

EMPLOYMENT FOR PEOPLE WITH
DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES:
THE IMPACT OF OKLAHOMA'S
STATE USE LAW

By

CAROL A. MINTON

Bachelor of Science
University of Central Oklahoma
Edmond, Oklahoma
1996

Master of Education
University of Central Oklahoma
Edmond, Oklahoma
1997

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
December, 1999

EMPLOYMENT FOR PEOPLE WITH
DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES:
THE IMPACT OF OKLAHOMA'S
STATE USE LAW

Thesis Approved:

Richard D. Dodder

Thesis Adviser

Robert Lee Maril

Margaret A. Johnson

Wayne B. Powell

Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This project is the result of the foresight of those involved with Oklahoma's State Use Law in recognizing the importance of an outcome based evaluation of this policy. Mr. Nils Richardson initially contacted the university and he along with Georgia Lynn, Oklahoma's state contracting officer, have been very instrumental in the successful completion of this project. I sincerely appreciate their help and cooperation during the research process.

I would also like to express my gratitude for the many people who contributed to my overall educational experience, and those who were specifically involved in this thesis project. I would like to thank those in the Department of Sociology who allowed me the opportunity to be a research assistant on the Developmental Disabilities Quality Assurance Research Grant. It was through this research experience that I was introduced to the special population of people with developmental disabilities.

I would like to give my appreciation to Dr. Lee Maril for his initial direction as my adviser. Due to a professional opportunity that became available, he withdrew from the primary responsibility of this project. He continued to serve on my committee and provided suggestions and support until its completion. His personal example of thoroughness and integrity in research will continue to be a pattern for me.

I would like to give special recognition to Dr. Richard Dodder. He willingly took over as my adviser for the continued reading and editing of the research and provided direction for problems that occurred. His insight into the standards of research that should be strived for with this special population was greatly appreciated.

I would also like to express my appreciation to Dr. Margaret Johnson. She initially invited me to participate in the evaluation that Mr. Nils Richardson had requested. I am very thankful that she told me of this research opportunity, and I am grateful for her help and suggestions throughout this study.

I want to include two of my undergraduate professors in my acknowledgments. Dr. Joseph Gryzbowski and Dr. Judith Lepuschitz were an encouragement to me during a time in my studies when I faced significant personal struggles. My desire to pursue graduate studies was due significantly to their positive influence.

The people with developmental disabilities who willingly participated in this project and gave of their time are also especially remembered. I am thankful for the opportunity to have become acquainted with them. Their insight and feelings about their work experiences are the strength of this research.

Finally, I would like to express my sincere appreciation to my children, Casi and Hannah. They were at home during this thesis project and were an encouragement and support to me during this challenging work. My extended family and friends also provided a listening ear, gentle wisdom and positive feedback throughout my many struggles to see this project to its completion. It is because of their spirit of love and encouragement this thesis was accomplished.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I. Introduction		1
Statement of the Problem.....		1
Objectives of the Study		2
Definition of Terms.....		3
II. Theoretical Perspective.....		5
Symbolic Interactionism.....		5
Normalization Theory.....		8
Normative Theory.....		10
III. Review of Literature.....		11
Historical Perspective.....		11
Studies Related to Meaning of Work for the General Population.....		19
Studies Related to Meaning of Employment for People with Developmental Disabilities.....		21
Studies Reflecting Differences in Perceptions of Consumers and Caregivers.....		25
Studies on State Employment Issues for People with Developmental Disabilities.....		26
State Use Law Definition and Oregon’s Study.....		28
Research Questions.....		29
IV. Methodology.....		30
Reliability and Validity.....		33
Generalizability.....		37
Ethical Concerns.....		38

Chapter	Page
V. Results.....	40
Economic Outcomes of State Use Law.....	40
Types of Employment Provided.....	40
Perceptions of the Work Environment by the Researcher.....	41
Perceptions of the Work Environment by the Worker.....	45
Job Satisfaction on State Use Contracts.....	48
VI. Summary and Discussion.....	55
Economic Outcomes.....	55
Diversity of Jobs.....	57
Work Environments.....	58
Job Satisfaction.....	62
Limitations of the Study.....	66
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	67
APPENDIXES.....	71
APPENDIX A--SURVEY OF STATE HOUSE PROGRAMS.....	71
APPENDIX B--LETTER TO AGENCIES.....	73
APPENDIX C--CONSENT FORM.....	75
APPENDIX D--SCRIPT REQUESTING PARTICIPATION.....	77
APPENDIX E--QUESTIONNAIRE.....	79
APPENDIX F--INTERNAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL.....	84

LIST OF TABLES

Table

1. Frequency and Percentage of Demographic Variables.....	35
2. Responses to Choices About Jobs by Frequency and Percentage.....	50
3. Responses to Relationships with Supervisors by Frequency and Percentage.....	51
4. Responses About Job Environments by Frequency and Percentage.....	52
5. Responses to Wages and Raises by Frequency and Percentage.....	52
6. Responses to Job Satisfaction by Frequency and Percentage.....	53

Chapter 1

Introduction

Statement of the Problem

Employment in the western world holds a central place in the life of the individual. More specifically, wage work enables one to acquire social existence and identity (Applebaum, 1995). Jahoda's study (1982) suggests that employment also fosters positive social psychological effects. It provides time structure, increased social relationships, and feelings of purpose and achievement.

For over half of the 9 million Americans with developmental disabilities however, employment has not been a reality. In a national consumer survey, people with developmental disabilities were interviewed (N=5,461). Of those surveyed 52% were unemployed (McGaughey, Kierman, McNally and Gillmore, 1993). The complexity of our society in the 1990s has brought about new problems for this population. Kirby (1997) found that decline in agricultural employment and manufacturing jobs as well as reduced availability of public transportation has decreased the types of employment available to people with developmental disabilities. Programs and policies that help to provide employment opportunities for this population are especially needed.

The reality of balanced budget and deficit reductions has mandated critical choices on the allocation of government funds. The proposed budget for 2002 by the United States Congress plans for reductions in Medicare, Medicaid, education, welfare, housing and employment. The reductions of monies for employment include rehabilitation programs and supported services (Croser, 1996). "Given the extraordinary budget deficit that this country has grown in the past 15 years we no longer have the luxury to fund programs which do not yield meaningful outcomes" (Wehmen, West, Kregel & Kane, 1996, p. 2). Currently,

the United States has experienced a surplus budget. The debate continues regarding how these funds are to be utilized. There is still pressure to reduce spending in some areas to allow a reduction in personal taxes.

Parents, caregivers and people with developmental disabilities themselves are concerned about the impact these reductions will have on employment opportunities, wages and quality of life. Recognizing the need to assess the outcomes of state programs, Mr. Nils Richardson the director of the sheltered workshop in Payne County, asked that a research project be done that would look at the outcomes of State Use Law in Oklahoma. This research project incorporated evaluation of economic outcomes, process evaluations (including the physical settings, organizational structures and language adopted by the services within those settings), as well as interviews by the workers with developmental disabilities. This is supportive of the more inclusive and holistic outcome studies for this population as suggested by McVilly and Rawlinson (1998).

Objective

This study is a descriptive evaluation of the outcomes of State Use Law in Oklahoma. It includes the economic impact of this law on individuals with developmental disabilities employed through state use contracts, and the state of Oklahoma. Additionally, it looks at the types of employment this law has provided and the experiences and feelings about this employment by the workers with developmental disabilities.

The foundation of this research is based on the interactionist perspective that meanings arise from the social interaction with others. The beliefs about people with developmental disabilities will be addressed, including a historical

overview. Additionally, the meaning of employment will be considered for the general population and for people with developmental disabilities. The Normalization Theory and The Normative Economic Theory will be reviewed, which are the underlying philosophies of State Use Law.

Definition of Terms

It is necessary to define terms that will be used throughout this thesis. First, **developmental disabilities (DDs)** is a severe, chronic physical or mental disability manifested before the age of twenty-two that results in substantial functional limitations in three or more areas of major life activity such as bathing, dressing, eating, and toileting (Szymanski, E. and Hanley-Maxwell, C., 1996). **Employment** is any work for which one receives wages. Specific definitions of employment terms for people with developmental disabilities will be defined from the Association of Retarded Citizens. **Inclusion** is defined as receiving wages and benefits commensurate with people without disabilities in similar positions, having equal access to promotions and work benefits offered to others, participating in the work place social life, and choosing jobs rather than being "placed" with no participation in the job selection.

Competitive or integrated employment is the environment where most workers do not have disabilities and where time-limited supports are provided. This means there may be initial help in the worker adjusting to the workplace, learning a particular skill, or helping establish transportation. However, within a few months not to exceed one year, the support is no longer provided. **Supported employment** is the same type of environment but there is on-going support for someone with developmental disabilities. **Sheltered employment** is where most workers have disabilities and there is

continuous support and supervision. A **day care habilitation facility** is an environment where most workers have disabilities, but the primary focus is on psycho-social skills and activities of daily living. Recreational activities are provided and professional therapies are available when necessary such as physical therapy or occupational therapy (McGaughey, et al., 1995).

Chapter 2

Theoretical Perspective

The theoretical foundation for this research study is Symbolic Interactionism and Normalization. These theories and their particular methods have implications which address employment environments and the experiences and feelings of people with developmental disabilities. Both of these ideologies rest on the assumption that one's growth and development occur through a shared interaction process with others. Additionally, the Normative Theory of economics was considered to understand the economic basis for Oklahoma's State Use law.

Symbolic Interactionism

The theoretical framework for Symbolic Interactionism was formally presented with specific premises and methodology by Herbert Blumer (1969). However, the foundation of this perspective developed from a synthesis of ideas from several scholars. Charles H. Cooley (1964) was one of the first philosophers who began to look critically at the individuals within the "thing" called society and social organizations. He looked at the ways in which people communicate with each other and how relationships develop. Cooley recognized that humans have a unique ability to assign meanings and interpretations of this communication. This is accomplished by words, facial expressions, and gestures (Ritzer, 1983). John Dewey in his work Mind, Experience and Behavior found that thinking influences the actions of individuals. Through the thinking process people can rehearse the different alternatives available to them (Rothman, 1998).

George Herbert Mead in his lectures at the University of Chicago incorporated ideas from Cooley's view of self and Dewey's view of thinking.

Mead further expanded on Cooley's ideas about the self. He divided the self into two phases or components, the *I* and *Me*. The *Me* is the expressed self incorporating understandings, expectations, and meanings common to the social group. The *I* responds to that expression, the interaction and reaction of others, making subjective values on the *Me*. The *Me*, then might be changed or altered if needed (Rothman, 1998).

Blumer (1969) combined these lectures of Mead with the different ideas from the various philosophers, and formalized the ideology of Symbolic Interactionism. Its foundation was three basic premises. First, human beings act toward symbols on the basis of their meanings. Second, these meanings arise from the social interaction one has with others. Finally, meanings are handled in and modified through the interpretive process of individuals as they reflect on the meanings of the symbols they encounter.

Blumer (1969) further expanded upon these statements regarding actions. Human actions are only understood as meanings of actions are understood. The sources of these meanings are not "naturally intrinsic"; rather meaning evolves out of the ways in which other persons act toward it. This process occurs in two steps. First, the actors indicate to themselves the symbols toward which they are acting. This is an internalized social process of communicating with one's self. Meanings, then, become a formative process that are used and revised for the guidance and formation of actions. Actions occur in the various activities that individuals perform in their daily lives, as they encounter others and deal with various situations. Individuals may act singly, collectively, or as representatives of others. The relationships derived from how people act toward each other is the interactionist conceptualization of social structure. Social structure is an ongoing process of fitting together the activities of its members.

Additionally, individuals create meanings within various situations. Thomas and Thomas (1928) suggested that how actors define their situation is the reality of that situation for them. This is different from a social structure or relationship that determines the actors actions or defines a specific reality. Therefore, for a researcher to understand a particular social setting, the researcher must come to understand the actors' definition of the situation (Ritzer, 1996).

The second primary contribution of Herbert Blumer (1969) was the methodology of Interactionism. Rather than the hypothesis testing, deductive approach, Blumer (1969) felt that the inductive approach would be required. To understand interactions, one must become familiar with the groups one wants to study. No longer would it be possible to be detached and distant, but exploration and inspection would be necessary. Blumer (1969) described the exploration process as an understanding of social life through use of direct observation, interviews, listening to conversations, media, information, letters, diaries, and public records. Furthermore, Blumer (1969) believed in utilizing a few participants within the observation study who seemed well-informed and good observers to be part of discussion groups providing insights about particular values or meanings in the particular group of interest. Following the exploratory phase comes inspection or the reflection and examination of the data collected, to look for common themes that emerge. This combination of exploration and inspection is the qualitative analysis or the naturalistic inquiry (Ritzer, 1983).

This is the methodology suggested by McVilly and Rawlinson (1998), Hogg and Mittler (1987), Bailey (1994) and incorporated partially by Wolfensberger (1972) as being the best way to assess services for people with developmental disabilities. Conducting interviews with individuals allows their voices to be

heard. Failure to utilize a more naturalistic inquiry continues to exclude people with developmental disabilities to be active participants in policies that affect their own lives.

Normalization Theory

Normalization ideology owes its beginning to Bank-Mikkelsen, the head of the Danish Mental Retardation Service, who said that the mentally retarded should be allowed to obtain an existence as close as is possible to the normal. Wolfensberger (1972) utilized three main ideas in his concept of Normalization. First, culturally valued means should be used to enable people with developmental disabilities to live culturally valued lives. Second, culturally normative means should be used to offer persons life conditions at least as good as that of the average citizen, and to enhance or support their behavior, appearances, experiences, status and reputation. Finally, the utilization of these normative means should be used to enable or support behaviors, appearances, experiences and interpretations which are as culturally normative as possible.

The goals of these position statements were to change the "roles" of persons who were mentally retarded. Historically their roles had included them as being a menace to society, someone to be pitied or someone who was sick requiring treatments and therapies (Trent, 1994). Instead, Wolfensberger (1972) asserted that people with developmental disabilities were to be given the dignity of normal roles as included members of society. They should be able to live in homes, work at jobs and experience leisure activities (Wolfensberger, 1972). Services should be provided in settings that afford maximum social integration while allowing appropriate level of care and supervision. Education and training should be provided that enables skills to be learned that are expected of members of the culture (Lakin, Hill and Buininks, 1986).

In order to change the roles and expectations of those labeled "retarded" Wolfensberger (1972) asserted that service providers must work with people who are mentally retarded and help them learn socially valued behaviors. Additionally, these individuals must be integrated into culturally normative settings. This would provide a framework for dignity in allowing those who had been so isolated to participate in the mainstream of American life (Trent, 1994). Although some states had created workshops within the community for those who were developmentally disabled, many were merely baby-sitting facilities. They provided nothing more than play activities because there was no paid work available.

Wolfensberger (1972) established guidelines or ideals for the environment of the work setting for people with developmental disabilities. First, rather than instruction by a powerful professional, there should be consultation about the type of work desired. There should be opportunities provided to see all available workshops or sheltered employment, allowing people with developmental disabilities to make their own choices. Secondly, the person with developmental disabilities should be referred to as a "worker" rather than a client. The meaning of worker implies strength and self respect, while client might suggest someone who needs help and treatment. Further, the workshop should resemble a workplace, not a clinic. There should be policies in place about dress, conduct, pay increase and rewards for increased production. Finally, the work should be as interesting and challenging as possible. It should provide preparation for the role as a worker in independent settings (Wolfensberger, 1972).

Normative Theory

Government involvement to provide equalization of employment opportunities is based on the philosophical assumptions of The Normative Theory. This perspective evolved in western economic thought. The competitive market in a free market system is thought to be the best. Competitive market failure is the failing of the achievement of the highest possible level of social well-being for all members of society. It is the belief of this ideology that government intervention be limited to demonstrated market failure and that the intervention is the absolute minimum needed (Tresch, 1982). C. Wright Mills (1959) recognized that when unemployment involves a significant portion of a society, individuals must look at the "structure of opportunities" available to those individuals. It becomes futile to merely assess the difficulties of each person.

Chapter 3

Review of Literature

Historical Perspective

In Europe, prior to the American Revolution most children with disabilities including those who were blind, deaf, mentally ill or mentally retarded were kept quietly at home or put away in state asylums. Following the revolution, ideals toward democracy emerged including taking responsibility for those in need. Philosophers such as Locke and Rousseau inspired some of the first special education programs for those with physical and mental handicaps (Kempton and Kahn, 1991).

There was great optimism about education and in 1848 the first private school was opened in Barre, MA. Two years later the first public school opened in Boston. Within the next forty years, twenty residential schools in fifteen states were started. The underlying belief of this moral education was the hope that those with limited mental abilities could be made "normal" (Zigler, 1990). Eventually, this positive outlook began to change. While the people who were labeled feebleminded were teachable in some areas, the schools did not seem to change the overall limitations of the students. Few were able to achieve independence to live in the community. The parents were concerned about bringing their children, now young men and young women, back home. There were extremely few services and it seemed best that the schools keep these now young adults. In 1894, the first custodial asylum was built in New York and many states soon followed (Davies, 1930).

Some researchers began to hope that science could eliminate the social problem of low intelligence, looking to heredity to explain the problem. Dr.

Goddard published a history of the Kallikak family in 1912. Martin Kallikak, Sr. during the revolutionary war, met a woman who was feeble-minded. She had a son who she named Martin. Dr. Goddard found that the son also had inherited his mother's feeble-mindedness. Dr. Goddard traced the ancestry of this man Martin, Sr. through the lineage of this woman and found 143 "conclusively proven feeble-minded" 36 illegitimate children, 33 sexually immoral persons, 24 alcoholics, 3 epileptics, 3 criminals, 8 keepers of houses of ill-fame and 82 died in infancy. The determination of the 143 as feeble-minded was "some record or memory is generally obtainable of how the person lived and how he conducted himself, whether he was able to make a living, how he brought up his children, what his reputation was in the community" (Davies, 1930, p.65). The descendants from the other woman that Martin, Sr. married (who was reported to be a fine upstanding woman) were all normal minded and there were only 3 "black sheep" named among the 496. Other heredity studies of this type were done of those families with "defective stock" Joerger, 1908; Estabrook, 1912; Davenport & Danielson, 1912; Kite, 1913; Kostir, 1916 (Davies, 1930).

British studies including large scale surveys of the care and control of the feeble-minded were undertaken by the British Royal Commission. The report filled eight volumes after four years of investigation. The summary of the findings included that in a large portion of cases of feeble-mindedness there was a family history that included a parent or near relative. Additionally, these studies noted that besides the heredity factor, people who were feeble-minded had larger families. These studies were then reviewed by writers of popular books. One such author, Lothrop Stoddard in his book *The Revolt Against Civilization* stated "Feeble-mindedness is a condition characterized by such traits as dull intelligence, low moral sense, lack of self-control, shiftlessness, improvidence, etc. It is

frequently associated with great physical strength and vitality, so that feeble-minded persons breed rapidly, with no regard for consequences" (Davies, 1930, p 72). Other English authorities, Tredgold and Lapage also supported American findings of the inheritance factor of feeble-mindedness and the greater fecundity of that population (Davies, 1930).

After the publication of the report by the British Royal Commission, scientists and social researchers began looking at the correlation between feeble-mindedness and crime. The invention of the Binet-Simon Intelligence Test allowed a numerical grading-scale to be assigned to mental age. These researchers made the following classifications of feeble-mindedness: **idiots**, mental age up to 2 years; **imbeciles**, mental age 3-7 years inclusive; **morons**, mental age 8-12 years inclusive. The last group was established because the highest IQ score of persons in institutions for the feeble-minded was 12 years of age. Thus it was assumed, that persons residing in the institution meant they were in fact feeble-minded so the additional category was necessary. This classification was adopted by the American Association for the Study of the Feeble-minded (Davies, 1930).

Using this IQ test instrument, studies were done among those in prisons, those admitting to alcoholism, etc. There seemed to be strong correlation between mental defect and crime. Ten states appointed investigating communities to determine the extent of the problem and what could be done. Two primary solutions emerged: life segregation and sterilization. Indiana was the first state to adopt eugenic sterilization in 1907. By January 1, 1926, 23 states had enacted such laws. During those 18 years 6,244 operations were performed. It is not hard to understand why children looked on by society as defective would be hidden or institutionalized. Families lost hope because

education was seen to be futile. Between 1920 and 1960 large, isolated institutions were built and filled up capacity (Zigler, 1990).

During World War I, this same IQ test was administered to those serving in the United States army at that time. The results of tests revealed 47.3% of the white men drafted were found to have a mental age less than thirteen years placing them in the feebleminded classification. While some accepted the "facts" at face value and wondered about the future of our country, it became evident that perhaps the definition or classification was inaccurate. The joint Mental Deficiency Committee of the Board of Education and Board of Control in England declared that the only satisfactory criterion for feeblemindedness is that which incorporates the lack of mental development which results in an incapability of independent social adaptation which necessitates supervision. Therefore, the reliance on mental-age criterion alone became generally recognized as inadequate (Davies, 1930).

Trent (1994) in his book *Inventing the Feeble Mind*, provides understanding of the changes that occurred within the custodial asylums from the 1920's to the 1960's. He primarily focuses on one such asylum, Letchworth Village which opened in 1911. By 1932, the population at Letchworth Village was growing, residents were sleeping two to a bed and the demand to admit more feebleminded children and adolescents was growing. In the depth of the Great Depression state resources were decreasing, with some states facing bankruptcy. Politicians found few reasons to provide money from the limited funds to public facilities for feebleminded. Charles Little, the superintendent at Letchworth wanted to show the public that their village was still training their "capable inmates" (p. 225). To accomplish this task a photographer was hired, a Margaret Bourke-White. Trent (1994) comments on these photographs. "In several

photographs, the patients seem to be in uniforms, all looking alike, whereas earlier photographs had shown inmates in their own, Sunday-best clothes. The subjects are busy doing laundry, ironing clothes, weaving, studying—but they looked too neat and attractive to be really working. Their work seems contrived created by the photographer, not the reality of the work in the daily lives of the workers”(p. 226).

During the war, more than 2,000 conscientious objectors working on civil public service teams began replacing the drafted men as attendants in training schools in 19 states. Several of these men began to keep diaries and would meet together after work to discuss the problems they encountered and to try and offer solutions. One of these teams around Philadelphia began publishing *Psychiatric Aid*, a monthly magazine to address issues such as run down institutions and inadequate care. In 1946, this team founded the National Mental Health Foundation. Despite growing concerns of institutional care, the post war American families were not ready to take on the challenge of caring for their mentally deficient child at home. Families found themselves relocating, often away from extended family members who might have provided support and help with caring for a child with special needs. Additionally, many women were returning to the work force, and there were no community provisions for their mentally retarded children (Trent, 1994).

In 1950, Pearl S. Buck published a book *The Child who Never Grew* which told the story of her daughter whom she raised till the age of ten and then searched to find the best facility for her care. The book shared her feelings of relief and peace when such a place was found. Excerpts from the book were published in the *Ladies Home Journal*, *Reader's Digest* and *Time Magazine*. Thus, public acceptance of institutions began and the desire to find the “best”

facilities became the primary focus for families. Additionally, families did feel the ability to discuss their problems and concerns as "famous" people began revealing their own personal struggles. Dale Evans in 1952 wrote her book about her daughter Robin, who was mentally retarded. She and Roy Rogers, the famous Hollywood stars became part of the National Association for Retarded Children (NARC) and gave the proceeds from the book about their daughter to advance the association's cause. This association provided the strength through unification of parents and advocates to effect change and reform in public policy for their children (Trent, 1994).

By the late fifties and early sixties, parents grew delusional with care provided in the institutions and became angry at the lack of options available to them. When John F. Kennedy became president in 1961, the highest political office in our country was someone who had been touched by a family member who was mentally retarded. He and Robert Kennedy helped enact funding for research through university settings rather than in medical ones. In 1965, Robert Kennedy reported the dehumanizing conditions found in two of the state schools in New York. By the end of the late sixties there were changes in federal policies that shifted the care and training from institutional settings to communities. Included in this care and training was the recognition of states to provide employment opportunities. The Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1965 provided the establishment of workshops and inclusion of people with mental disabilities in equal opportunities for employment (Trent, 1994).

Just the mere passage of legislation did not automatically result in the large availability of jobs for those with mental retardation or other physical disabilities. Eventually, advocates, families and some professionals modeling workshops created for special populations (those disabled during the war) helped establish employment facilities to fill an unmet need. They recognized that many

with developmental disabilities needed training to accomplish even very simplistic jobs and these workshops could provide that training. By the end of the late sixties, there were programs providing community supports and 320 sheltered workshops were established (NARC, 1964).

With the principle of normalization as set forth by Wolfensberger (1972), professionals in the field began to look for other alternatives to sheltered employment. Work crews of 6 to 8 individuals with developmental disabilities went to work at different sites to perform their newly learned skills, rather than remaining in segregated settings. The mid-eighties saw the establishment of supported employment which incorporated a "job coach" for someone with disabilities to help them learn the skills necessary in whatever community employment opportunity that was available (Hagner and Dileo, 1995).

The reality of vocational opportunities were still difficult to come by for many who had developmental disabilities. Despite the changing of labels (from imbeciles, idiots and morons to people with developmental disabilities) stigma still existed and many young people graduating from special education classes found themselves without employment and no meaningful activities with which to be engaged. This researcher interviewed Mrs. Effie Foster Ballard who shared her story of the history of the workshop in her small urban area that she helped to start. The literature suggests this was very typical of how workshops began in different cities throughout this state and others (Trent, 1994).

In 1980, Mrs. Ballard's daughter graduated from special education classes. On June 4, 1980, just a few weeks after her daughter's graduation, Mrs. Ballard's husband passed away suddenly. Mrs. Ballard decided to return to teaching, but with her daughter's education completed and no one to care for her, Mrs. Ballard

resigned. Mrs. Ballard realized there were no additional training programs or vocational opportunities available to her daughter. Many employers were hesitant to hire someone with her daughter's limitations. Mrs. Ballard talked with several other parents whose students had also graduated that year or a year or two earlier and found they were in the same position. Their children wanted something to do, and there was nothing for them. Some of the parents got together and formed a parent/guardian association. They began advertising in the newspaper to let other parents know about the support group. After visiting two workshops in the state, Mrs. Ballard wrote a grant requesting for funds to establish a nonprofit work center in her area. She began with two contracts and six workers. A contract is an agreement to perform work that a company would need for a certain price. A local nursery in the area needed wooden trellises nailed together and company labels put on plastic bags. Mrs. Ballard's workshop agreed to do those two contracts for the nursery. The workers were paid by "piece rate" by how many trellises they nailed or how many labels they put on the bags (Ballard, 1999).

State Use Contracts in Oklahoma began when Donna Nye (the governor's wife at that time) joined efforts with Oklahoma's League for the Blind, in passing Oklahoma's State Use Law. The law would allow those agencies employing people with visual impairments to bid on work, a product or service the state needed without competition, providing they could provide that work or service at a fair market price. This law was passed in 1978. In 1980, the law was revised to include those agencies that employed people with developmental disabilities as well. Shortly after the revision of that law, Mrs. Ballard's workshop contracted for the cleaning services for the Oklahoma State Bureau of Investigation offices in their community. Currently Mrs. Ballard's employment

center has 45 workers. Additionally, they expanded to supervise seven group homes, some assisted living apartments and one supported living home. At this time, 50% of the budget of the work center is from state use contracts (Ballard, 1999).

Many of the workshop directors in Oklahoma felt there would be many such products or services they could provide if there was someone in the state purchasing department who would actively look for such opportunities as well as come to know the types of goods and services the workshops could perform. The state did not have funds to pay the salary for such an individual, so the workshop directors agreed to pay 1% of the monies received from state contract work to provide the salary for a state contracting officer. Since Georgia Lynn was hired, currently the state of Oklahoma has contracted for this fiscal year to purchase 10.2 million dollars in services and goods from agencies employing those with developmental disabilities resulting from Oklahoma's State Use Law.

Studies Related to Meanings of Work for the General Population

Robert Rothman (1998) in his book Working: Sociological Perspectives, looks at the various aspects of the meaning of work and the impact of joblessness primarily focusing on people without developmental disabilities. Wages and benefits have been considered the most important factors of job satisfaction. Money not only provides consumer goods and services beyond basic necessities, but it symbolizes success and accomplishment (Judge, 1993 as cited in Rothman, 1998).

Research has shown that money is not the only aspect of job satisfaction. Rothman (1998) describes a personal pride or satisfaction which can be found among people who do seemingly mundane jobs. These intrinsic rewards also

include the opportunities for intellectual and physical challenge and a sense of accomplishment.

Work provides structure and organization of one's day. Reviewing studies among those unemployed, Johoda (1971) found people had difficulty remembering their daily activities. They seemed to have lost the sense of time passing, unable to remember whether an event happened a few days or a few weeks ago (Johoda, et al., 1971 as cited in Rothman, 1998).

Yankelovich (1987) in his longitudinal study with college-age youth first observed four major themes representing the meaning of work for these young people. Among the males surveyed, there was a strong desire to be a good provider. For both males and females the desire to be independent was important, to be able to make it on one's own. Additionally, both felt that hard work pays off and doing your best and working hard at any type of work brought about self-respect. This study suggests even menial jobs provide important roles, and to have a job is still perceived as a good thing in American society.

While some of these meanings have continued, Yankelovich (1987) found more recently that prestige began to take on an important aspect of getting a job. Gaining material goods seemed to have lost some of its significance compared to the desire for quality family time and a career. The college-age young people surveyed toward the end of the longitudinal study also seemed more willing to risk security for having more interesting and varied work. The idea of wanting to do a good job in whatever career they had was still present. The reality that money wasn't everything impacted the continuing grind and sacrifice for it. Many young people saw the need to enjoy their families while making a living. Perhaps, they had noticed the lack of time spent with their parents and felt they wanted different relationships with their children. Expensive things such as televisions, VCRs, electronic games, etc. all seem of

little value if they must be enjoyed alone or if there is no time to enjoy them at all.

Studies Related to Meaning of Employment for People with Developmental Disabilities

The meaning of employment for people with developmental disabilities is implied or indirectly obtained in the majority of research literature. Research has been scarce that utilize the feelings and opinions of people with developmental disabilities themselves. McVilly and Rawlinson (1998) discuss the different ways feelings and meanings of employment were measured for this population. First they found that research often incorporates process evaluations. These include assessing physical settings, organizational structures and the language and symbols adopted by the service providers. In reviewing the research of Bellamy, Newton, LeBaron, and Horner (1990), McVilly and Rawlinson (1998) found that process evaluation only provides indirect information about quality of life and it fails to address if specific environmental features are important to the individuals served.

Secondly, objective measures are used that represent the ideology of community integration and normalization. For example, one would look at the number of people employed in settings that are integrated rather than segregated, the amount of wages earned, and the ability to choose various types of employment. This theoretical framework assumes that integrated employment for people with developmental disabilities is more meaningful because it will be similar to the "normal" work environment of the majority of society. This seems to be the dominant trend in research with this population (Conyers, Ellwanger, Ferguson, Nemeth, et al ,1999; Marrone, Hoff, and Gold,

1999; Weiner-Zivolich and Zivolich, 1995; Wehman and Kregel, 1995; McGaughey, Kiernan, McNally, Gilmore, and Keith, 1995).

Proxy-based responses have provided another way of determining perceptions and feelings about employment for this population. While not the primary source of research studies, family and caregiver's opinions and ideas have been the foundation of sheltered workshops and day activity centers. (Bradley and Allard, 1982; NARC, 1964). The discrepancies between proxy-based responses and those of the consumers themselves will be further addressed in the next section.

There is a recent trend in some studies to incorporate the actual opinions and views of people with developmental disabilities. Angrosino (1997) conducted an ethnographic study among a group of adults with mental retardation living in several group homes. He found that most public policy is addressed as though people with developmental disabilities all shared similar characteristics. Angrosino (1997) found even within his small sample a great deal of diversity. The three primary ethnic backgrounds were Caucasian, African Americans and Hispanics from varied socioeconomic backgrounds. They ranged in age from their early twenties to those in their forties and came from both rural and urban environments.

The dominant theme from this ethnographic study was these individuals wanted to think of themselves as adults and be treated as such. Many times Angrosino heard the phrase from those in authority about the "dignity of risk" since deinstitutionalization. However, in practice within the group homes Angrosino felt this "right" was rarely given. This was especially evident in the area of sexuality. Clients had habilitation programs that helped guide them in achieving work and basic independent living goals. But there was a basic gap between learning social etiquette and adult sexuality. The adult figures in their

lives did not discuss this topic, but rather it was evident that their opinions, thoughts and ideas came from television and movies which feature adulthood as being sexually active. Angrosino (1998) summarizes his findings:

"the narratives speak of a longing for human contact that is palpable even beneath the surface discourse about macho men and prim homebodies. If ever there was a ready audience for some plain, no-Latin-names talk about biology and clear, experience-based discussion about relationships, this is it" (p. 108).

Freedman and Fresko (1996) utilized 4 focus groups of consumers with severe disabilities and their families to obtain their perspectives of the meaning of work. Five areas of work were discussed: job satisfaction, job relationships, support, obstacles, and job expectations. Feeling productive and keeping busy were seen as important by both consumers and family members. Doing a variety of tasks and completing work on time gave the consumers a sense of self-esteem and well-being.

"Many consumers expressed pride in knowing that they had the ability to do their jobs and that they could do the work as well or better than any one else." (p. 51), Decent pay, steady but flexible work schedules and benefits such as merchandise discounts, transportation vouchers, and company holiday parties were also mentioned as important. Families perceived social relationships as an important outcome for their relatives. The consumers, however, liked their acceptance but expressed they did not have any "real friends" at work and that they were uncomfortable working with some individuals. Supervisors and job coaches were seen very positively by both families and consumers, but some clients felt that their agencies never discussed their job options again once they placed them in a job. Families were concerned about the lack of additional training that might enable their family member to achieve independence (Freedman and Fresko, 1996). The desires to work hard, feel accepted and be

independent is similar to the findings for people without disabilities as described by Rothman (1998) and Yankelovich (1987).

The Guilford County Area Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities Program included in their report (1997-1998) that being responsible, respected, and a productive member of the community were important feelings of people with developmental disabilities. They want the recognition and knowledge that they belong to an organization and are part of that organization's success.

Parent and Kregel (1996) conducted a consumer satisfaction survey with 110 individuals with developmental disabilities in supported employment. Supported employment provided these individuals with a variety of different types of jobs including commercial (retail stores) 37.3%, stocker or warehouse worker 16.7%, dishwasher/food prep 18.5%, clerk/office worker 26.9%, and public agencies (church, park service provider) 15.5%.

Most individuals in this study were happy with their wages (62.8%) and over half had received raises. About 81%, however, felt their company medical benefits were inadequate. All but one of the consumers felt that they had a positive relationship with their supervisor and approximately half (51.8%) stated their boss treated them no differently from anyone else. The largest positive response was regarding their specific job. Ninety percent stated that they liked their job, and many included they were happy to have a job (Parent & Kregel, 1996).

Blanck's study (1993) reported that integrated employment resulted in fewer medical needs and greater life satisfaction for people with developmental disabilities. Additionally, employment provided empowerment and increased choices for them. It is important to note these last two studies (Parent and Kregel, 1996; Blanck, 1993) incorporated the feelings and ideas of people with

developmental disabilities only from integrated or supported employment environments.

Another aspect of normal work environments as set forth by Wolfensberger (1972) is consumer choices. MacEachen and Mundy (1996) reported that personal control was a fundamental issue for the seven mildly developmentally disabled adults in their ethnographic study. Although a small sample size ($n=7$) their data collection was conducted over six months including 46 field sessions, and 21 telephone conversations that occurred in many different environments: home, work, advocacy meetings, church, and doughnut shops. This theme reflected particularly their desire for choices within their home environments; however, one of the consumers mentioned she did not attend her day program by choice but rather "for lack of options".

Studies Reflecting Differences in Perceptions of Consumers and Caregivers

Beliefs and ideas about what is important for people with developmental disabilities is usually discussed in terms of what researchers, caregivers, or family members perceive as important. There has been little study of the differences of perceptions between these different groups directly involved with these individuals and the individuals themselves.

McVilly and Rawlinson (1998) reviewed the research studies of Merkel, (1984); Rende and Plomin, (1991); Seckler, Meier, Mulvihill and Paris, (1991); which reported what families and caregivers perceive as important or satisfying may differ from the individuals they represent, especially in evaluations of emotional experience and personal preferences.

Chadsey-Rusch, Linneman and Rylance (1997) looked at the feelings about social integration outcomes from each of these different perspectives. Their results found nine significant f ratios, $p < .01$, across six sub-scale scores.

Employers consistently differed from the groups of people with mental retardation in their perceptions of implementation and effectiveness of interventions to increase social integration and the barriers perceived as detrimental to social integration. One primary difference in intervention perceptions was that job coaches reported using twice as many specific interventions to help with social integration than the individuals perceived they were receiving. Additionally, the barriers felt to exist for social integration from the consumer's perspective included not enough time or resources and difficulty learning new skills. Significantly fewer job coaches felt that these were barriers (Chadsey-Rusch, Linneman & Rylance, 1997).

This study recognizes the importance of understanding and knowing both perspectives in order to provide greater success in interventions that are to assist in social integration in a work environment. These different perspectives are considered necessary in the assessing of outcomes and implementing better programs and policies. "Failure to do so is to continue to condone the exclusion of retarded people from taking an active participant role in decisions affecting their own lives"(Hogg and Mittler, 1987 p. 283 cited by McVilly and Rawlinson, 1998).

Studies on State Employment Issues for People with Developmental Disabilities

Kiernan, Butterworth and McGaughey (1995) looked at the trend of different states toward integrated employment for those with developmental disabilities. Oklahoma in 1988 had only 4% of those employed in integrated employment and by 1990 had 12% in integrated employment. Twenty-one states, however, had at least 20% involved in integrated employment which shows that Oklahoma is still lagging significantly behind. McGaughey, et al.

(1993), however, found that Oklahoma ranked 17th in state improvement for integrated services. The success of increased integrated services they felt was due to the impetus of federal and state legislation, regulations and funding. Both of these studies also reflected the ideology that integration is best.

The President's Committee on Employment for People with Disabilities (1996) found that while 82% of our total population was employed, only 15.39 million or 52.3 % of those with developmental disabilities had wage work. This is an increase from 1991 when only 14.26 million persons or 52% with developmental disabilities were employed. The committee further reported that the average cost to provide support and training for this population averaged only \$200 per person. This cost was offset by the savings in government supports averaging \$34 per person. In light of the meaning that employment has for people with developmental disabilities, the difference it makes to them economically and the moderate cost to the taxpayer, it must cause us to look at what else can be done to achieve more work opportunities for this population.

Huang and Ruben (1997) discuss the obligation of society to provide equal employment opportunities for those with developmental disabilities. They assert that this obligation is grounded in the moral foundation of our country and its ethical principles. These principles are beneficence, justice and autonomy. They define beneficence as the belief that the interests of all people of society are to be protected despite the costs. Justice incorporates the idea that those not responsible for their impairments cannot be held responsible for their lack of employment. It would be unjust to deprive them of equal access to opportunities available to the majority of society. Finally, the principle of autonomy honors the freedom of all individuals to control their own lives and make their own choices.

These principles are supportive of the Theory of Normalization (Wolfensberger, 1972).

The literature has reflected whether directly or indirectly that employment is desired for people with developmental disabilities since deinstitutionalization. Although there have been limited studies involving the opinions and feelings of this population, those that have included their views have shown their desires are similar to those without disabilities. They want work, the ability to earn money and to have some choices about the type of jobs they do (Freedman and Fresko, 1996; Guilford County Area Mental Health, 1997-1998; Parent and Kregel, 1996; Blanck, 1993; MacEachen and Mundy, 1996).

State Use Law Definition and Oregon's Study

This study emerged from the Oregon Study (Orcutt, 1994) which looked at the economic gains for the state as a direct result of employment opportunities provided by their state use law. The researchers surveyed 7.5% of those workers employed as a result of work procured from Oregon's Products of Disabled Individuals Law. There were 126 people who responded. The results were quite substantial. One third (33%) of those involved were able to get off all public support which reduced payments by more than \$4 million annually. Prior to this employment opportunity, 7% were homeless and 72% were unemployed. Over half of those unemployed had been so over one year. Additionally, State and Federal tax payments of these workers now exceed \$1 million annually.

Oklahoma's State Use law is one of the legislative actions to help reinforce the "structure of opportunities" for those with developmental disabilities. It was instituted to provide greater employment opportunities by exempting qualified

rehabilitation facilities from competitive bidding for goods and services procured by public agencies. This was to provide an ongoing and expanded market in the public sector. Some studies have suggested this law as well as other legislative policies and government funds has helped Oklahoma in achieving more integrated employment for this population. Balanced budgets and limited funds are a reality. The need to research the outcomes of these programs is evident. What must not get lost is the commitment to look at the benefits that are not limited to economic outcomes. It must include foremost the feelings of those whose lives it will inevitably impact.

Research Questions

1. What are the economic outcomes of state use law; specifically: the number of people with developmental disabilities employed, the amount of income earned, the amount of taxes paid and the amount of public support reduced?
2. What types of employment have been provided ?
3. How well do they meet the standards of "normal work" environments as set forth by Wolfensberger?
4. How do the workers perceive their work environments?
5. How satisfied are the workers with the jobs provided by state use contracts

Chapter 4

Methodology

A list of the 48 agencies using state use contracts was obtained from Georgia Lynn, the state's contracting officer, to enable a convenient quota sample to be chosen. This researcher and Georgia Lynn went over this list carefully and determined that size and location would be the two significant factors of variation within this population of agencies. It was found that approximately 25% of the population agencies were in rural areas (areas with less than 6,000 people). Additionally, about 1/3 of the agencies had fewer than 50 employees, about 1/2 had between 50-150 employees and approximately 1/6 had greater than 150 employees. Therefore, to try and make the sample as representative of the population as possible and convenient in distance for the researcher, 3 of the agencies were chosen from rural areas (25% of the sample). Additionally, 5 of the 12 agencies were chosen that had fewer than 50 employees with developmental disabilities; 6 between 50 and 150 employees; and one had greater than 500.

The directors of the 12 sample agencies were contacted by telephone to explain the study and its purpose. Then surveys were sent to each of these agencies. See Appendix A for a sample of the survey and Appendix B for the letter to the agencies. Initially, the researcher was going to visit all twelve of the agencies. However, due to time and financial constraints the 12 agencies were asked to mail in their surveys and a subset sample of six agencies was used for interviews and observations. All twelve of the agencies returned the economic surveys that provided the number of employees, the total amount of wages paid, taxes withheld, and the total amount of individuals who had been able to

get off partial or complete government supports during 1998. This enabled aggregate financial information to be obtained without personal information given.

Additionally, permission was asked to observe at a convenient quota subset sample of six of these facilities keeping the percentage of urban and rural in the population to be the same in the subset sample of six. Again, the agencies were chosen within this quota subset because of their location convenience for the researcher. There were six hours of observation at each of these facilities. This researcher looked for the criteria of "normal work environments" as set forth by Wolfensberger. This was different than the usual distinction between integrated and segregated employment. Wolfensberger (1972) conceptualized "normal work environments" by five factors. Additionally, a sixth factor was included regarding integrated employment. Each of these factors was considered equal in value and therefore a score of six means the most normal work environment was achieved.

These six factors are:

- *consultation about the type of work desired, the individual should have choices about their workplace

- *the work should be "real work" intended to be marketed, the work should vary in kind and complexity to the varying interests, skills and needs of the population,

- *wage rates should be those prevailing in regular industry with increments based on increased production,

- * the person with developmental disabilities should be referred to as a "worker" rather than a client,

- * the workshop should resemble a workplace not a clinic, there should be policies in place about dress, conduct, pay increase and rewards for increased production,

* people with developmental disabilities should be integrated with workers without developmental disabilities.

Finally, the researcher asked the supervisor or director of these facilities to make a general announcement asking for volunteers who would like to share their feelings and ideas about working on state use contracts. See Appendix C for the announcement. There were 19 males and 18 females (N=37) who volunteered. See Table 1 for the demographics of these subjects. These individuals were currently working on state contracts, were their own guardians and were willing to share their opinions and feelings about their work. Additionally, at one workshop there were two employees who did not have developmental disabilities who were working on state contracts. They also volunteered to share their feelings about working at the workshop. Those who were interested were told specifically what the project was for and the confidentiality of the information they would give. A consent form was read (see Appendix D), and all the subjects gave verbal consent. This was witnessed by the supervisor at the site. See Appendix E for the questionnaire used.

Although the questions were open-ended with verbal prompts, the responses generally fell into three or four themes. Those who expressed different thoughts were also included in an individual theme category. This allowed for frequencies of responses to be utilized. Additionally, the comments made that didn't include responses to questions were included in the details of the description of their feelings or ideas about various topics. For example, one gentleman who when asked about his wages talked about his own apartment and being able to have his friends over. His satisfaction with his wage was incorporated with a frequency response, but his additional feelings were also included in the descriptive analysis of the results.

Reliability and Validity

This study incorporated both qualitative and quantitative methods to allow a more holistic evaluation of Oklahoma's State Use Law. It is important to discuss the reliability and validity of each of the methods used. Reliability is the consistency of the results a particular instrument or method provides. Validity is the descriptive term of a method which accurately reflects the concepts it intends to measure (Bailey, 1972).

Interviews

Estimating reliability and validity of qualitative measures, specifically interview questionnaires, used with small groups of people with diverse cognitive abilities was thought to be very difficult to carry out (Chadsey-Rusch, et al., 1992) It has only been recently that this statistical condition has been imposed on the measures concerned. This situation is gradually changing (Kirby, 1995). While not mandatory in mainstream practices (Petrovski and Gleeson, 1997) this study has incorporated an interview instrument developed by Parent and Kregel (1996) that was tested by these researchers for both reliability and validity.

To ensure that valid concepts of job satisfaction were measured, the concepts on the questionnaire concerning job satisfaction emerged from discussions with people with developmental disabilities themselves. Professionals in the field of disabilities formatted these concepts and worded them so that they would be easily understood (Parent and Kregel, 1996).

Reliability of the data was verified by reviewing the completed instrument (except question 21) and comparing items of similar content to check for response consistency and bias. Chi-square analysis was prohibited due to the

small sample size which yielded cell counts of less than 5 on all of the 5 items. Test-retest reliability was calculated to determine the consistency of measurement when administered by two different interviewers on two different occasions. Reliability measures were gathered on 27% of the interviews, or 30 of the 110 instruments administered. A Pearson correlation coefficient of .82 was obtained, significant at the $p < .0001$ level. The results indicated a strong direct relationship between individual responses on the survey the first and second administrations conducted up to 2 months apart by two different interviewers (Parent and Kregel, 1996).

Additionally, this researcher received three days of training from the Developmental Disability Quality Assurance Research Project through Oklahoma State University to learn the special techniques of interviewing people with developmental disabilities. Furthermore, the researcher personally interviewed over 200 people with developmental disabilities since she was a research assistant on the project. This provided her with a comfortableness around this population and helped to provide a relaxed atmosphere for those being interviewed. Rubin & Rubin (1995) mention this as important for obtaining accurate information.

During this study, the researcher went back to one workshop approximately four weeks later to complete more interviews at that agency. Only 4 interviews had been obtained the first time and five were completed the second time. One gentleman came in to be interviewed, and after the first four questions were asked, it was realized he had already participated. I asked if he had interviewed before with me. He replied: "Yes, but I wanted to do it again". It was decided to proceed with the interview to assess reliability of the responses compared to the first interview. Out of the 26 questions on the interview, he

answered 24 with the same response and very similar comments. For example, the best thing about his job was working on the road crew "pick up trash" on the first interview, and this exact same response was given during the second interview. When asked about his relationship with his boss, he responded great

Table 1

Frequency and Percentage of Demographic Variables

Sex	Frequency	Percentage
Male	19	51.4
Female	18	48.6
Race		
African American	5	13.5
Caucasian	32	86.5
Age Categories		
Young Adult (20-30)	12	32.4
Adult (31-40)	10	27.0
Older Adult (>40)	14	37.8
Unknown	1	2.8

and gave the name of the specific supervisor both times. The two inconsistent responses were on question 21 and 23. Question 21 asks "Do you think this is a regular job?" The first time, the man responded yes. The second time he said no, a grocery store. On question 23 there was a similar discrepancy. He was

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

asked if he liked this job better than his previous employment. The first time he said this job was the only place he had worked. The second time he said he had worked at another workshop and didn't like it. These results are similar to reliability tests for those without developmental disabilities. Parry and Crossley (1950) found 96-98% accuracy when asked about specific, present facts and only 73% accuracy with events that occurred in the past (Bailey, 1994).

Observations

During the observations at the different workshops, the researcher was looking for specific characteristics about the work environment. Bailey (1994) states that structured observation creates some bias (one sees what one expects to see); however, validity is increased if the characteristics one is looking for are based on specific concepts. The framework for these observations was based on the specific concepts of desired work environments set forth by Wolfensberger (1972) in his theory of Normalization. Additionally, reliability of these observations is increased by looking for specific concepts (Bailey, 1994). Another researcher using these same guidelines could come in and observe and make comparisons about the specific characteristics observed. These observations were not tested for reliability, but a comparison was made between the worker's perceptions of their environment compared to that of the researcher. These similarities and differences will be discussed in the results section.

The observation portion of this study as well as the interviews followed the guidelines set forth by Rubin and Rubin (1995). Rich, detailed notes were kept enabling other researchers to read them and know what took place, how long the observations or interviews took, the ideas that emerged and the researcher's thoughts, ideas and feelings. Inconsistencies of different

interviewers or discrepancies from the same interviewer were explored to give understanding of these differences.

Economic Survey of State Use Law

The quantitative data that was obtained was consistent with the specific information requested by those wanting this evaluation and was utilized as representative of economic outcomes in the Oregon Study evaluating their state use law. This helped to ensure the validity of the information for this study. There were some questions by the directors after the survey was sent out. The month chosen for study was changed from December, 1998 to June, 1998 since December is a month where the workshops are closed for at least five days for the holidays. Additionally, clarification was made about those who were transitioned from state use programs to competitive employment not subsidized by Developmental Disability Service Division of the Department of Human Services. These were to be individuals no longer working in the state "slots" which are supported by \$19 for each work day. Those who no longer received any support, were to be those individuals no longer receiving monthly supplemental wage. This was reflected by an average amount given by the director of the service division in Oklahoma, \$543. These average amounts are those used by the Developmental Disability Service Division of the Department of Human Services (Driskill, 1999). This clarification helped to provide more reliable financial information.

Generalizability

The economic results from this convenient quota sample cannot be generalized to the population of the 48 agencies using State Use Law. However, since the agencies were chosen to be representative of the various sizes and locations of the agencies by quota percentages, and then chosen based on

convenience rather than a specific bias, these results are believed to be representative of the population. The interviews with people with developmental disabilities cannot be generalized to the population of the workers within these agencies due to the restrictions of the types of individuals that were allowed to be interviewed: they had to be their own guardian and had to have the cognitive and communicative ability to answer questions on the questionnaire. However, it is believed these people provided insight and understanding to the feelings and meanings they had about their various types of employment. A demographic description of the individuals interviewed will be provided including age and gender to provide some comparisons to other groups. See Table 1.

Ethical Concerns

This is a very special population of individuals. There have been serious, detrimental impacts to them as a result of poorly conducted research (Trent, 1994). It is with this serious recognition of the consequences of failure that I conducted this research project with integrity and thoroughness. I incorporated both qualitative and quantitative methods in this project to allow a more holistic approach. Denzin & Lincoln (1994) suggest that single methodology is limiting in understanding the event or process being studied. As a research assistant on the Developmental Disability Quality Assurance Longitudinal Project I have found from my interviews with people with developmental disabilities that most of them are quite capable of expressing their feelings and desires. Additionally, they are eager for someone to listen truly to their opinions and feelings.

Confidentiality was maintained by assigning numbers to the individuals that were interviewed, and all identifying information was stripped so the data could not be linked to these consumers. Additionally, the facilities were only

characterized by their size (small, medium and large) and their location (rural or urban). All of these reports were kept secured until the data ^{was} were recoded. In the more in-depth questions, any information that was personally identifying was not used, or changed to reflect general themes or ideas expressed.

Permission was asked to conduct every interview or to obtain wage or employment information. Additionally, I only conducted more in-depth interviews with those who were their own guardian, and I did not precede with the interview unless I was certain of the willingness and understanding on the part of the individual. To ensure reliability I incorporated four questions from the Developmental Disability Service Division longitudinal project used on their survey instrument. These are: Do cats fly?, Do dogs bark? Additionally, four pictures are shown: two are of individuals, one sitting the other standing; the other two are showing someone happy and sad. The individuals were asked to point to the picture they think shows someone sitting down and someone happy. These questions helped to establish the understanding of the individuals and their ability to answer the questions. There was only one individual who failed to answer all four of the questions correctly and his responses were not included.

Chapter 5

Results

Economic Outcomes of State Use Law

The twelve agencies reported 1746 workers with developmental disabilities employed at their workshop as of June, 1998. Of these workers, 541 employees worked on state use contracts and earned \$97,396.75 in the month of June, 1998. These results should be read with the recognition that without employment, people with developmental disabilities living in state supported environments are only given \$30 above their living expenses for "extra things". By having paid work, these individuals now have an average monthly income of \$180. It provides them with the ability to eat out, enjoy various activities and purchase clothes. Utilizing their supplemental supported income and their wages, they are able to live in group homes or their own apartments.

During the calendar year of 1998, 637 employees transferred to competitive employment. This allowed 637 "state slots" supported by \$19 per day to be opened for other individuals. Twenty-six individuals with developmental disabilities were able to achieve complete unsubsidized employment and received no support or very limited support from other public sources in the calendar year 1998. This represents for the sample agencies (N=12) an annual savings of public funds of \$169,416. This amount is based on the Developmental Disability Service Division's average supplemental supportive income, \$543 (Driskill, 1999).

Types of Employment Provided

The types of services provided is a very extensive list. The janitorial contracts are completed by several of these 12 agencies. They include cleaning government buildings such as state museums, D.H.S. offices, The Board of

Education offices. There are more than 200 government buildings or offices cleaned by these agencies in both rural and urban settings. Additionally, people with developmental disabilities work on road crews that cover several counties and include many major highways. Grounds maintenance at several government buildings as well as waste management for 5 state parks is provided. Recycling services is provided by two of the twelve agencies. Mail contracts for the state is a very large contract provided by one of the urban agencies. Packaging different items into kits (toothbrush, toothpaste, comb, deodorant) for the prisons, juvenile halls, and department of health is a contract that provides jobs done by people with more limited skills. These jobs are divided into steps. One individual may assemble the box; another will put the various items in the box. Another will put a label on the box and seal it shut. Therefore, someone with very limited abilities may put labels on the boxes. Survey flags for the public utilities, heating and air filters and quality control packaging of latex gloves are also jobs that are divided into simple steps and have provided employment for people with more severe disabilities. These various jobs have enabled two of the twelve agencies to no longer have waiting lists for their facilities. For one of the urban agencies, state use contracts provides more than 75% of their workshop contracts.

Perceptions of the Work Environments by the Researcher

The type of work environment was determined by the six specific standards of "normal" work has set for by Wolfensberger. All six of the agencies in the subset sample provided "real work" intended to be marketed providing a variety of simplistic to complex tasks and a wide range of settings allowing for the various needs of the population to be met. Some of the places the goods were marketed were Tinker Air Force Base, Hobby Lobby, and numerous state

agencies. The workers were aware that what they made was being marketed. "We sell our pallets and sawdust"; "We do stuff for Hobby Lobby"; "I do meals on wheels sometimes, I'm helping handicapped because I am handicapped". This "real work" seems important to the supervisors as well. One supervisor stated: "I oversee mowing and the recycling center; we have a good reputation in the community".

An example of how some of the workshops adapted to various needs was observed: At one table a man who looked to be in his 40s wearing a collared knit shirt and slacks was bent over the table. He was carefully placing screws along a board with 4 holes in it. The supervisor explained it was a counting board. This enabled the gentleman to put exactly 4 screws in the plastic bag to be sealed, labeled and sold without his needing to know how to count.

Some shops also provided jobs with more complex skills. There are two rather noisy machines at a workbench toward the back of the room. Two men are sitting on stools in front of them wearing protective goggles. They are working those machines which fit "bits" into sleeves. The supervisor explained that some of these technical machines have been adapted to ensure extra safety for the workers (field notes).

Additionally, there were choices about the type of work desired, although choosing work at a specific workshop or job site was limited for some. Several of the directors showed me the job analysis forms that were used to determine the likes and dislikes of the individuals, their skills and limitations, and their health issues. One of the directors mentioned that their facility had continuing education opportunities. "Our continuing education is connected with the vo-tech in our area. Some of the things they learn are reading, writing their name, learning colors. Some earn their G.E.D., but for most they are increasing task skills." I also saw at this shop a big screen TV and VCR. The director explained

this is for training tapes, but also provides recreation activities after work where some come to watch movies together. Several of the workshops had a specified employee who went out in the community to find integrated employment opportunities for those within the workshop who were able to handle that type of work. They also continued to monitor and support those individuals until the job was comfortable for them and the employers were comfortable with their work.

The people with developmental disabilities were referred to as workers and were treated as such. The supervisors worked along with the employees often doing tasks, or completing a portion of the job that then the workers would need to finish. Supervisors were reminding people to continue with their work if they slowed down or to take their seats if they began to wander around. They were spoken to as adults, and I did not observe any instances where the supervisors treated anyone in a demeaning manner. There were only limited opportunities to observe interactions between supervisors and workers. I did observe some very positive and supportive interactions. At one of the urban facilities, I was in a room with approximately 20 workers representing half of the workshop. There were 6 tables with anywhere from 3-6 workers at each table: There were 3 people at one table closest to me. The supervisor mentions that they have a deadline for the state flags at 2:00 p.m. A woman (in her early twenties, perhaps) looks at me and says "With her on our side, we'll make it. We all pitch in together. One time we all worked together to finish a large order of flags. We got done by 1:30 p.m. and they let us have the rest of the day off!" (field notes)

I informally talked with a young man who was in charge of the road crew. He is in his mid twenties, and his complexion was quite tanned. His comments were: "I treat everyone like I want to be treated; our workers actually hate to

miss work; one of our men hurt his back and was anxious about coming back to work; I get along with all the guys and sometimes go on activities with them after work with their group home”.

I also noticed some workers helping each other. It was break time. From a table close to the back of the room, three workers went to the table along the wall where three people who were blind were seated. The workers from the back took the three workers with visual problems by the arm and guided them to the break room (field notes).

The workshops resembled small factories with different types of piece work being accomplished. The workshops had very basic furniture. Most of the work was conducted on long tables with approximately six workers sitting at each. One of the directors of a rural workshop explained: “Because of limited funds, it is difficult to purchase equipment necessary to employ more or provide different jobs; the offices here do not even have basic computers for administrative work”. Some of the agencies did have very technical machines being operated by those with developmental disabilities. The agencies met safety standards and had safety equipment in areas where it was needed. All the agencies had specific policies about dress codes especially as they related to safety issues, such as no open toed shoes. I recorded in my field notes, . . . on the wall just before entering the workshop there was a bulletin board. There was a dress code policy hung by thumb tacks, and there were several pictures of individuals under a sign “employee of the month”. In the bookcase in the director’s office are manuals about OSHA requirements. I’m shown a closet where emergency and safety equipment are stored (field notes). There were regularly scheduled breaks and lunch times and the directors discussed the bonuses that were sometimes given or parties or trips when contracts were completed on time.

The six facilities that were observed were given a score of one point for the following factors set forth by Wolfensberger (1972): a real work environment with specific policies in place for dress and safety; choices concerning types of jobs to be performed; interactions between supervisors and subjects was that of supervisors and employees; and work was marketable. None of the twelve agencies offered minimum wage, but rather piece rate was paid. This wage rate is set by the department of labor and they provide a detailed method of establishing pay rates for those who do piece work. None of the agencies received a score for minimum wage rates. Additionally, only one of the agencies had integrated employment and that was very minimal (only two workers), so no score was given to any of the six agencies for integrated employment. For each of these six agencies a score of 4 was given out of a possibility of 6. These "points" were just an arbitrary way of recording the different characteristics of normal work environments as set forth by Wolfensberger (1972). None of these concepts were given any more significance than the other.

Perceptions of Work Environments by the Workers

Tables 2 through 5 present participant responses to the questions on the job satisfaction interview related to choices of jobs, wages and job environments. Each of these responses will be discussed and the tables with the frequencies and percentages will follow.

Choices

For slightly more than three-fourths of the subjects (75.7%), they believed there were many different choices of jobs available to them. Of those who did not feel there were different jobs available or they didn't want different jobs, their comments give some insight as to some of the reasons:

" My doctor sets limitations for me."; "I don't want a different job. I get Saturday and Sunday off."; "Jobs are hard to come by"; "It's just the same old thing"; "My wheelchair keeps me from jobs."

When asked if they chose to work at the particular workshop, 45.9% said that decision was made by someone else. The different people listed who made the choice was as follows: family members, directors/case managers, or friends.

Relationships with Supervisors

All but one (2.7%) of the workers felt they at least got along with their supervisor. Over half (59.5) stated they "got along" great with their supervisor. Management style was OK for 48.7% of the employees, and 45.9% felt they were treated good. Some of the comments were: "I try and get along with everybody." "I like her." "He treats me like a son" "She helps us if we need it" "I like her a lot". Additionally, 91.9% of the employees felt they could ask the supervisor for help and 83.8% said their boss was available. Two consumers (5.4%) felt the supervisor was around too much and two (5.4%) felt the supervisor was not available.

"Regular" job environment

The consumers were asked if they felt the job they were doing was a "regular job". A little more than half (54.1%) believed that it was. Some of their comments were: "It's a regular job here; I'm treated like an adult, I get paid." "This to me is important here; I feel like they depend on me"; "Yes, we send stuff to Hobby Lobby"; "This is a real job, but outside job is where I'd like to work"; "This seems like a regular job, we sell sawdust and palates".

There were two people interviewed that seemed particularly concerned that their job in the workshop should be considered "real work". One man came in to interview that was in his mid twenties. He looked to be older with his thinning hair, but he was nice looking and you would not suspect he had any

disabilities. He wore wire-rimmed glasses. While I observed him at the workshop he was sealing bags using a special machine. The supervisor looked his way and turned to me and said "he is one of our best workers". During his interview he commented he could do all the jobs at the workshop. He sat up straight as he talked, with a sense of pride in his ability. He also has a job in the community wrapping napkins around silverware at a local restaurant. He mentioned he doesn't like the supervisor there: "he's around too much". The worker also mentioned he has to do his community job on Saturday. Another man in his 40s explained: "I turned down the job at subway and the litter crew; it's pretty rough". He was the same gentlemen who said that he likes helping handicapped because he is handicapped.

There were 17 workers (45.9%) who felt their job was not "regular". Most expressed that outside (integrated) jobs were regular to them. Several mentioned work at fast food places and one stated cleaning at a hotel was regular. One of the women said: "No, it's not to me; Wal-Mart, K-Mart, those are regular jobs; I don't know if they're helping me find one". A man commented: "This is not a regular job, but it's training for outside work".

There were two workers who did not have developmental disabilities but had been employed by one of the workshops to help with the work for one of the contracts. One was a 21-year old female who was a college student. She had been employed by the workshop since March, 1999. "I'm treated the same as everyone" she said. "I was afraid to work here, at first, I had concerns; but now I know these are real people, they are adults; I like the work because there's flexible scheduling around my school schedule; seems like everyone here finds their niche; I like working on the same job". The other woman was a 32 year old female who had heard about the needed help from a relative who is a supervisor at this shop. She's been employed since November, 1998. "I like the

job." she said. "It's changed my attitude. I was scared, I didn't know how 'they' (the workers with disabilities) would react. They're really not much different than me. There is some changing jobs and there's time for social interactions. Some are easily distracted." At lunch, both of these workers sat with the other employees, not with the supervisors or at a separate table.

Wages

Despite the fact the employees were not earning minimum wage, just slightly more than half (51.3%) said their wages were enough or more than enough for them. Their responses reflected that the wages they received had enabled them to live more independently and purchase things beyond just basic necessities. One older man said: "I live with my best friend; I got my own telephone". Another 45-year old man has been able to live by himself since 1989. I described him as someone who was proud and carried himself well. He talked about his apartment and being able to be with his friends: "I have several friends; they come over for BBQ; here I can be by myself and be independent". A 48-year old woman stated: "I used to live in the state school; now I have my own apartment, and I work and get paid". She began smiling.

In response to the question about raises, 27.0% of the consumers had received a raise or bonus while 56.8% stated they would not get a raise. One young man expressed: "I wish I made more, but I'm on SSI now, and if my checks go higher I lose it; I feel like I'm getting screwed money wise".

Job Satisfaction on State Use Contracts

There were sixteen questions that addressed job satisfaction including relationships with co-workers, feelings at work, enjoyment of the type of work and how they liked their job. Over half of the consumers felt happy at work (59.5%) and considered their job fun (51.4%). Nearly three-fourths of the workers (72.9%) stated they liked their job. Relationships with co-workers were

primarily OK (59.5%) rather than great(35.1%). Less than 3% however, stated they were treated meanly or not very well. Quite a few workers (48.7%) said they liked their job a lot, and 40.5% felt it was at least OK. Only 2 workers (5.4%) stated they did not like their job.

Just over half of the workers (51.4%) wished they could learn more new things, while 43.2% expressed they were learning enough new things on their jobs. More than half of the employees were happy with the number of hours they worked (51.4%) and the time of day (67.6%). For quite a few of the workers (32.4%) said this was the only job they had, and 37.9% felt their present job was better than their previous one. Many were very satisfied with the time given for breaks and lunch (75.7%), and 59.5% felt that there were enough opportunities to get together with co-workers after work. One older woman in her early fifties made an interesting comment about getting together with co-workers. She had been employed at the workshop since 1985, 14 years. "I don't usually go with them after work. I've been with them all day. I like being with someone else, like my church friends."

Table 2**Responses to Choices About Jobs by Frequency and Percentage**

Responses	Frequency	Percent
Nobody gets different jobs	4	10.8
I won't get a different job	2	5.4
There are plenty of different jobs	28	75.7
I don't want a different job	1	2.7
I would like a different job	2	5.4
24. Did you choose this job?		
yes	20	54.1
no	17	45.9
25. Who chose it, if not you?		
families	6	35.3
case managers	3	17.6
supervisors/directors	4	23.5
unknown	2	11.8
teachers	2	11.8

Table 3**Responses to Relationships about Supervisors
by Frequency and Percentage**

Questions	Responses	Frequencies	Percentages
4. Do you feel that you and your boss get along:	great	22	59.5
	OK	14	37.8
	not very well	0	0
	no answer	1	2.7
5. Does your boss treat you:	good	17	45.9
	OK	18	48.7
	badly	1	2.7
	no answer	1	2.7
6. If you have a problem could you:	ask for help	34	91.9
	rather not	0	0
	find someone else	0	0
	no answer	3	0
7. Do you feel the boss is:	available	31	83.8
	not available	2	5.4
	available too much	2	5.4
	no answer	2	5.4

Table 4**Responses About Job Environment
by Frequency and Percentage**

Question	Response	Frequency	Percentage
21. Does this seem like a regular job to you?	yes	20	54.1
	no	17	45.9

Table 5**Responses to Wages and Raises
by Frequency and Percentage**

Question	Response	Frequency	Percentage
1. Is the money you earn from your job:	more than enough	6	16.2
	enough	13	35.1
	not enough	17	46.0
	unknown	1	2.7
2. Since you have worked here, do you	expect a raise	2	5.4
	won't get a raise	21	56.8
	received a raise	10	27.0
	no answer	4	10.8

Table 6**Responses to Job Satisfaction
by Frequency and Percentage**

Question	Response	Frequency	Percentage
8. Are the people you work with:	nice	26	70.3
	all right	7	18.9
	mean	1	2.7
	no answer	3	8.1
9. Do you feel you and your co-workers get along:	great	13	35.1
	OK	22	59.5
	not very well	1	2.7
	no answer	1	2.7
10. Do your co-workers treat you:	the same	31	83.8
	differently	3	8.1
	very different	0	0
	no answer	3	8.1
11. How do you feel at work	happy	22	59.5
	OK	8	18.9
	lonely	5	13.5
	both	1	2.7
	no answer	1	2.7
12. During lunch and break do you	spend enough time	28	75.7
	wish more time	5	13.5
	wish less time	1	2.7
	no answer	3	8.1
13. After work do you go out together	spend enough time	22	59.5
	wish more time	9	24.3
	wish less time	3	8.1
	no answer	3	8.1
14. Do you feel your job is	fun	19	51.4
	fun/boring	11	29.7
	boring	7	18.9
15. Do you enjoy the kind of job you do?	a lot	18	48.7
	OK	15	40.5
	don't like	2	5.4
	no answer	2	5.4
16. teaching you new things?	enough	16	43.2
	wish more	19	51.4
	wish less	0	0
	no answer	2	5.4
17. How do you like the number of hours you work?	enough hours	16	43.2
	wish more	19	51.4
	too much	0	0
	no answer	2	5.4

Table 6 (cont)

**Responses to Job Satisfaction
by Frequency and Percentage**

Question	Response	Frequency	Percentage
18. Do you like the time you work?would like	different time	10	27.0
	same time	25	67.6
	no answer	2	5.4
19. How easy is it to get to your job?	easy	26	70.3
	hard	9	24.3
	transp. problem	1	2.7
	no answer	1	2.7
20. Do you like your job?	yes	27	73.0
	OK	3	8.1
	no	4	10.8
	no answer	3	8.1
22. How do you feel about your job?	best job I could get	7	18.9
	OK for now	11	29.7
	different job	16	43.3
	no answer	3	8.1
23. Do you like this job as well as previous job?	yes, I like this job more	14	37.9
	no, not as much	4	10.8
	like the same	2	5.4
	only job	12	32.4
	no answer	5	13.5
26. What things do you like best about your job?	"Get breaks and get to visit."		
	"I do some work at Wall Mart"		
	"I like it, cause I do"		
	"Doing air filters, those are the best things"		
	"I like it, it's a job."		
	"paid"		
	"everything"		
	The best thing is I have lots of friends here"		
	"working hard"		
	"The assignments are good, I don't have to do the same old boring thing"		
	"working here"		
	"my job"		
	"get away from home"		
	"putting filters together, I caught on pretty quick"		
"helping people"			

Chapter 6

Summary and Discussion

Economic Outcomes

Employment provided

The results of the economic outcomes of this study are based on the surveys returned by the convenient quota sample of the 48 agencies using state use contracts (N=12). These results suggest that Oklahoma's State Use Law has had a significant impact on employment opportunities for people with developmental disabilities. The agencies (N=12) were able to provide 541 people with developmental disabilities diverse opportunities of wage work to fill the state use contracts. Believing this to be representative of the population, that is an estimated 2,220 people who were provided with employment directly resulting from this law. For the rural areas, people employed on state contracts represented 23.9% of the total employees and for urban areas it was 32.1%. The literature seems to suggest that unemployment for people with developmental disabilities is still slightly over 50% for this population (McGaughey, Kierman, McNally and Gillmore, 1993; Kirby, 1997). This problem can be more fully understood from the personal perspective. Mrs. Effie Ballard's (1999) interview reflected the impact of unemployment for the person with developmental disabilities and their families. Mrs. Ballard mentioned the concern for continued personal growth and social interaction for her daughter without employment and the inability to return to teaching for herself. According to the president's report in 1996 "there is an estimated 20.3 million families who have one family member with a disability". This reflects a substantial portion of

families in our country who have a family member who is unemployed. Based on the Normative ideology the free market system has failed for these individuals and their families. Government intervention continues to be necessary (Tresch, 1982).

Wages

The individuals who worked on state use contracts earned approximately \$400,000 in monthly income, (\$180 per month/per individual worker), enabling them to live more independently and enjoy many things typical of others in our society. The comments of the workers suggested that this has had a positive impact on their quality of life. They mentioned such things as owning their own phone, having friends over for BBQ, being in their own apartment and being able to work and get paid. Additionally, they included that their jobs enabled them to help others and to feel needed. The literature reflected that these feelings were important for people with and without developmental disabilities (Rothman, 1998; Freedman and Fresco, 1996; Guilford County Area Mental Health, 1998) These results seem supportive of Wolfensberger's (1972) theory that more normal living and working environments would provide improved quality of life. Oklahoma's State Use Law has helped contribute to this through increased employment opportunities for people with developmental disabilities in both rural and urban settings.

State and Federal Benefits

There has also been positive economic benefits to the state and federal government. By restricting purchases of needed goods and services to agencies employing people with developmental disabilities, Oklahoma's State Use Law has enabled an estimated 2,548 workers to no longer require supported employment (adjusted by the 637 workers represented by 25% of the agencies). Had these workers continued on subsidized employment, it would have cost an estimated

\$11.6 million annually. These funds may now be used to support and train others with disabilities; or some of these funds are now able to be allocated in other areas of state needs.

Furthermore, just over 100 workers are estimated to be off public supports, reducing federal expenditures by an estimated \$651,500 annually (adjusted by the 26 workers represented by 25% of the agencies whose public supports were \$583 monthly). These results are similar to the results of the outcome based evaluation of Oregon's State Use Law. Although not as many workers were able to get completely off government supports, Oklahoma had almost 200 more workers to achieve unsubsidized employment (Orcutt, 1994).

Diversity of Jobs

The jobs provided, the environment they were provided in, the relationships between supervisors and workers and the job satisfaction interviews were conducted in a stratified subset by size and location of the sample agencies (N=6). The information was gathered by observations, informal interviews with directors and supervisors, data information sheets provided by the directors and interviews with the workers with developmental disabilities. The agencies in most cases, provided the researcher with a list of the different state contracts that were filled by their agency. Greater than 300 different state contracts are being completed by those with developmental disabilities through the various agencies. They include janitorial work, landscaping, recycling, road work, making heating and air filters, providing mail service, and other varied types of work.

MacEachen and Mundy (1996) found in their ethnographic study that being able to make independent decisions was important for people with developmental disabilities. Wolfensberger (1972) also listed the ability to choose

one's job the first characteristic of "normal" work environments. Oklahoma's State Use Law has provided workshops with a great variety of jobs even in the rural areas. It has increased the opportunities for people with developmental disabilities to learn new skills and develop a sense of pride and accomplishment about their work. It is interesting to note in comparing the belief about the availability of different types of jobs from the researcher's perspective and the perceived reality of this for the workers was very similar. Just over three-fourths of the subjects (N=37) felt there were many different jobs available from which they could choose within their workshops. For just under half of the subjects (45.9%), however, they were not able to choose the specific workshop or community employment opportunity they wanted. This seems to result from several factors. One of the employees interviewed mentioned her wheelchair seemed to prevent her from having different jobs. This researcher knows two ladies with developmental disabilities living in a group home. These ladies attend the same church and Sunday School class with her. They both live in a group home, and all the people at the three group homes owned by one agency work at the same workshop. This seems due to the fact it makes it easier for transportation and with schedules (they all are able to go to work and come home at the same time).

Work Environments

The work environments have been impacted by the type and quality of government contracts they have been given. Each of these workshops have marketable goods and services to produce that require certain standards and deadlines. One of the employees mentioned a specific time deadline that when they worked hard and met the designated time they were given the rest of the day off. Of the six agencies observed it was noted they provided 4 of the 6

characteristics for normal work environments as set forth by Wolfensberger (1972). Although not integrated and not paying minimum wage, the workshops provided a work atmosphere with specific policies and regulations. Interactions were observed of supervisors and workers that were supportive and encouraging. Marketable goods were produced and services provided. These workshops had specific policies in place about dress and conduct and there were safety regulations and specific equipment provided for jobs that required them.

Choices

Wolfensberger's first premise of normal work environment was that consultation be available about the type of work desired and choices about specific workplaces. This study suggests that in the workshops where there were state use contracts there was enough variety of jobs to perform that the workers felt they had different choices available to them (75.7%). MacEachen and Mundy (1996) found in their ethnographic study that being able to make independent choices was important to people with developmental disabilities.

Slightly over half (54.1%) did not choose their specific workplace. This researcher has observed from her interviews as a research assistant that there are family concerns that may keep individuals in sheltered workshop settings and the practical limitations of transportation, schedules and staffing concerns that may have contributed to this lack of specific job choice. Since specific work places are so limited at this time, it seems imperative that there continue to be diversity and choice within workshops. This study suggests that State Use Contracts have helped to increase choices for people with developmental disabilities.

Marketable Goods

The work environment was considered from both the researcher's and worker's perspectives. Both the researcher and worker believed the work was marketable. The researcher was told the goods and services were being produced for government agencies, such as Tinker Air Force Base, Department of Education, Department of Human Services, mail contracts for the state, and recycling and road maintenance. Several of the workers mentioned they knew their work was marketed: "We do stuff for Hobby Lobby"; "We sell our palates and sawdust". There was a sense of pride and community in their expressions about their jobs and their products that were sold. This research study suggests that these workers feel personal pride, satisfaction and sense of accomplishment with work that to some might seem very repetitious and boring. This was supportive of Freedman and Fresko's (1996) study with focus groups of people with developmental disabilities and Rothman's (1998) study involving those without disabilities.

This can be understood from the interactionist perspective. Cooley(1964) recognized the important contribution that interactions with others have on the self. Meanings and values are exchanged and the ideas and opinions of others then are accepted or rejected by the individual. The composite of the thoughts of others comes to form what Cooley called "the looking glass self" (Ritzer, 1983). Mead talks about the two parts of the self that help provide understanding of this concept. Mead stated the *Me* is the expressed self incorporating the understandings, expectations and meanings common to the social group. The *I* responds and decides to change or alter the expressed self (Ritzer, 1996). These internalized meanings and values of others was expressed several times by the subjects in this study. They shared their feelings of being important and needed. Their work roles provided them with these opportunities

for this type of interaction. Some of their comments were: "I'm treated like an adult, I get paid"; "This to me is important. I feel like they depend on me"; "I'm helping handicapped because I am handicapped". In my field notes I also noted that several workers helped those who had vision impairments to come to the break room during break.

Relationships with Supervisors

Wolfensberger (1972) also included relationships with supervisors as an important part of work environments. People with developmental disabilities who resided in the institutions were often placed in the role as someone who needed to be cared for and protected (Trent, 1994). Therefore, Wolfensberger felt that people with developmental disabilities should not just be "placed" in workshops where this role was continued, but rather they should actually be able to perform marketable work and be treated and given certain expectations as that of a worker. This was accomplished, significantly, by the type of work expected from their contracts. These government contracts have certain standards and expectations. Although there is no competitive bidding, the work must meet certain standards. The importance of the work and the deadlines that had to be met were recognized by the supervisors and the workers, giving them a sense of pride and accomplishment when goals were met. The results from the worker's interviews suggest that they felt they were treated like workers and had fairly positive relationships with their supervisors. Several comments from the workers included "we all pitched in together"; "I'm treated like an adult"; "I'm helping handicapped because I am handicapped". Several of the directors and supervisors discussed the dependability of the workers and the quality of work they did.

As a researcher with limited observation time for interactions, I felt that the relationship between supervisors and workers were supportive and positive.

The majority of workers expressed this as well. Just over half (59.5%) stated they got along great with their supervisors. An additional 37.8% said their relationship was satisfactory. Just under half (45.9%) felt they were treated good, and 48.7% stated they "got along" with their supervisors. The highest percentage of responses were especially favorable for the ability to ask the supervisor for help when questions or problems arose, and that the supervisor was easily accessible. Even with limited time, the feeling of a positive atmosphere seemed similar from both the worker's and researcher's perspective.

Job Satisfaction

There were sixteen questions that addressed the issue of job satisfaction. Overall, the workers felt very satisfied with their work. It was interesting comparing this study to the one conducted by Parent and Kregel (1996) who used this same satisfaction questionnaire with 110 individuals in supported and competitive employment. The results will be reflected with Parent and Kregel's study first and then this study's results. Wages were said to be enough or more than enough for 62.8% and 51.3% in these studies. In regard to relationships with supervisors, both studies had low percentages of those who had negative relationships .9% and 0%. Specific items related to relationships and co-workers were also similar. The subjects in both studies felt the people they worked with were nice 70.9% and 70.3%; felt happy while at work 55.6% and 59.5%; and expressed that they enjoyed the type of work they did 61.8% and 48.7%. Similarities were also seen in the workers who felt their job was fun 46.4% and 51.4%. Some of the highest percentage of responses were regarding the time for breaks and the time schedule for work. There were 73.5%, and 75.7% of the subjects who expressed they had enough time for breaks and lunch, and 85.5% and 67.6% of the workers felt the day time schedule was good.

Additionally, 86.4% and 70.3% of the subjects felt it was easy for them to obtain their jobs. There were some significant differences in results. In Parent and Kregel's (1996) study 90% expressed they liked their job a lot, while only 48.7% expressed that in this study. Raises were received by 53.7% in competitive employment while only 27.0% received raises in the segregated settings. Those in community employment also chose their job 87.3% of the time, while those in the workshop only chose it 54.1%. Additionally, 71% stated they like the community job more than their previous one, while only 37.9% expressed they liked the sheltered workshop more. It is important to note that there were 32.4% of the individuals in this research study that were young adults. Many had not held previous jobs. One significant difference was observed in favor of the sheltered workshops. Regarding the availability of different jobs there were 41.2% who felt there were different jobs available in the community and supported employment settings, while 75.7% felt different jobs were available to them in the workshops that had state use contracts. This research seems to suggest that many of the subjects in the sheltered workshops using state use contracts are satisfied with their jobs and have more choices in the type of jobs available than supported or integrated employment.

These findings seem to support that what many researchers and theorists believe is an important outcome of employment opportunities for people with developmental disabilities, specifically integrated employment (Wehman, West, Kregel and Kane, 1996; Parent and Kregel, 1996), is not necessarily the wanted outcome for the people with developmental disabilities themselves. Chadsey-Rusch and Linneman (1997) found that social integration, which has been stated as a desired outcome, found that it does not always occur when persons with mental retardation are working alongside coworkers who do not have disabilities. It also differs in the perceptions between the workers and the

job coaches. Just saying hi or having an exchange of informal greetings was viewed by the job coaches as social integration and acceptance while this was not considered acceptance to a significant degree by the workers. "It is important to hear from the youths themselves about their beliefs regarding social integration, because the nature of this sensitive and personal topic dictates that those affected by possible decisions should have a voice in expressing their beliefs" (p.2).

This research study suggests that there have been very positive social interactions for those in segregated employment settings. The workers themselves expressed that working with others with developmental disabilities have made them feel needed: "I am working with handicapped, because I am handicapped". Their jobs within a segregated environment was mentioned as less stressful and offered them daytime hours and no weekend work. Many expressed these were important benefits for them. Additionally, some in the segregated settings had more difficult or technical jobs to perform giving them a sense of pride and accomplishment. The workshops seemed to offer more choices than those in the community. This was expressed by the young man working at the restaurant folding napkins around silverware, the gentleman who chose not to work at Wal-Mart because of the stress, and the man who turned down the job at a fast food restaurant. Chandsey-Rusch and Linneman (1997) felt the question to be addressed is shouldn't those most affected be allowed to decide the important outcomes?

Symbolic Interactionism in its premises and methodology emphasizes the importance of understanding how individuals "define" their situation and that researchers must learn through observations, interviews, letters and historical documents the meanings of actions and objects to the actors. The individuals in this study expressed the reality of their world of segregated employment. Unlike

the researchers and theorists, these individuals found many positive aspects of the sheltered environment. As they interacted with their fellow workers they found positive interactions and meaning to their work. While almost half of the individuals expressed the desire to have integrated employment, the other half of the subjects were very specific about the positive aspects of sheltered work. This researcher believes that people with developmental disabilities should be allowed to have the choice. Some would want to force their idea of the best environment on the workers with developmental disabilities, and eliminate sheltered workshops because they are not integrated. It is hoped that this research will provide some insight of the feelings and desires of the people with developmental disabilities and the things that are important to them in workplace settings.

The purpose of this study was to be an evaluation of the outcomes of State Use Law that would incorporate a more inclusive look at the results of this policy. It was to include the feelings and ideas of those who have been most affected by this decision. Oklahoma's State Use Law seems to have provided positive outcomes in all of the areas that were explored. Economically it has shown to have provided a significant number of jobs and these jobs are quite diverse. This has enabled more job choices as well as jobs that require high standards and expectations. The goods that must be delivered are marketable and wages while not meeting minimum standards have enabled these workers to have more independence and to serve in a valued role. While most of these jobs are provided in a segregated setting, this was expressed as a positive environment for over half of the workers. This study seems to suggest that positive social interactions and feeling needed and important were perhaps the more important characteristics for job satisfaction than minimum wage or integrated employment. It would be beneficial for further studies to look at

other segregated work places to see if results are similar without state use contracts.

Oklahoma has had returned benefit from the implementation of this law. People with developmental disabilities have more money to spend in Oklahoma providing revenue back to the state and the places of employment now can buy goods and services from other providers needed in these new work contracts. Over 600 workers in the sample have gotten off subsidized employment and 26 individuals are no longer on any government supports. Furthermore, this law has provided substantial improvement in the quality of life of the individuals it serves. This study indicates there is value in continued support and implementation of Oklahoma's State Use Law allowing people with developmental disabilities to meet their goals and desires through meaningful work opportunities.

Limitations of the Study

This study utilized a convenient quota sample for the survey portion of the study as well as the observations and interviews. Additionally, the people interviewed had to be their own guardian and cognitively able to participate in an interview; this prevented random sampling. Those agencies that did not have state use contracts were not included which prevented comparisons. The sample size of individuals interviewed in each agency was too small to provide statistically significant comparisons of answers between those six agencies. Since the work environments were similar in the four characteristics of normal work environments set forth by Wolfensberger (1972) the subjects were just studied collectively as a group.

Bibliography

- Angrosino, M. (1997) The Ethnography of Mental Retardation: An applied perspective. Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 26, (1), April. 98-109.
- Applebaum, H. (1995) The concept of work in western thought. In Frederick Gamst (ed) Meanings of Work: Consideration for the Twenty-first Century. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Association of Retarded Citizens (1993) The ADA and People with Mental Retardation: A Blueprint for Providing Employment. Publication.
- Bailey, K. (1994) Methods of Social Research. 4th edition. New York: The Free Press.
- Ballard, E.F. (1999) Telephone Interview, July 28. Director of Oklahoma Production Center. Talequah, OK.
- Blanck, P. (1995) Assessing five years of employment integration and economic opportunity under the ADA. MPDLR, 19, (3). pp 384-392.
- Blumer, H. (1969) Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Printice-Hall, Inc.
- Chadsey-Rusch, J., DeStefano, L., O'Reilly, M., Gonzalez, P., and Collet-Klingenberg, L. (1992) Assessing the loneliness of workers with mental retardation. Mental Retardation, 30, pp. 85-92.
- Chadsey-Rusch, J., Linneman, D., & Rylance, B. (1997) Beliefs about social integration from the perspectives of persons with mental retardation, job coaches, and employers. American Journal on Mental Retardation, 102, (1), pp. 1-12.
- Conyers, Ellwanger, Ferguson, Nemeth, et al. (1999) A public relations program for integrating people with developmental disabilities into the work force. Public Relations Quarterly. Spring.
- Croser, D. (1996) Word from Washington. Mental Retardation. February.
- Davies, S.P. (1930) Social Control of the Mentally Deficient. Crowell's Social Science Series. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company.
- Denzin, N.K. and Lincoln, Y.S. (1994) Handbook of Qualitative Research. London: Sage Publications.

Driskill, S. (1999) Telephone Interview, July 26. District Coordinator for area 1 Oklahoma County, Developmental Disability Service Division. Department of Human Services.

Freedman, R.; Fresco, S. (1996) The meaning of work in the lives of people with significant disabilities: consumer and family perspectives. Rehabilitation. July.

Guilford County Area Mental Health, Developmental Disabilities and Substance Abuse Program. (1997/1998) Workshop Report.

Hagner, D. and Dileo, D. (1995) Working Together: Workplace Culture, Supported Employment, and Persons with Disabilities. Cambridge, MA. Brookline Books.

Huang, W, and Rubin, S. (1997) Equal access to employment opportunities for people with mental retardation: an obligation of society. Journal of Rehabilitation, 63, (1). pp. 27-33.

Jahoda, M. (1982) Employment and Unemployment: A Social Psychological Analysis.

Kempton, W. & Kahn, E. (1991) Sexuality and people with intellectual disabilities: a historical perspective. Sexuality and Disability, 9, (2), summer. pp 93-111.

Kierman, W.E., Butterworth, J., McGaughey, M. (1995) Trends and Milestones. Mental Retardation. February.

Kirby, Neal (1997) Employment and Mental Retardation. In Bray, N. (eds) International Review of Research in Mental Retardation, 20, San Diego: Academic Press.

Lakin, C.K., Hill, B.K., Bruininks, R.H. (1986) Habilitative Functions and effects of residential services. RASE, 7, (6), pp. 54-62.

MacEachen, E., & Menby, H. (1996) Developmentally disabled adults in community living: the significance of personal control. Qualitative Health Research; Thousand Oaks; February.

Marrone, Hoff and Gold (1999) Organizational change for community employment. Journal of Rehabilitation, 65, (2) Apr/May/June. 10-25.

McGaughey, Kiernan, McNally, Gillmore and Keith (1995) Beyond the workshop: national trends in integrated and segregated day and employment services. JASH, 20, (4), 270-285.

McVilly and Rawlinson (1998) Quality of life issues in the development and evaluation of services for people with intellectual disability. Journal of Intellectual and Developmental Disability. September.

Mills, C.W. (1959) The Sociological Imagination. New York: Oxford University Press.

Orcutt, C. (1994) The employment of individuals with disabilities: an economic gain for Oregon. Results of an impact study of ORS 279.015 and 279.835-55. Conducted by the Oregon Rehabilitation Association.

Parent, W. & Kregel, J. (1996) Consumer satisfaction: a survey of individuals with severe disabilities who receive supported employment services. Focus on Autism and Other Developmental Disabilities. December

Petrovski, P. & Gleeson, G. (1997) The relationship between job satisfaction and psychological health in people with an intellectual disability in competitive employment. Journal of Intellectual & Developmental Disability. Abingdon. September.

Ritzer, G. (1983) Sociological Theory. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.

Rothman, R.A. (1998) Working: Sociological Perspectives. New Jersey. Prentice Hall.

Rubin, H.J., and Rubin, I.S. (1995) Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data. London: Sage Publications.

Szymanski, E., Mora, E., Hanley-Maxwell, C. (1996) Career development of people with development disabilities: an ecological model. Journal of Rehabilitation, 62, (1) 48-56.

Trent, J.W. Jr. (1994) Inventing the Feeble Mind. California: University of California Press.

Tresch, R.W. (1981) Public Finance: A Normative Theory. Plano, TX: Business Publications.

Wehman, P., West, M., Kregel, J., & Kane, K. (1996) Expanding competitive employment for persons with severe disabilities as a means of reducing Social Security expenditures. Paper presented to Social Security administrators at the President's Committee on Employment for Person's with Disabilities.

Weiner-Zilovich, J.S., Zilovich, S. (1995) Not now, when? The case against waiting for sheltered workshop changeover. JASH, 20, (4) 311-312.

Wolfensberger, W., Nirje, B., Olshansky, S., Perske, R. & Roos, P. (1972) The Principle of Normalization in Human Services. Toronto, Canada: National Institute on mental Retardation

Yankelovich, Daniel (1981) The Meaning of Work. ed. O'Toole, Scheiber, J. & Wood, L. Working Changes and Choices. New York: Human Sciences Press, Inc.

APPENDIX A
SURVEY OF STATE USE PROGRAMS

Survey of the State-Use Program (SUP)

Size of Organization: total number of individuals with developmental disabilities employed (including contract and noncontract work) _____

Location of facility: Rural or Urban _____
determined by size of nearest town: rural nearby town < 6000 people

1. Total number of individuals with developmental disabilities employed on all contracts negotiated under Oklahoma's State Use Law as of 6/30/1998.

2. Total number of individuals with disabilities who received public funds and transition from the SUP to competitive employment (i.e. employment that is not subsidized by payments from DDS, or other public sources) in the calendar year 1998. _____

3. Total number of individuals with disabilities involved in the SUP who attained unsubsidized employment and received no support, or limited support (job coach, tax credits) from DDS, or other public sources in calendar year 1998. _____

4. Total wages received for work performed in the SUP in June, 1998
of employees _____
total wages \$ _____

5. Taxes paid in June, 1998 by people employed in SUP:
a) Federal \$ _____ d) work comp \$ _____
b) State \$ _____ e) other \$ _____
c) FICA \$ _____

APPENDIX B
LETTER TO AGENCIES

Letter to Agencies

Carol A. Minton
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, OK

Contact Person
Organization
Address

Dear Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am a graduate student at Oklahoma State University and I have been asked by Georgia Lynn and Nils Richardson to conduct an evaluation of Oklahoma's State Use Law. Evaluation of outcomes of state policies has become an economic reality. The information will be used in presentations to the Legislature, other public policy makers, and public purchasers, and will be used in my thesis in completion of the Master's degree.

Enclosed is a survey that asks you to provide aggregate, financial information for your sample number of employees actually working on state use contracts. Actual names and addresses of organizations will be kept confidential utilizing only approximate size of agency and it's location as rural or urban.

Additionally, this evaluation will include interviewing individuals (who are their own guardian and willing to participate) in order to obtain their feelings and experiences in this type of employment. Further, I will be observing (in a corner, or unobtrusively) to help me gain understanding of the work environment. Including interview time, this evaluation should take from six to twelve hours; one to two work days.

Your cooperation is essential to help determine the economic benefit (if any) for people with developmental disabilities and the reduction (if any) of public spending by the state. Each organization has been selected from a stratified sample of agencies using state use contracts.

If you have any questions please contact Georgia Lynn, Contracting Officer at 405-521-4474, or Carol Minton at 405-359-6320. Thank you for your help in this matter.

Sincerely,

Carol A. Minton

APPENDIX C
CONSENT FORM

Consent Form

I agree to allow Carol Minton to ask me questions about my job. I understand that this will take about 15 minutes and I will be given a can of pop of my choice to drink during the interview.

I understand that I do not have to answer these questions, but I am choosing to participate. I realize that Carol will not tell anyone my name, but just my age, and sex, and types of disabilities and use everyone's information together from this shop.

I understand that I can stop answering questions whenever I want. I understand that my choice to do this interview or not do this interview will not effect my job.

I understand that my answers will provide legislatures and other people who are interested information about how people with developmental disabilities feel about their jobs.

Signature _____

Witness _____

Date _____

I certify that I have personally explained all elements of this form to the subject and his/her representative before requesting these signatures.

Signed _____

Carol A. Minton

APPENDIX D
SCRIPT REQUESTING PARTICIPATION

Script Requesting Participation

Carol Minton is a graduate student at Oklahoma State University. She is interested in finding out how our employees feel about working and the type of work they do. It will take about 15 minutes of your time and you will be given a soft drink during the interview. No one will know what your answers will be and no one has to participate. If you get tired, or do not want to answer any more questions you may stop at any time. It is your choice to participate. These interviews will be used to help the state legislature's know about how people with developmental disabilities like the types of jobs they do. Please raise your hand if you would like to participate in this project. Carol may not have time to interview everyone who volunteers. Thank you for your help in this matter.

APPENDIX E
QUESTIONNAIRE

Job Satisfaction Interview

Demographics: age:
sex:
gender:
how long employed at this job?

Introductory questions for reliability

- a. Do cats fly?
- b. Do dogs bark?
- c. Which one of the people are sitting down?
- d. Which one of the people are standing up?

1. Is the money you earn from your job
 - a. more than enough for you?
 - b. enough?
 - c. not enough

2. Since you have worked here, do you
 - a. expect a raise sometime
 - b. think you won't ever get a raise
 - c. have already received a raise
 - d. not reported

3. Some people think about getting a better job. What do you think?
 - a. Nobody here gets to move to a different job.
 - b. Some people get different jobs here, but I probably won't.
 - c. There are plenty of different jobs in this company for those who want to change jobs, including me.
 - d. not reported

4. Do you feel that you and your boss get along
 - a. great?
 - b. O.K.?
 - c. not very well?

5. Does your boss treat you
 - a. good, couldn't ask for anything better
 - b. all right, no different than anyone else?
 - c. badly, different from all of the others?

6. When you have a question or problem about your job
 - a. can you ask your boss for help?
 - b. can you go to your boss for help but would rather not?
 - c. do you have to find someone else to help you out?

7. Do you feel that your boss
 - a. is always available when you need him or her?
 - b. is not available as much as you would like?
 - c. is around more than you would like him or her to be?

8. Are the people you work with
 - a. nice
 - b. all right
 - c. mean

9. Do you feel that you and your co-workers get along
 - a. great
 - b. OK?
 - c. not very well?
 - d. not reported

10. Do your co-workers treat you
 - a. the same as everyone else?
 - b. somewhat differently than other employees
 - c. very different from other employees?
 - d. not reported

11. How do you feel when you are at work?
 - a. I feel lonely at work
 - b. I'm happy because I can see my friends
 - c. I feel OK at work, nothing special
 - d. not reported

12. During lunch and break, do you
 - a. spend as much time with co-workers as you would like/
 - b. wish you could spend more time with co-worker?
 - c. want to spend less time with co-workers than you do?
 - d. not reported

13. When people from work get together or go out after work, do you
 - a. go along with them as much as you would like?
 - b. wish you could get together with them more often than you do?
 - c. want to go out with them less than you do?
 - d. not reported

14. Do you feel that your job is
 - a. a lot of fun
 - b. sometimes boring and sometimes fun
 - c. boring most of the time

15. Do you enjoy the kind of work that you do
 - a. I like my job duties a lot
 - b. My job duties are OK.
 - c. I don't like my job duties

16. Would you say that your job is teaching you how to do new things?
 - a. I am learning as many new things as I would like to
 - b. I would like to be able to learn more new things at work
 - c. I wish I did not have to learn as many new things at my job

17. How do you like the number of hours you work?
 - a. I wish I could work more or less hours.
 - b. The number of hours I work is fine
 - c. I would like to work different hours

18. How do you like the time of day you work?
 - a. I wish I could work earlier or later in the day
 - b. I wish I could work at a different time of day
 - c. The time of day that I work is fine

19. How easy is it to get to your job?
 - a. very easy, no problem at all
 - b. sometimes I miss work because of transportation problems
 - c. I worry a lot about transportation problems

20. Do you like your job?
 - a. yes
 - b. no
 - c. somewhat

21. Does this seem like a regular job to you?
(If not, what do you think a regular job is?)

22. Which of these statements says how you feel about your job?
 - a. This is the best job I could get
 - b. This job is OK for now
 - c. I wish I could have a different job

23. Do you like this job as much as what you were doing before working here?
 - a. yes, I like this job more
 - b. no, not as much
 - c. I like them both about the same.

24. Did you choose this job?
 - a. yes
 - b. no

25. (If no on question 23) Who decided you should work here?

26. What things do you like best about your job ?

APPENDIX F
INTERNAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL

**OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD**

Date: May 21, 1999

IRB# AS-99-055

Proposal Title: "EMPLOYMENT FOR PEOPLE WITH DEVELOPMENTAL
DISABILITIES: THE IMPACT OF OKLAHOMA'S STATE USE LAW

Principal: Lee Maril
Investigator(s): Carol Minton

Reviewed and
Processed as: Expedited (Special Population)

Approval Status Recommended by Reviewer(s): Approved

Signature:



Carol Olson, Director of University Research Compliance

May 21, 1999
Date

Approvals are valid for one calendar year, after which time a request for continuation must be submitted. Any modification to the research project approved by the IRB must be submitted for approval. Approved projects are subject to monitoring by the IRB. Expedited and exempt projects may be reviewed by the full Institutional Review Board.

VITA

Carol A. Minton

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: EMPLOYMENT FOR PEOPLE WITH DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES:
THE IMPACT OF OKLAHOMA'S STATE USE LAW

Major Field: Sociology

Biographical:

Education: Graduated from Donald Gavit High School, Hammond, Indiana in June, 1969; received Bachelor of Science degree in General Studies and a Master of Education degree in Gerontology from the University of Central Oklahoma in May, 1996 and July, 1997 respectively. Completed the requirements for the Master of Science degree with a major in Sociology at Oklahoma State University in December, 1999.

Experience: Employed at Integris Medical Center as a unit secretary on the renal transplant and coronary care units; Volunteer CPR/First Aid Instructor for the American Red Cross; employed by Oklahoma State University, Department of Sociology as a research assistant; Oklahoma State University, Department of Sociology, 1997 to 1999.

Professional Memberships: Midsouth Sociological Association, Sigma Phi Omega