



PROJECT MUSE®

---

## Index

### Published by

Hunt, H. Allan and Marcus Dillender.

Workers' Compensation: Analysis for Its Second Century.

W.E. Upjohn Institute, 2017.

Project MUSE. <https://muse.jhu.edu/book/52043>.



➔ For additional information about this book

<https://muse.jhu.edu/book/52043>



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[136.0.111.243] Project MUSE (2025-01-31 11:09 GMT)

## Index

NOTE: The italic letters *f*, *n*, or *t* following a page number indicate a figure, note or table, respectively, on that page. Double letters mean more than one such consecutive item on a single page.

- ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act), 34, 48–49, 62, 63*n*16
- Adequacy of Workmen's Compensation* (Reede), scholarly treatment of subject, 5
- Affordable Care Act, as public health insurance, 93*n*3
- Akabas, Sheila, as coauthor of classic text, 37, 105
- Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) employee antidiscrimination protection, 34, 48–49 employer bonus possibilities in, 62, 64*n*20
- Arizona, injured workers sampled for RTW study in, 34–35, 36*t*, 63*n*7
- Attorneys, workers' compensation reform and, 87
- BLS (Bureau of Labor Statistics), data collection by, 38, 71–72, 74, 82, 84
- British Columbia benefit adequacy of different Canadian compensation regimes compared in, 14, 15*t*, 97, 104*n*2 experience rating and claims in, 85–86 impairment and wage-loss benefits in, 16–18, 16*f*, 17*f*, 19*t*, 97 wage-loss measurement studied in, 18, 20, 30*n*4
- Business issues compliance with state requirements, 90–91 firms' experience rating on occupational safety among, 56, 79–80, 83–84, 85–87 impact of politics on, 2–3, 27 premiums for workers' compensation programs, 67, 79, 89, 92, 93*nn*6–7 tort liability for workplace injuries, 1, 68–70
- California, 48 benefit adequacy interviews of injured workers in, 6–7, 58 initiative for RTW encouragement in, 58–60 PPD compensation in, 11, 12*t* state evaluation strategies for disabled workers in, 7–9, 28, 30*n*3 wage replacement for PPD workers in, 9–10, 11, 13
- California Commission on Health and Safety and Workers' Compensation, 13, 43
- California law and legislation, antidiscrimination, 59–60
- California Workers' Compensation Institute, benefit adequacy interview study by, 7
- Canada construction industry claims data from, 85–86 recent workers' compensation adequacy studies in, 13–20, 16*f*, 17*f*, 19*t*, 97 RTW studies in, 44–45, 63*n*11 social insurance programs in, 5, 6, 13–20, 96, 97 TTD compensation payments in, vs. United States, 23, 24*t* workplace safety improvements related to OPP in, 42–43 *See also specific provinces within, e.g., British Columbia; Ontario*
- Canada law and legislation, workers' compensation, 18, 20
- Cash benefits, disabilities and, 78*f*, 81

- Census of Fatal Occupational Injuries (CFOI), both public-sector and self-employed workers in, 74, 84
- Centers of Occupational Health and Education (COHE), state medical management by, 47
- CFOI (Census of Fatal Occupational Injuries), 74, 84
- Claims practices  
 indemnity, 21–22, 30n5, 60  
 management of, as beneficial vs. perverse, 80, 86, 90, 92, 100, 102–103  
 safety and, 77, 79–80, 89  
 workers and, 39, 67, 72, 77, 85, 94n8
- Code Rule 60 programs, 56–57
- COHE (Centers of Occupational Health and Education), 47
- Compensation of attorneys, workers' compensation reform and, 87
- Compensation of disabled workers, 5, 31  
 conclusions from adequacy and equity research on, 7, 9, 12, 27–30, 95–98  
 earnings replacement vs. loss replacement as, 96–98  
 (see also Wage-loss benefits)  
 lump-sum payments as, 22f, 23–26, 24t, 26f, 29, 97–98  
 previous studies, 6–13, 96  
 recent studies, 13–27  
 research on adequacy and equity of, 1, 2, 3, 5–30  
 statutory framework and formulas for, 5, 7, 13–14, 15t, 30nn1–2, 30n6, 31
- Competition, state insurance programs and, 89
- Connecticut, injured workers sampled for RTW study in, 34–35, 36t, 63n7
- Court systems, tort liability for workplace injuries in, 1, 68–69
- CPS (March Current Population Survey), 72, 81
- Disability management  
 accommodation in, 46, 63n16, 100, 478–49  
 emergence of, as RTW solution, 35–39, 46–47, 63n8, 101–103  
 impact assessment on, activities, 45, 45t, 60  
 impacts on, and Upjohn Institute research, 32, 39–43, 62n1  
 lost workdays due to occupational injuries and illnesses, 38–39, 38f, 61  
 perverse practices of, 80, 86, 90, 92  
*Disability management* (Akabas, Gates, and Galvin), definitions of terms in classic work, 37, 105
- Disabled workers  
 causes contributing to, 32, 62n2  
 disability duration of, 43–46, 44t, 45t, 96, 101–102  
 research on compensation for, 1, 2, 3, 3nn2–3, 5–30  
 SSDI program for, 33–34  
 state evaluation strategies for, 7–8  
 TTD, 9, 12, 23, 24t, 25–26  
 See also Permanent partial disability (PPD)
- EAIP (Employer-at-Injury Program), 48, 51–52
- Employer-at-Injury Program (EAIP), with qualifying incentive in Oregon, 48, 51–52
- Employers  
 claim suppression by  
 (see under Employers, disability management)  
 conceptual model and its variants of, in Michigan, 40, 41f, 42  
 disability management and, 46–47, 53–56, 61, 62, 63n13, 72, 84, 86  
 employees of  
 (see Workers)  
 health care costs and, 31, 58  
 impact of politics on business issues, 2–3, 27  
 incentives for  
 (see under Incentives, hiring by at-injury employers)  
 OPP of, in research, 42–43

- Employers, *cont.*  
 responsibilities of, 1, 5, 34, 48–49, 63n16  
 RTW and, 32–33, 58–59  
 safety choices of, 58–59, 65
- Fair Housing and Employment Act, California, 59–60
- Finland, RTW studies in, 44–45, 63n11
- Florida  
 benefit adequacy interviews of injured workers in, 6–7  
 injured workers sampled for RTW study in, 34–35, 36*t*, 63n7  
 state evaluation strategies for disabled workers in, 7–9, 30n3
- Galvin, Donald, as coauthor of classic text, 37, 105
- Gates, Lauren, as coauthor of classic text, 37, 105
- Gender differences, wage-loss benefits and, 9, 11
- Georgia, injured workers sampled for RTW study in, 34–35, 36*t*, 63n7
- Health care costs, 31, 66  
 disability management and, 45, 45*t*, 58
- Impairments  
 ADA and, 49, 63n16  
 assessment of, 22–23, 31, 32, 33, 50, 96  
 trends in work-related, 74–79, 75*f*  
*(see also* Injured workers)  
 types of, 6, 11, 17–18, 22*f*, 74, 84, 85  
*(see also* Permanent partial disability [PPD]; Temporary total disability [TTD])  
 wage-loss benefits for workers with, 16*f*, 17*f*, 19*t*, 28–29
- Incentives  
 hiring, by at-injury employers, 51–52  
 monetary, to minimize lost work time, 48, 66  
 qualifying, by at-injury employers for injured workers, 48, 58–59, 62, 64n21  
 reporting, for workers, 73, 77–78, 80, 84, 85, 92, 94n8, 99  
 RTW determinants and, in workers’ compensation programs, 21, 28–29, 48  
 safety, 56–57, 73–74, 79–80, 85, 86–87, 91–93, 98–100
- Indemnity injuries  
 claims for, 21–22, 30n5, 60, 90  
 earnings with, vs. medical-only injuries, 21–22, 22*f*, 25, 26*f*, 27
- Indiana, injured workers sampled for RTW study in, 34–35, 36*t*, 63n7
- Industrialization, U.S.  
 types of, in economy, 76–77, 77*f*  
 workplace injuries and, 1, 39–40, 63n10, 69–70, 76, 80–81
- Injured workers, 3, 32  
 benefit adequacy interviews of, 6–7  
 deaths of, 69, 74, 75–76, 76*f*, 84–85, 93n5  
 impairment and wage-loss benefits, 16*f*, 17*f*, 19*t*, 28–29  
 impairment types in, 6, 11, 17–18, 22*f*, 74, 84, 85  
*(see also* Permanent partial disability [PPD]; Temporary total disability [TTD])  
 nonfatal injury rates of, 71, 80–83  
 prevention of  
*(see* Occupational safety)  
 qualifying incentives by at-injury employers to, 48, 62, 64n21  
 reporting, to OSHA, 38, 40, 42, 74  
 research on RTW goal of, after disability, 1, 2, 3, 31  
 separation effect on, as permanent earnings drop, 29, 98
- Institute for Work and Health (IWH)  
 RTW studies by, 44–45, 45*t*, 63n11  
 use of OPP by, 42–43
- Insurance programs, North America  
 deductibles in, 89–90, 99–100  
 health, private and public, 68, 93n3, 104n1  
 insurer behaviors in, 29, 32, 55, 59, 67, 78, 102  
 NCCI data on, 60, 72, 81

- Insurance programs, North America, *cont.*  
social, 1, 5, 28, 33, 34  
(*see also* Workers' compensation programs)
- Internal Revenue Service, U.S., federal data from, 12–13
- Iowa, injured workers sampled for RTW study in, 34–35, 36*t*, 63*n*7
- Kentucky, injured workers sampled for RTW study in, 34–35, 36*t*, 63*n*7
- Labor markets, as RTW barrier, 32–33, 34–35, 63*nn*6–7
- Lawsuits, workers' right to sue in court, 1
- Local governments, welfare assistance from, 34
- Maine, workplace safety improvements related to OPP in, 42–43
- March Current Population Survey (CPS), as safety data source, 72, 81
- Massachusetts  
high-risk firms and premium credit in, 90  
initiative for RTW encouragement in, 54–56  
injured workers sampled for RTW study in, 34–35, 36*t*, 63*n*7
- Mathematical Policy Research, RTW collaboration by, 46
- Medical benefits, 1, 104*n*1  
adequacy of, 2, 78–79, 78*f*  
indemnity claims for, only *vs.*  
postinjury earnings, 21–22, 22*f*, 26*f*, 30*nn*5–6  
RTW as goal of, 31, 32  
Washington State and, 10, 64*n*18
- Medical management  
methods based on, as RTW determinant, 47, 57–58, 64*n*19, 101  
workers' compensation reforms and, 87, 88
- Michigan, 3, 29, 72  
adequacy, equity, and efficacy of workers' compensation in, 20–26, 28–30, 30*n*5, 95–96, 96–97  
disability prevention and management in, 32, 62*n*1  
estimated postinjury earnings with indemnity *vs.* medical-only injuries in, 21–22, 22*f*, 30*nn*5–6  
formula for disability compensation in, 5, 30*n*2, 30*n*6, 97  
injured workers sampled in, for RTW study, 34–35, 36*t*, 63*n*7  
wage-loss measurement studied in, 13, 30*nn*5–6, 97–98
- Michigan. Department of Energy, Labor, and Economic Growth, as data source, 21
- Michigan. Department of Labor  
Bureau of Safety and Regulation under, as study sponsor, 39, 42  
Bureau of Workers' Disability Compensation under, as research funder, 39
- Michigan Disability Prevention Study, 39–42, 41*f*, 63*nn*9–11
- Michigan State University, as research collaborator, 39
- Minnesota, injured workers sampled for RTW study in, 34–35, 36*t*, 63*n*7
- Missouri, modified QLMP for disability management in, 56
- National Academy of Social Insurance, worker compensation research and, 11–12, 27
- National Commission on State Workmen's Compensation Laws  
OSHA and, 65–66  
state responses to, 78*f*, 87–88
- National Council on Compensation Insurance (NCCI), state data on workers' compensation premiums and claims from, 60, 72, 81, 101
- National Health Interview Survey (NHIS), as safety data source, 72
- National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH), as predecessor to BLS, 74
- National Longitudinal Survey of Youth, filing for workers' compensation benefits and, 72, 73, 88

- National Science Foundation, workers' compensation research and, 7
- National Traumatic Occupational Fatality surveillance system, as predecessor to CFOI, 74, 84
- NCCI (National Council on Compensation Insurance), 60, 72, 81, 101
- Netherlands, the, RTW studies in, 44–45, 63*n*11
- New Brunswick, workplace safety improvements related to OPP in, 43
- New Hampshire, 53–54, 56
- New Mexico, 54  
federal data used in, study, 12–13, 27–28  
PPD compensation in, 3*n*2, 11, 12*t*  
SSDI awards in, 33, 63*n*3
- New York State, 6–7, 56–57  
NIOSH (National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health), 74
- No-fault insurance programs, 1
- North Carolina, injured workers sampled for RTW study in, 34–35, 36*t*, 63*n*7
- North Dakota, 90
- OASDI (Old Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance), 33
- Occupational injuries and illnesses  
BLS surveys and, 38, 71, 74  
costs of, 65, 66, 93*n*1, 93*n*7  
employer liability for, 1, 92  
lost workdays due to, 38–39, 38*f*, 42  
prevention of  
(*see* Occupational safety)
- Occupational safety, 65–93  
conclusions, 91–93, 99  
direct workers' compensation interventions and, 90–91  
effect of firms' experience rating on, 56, 79–80, 83–84, 85–87, 92, 93*nn*6–7  
effect of workers' compensation benefits on, 80–85  
failure of  
(*see* Impairments; Injured workers; Occupational injuries and illnesses)  
impact of workers' compensation on, 68–70, 87–90  
incentives for, 56–57, 73–74, 79–80, 85, 86–87, 91–93, 98–100  
influence of workers' compensation programs on, 66–68  
measurement of, 71–74, 83  
as objective of workers' compensation, 1, 2, 3, 31, 100  
research on, at state, federal, and international levels, 3, 3*n*3
- Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), 65–66  
federal reporting requirement of, 38, 40, 60, 74
- Ohio, initiative for RTW encouragement in, 57–58, 64*n*19
- Oklahoma, workers' compensation insurance not required in, 70, 103
- Old Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance (OASDI), payroll taxes and, 33
- Ontario, 43  
benefit adequacy of different Canadian compensation regimes compared in, 13–14, 15*t*, 97  
experience rating in, 85–86
- On-the-job performance, 50  
risk in, and benefits differential, 67–69, 81, 93*n*2, 99
- OPP (Organizational policies and practices) scale, 42–43
- Oregon  
EAIIP and PWP in, 48, 51–52  
initiative for RTW encouragement in, 51–52, 63*n*17  
PPD compensation in, 11, 12*t*  
Organizational policies and practices (OPP) scale, descriptive characteristics of employers in, 42–43
- OSHA (Occupational Safety and Health Administration), 38, 40, 60, 65–66, 74

- Panel Survey of Income Dynamics, as safety data source, 73
- Pennsylvania  
 injured workers sampled for RTW study in, 34–35, 36*t*, 63*n*7  
 labor-management safety committee at firms as monetary incentive, 90, 91
- Permanent partial disability (PPD), 12, 52, 81  
 compensation for, 3*n*2, 23, 25, 97–98  
 degree of impairment assessment for, 22–23, 95  
 qualifying incentive by at-injury employer for, 48, 58–59  
 wage-loss benefits in U.S. for, 7, 9–11, 12*t*
- Politics  
 impact of, on labor and business issues in workers' compensation, 2–3, 27  
 workers' compensation reforms and, 1, 2, 104
- PPD. *See* Permanent partial disability
- Preferred Worker Program (PWP)  
 wage subsidies for workers with permanent work restrictions in Oregon, 48, 51–52  
 workers contribute premiums for medical benefits in Washington, 64*n*18
- Productivity, 49  
 loss of, and workplace injuries and diseases, 65, 66  
 methods based on, as RTW determinant, 31, 46, 50
- ProPublica publication series, 28, 103, 104*n*5
- Public policy  
 implications of worker compensation research on, 1, 2, 3  
 measures of, and RTW, 31, 33–34, 46–47, 50  
 workers' compensation, set by state governments, 1, 65
- Public welfare, 34  
 compensation equity as element of, 5, 28
- PWP (Preferred Worker Program), 48, 51–52, 64*n*18
- Qualified Loss Management Program (QLMP)  
 as assigned risk employers in Massachusetts, 53–55  
 modification of, in other states, 56
- Quality of life, disability management and, 45, 45*t*
- Quebec, 85, 86, 94*n*8
- QLMP (Qualified Loss Management Program), 53–55
- RAND Institute for Civil Justice, RTW research by, 43–44, 44*t*
- Redemption payments. *See under* Compensation of disabled workers, lump sum payments as
- Reede, Arthur, as scholarly author, 5
- Rehabilitation benefits  
 prompt, for workplace injuries, 1, 100  
 RTW as goal of, 31, 32  
 (*see also* Vocational rehabilitation)
- Return-to-work (RTW) determinants, 32–60  
 accommodation-based methods as, 46, 48–49, 101  
 conclusions from RTW workers' compensation programs, 60–62, 100–104  
 emergence of disability management as, 35–39, 101–103  
 incentives for, in workers' compensation programs, 21, 28–29, 48  
 (*see also* Incentives)  
 medical management-based methods as, 47, 101  
 other empirical research on, 32, 43–46, 44*t*, 45*t*, 62*n*2, 63*n*12  
 productivity-based methods as, 31, 46, 50  
 public policy measures as, 33–34, 46–47, 50, 63*n*14–15  
 state initiatives as, 50–60

- Return-to-work (RTW) determinants,  
*cont.*  
Upjohn Institute research on  
disability management impacts,  
39–43
- Return-to-work (RTW) objectives  
failure of, 33–35, 60–61, 80, 86–87  
performance among, 1, 2, 3, 29, 58,  
62, 100–101, 104*n*4
- RTW. *See entries beginning with Return-*  
*to-work*
- Social insurance programs, North  
America, 27, 33, 34, 104*n*1  
equity as element of social welfare  
in, 5, 28  
original public example of  
(*see Workers' compensation*  
*programs*)
- Social Security Administration, U.S.  
federal SSDI benefits from, 28, 33,  
34, 63*n*5  
postinjury earnings data from, 8,  
12–13
- Social Security Disability Insurance  
(SSDI) program  
failure to RTW and, 33–34  
federal provision of, 28, 33, 34, 63*n*5,  
93*n*4  
state claims for, 34, 63*nn*3–4
- South Carolina, workers' compensation  
insurance requirements in, 70, 103
- SSDI. *See Social Security Disability*  
*Insurance program*
- SSI (Supplemental Security Insurance),  
34
- State governments, 34  
best practices by, and workers'  
compensation reform, 2, 104  
competition of insurance systems  
between, and injury rates, 89, 92  
role of, and work-related injury or  
disease benefits, 1, 65, 81–83,  
87–91, 102
- Stay at Work Program, as insurance  
reform in Washington State, 53
- Supplemental Security Insurance (SSI),  
federal provision of, 34
- Survey of Income and Program  
Participation, as safety data  
source, 73
- Sweden, RTW studies in, 44–45, 63*n*11
- Tax policy, 5, 21–22, 30*n*6, 33
- Temporary total disability (TTD), 52, 81  
replacement compensation for, 9, 12,  
23, 24*t*, 25–26
- Tennessee  
injured workers sampled in, for RTW  
study, 34–35, 36*t*, 63*n*7  
workers' compensation insurance  
requirements in, 70, 103
- Texas  
high-deductible policies and  
indemnity claims in, 90  
temporary mandates in, for illness  
and injury prevention programs,  
90–91  
workers' compensation insurance not  
required in, 70, 103
- Tort liability, workplace injuries and, 1,  
68–69
- Trade-offs, workers' loss of right to sue  
among, 1
- Trade unions, 56, 78
- TTD (Temporary total disability), 9, 12,  
23, 24*t*, 25–26
- United States (U.S.)  
RTW studies in, 44–45, 63*n*11  
social insurance programs in, 1,  
6–13, 28, 33, 34, 104*n*1  
TTD compensation payments in, vs.  
Canada, 23, 24*t*  
*See also specific states within, e.g.,*  
*California; Michigan; Wisconsin*
- Upjohn Institute for Employment  
Research  
impacts of disability management  
and, 32, 39–43, 62*n*1, 63*n*9  
Michigan Disability Prevention  
Study by, 39–42, 41*f*, 63*nn*9–11  
websites of, 63*n*3, 63*n*9  
worker compensation research and,  
3, 3*n*3, 7, 11–12



- U.S. Department of Labor (USDOL),
  - 46, 103
  - Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) data collection under, 38, 71–72, 74, 82, 84
- U.S. law and legislation
  - antidiscrimination, 34, 48–49, 63*n*16
  - health insurance, 93*n*3, 104*n*1
  - worker health and safety, 65–66
- USDOL. *See* U.S. Department of Labor
- Virginia, 56
  - injured workers sampled for RTW study in, 34–35, 36*t*, 63*n*7
- Vocational rehabilitation, 31, 50, 52, 62
- Wage-loss benefits
  - adequacy of Canadian, 2, 13–20
  - adequacy of U.S., 2, 6–13, 20–26, 35
  - earnings replacement *vs.* loss replacement as, 96–98
  - federal and state taxes on, 5, 9
  - impairment and, 6, 11, 16*f*, 17–18, 17*f*, 19*t*, 78*f*, 81
  - specification of, for workplace injuries, 1, 65, 81–83, 87–91, 101
- Wages
  - lost, and replacement rates (*see under* Compensation of disabled workers, statutory framework and formulas for; Wage-loss benefits)
  - premium, paid according to job risks, 67, 93*n*2, 99
  - subsidies for, and PWP with permanent work restrictions in Oregon, 48, 51–52
- Washington State, 53
  - benefit adequacy interviews of injured workers in, 6–7
  - medical benefits in, 10, 64*n*18
  - PPD compensation in, 11, 12*t*
- Washington State. Department of Labor and Industries, 47, 53
- Wisconsin
  - benefit adequacy interviews of injured workers in, 6–7
  - injured workers sampled in, for RTW study, 34–35, 36*t*, 63*n*7
  - PPD compensation in, 9, 11, 12*t*
  - state evaluation strategies for disabled workers in, 7–9, 30*n*3
- Workers, 1
  - age of, wage losses, 10, 20
  - claims reporting and filing by, 67, 72, 77, 84, 85, 92, 94*n*8, 103
  - costs of occupational injuries and diseases to, 65, 66–68, 99
  - employment-at-will labor markets and, 32–33, 34–35, 63*nn*6–7, 98–99, 104*n*3
  - impact of politics on labor issues, 2–3, 27
  - income of, 10, 29, 66
  - separation effect on, after injuries, 29, 98
- Workers' compensation programs
  - benefits from, 5–30 (*see also* Medical benefits; Rehabilitation benefits; Wage-loss benefits)
  - influence of, on work-related safety, 66–68 (*see also under* Occupational safety)
  - intended recipients (*see* Disabled workers; Injured workers; Occupational injuries and illnesses)
  - objectives of, as social insurance, 1–2, 3*n*1, 31
  - overall conclusions on, 95–104
  - policy for, set by state governments, 1, 65, 70
  - return-to-work incentives in, 21, 28–29, 48, 62, 64*n*21
- Workers' compensation reform
  - best practices and, 2, 104
  - design elements for, 103–104
  - politics and, 1, 2, 104
  - results to date of, 77–78, 87–88
- Washington State programs in, 47, 53
- Workers' compensation research
  - data sources for, 6, 7, 12–13, 21, 50, 71, 72, 73, 93*n*4

- Workers' compensation research, *cont.*  
future studies still needed in, 27, 30, 93  
hurdles faced by, 2, 22–23, 27–28, 92–93, 99  
policy implications and, 1, 2, 3  
RTW in, 21, 29, 39–46  
sponsorship of, 2–3, 7, 13, 39, 43, 46
- Workers Compensation Research Institute (WCRI)  
adequacy, equity, and efficacy study in Michigan by, 20–26, 30*n*5  
interview studies of injured workers and RTW by, 34–35, 36*t*, 60–61, 63*n*7  
wage-loss measurement in Michigan studied by, 13, 29
- Workplace safety. *See* Occupational safety
- Workplace Safety and Insurance Board (WSIB)  
benefit adequacy of different Canadian compensation regimes compared by, 13–14, 15*t*
- Workplace Safety Incentive Programs, employer choice among, 56–57

