

Original article

Scand J Work Environ Health. 2015;41(5):451–459. doi:10.5271/sjweh.3515

Perceived fairness of pay among people with and without disabilities: a propensity score matched analysis of working Australians ¹

by Allison Milner, PhD,² Zoe Aitken, MSc, Lauren Krnjacki, MPH, Rebecca Bentley, PhD, Tony Blakely, PhD, Anthony D LaMontagne, ScD, Anne M Kavanagh, PhD

¹ *Supplementary materials*

² *Correspondence to: Dr Allison Milner, Population Health Strategic Research Centre, Building BC3.213, School of Health & Social Development, Deakin University, Burwood VIC 3125, Australia. [E-mail: Allison.milner@deakin.edu.au]*

Supplementary File 1. Explanation of exposure and the analytic sample

A conceptual description of the sample can be seen in Supplementary Table 1, which provides a snapshot of six persons in the first five waves of HILDA. Person 1 was considered exposed as they experienced two consecutive waves of disability in wave 1 and 2. Similarly, person 2 also had two consecutive waves, starting from wave 2 onward. Person 3 experienced two consecutive waves of disability and two waves of non-disability. If people experienced both disability and non-disability consecutively, we took their consecutive waves of disability and considered them exposed in order to maximise the size sample of disability group. Because of this, we considered person 3 as exposed (using outcome and covariate data from wave 5). Person 4 experienced two consecutive waves of no disability and therefore was unexposed. Person 5 experienced two consecutive waves of no disability but was not considered eligible for the unexposed sample because they experienced a single prior wave of disability. We would note that the outcome and covariate data on the analytic sample can be drawn from any of the waves from wave three onwards. In the exposed group, 32% were drawn from wave 3 and in the unexposed group 56% were drawn from wave 3. These people would have entered HILDA in wave 1, and reported two waves of disability/no disability, and were therefore included in the analytic sample in wave 3. The reason the remaining 68% and 44% of the exposed and non-exposed groups were drawn from other waves is because they entered the HILDA cohort in a later wave, had missing data on disability in prior waves, or did not report a consecutive experience of disability until later waves.

Table 1. Conceptual example of exposure definition

Person ID	W1	W2	W3	W4	W5	Eligibility for sample	Exposure status	Wave used for covariates and outcome
Person 1	Disability	Disability	Disability	No disability	Disability	Yes	Disability	3
Person 2	No disability	Disability	Disability	Disability	Disability	Yes	Disability	4
Person 3	No disability	No disability	Disability	Disability	Disability	Yes	Disability	5
Person 4	No disability	No disability	No disability	No disability	No disability	Yes	No disability	3
Person 5	Disability	No disability	No disability	No disability	No disability	No	Not eligible	Nil
Person 6	No disability	Disability	No disability	Disability	No disability	No	Not eligible	Nil

Supplementary File 2

Parameter estimate from propensity score models of the mean difference in perceived fairness of pay between people with disabilities and those without a disability, restricted to those persons who reported three consecutive waves of disability or non-disability (n=5758 no disability, n=1618 disability)

Model	Coeff (95% CI)
PS Matched sample	-0.26 (-0.49, -0.02)
Stratification	-0.25 (-0.53, -0.04)
IPTW	-0.29 (-0.47, -0.12)
Adjustment for the PS	-0.39 (-0.53, -0.25)

Parameter estimate from the multivariable regression models of the mean difference in perceived fairness of pay between people with disabilities and those without a disability, restricted to those persons who reported three consecutive waves of disability or non-disability (n=5758 no disability, n=1618 disability)

Model	Coeff (95% CI)
Model 1 (unadjusted)	-0.26 (-0.38, -0.14)
Model 2*	-0.36 (-0.49, -0.22)
Model 3 **	-0.37 (-0.52, -0.23)

*Model adjusted for age group, sex, country of birth, education, father's occupation and year of survey.

** Model adjusted for age group, sex, country of birth, education, father's occupation, year of survey, occupational skill level and employment arrangements.