COMPLYING WITH THE ADA: AN EXAMINATION OF DEPARTMENT AND SPECIALTY STORES

JANE P. WAYLAND, Eastern Illinois University
CATHY OWENS SWIFT, Georgia Southern University

Increased litigation is expected as the passage of the Americans with Disabilities Act passes its tenth anniversary. The Act clearly forbids discrimination against the disabled but is ambiguous in how a firm ensures this purpose. A review of the Justice Department's work over the past ten years reveals that compliance is enforced through lawsuits as well as mediation and no retail business is exempt from compliance. A study of department stores and men's and women's specialty stores determined that these firms were attempting to comply with the law. Findings indicate that the stores were more likely to implement inexpensive strategies performed by sales associates than more costly strategies specifically for disabled customers. Larger stores, as measured by square feet, sales, and number of outlets, floors, and employees were more likely than smaller stores to provide auxiliary aids and barrier removal.

INTRODUCTION

In 1993, there were 49 million people with disabilities and at the beginning of 2002 there will be an estimated 60 million individuals (*Chain Store Age 2001).* The Americans with Disabilities Act protects persons with disabilities from discrimination in employment, public accommodations, telecommunications, as well as in the activities of state and local government (Bishop and Jones 1993) and has been considered a historic landmark in federal rights law (Woods and Kavanaugh 1992). The ADA calls for significant changes for businesses and has and continues to have a dramatic impact on how companies relate to both employees and customers.

The relationship between retailers and their customers is affected by Title III of the law which covers places of public accommodations. The law must provide to disabled individuals *full and equal enjoyment of goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and accommodations* (Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 ¶300). While the law is clear that discrimination against the disabled is not allowed, how that purpose is accomplished is ambiguous. Even after more than ten years from the law's enactment, retailers are still struggling to understand and comply with the law (Wilson 2001).

The Marketing Management Journal
Volume 12, Issue 2, pages 112-122

Retailers must be concerned with compliance. They are coming under intense scrutiny from disability rights groups and legal firms (Reba 2001) . In California, a single plaintiff began 20 lawsuits in a single day against stores on just one stretch of highway (Carlino 2000). ADA advocates believe some retailers are not addressing the ADA adequately and have failed to provide disabled customers an equal shopping experience (Reba 2001). While much current concern surrounds merchandise availability (Reba 2001; Wilson 2001), the ambiguity of the law leaves retailers with few concrete rules.

Most current literature on Title III compliance is anecdotal and does not reflect current business practices. While the Attorney General's Office provides technical assistance and other published information, there is ambiguity in addressing current structures because of the "undue burden" and "readily achievable" clauses in the law. Very little empirical information is offered to retailers as guidelines for compliance by practicing retailers. Furthermore, what information that is available is not specific enough to guide retailers with strategies and techniques they can use to reach compliance.

The purpose of this paper is to review Title III of the ADA and how it relates to retailers, illustrate how the Justice Department has pursued compliance through litigation and mediation, and understand how department stores and men's and women's specialty stores have reacted to the ADA through an analysis of compliance strategies used in existing facilities. A comparison of store types, size, and number of employees is explored to determine if these factors change the compliance strategies selected in reaction to the interpretation of the law. Managerial implications for compliance are provided.

TITLE III OF THE ADA

The ADA states that public places of accommodation must:

(1) make reasonable modifications of policies, practices, and procedures,
(2) provide auxiliary aids and services unless to do so provides "undue burden" on the business,
(3) remove architectural and other barriers where removal is "readily achievable," and
(4) provide alternative readily achievable methods (ADA ¶303).

These requirements can be met with a wide variety of methods depending on the disability of the customer and the ability of the retail store to achieve reasonable compliance. Appendix 1 provides examples for each of these requirements.

"Undue burden" and "readily achievable" must be interpreted based on several factors such as nature and cost of the action, financial resources of the site, number of people employed at the facility, the number and type of operation, or whether the change would alter the nature of the product or service. In fact, overall financial resources, size with respect to the number of employees, and the number, type, and location of the facilities of any parent corporation or entity may be considered when determining "undue burden" (*The Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990: U.S. Department of Justice Department Title II Technical Assistance Manual 1992, p. 28*).

Complete interpretation of the law has not had sufficient time to work through the court system. Lawyers representing companies, however, feel that vague language in the law is exposing many companies to lawsuits (Litvan 1994). The wording of the law forces retailers to determine exactly how they will comply with the law in their existing facilities to avoid discrimination. Given the wide array of alternatives available to comply with the ADA, retailers must 1) determine what they can afford to do, 2) serve their customers, and 3) be in compliance with the law.

Kaufman-Scarborough (1998) interviewed retailers on their perceptions of the ADA. A cross section of 22 retailers were interviewed to determine how they complied to the ADA. Only 16 of the 22 admitted to having some knowledge of the ADA. Most policies included handicap parking and shopper assistance with merchandise. Only 50 percent considered display location and had signs regarding handicap areas and only 23 percent trained store personnel.

Good faith compliance to the ADA can be achieved even though the strategies implemented may be different between retailers. For example, one retailer may choose to serve the wheelchair bound customer by installing ramps and removing barriers to all merchandise areas of the store. Another retailer may choose to have a sales associate retrieve merchandise for the customer from inaccessible areas. Both retailers may be in compliance with the ADA due to the "readily achievable" wording of the law. New construction is *not* left to interpretation and must meet the guidelines provided by the Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board.

Title III of the ADA presents a dilemma to retailers. Retailers cannot discriminate against individuals with disabilities; however, the law allows flexibility to the retailer in complying with the law. Specific guidelines are lacking for existing facilities and retailers may not appropriately interpret the flexibility within the law. For example, a ramp may not be considered "readily achievable" to a retailer. The question is, how will the Justice Department view the situation should a complaint occur?

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT REACTION

In the first five years since the enactment of the ADA, there were 650 lawsuits nationwide with the Justice Department participating in 20 of these suits (*Myths and Facts About the ADA* 1996). The Department settles numerous complaints without litigation or formal agreement by requesting the entity comply with the law through informal settlements and mediation. While the Justice Department promotes voluntary compliance, it has and will take action to ensure that businesses comply with the law.

For example, Gibson's Discount Centers, a chain of 31 discount department stores, was sued for failing to remove architectural barriers and making alterations to comply to the ADA standards (*A Special Fifth Anniversary Status Report: Enforcing the ADA* 1995). Wendy's, in 1998, agreed in an out-of-court settlement to either widen queues in which customers wait to order food, or remove railings or other dividers marking the queues to accommodate customers who use wheelchairs. This agreement resolved a two-year investigation into access issues at Wendy's restaurants by the Department of Justice and nine states — the first such team investigation with states (*Enforcing the ADA: Special 10th Anniversary Edition* 2000).

Venture Department Stores, through a consent decree, agreed to modify its policy of permitting only customers with a driver's license to pay with a personal check (*Enforcing the ADA* April 1994). In 1997, Shoney's Restaurants agreed to adopt a new national policy to ensure that people with service animals have access to all Shoney Restaurants (Settle Agreement, Department of Justice, June 26, 1997). Under a formal settlement, Avis agreed to provide rental cars with hand controls. It also required all new franchise holders to adopt the policy and encouraged present franchisees to provide the auxiliary aids (*Enforcing the ADA* 1995). Complaints continued after the September 1994 agreement. Under a new agreement, Avis affirmed its policy and agreed to extensive training for employees (*Enforcing the ADA* 1995-1996). Walt Disney World, in 1997, reached a comprehensive agreement to provide auxiliary aids for effective communication for persons who are hearing impaired (*Enforcing the ADA: Special 10th Anniversary Edition* 2000).

While these firms are large retail businesses, small businesses are not immune. Bel-Loc Diner in Baltimore, Maryland agreed in a settlement to provide accessible parking spaces, construct a ramp, and widen the doors. Preferred Motor Inn in Limon, Colorado agreed to develop and post a written policy statement indicating that persons with disabilities accompanied by a service animal were welcome, allow the animal into the Inn without proof of certification, and train staff to ensure that persons with service animals were treated in a nondiscriminatory manner (*Enforcing the ADA* 1995-1996). The operators of Henry Doorly Zoo in Omaha, Nebraska agreed to remove architectural barriers and provide auxiliary aids (*Enforcing the ADA* April 1994).

The Justice Department has also established a voluntary mediation program to provide an efficient, effective alternative way to resolve complaints. By 2000, the Department referred over 1,000 complaints to mediation with 80 percent of these cases successfully resolved (*Enforcing the ADA: Special 10th Anniversary Edition* 2000). Appendix 2 lists selected settlements negotiated by the Justice Department without litigation.

The Justice Department takes the ADA seriously and has used the full extent of their power to insure compliance with the law. Cynthia Leibrock, president of Easy Access Barrier Free Designs Consultants (Wilson 1995), feels that enforcement is likely to become more stringent as the ADA is integrated into individual state building codes. The issue of compliance is a serious one. Understanding how retailers have attempted to comply to the ADA legislation is an important issue to examine. The study described below was an effort to determine what efforts retailers have made to comply to the ADA regulations.

METHODOLOGY

A mailing list was developed from *Sheldon's Retail Directory*. All department stores, department store chains, women's and men's specialty stores, and women's and men's specialty store chains were placed on the mailing list for a total of 1097 stores.

A questionnaire was developed to determine what type of strategies retailers were using to comply with the ADA. A preliminary questionnaire was developed and pretested with a random sample of 202 stores. A list of 30 strategies were critiqued by store managers. Based on their responses, a revised questionnaire was mailed which included 33 strategies. Respondents rated each strategy on a Likert scale where one indicates the strategy will definitely be implemented and a five indicates the strategy will definitely not be implemented. Respondents were also asked if they were currently using the strategy. For analysis, responses were recoded and scaled from one (currently using the strategy) to six (definitely will not implement).

It was noted in the cover letter that the strategies were not construed to be legal requirements of the law but rather innovative approaches used by retailers to assist their disabled customers. Store information such as number of stores, number of selling floors, sales, number of employees, and square feet of selling space was included on the questionnaire. Questionnaires were mailed to 895 retailers located throughout the United States. While 58 questionnaires were returned undeliverable, there were 120 usable responses yielding a 14.3 percent response rate. The low response rate may have resulted due to the sensitivity of the issues of compliance with the Act. However, the data were considered adequate for the study because respondents held top-level positions (CEOs and presidents 53.8 percent; store or operations managers 18.8 percent; vice presidents 17.9 percent; others 9.4 percent) who would know the importance of the ADA and the procedures their organizations were taking to comply.

Because the law does not contain specific requirements for compliance, the retailer can determine how it will achieve accessibility. Exploratory factor analysis with varimax rotation was used to determine the general strategy factors. Thirty-three variables were used in the factor analysis. All variables loading less than .40 were dropped. The .40 criterion was used based upon the exploratory nature of the analysis. Loadings of .40 are considered more important when the samples size is 50 or larger (Hair, et al. 1992). The analysis was repeated until all variables loaded at .40 and above. The solution accounted for 49 percent of the variance.

Three factors emerged from the analysis as noted in Table 1. The first factor contains strategies that would be useful only for customers with a disability. Except for the sensitivity training for managers and employees, all strategies specifically assist mobility, sight, or hearing impaired customers. Sensitivity training would serve the disabled indirectly. Other customers would not benefit from these services, auxiliary aids, or barrier removal.

The second factor contains strategies from which all customers would benefit. Widening aisles and making all shopping areas more easily accessible not only assists the disabled customer, it also provides for ease of movement, less clutter, and more visibility of merchandise for all customers.

Strategies in the third factor require employees to assist disabled customers. These strategies require minimal training for employees and have little or no cost. Employees can use pen and paper to provide information for the hearing impaired and can be told how to write checks for a customer who cannot hold a pen. Employees can watch for disabled customers and ask them if special assistance is needed either in the dressing room or in locating merchandise.

The Cronbach's Alpha reliability measure was computed for each of the three scales. The reliabilities, .87, .79, and .71, are high and can be considered reliable for exploratory research. Variables for each of the three factors were averaged as surrogate variables for further univariate analysis.The sample mean for the three factors were: *Serves Disabled Customers Only* - 4.27, *Serves All Customers* - 2.68, *Inexpensive Strategies by Sales*

Table 1
Compliance Strategies Factor Loadings

Factor 1: Serves Disabled Customers Only	**Factor Loading**	**Explained Variance**	**Cronbach's Alpha**
Having written information (such as credit applications) available in Braille or large print.	0.70405	28.3	0.8793
Providing Braille or large print information for merchandise location.	0.68238		
Providing sign language interpreters.	0.65781		
Providing on-site wheel chairs for customers.	0.64801		
Providing Braille elevator buttons.	0.6389		
Adding grab bars to some dressing rooms.	0.63508		
Providing "handicap" signs for checkouts, water fountains, and restroom facilities.	0.62847		
Providing a TDD (telecommunication device for the deaf) for hearing impaired customers that call your store.	0.61552		
Lowering some checkout counters for individuals in wheelchairs.	0.60446		
Providing prominent signs to describe services offered tot he disabled.	0.60102		
Using Braille tags on all merchandise.	0.57684		
Requiring sensitivity training for sales associates.	0.56022		
Requiring sensitivity training for managers regarding the issues of the disabled.	0.54253		
Offering special events (such as fashion shows) for the visually impaired to describe the merchandise.	0.54087		
Factor 2: Serves All Customers	**Factor Loading**	**Explained Variance**	**Cronbach's Alpha**
Widening major aisles for ease of movement for individuals with a mobility impairment.	0.82637	13.1	0.7879
Widening spaces between merchandise and fixtures for individuals with mobility impairments.	0.78056		
Providing access to every shopping area in the store to be disabled.	0.69242		
Removing shelf protrusions (products or fixtures) for safer passage for individuals with visual or mobility impairments.	0.66366		
Increasing the size of the dressing rooms to accommodate the needs of individuals with mobility impairments.	0.48112		
Factor 3: Inexpensive Strategies by Sales Associates	**Factor Loading**	**Explained Variance**	**Cronbach's Alpha**
Requiring employees to assist disabled customers in trying on cloths in the dressing rooms.	0.73154	7.6	0.7069
Having pen and paper available for employees to use with customers with a hearing disability.	0.72185		
Requiring employees to assist in locating merchandise for the disabled.	0.67591		
Requiring employees to assist the disabled customers in writing checks.	0.64838		

Associates - 1.80. Respondents were more likely to implement the inexpensive strategies performed by their sales associates than those that serve all customers. Respondents indicated they were not as likely to implement strategies that are designed to aid the disabled only.

While the law is not specific on exactly what is "undue burden", the Justice Department will consider financial resources, size in respect to the number of employees, as well as the number, size, type, and location of its facilities. To determine if retailers differ in compliance strategies when defined by size and type of stores, one-way ANOVAS were computed. Size of the store was measured by the number of selling floors, total square feet of selling space, number of store locations, sales, and number of employees. Type of store for this study was defined as men's and women's specialty stores and department stores.

There were no differences between specialty and department stores in their use of the three types of compliance factors (see Table 2). A review of the means, however, indicates that both department store and specialty stores were more likely to implement inexpensive strategies by sales associates to assist the disabled and less likely to implement strategies that are specifically for the disabled customers.

There were significant differences in compliance strategies when analyzing the store size by square feet of selling space as shown in Table 2. Stores that had less than 10,000 average square feet per store were less likely to implement strategies for the disabled only or strategies that would benefit all customers, than stores that were over 10,000 square feet of selling space. There was no significant difference between stores in the use of sales associates' methods of compliance.

The number of selling floors also made a difference in compliance strategies used. Table 2 illustrates that stores with more than one floor were significantly more likely to implement strategies designed specifically for the disabled than single floor stores. There were no differences in the other two kinds of compliance strategies. Stores with more than one floor have physical barriers making it necessary to increase communication and ease of movement for the disabled.

Chain stores with more than ten outlets were also more likely than single independent stores to implement strategies for the disabled and were less likely to implement the strategies by sales associates as noted in Table 3. There appeared to be no differences when implementing the strategies benefitting all customers.

Stores with sales of 25 million dollars or more were also more likely to implement strategies benefitting only the disabled and more likely to implement strategies benefitting all customers than stores with sales of less than one million. See Table 4. Also stores with sales of one to 25 million dollars were more likely to implement strategies that benefit the disabled only than stores with less than one million. Stores with sales of less than one million dollars were likely to implement the strategies that utilize sales associates to assist the disabled than stores with sales over 25 million.

Similar patterns were seen with respect to the number of employees in Table 5. Stores with more than 50 employees were more likely to implement the strategies designed for the disabled only and all customers, than those with fewer than 25 employees.

DISCUSSION AND LIMITATIONS

This exploratory study suggests that department and men's and women's speciality stores use various strategies to comply with the ADA. The stores studied do not differ in their compliance strategies. However, the data does suggest that stores are more likely to use inexpensive strategies that can be implemented by their sales associates such as merchandise location, using pen and paper to communicate with the hearing impaired, or writing checks. These are logical compliance strategies which require little training and in some cases may already be in use informally to assist their customers.

Removing barriers that allow access to the disabled, such as widening aisles and spaces between merchandise and providing accessible dressing rooms, also benefits all customers. The space decreases crowding, which can improve the shopping experience. However, increasing space for ease of movement and increasing the size of dressing rooms can result in the loss of selling space. While more costly, retailers may view these strategies as easier methods of complying with the ADA, while serving their entire customer service base.

Strategies that assist only the disabled customer were the least likely to be implemented. A wide range of auxiliary aids such as store publications in Braille, TDDs, and on site wheel chairs are more costly. Lowering checkouts, adding grab bars, and increasing signage may be viewed difficult to implement with a limited return on the investment.

Table 2
Compliance Strategies By Store Type

Types of Compliance Strategies	Types of Stores	Mean	F	p
Serves Disabled Customers	Department	4.27	0.0177	0.0894 4
	Specialty	4.3		
Serves All Customers	Department	2.84	0.7699	0.3822
	Specialty	2.63		
Inexpensive Strategies by Sales Associates	Department	1.85	1.0591	0.3057
	Specialty	1.67		
Types of Compliance Strategies	**Square Feet**	**Mean**	**F**	**p**
Serves Disabled Customers	10,000 or less	4.67	23.1062	0.000
	More than 10,000	3.93		
Serves All Customers	10,000 or less	2.92	3.8488	0.0531
	More than 10,000	2.48		
Inexpensive Strategies by Sales Associates	10,000 or less	1.72	0.6278	0.4298
	More than 10,000	1.85		
Types of Compliance Strategies	**Number of Floors**	**Mean**	**F**	**p**
Serves Disabled Customers	Single Floor	4.46	10.407	0.002
	Muti-Floor	3.91		
Serves All Customers	Single Floor	2.69	0.0049	0.9445
	Multi-Floor	2.67		
Inexpensive Strategies by Sales Associates	Single Floor	1.78	0.1987	0.6556
	Multi-Floor	1.84		

Table 3
Compliance Strategies by Number of Store Outlets

Types of Compliance Strategies	Number of Outlets	Mean	F	p
Serves Disabled Customers	Single	4.55	4.7595	.0103[a]
	2 - 10	4.24		
	More than 10	3.87		
Serves All Customers	Single	2.73	0.0461	0.9549
	2 - 10	2.67		
	More than 10	2.64		
Inexpensive Strategies by Sales Associates	Single	1.6	2.6245	.0767[a]
	2 - 10	1.8		
	More than 10	2.09		

[a] Single stores are significantly different than stores with more than ten locations.

Table 4
Compliance Strategies by Number of Store Sales

Types of Compliance Strategies	Number of Outlets	Mean	F	p
Serves Disabled Customers	Less than 1 million	4.88	23.9491	.000[a]
	1 - 25 million	4.27		
	Over 25 million	3.45		
Serves All Customers	Less than 1 million	3.05	2.9175	0.58[b]
	1 - 25 million	2.64		
	Over 25 million	2.28		
Inexpensive Strategies by Sales Associates	Less than 1 million	1.38	5.4419	.0055[a]
	1 - 25 million	1.92		
	Over 25 million	2.05		

[a]Stores that have less than 1 million in sales are significantly different than stores that have sales for more than 1 million.
[a]Stores that have less than 1 million in sales are significantly different than stores that have sales of more than 25 million.

Table 5
Compliance Strategies by Number of Employees

Types of Compliance Strategies	Number of Outlets	Mean	F	p
Serves Disabled Customers	1 - 25	4.64	21.6934	.0000[a]
	26 - 50	4.14		
	Fewer than 50	3.58		
Serves All Customers	1 - 25	2.96	7.1122	.0012[a]
	26 - 50	2.89		
	Fewer than 50	2.08		
Inexpensive Strategies by Sales Associates	1 - 25	1.67	2.006	.1391
	26 - 50	2.08		
	Fewer than 50	1.97		

[a] Stores that have less than 25 employees are significantly different from stores with over 50 employees.

However, larger stores as measured by square feet, sales and number of outlets, floors, and employees, are more likely than smaller stores to provide these auxiliary aids and barrier removal. It appears that these larger stores feel that "undue burden" and "readily achievable" will be applied less favorably to them because of their size, financial resources and service to a wider range of customers.

LIMITATIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

This study provides an indication of the types of strategies used by retailers but cannot be generalized to all retailers. The sample was derived from only two types of stores. A more thorough sample that involves restaurants, retail services, and a cross section of stores by product category would provide more generalizable data. Also, the current study asked the store management to interpret whether or not they felt their strategies complied with the ADA. A more thorough understanding of compliance may be found by examining the shopping experiences of the disabled. Their insight would be invaluable in determining whether or not stores were actually providing equal access of goods and services.

The study indicates that retailers are attempting to comply with the ADA primarily through less expensive strategies that can be implemented by their sales associates. Only larger stores or more likely to provide auxiliary aids and barrier removal. However, compliance is the law and a review of the enforcement documents of the ADA indicates that no business or type of business is immune from the law.

In light of the increasing litigious environment, all retailers must actively review their store's policies, layouts, and services to insure compliance before a law suit is presented. Suggestions for compliance for existing stores include:

- Review merchandise location and aisles. Provide more space and lower displays. Can a person who is in a wheel chair or on crutches navigate around the displays?.
- Check all carpets and stairs for areas that may slow accessability.
- Hire an expert to build ramps, review parking spaces, and reconstruct lavatories, dressing rooms, and checkouts to insure compliance.
- Review the store lighting. Make sure there is sufficient lighting for the visually impaired.
- Pursue advocacy groups for the disabled for input on how to be more accessible. A proactive approach may prevent needless litigation.
- Train all employees on policies and include sensitivity training. Create an exercise that vividly illustrates the accessibility issues a disabled person may have. Put employees in a wheel chair or provide crutches and let them "shop" your store. Blindfold or use ear plugs to show how difficult it may be for a disabled person to communicate with a sales associate.
- Actively pursue the disabled. Disabled individuals and their friends and family spend more than $6 million each year in retail stores (*Chain Store Age* May 2001).

CONCLUSIONS

Retailers surveyed view compliance from a practical point of view. Inexpensive strategies followed by strategies that would benefit all customers are more likely to be implemented to stay in compliance with the ADA. A review of the Justice Department ADA litigation and mediation suggests they actively pursue retailers that violate the law regardless of the type or size of the business. Compliance is necessary, and retailers must evaluate their own situations and implement appropriate remedies. Failure to do so may cost the firm both in litigation as well in public opinion. As stated by Deval L. Patrick, Assistant Attorney General in the Fifth Anniversary Status Report (1996), "We are committed to the long-term effort that will be required to fully implement the ADA. Through vigorous enforcement-- and partnerships with business, state and local government, and the disability community--we will realize the ADA's promise of new opportunities for people with disabilities and all Americans."

REFERENCES

A Special Fifth Anniversary Status Report (July 1995), Washington, D.C.: Department of Justice, Civil Rights Division.

Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990: Law and Explanation (1990), Chicago, Illinois: Commerce Clearing House.

Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990: U.S. Department of Justice Technical Assistance Manuel Titles II & III (1992), Chicago, Illinois: Commerce Clearing House.

Bishop, P. C. and A. J. Jones (1993), "Implementing the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990: Assessing the Variables of Success," *Public Administration Review*, 53.2: 121-8.

Carlino, Bill (2000), "ADA Law Was Meant to Protect the Interests of the Disabled, not Handicap Business," *Nation's Restaurant News*, (April) 34.16, 31.

Chain Store Age (2001), "Small Store Tackle Big Challenges," 77.5, 174.

Enforcing the ADA: A Special Tenth Anniversary Status Report from the Department of Justice (July 2000), Washington, D.C.: Department of Justice, Civil Rights Division.

Enforcing the ADA: A Status Report (April 1994), Washington, D.C.: Department of Justice, Civil Rights Division.

Enforcing the ADA: A Status Report (July-September 1994), Washington, D.C.: Department of Justice, Civil Rights Division.

Enforcing the ADA: A Status Report (October-December 1994), Washington, D.C.: Department of Justice, Civil Rights Division.

Enforcing the ADA: A Status Report (January-March 1995), Washington, D.C.: Department of Justice, Civil Rights Division.

Enforcing the ADA: A Status Report (October 1995-March 1996), Washington, D.C.: Department of Justice, Civil Rights Division.

Enforcing the ADA: A Status Report (October - December 1998), Washington, D.C.: Department of Justice, Civil Rights Division.

Enforcing the ADA: A Status Report (October - December 2000), Washington, D.C.: Department of Justice, Civil Rights Division.

Enforcing the ADA: A Status Report (October - December 2001), Washington, D.C.: Department of Justice, Civil Rights Division.

Hair, J. F., Jr., R. E. Anderson, R. L. Tatham and W. C. Black (1992), *Multivariate Data Analysis with Readings* 3rd edition. New York, NY: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Kaufman-Scarbough C. (1998), "Retailers' Perceptions of the Americans with Disabilities Act: suggestions for low-cost, high-impact accommodations for disabled shoppers," *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 15.2, 94-110.

Litvan, L. M. (1994), "The Disabilities Law: Avoid the Pitfalls," *Nation's Business*, (January), 25-27.

Myths and Facts About the Americans with Disabilities Act (1996), U.S. Department of Justice.gopher://justice2.usdoj.gov.70/00/crt/ada/mythfct.txt.

Reba, S. (2001), "Activists Press Access Issues," *Stores*, 83.9 (September), 28-32.

Settle Agreement (1997), "Shoney's Restaurants to let Diners with Disabilities Bring in Service Animals Under an Agreement with the Justice Department." June 26, http://www.usdoj.gov/crt/foia/ale.txt.

Sheldon's Retail Directory (1992), Fairview, NJ: Phelan, Sheldo, and Marsar, Inc.

Wilson, M. (1995), "Designing for Empowerment," *Chain Store Age*, 71.1. 131

Wilson, M. (2001), "ADA Unclear on Merchandise Access," *Chain Store Age*, 124.7 (July), 124.

Woods, R. H. and R. R. Kavanaugh (1992), "Here Comes the ADA - Are you Ready? (Part 1)," *The Cornell HRA Quarterly*, (February), 24-32.

Appendix 1
Examples of Compliance

ADA Requirements	Examples
Modifications of Policies	A store that does not allow dogs must modify their policy to allow seeing-eye dogs and other service dogs used by persons with disabilities. Museums policy of not allowing visitors to touch delicate artwork because of potential damage, would not be required to allow blind people to touch the art.
Auxiliary Aids and Services	A store could have someone available to read merchandise tags to a blind person or write down information for a deaf person. Some regulations may require hotels of a certain size to have a telecommunications devise for the deaf, but individual retail stores do not have to provide the service because the use is incidental.
Barrier Removal	Adding grab bars, ramping of steps, lowering of telephones, marking of elevator buttons with raised letters or Braille, and the addition of flashing alarm lights. Moving chairs and tables in a restaurant to provide easy access for a wheelchair.
Alternative Methods	If a dry cleaner determines that adding a ramp is not readily achievable, sales personnel could go the door to receive or return dry cleaning.

Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 Law and Explanation.

Appendix 2
Selected Justice Department Informal Title III Settlements

ADA Requirements	Settlements
Modifications of Policies	A women was unable to bring cookies into the theater for her diabetic child. A Texas movie theater agreed to modify its policy against outside food and beverages an exception for medical reasons.[a] A restaurant in New York City agreed to modify its dress code allowing for a person to wear sneakers due to a disability.[a] A small town Ohio bank will now allow individuals with developmental disabilities to open an account without a co-signer or co-owner. [c] A restaurant in Maryland reaffirmed its policy to accept phone orders by TTY.[c]
Auxiliary Aids and Services	A New Mexico shopping mall along with barrier removal accessability installed new public telephones including a TDD. [b] A Virginia financial planning association agreed to provide an interpreter for a deaf student at one of its seminars. [c] A Georgia motel agreed to install TTY's, visual alarms, telephones, and notification devices for guests who are deaf. [e] A Maryland automobile dealership agreed to install hand controls in a car for a customer to test drive. [f]
Barrier Removal	An Illinois bank agreed to install automatic doors at its front entrance to make access easier for the disabled. [a] A California department store agreed to make its restrooms and fitting rooms accessible for people with disabilities, lower the height of drinking fountains, upgrade its elevators, and install signage to assist individuals with visual impairments. [a] A convenience store agreed to make three of its checkout aisles, including one express lane, accessible for individuals who use mobility devices. [a] A Florida restaurant owner agreed to install a lift and renovate the restrooms to make them accessible for people with disabilities. [d]

[a] *Enforcing the ADA* April 4, 1994
[b] *Enforcing the ADA* January-March 1995
[c] *Enforcing the ADA* October-March 1996
[d] *Enforcing the ADA* October-December 1998
[e] *Enforcing the ADA* October-December 2000
[f] *Enforcing the ADA* October-December 2001