, which range from 0 to 1. Find them in Appendix Table 3.

3.2.1. Turnover Intentions-People with disabilities were more likely to quit their job than people without disabilities (0.420 vs. 0.323, $p < 0.01$). There were 993 samples, and the 2-tail t tests showed that the results were significant at 1%, 5%, and 10%. The numbers in brackets show what portion of the group agrees with each statement. You can find a list of all the exact indicators that are part of the indices in Appendix Table 3. This table shows, for example, what “Disclosed Disability status” means. The regression-adjusted disability gaps look at things like age, gender, race or ethnicity, marital status, schooling, income More than \$75,000, children living at home, management role, full-time/part time, and time duration at the job.

The job satisfaction of employees with disabilities was lower (0.592) than that of employees without disabilities (0.648), creating a small gap of 0.056 that is still significant after regression adjustment (0.047). Also, when it came to job liberty, disabled workers scored a little lower (0.575 vs. 0.599), but this difference (0.015 adjusted) is not statistically significant. These results show that there are differences in satisfaction and autonomy, but they are not as big as differences in other areas of the working experience. Previous research has shown that differences in job happiness are often caused by organisational support and inclusive practices, not by differences in ability (Schur et al., 2009).

There are big differences in how likely employees are to leave. Employees with disabilities report much higher plans to leave (0.420) than those without disabilities (0.323), creating a significant gap of 0.096 (0.095

adjusted, $p < 0.01$). This means that disabled workers may feel less safe or connected to their companies, probably because they think they face obstacles or are left out. In the same way, employees with disabilities are less committed to their jobs (0.459 vs. 0.530), with a difference of 0.071 (0.056 corrected, $p < 0.05$). These differences show a pattern of less attachment to the employer, which fits with research that shows that not having inclusive practices makes disabled workers more likely to leave their jobs (Jones, 2016).

The gaps are biggest in leader–member exchange (how people talk to their bosses) and coworker exchange (how people talk to their coworkers). Employees without disabilities score 0.761 on manager interactions, while employees with disabilities score 0.657. This is a significant difference of 0.105 (0.095 adjusted, $p < 0.01$). In the same way, there is a gap of 0.095 (0.067 adjusted, $p < 0.01$) in coworker trade. According to these data, employees with disabilities face relational barriers both in the workplace and in their daily interactions. These barriers are often caused by subtle exclusion, lack of understanding, or stigma (Colella & Stone, 2005).

It's interesting that some measurements have very small or no gaps at all. For instance, there are very small changes that are not statistically significant in how people treat people with disabilities (0.415 vs. 0.438) and how they behave as members of the organization (0.550 vs. 0.557). This means that disabled workers may think their companies are less supportive and open, but that doesn't mean they are less willing to do nice things for others at work, and it doesn't mean they always think they are being treated badly. This fits with research that shows disabled workers often keep up good work habits and get along with others, even when they face systemic hurdles (Schur et al., 2013).

Overall, the data show a consistent pattern: there are small differences in satisfaction and autonomy, but much bigger differences in intentions to leave, organisational support, openness, inclusion, and relationships with other people. These results show that disabled workers are not automatically disconnected; instead, they are more likely to face problems with support and inclusion that make them less committed to their companies over time. To fix these problems, we need proactive training for managers, anti-stigma programs, and more welcoming environments. This will help close the support and relationship gaps, which will lead to better retention and fair results.

. TABLE-4

WFH parameter	Mean (Disability)	Mean (No Disability)	Difference in Means
WFH before pandemic	0.189	0.16	0.029
If no: did not WFH b/c not permitted	0.454	0.443	0.01
If yes: WFH to coordinate w/family schedule	0.463	0.5	0.037
If yes: WFH 3 or more days/week	0.439	0.333	0.106
WFH currently	0.529	0.529	0.001
If no: do not WFH b/c not permitted	0.292	0.288	0.005
If yes: WFH to coordinate w/family schedule	0.331	0.371	0.04
If yes: WFH 3 or more days/week	0.825	0.716	0.109

I want to WFH more than I do now	0.462	0.333	0.129
Index of agreement that WFH had positive effects before pandemic	0.544	0.506	0.039
Index of agreement that WFH has positive effects currently	0.651	0.628	0.023

Employees with disabilities reported lower levels of job satisfaction (0.592) compared to their non-disabled counterparts (0.648), producing a modest gap of 0.056, which remains significant after regression adjustment (0.047). Similarly, in terms of job autonomy, employees with disabilities scored slightly lower (0.575 vs 0.599), although this difference (0.015 adjusted) is not statistically significant. These findings suggest that while differences in satisfaction and autonomy exist, they are smaller in magnitude compared to other aspects of workplace experience. Prior studies indicate that job satisfaction gaps are often mediated by organizational support and inclusive practices rather than intrinsic differences in capability (Schur et al., 2009).

Striking differences emerge in turnover intentions, where employees with disabilities report substantially higher intentions to leave (0.420) than those without disabilities (0.323), yielding a significant gap of 0.096 (0.095 adjusted, $p < 0.01$). This suggests that employees with disabilities may feel less secure or less attached to their organizations, likely due to perceived barriers or exclusion. Similarly, organizational commitment is lower among employees with disabilities (0.459 vs 0.530), with a gap of 0.071 (0.056 adjusted, $p < 0.05$). These differences highlight a pattern of weaker attachment to the employer, consistent with literature showing that lack of inclusive practices contributes to elevated turnover risks among disabled employees (Jones, 2016).

The largest gaps appear in leader–member exchange (relationship with managers) and coworker exchange (relationships with colleagues). Employees with disabilities score 0.657 on manager relationships compared to 0.761 for those without disabilities, producing a significant gap of 0.105 (0.095 adjusted, $p < 0.01$). Similarly, coworker exchange shows a gap of 0.095 (0.067 adjusted, $p < 0.01$). These results suggest that employees with disabilities face relational barriers not only at the structural level but also in day-to-day interactions, a factor often linked to subtle exclusion, lack of understanding, or stigma (Colella & Stone, 2005).

Interestingly, certain dimensions show minimal or non-significant gaps. For example, organizational citizenship behaviors (0.550 vs 0.557) and treatment of people with disabilities (0.415 vs 0.438) exhibit very small differences that are not statistically significant. This suggests that while disabled employees perceive lower support and openness from their organizations, they do not necessarily differ in their willingness to engage in discretionary prosocial behaviors at work, nor do they uniformly perceive overt mistreatment. This aligns with research indicating that employees with disabilities often maintain strong work ethics and collegiality, even when facing systemic barriers (Schur et al., 2013).

Overall, the results reveal a consistent pattern: while gaps in satisfaction and autonomy are modest, much larger differences exist in turnover intentions, organizational support, openness, inclusion, and interpersonal relationships. These findings suggest that employees with disabilities are not disengaged by default but are more likely to experience barriers to support and inclusion that reduce their long-term attachment to organizations. Addressing these disparities requires proactive managerial training, anti-stigma initiatives, and stronger inclusion climates to close the relationship and support gaps, thereby improving retention and equity outcomes.

3.3. WFH Statistics-Stats that describe people who work from home: Table 3 shows that the effects are mostly the same for people with and without disabilities who work from home. It was about the same for people with and without disabilities to be able to WFH before the pandemic (0.189 versus 0.160; $p > 0.10$). It was the same chance for both groups to the time of the study (0.529). Another study found that disabled people were more likely to WFH before the pandemic but less likely to do so during it. This result is not the same.

3.4. Regression Analysis-Table 5 shows that there is a link between job satisfaction, having a condition, and working from home. The table shows the responses to the one question about job happiness as well as the 10 questions that asked people to describe how they felt about their jobs. Don't forget that every regression has a set of dummy factors that show how often someone works from home (not at all, less than three days a week, or three or more days a week) and how that affects their disability status. There is no main effect for disability in the regressions, so the numbers for the interactions between disability and WFH show the full disability effect for each frequency group.

TABLE-5

Condition	Job Satisfaction	Job Autonomy	Turnover Intentions	Org Commitment	OCB	POS
WFH <3 days/week	0.124*** (0.047)	0.226*** (0.034)	-0.063 (0.041)	0.127*** (0.042)	0.080** (0.038)	0.188*** (0.041)
WFH ≥3 days/week	0.195*** (0.041)	0.294*** (0.029)	-0.162*** (0.036)	0.176*** (0.036)	0.088*** (0.033)	0.253*** (0.035)
Disability × No WFH	-0.080 (0.054)	0.040 (0.039)	0.159*** (0.047)	-0.046 (0.048)	0.020 (0.043)	-0.035 (0.047)
Disability × WFH <3 days	-0.013 (0.087)	-0.131** (0.062)	0.016 (0.076)	-0.016 (0.077)	-0.010 (0.069)	-0.135* (0.076)
Disability × WFH ≥3 days	-0.058 (0.061)	-0.005 (0.044)	0.084 (0.053)	-0.117** (0.054)	-0.002 (0.048)	-0.164*** (0.053)

TABLE-6

Variable	Employer openness to difference	Climate for inclusion	Treatment of people with disabilities	Manager relations	Co-worker relations
WFH <3 days/week	0.108*** (0.042)	0.122*** (0.042)	0.033 (0.030)	0.110*** (0.035)	0.010 (0.032)
WFH ≥3 days/week	0.154*** (0.036)	0.190*** (0.036)	0.042* (0.025)	0.124*** (0.030)	0.035 (0.027)
Disability × No WFH	-0.091* (0.048)	-0.026 (0.048)	-0.011 (0.034)	-0.035 (0.040)	-0.057 (0.036)
Disability × WFH <3	-0.094 (0.077)	0.005 (0.077)	-0.016 (0.054)	-0.135** (0.064)	-0.072 (0.059)

Disability × WFH ≥3	−0.134** (0.054)	−0.148*** (0.054)	−0.019 (0.038)	−0.171*** (0.044)	−0.078* (0.041)
----------------------------	------------------	-------------------	----------------	-------------------	-----------------

FIGURE-1



The results show that working from home (WFH) is usually linked to better outcomes for employees, though the size of the effects depends on how often the employee works from home. A lot more job happiness, job autonomy, organisational commitment, organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs), and perceived organisational support (POS) were found in employees who worked from home less than three days a week. But it didn't have a big effect on people's plans to leave. This supports the idea that even limited access to online work can improve the experiences of employees, which is in line with earlier research that showed the advantages of flexible work policies (Bloom et al., 2015; Choudhury, Foroughi, & Larson, 2021).

People who worked from home three or more days a week saw stronger positive results. All of the outcomes that were looked at—job happiness, autonomy, commitment, OCBs, and POS—were much better in this situation. Most importantly, plans to leave the company were cut down by a lot ($\beta = -0.162$, $p < 0.001$), which suggests that letting employees WFH a lot can be a good way to keep them. These results support earlier study that telework makes workers happier, more engaged, and less likely to quit (Gajendran & Harrison, 2007; Allen, Golden, & Shockley, 2015).

When it comes to workers with disabilities, the interaction terms paint a more complex picture. People with disabilities were much more likely to want to leave their jobs when there was no WFH choice ($\beta = +0.159$, $p < 0.001$). This shows how important flexible work plans are for helping disabled workers stay with their jobs. However, giving disabled workers WFH opportunities did not always help them. People who worked from home less than three days a week had significantly lower job liberty ($\beta = -0.131$, $p < 0.05$) and POS ($\beta = -0.135$, $p < 0.10$) than their non-disabled coworkers. In the same way, organisational commitment ($\beta = -0.117$, $p < 0.05$) and POS ($\beta = -0.164$, $p < 0.001$) were much lower among disabled workers who worked from home three or more days a week.

These results show that even though WFH policies improve outcomes for everyone in the workforce, disabled workers still have problems, especially when it comes to how much help and commitment they feel from their

employers. This fits with earlier research that found disabled workers often face structural, social, and technological hurdles that keep them from fully benefiting from flexible work arrangements (Shinohara & Wobbrock, 2011; Schur, Ameri, & Kruse, 2020). To make sure disabled workers get the same benefits as other workers, companies need to do more than just offer remote work options. They need to actively adopt inclusive practices, accessible technologies, and supportive organisational cultures

Conclusion- Going forward, more research could help us learn more about how to make it easier for disabled people to find useful work and how to improve their experiences at work once they do get a job. Another interesting subject to study is how to make tools for online work look good and be easy to use. People with different kinds of disabilities might not be able to use some of the most popular virtual office apps and tools. You could also look into how new technologies like AI, VR, and AR can help handicapped people who WFH do their jobs better. Because of our findings, more research needs to be done on the mental health benefits of disabled people working from home, like having less stress from travelling and more comfort at home. But this kind of research also needs to look at the issues that might come up, like being alone or not having enough friends, and offer ways to fix them. In many cases, measures that help groups that aren't well-represented also help groups that are well-represented more. This finding, which says that work-from-home policies help people without disabilities a lot, fits with that. 32,334 These rules shouldn't be broken, though; they should be built into the way things are done at work. However, we shouldn't think that these rules will make things fair. There isn't a clear line between people with and without disabilities, which helps the group that is in charge when it comes to disabilities. Many people who are having trouble don't know it. Some people who know they need accommodations might not ask for them, and some people who know they would gain from them still feel bad about it. Steps must be taken to close the gaps that help people with disabilities that need accommodations the most.

References-

- Bloom, N., Liang, J., Roberts, J., & Ying, Z. J. (2015). Does working from home work? Evidence from a Chinese experiment. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 130(1), 165–218. <https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qju032>
- Choudhury, P., Foroughi, C., & Larson, B. Z. (2021). Work-from-anywhere: The productivity effects of geographic flexibility. *Strategic Management Journal*, 42(4), 655–683. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.3251>
- Gajendran, R. S., & Harrison, D. A. (2007). The good, the bad, and the unknown about telecommuting: Meta-analysis of psychological mediators and individual consequences. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(6), 1524–1541. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.6.1524>
- Schur, L., Ameri, M., & Kruse, D. (2020). Telework after COVID: A “silver lining” for workers with disabilities? *Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation*, 30(4), 521–536. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10926-020-09936-5>
- Shinohara, K., & Wobbrock, J. O. (2011). In the shadow of misperception: Assistive technology use and social interactions. *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 705–714. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1978942.1979044>
- Allen, T. D., Golden, T. D., & Shockley, K. M. (2015). How effective is telecommuting? Assessing the status of our scientific findings. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 16(2), 40–68. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1529100615593273>

- Choudhury, P., Foroughi, C., & Larson, B. Z. (2021). Work-from-anywhere: The productivity effects of geographic flexibility. *Strategic Management Journal*, 42(4), 655–683. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.3251>
- Gajendran, R. S., & Harrison, D. A. (2007). The good, the bad, and the unknown about telecommuting: Meta-analysis of psychological mediators and individual consequences. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(6), 1524–1541. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.6.1524>
- Kossek, E. E., Thompson, R. J., & Lautsch, B. A. (2014). Balanced workplace flexibility: Avoiding the traps. *California Management Review*, 56(2), 5–25. <https://doi.org/10.1525/cmr.2014.56.2.5>
- Schur, L., Ameri, M., & Kruse, D. (2020). Telework after COVID: A “silver lining” for workers with disabilities? *Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation*, 30(4), 521–536. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10926-020-09936-5>
- Shinohara, K., & Wobbrock, J. O. (2011). In the shadow of misperception: Assistive technology use and social interactions. *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 705–714. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1978942.1979044>