

Running head: EFFECTIVENESS OF SELF-DETERMINATION

The Effectiveness of Self-Determination Instruction and Career Planning

on the Employment of Job Seekers

Debra Martin Luecking and Elizabeth M. Fussell

The University of Tennessee

Abstract

This article describes the positive effects of a systematic approach to self-determination instruction and career planning on employment for job seekers with significant disabilities and on adult community service providers that provide their support. In detail are the steps taken to develop the curriculum and process. Results of a follow-up study concludes the article in which is described the impact of the process on job seekers' employment and on the ability of community providers to integrate self-determination principles and practice into their operations. Implications for self-determination practices to be a part of services offered to job seekers are discussed.

The Effectiveness of Self-Determination Instruction and Career Planning
on the Employment of Job Seekers

The self-determination movement is a result of the empowering civil rights movements of the preceding decades and the emergent voices of people with disabilities demanding greater control in their lives (Sands & Wehmeyer, 1996). In the 1990s, this empowering movement became widely recognized in the literature and in federal policy as a best practice for individuals with disabilities (Ward, 1996). As defined by Wehmeyer (Thoma & Sax, 2003) self-determination is “acting as the primary causal agent in one’s life and making choices and decisions regarding one’s quality of life free from undue external influence or interference.”

The Alliance for Self-Determination (October 1999) provides principles of self-determination broad enough to include all individuals with disabilities and concrete enough to guide policies and practices. The following principles to provide guidance to policy and practice have been reinforced by many: Freedom to make basic life choices, authority over dollars needed for support, support to organize resources in ways that are life enhancing and meaningful, responsibility to accept a valued role in the community, and confirmation of the important leadership that self-advocates must hold in a newly designed system (The Alliance for Self-Determination, October 1999; Center for Self-Determination, <http://www.self-determination.com>; Imagine Enterprises, <http://www.imagineenterprises.com/self.html>). Abery and Stancliffe (1996) state that various conceptual frameworks have identified goal setting, choice making, problem solving, self-regulation, personal advocacy skills, and knowledge of self and the external environment as necessary for the exercise to personal control.

Several forces are impacting on the self-determination construct to make it a common practice in the field. First and foremost, a growing number of disability advocates, parents, and

professionals are convinced that all people can and should be taught to express preferences, make choices, and exert greater control over the decisions that affect their lives (West, 1996).

Second, federal policy and legislation promote informed choice and self-determination. The New Freedom Initiative Act represents an important step to ensure that all Americans with disabilities have the opportunity to engage in productive work, choose where to live, and participate in community life. The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act requires that transition services take into account students' preferences and interests (IDEA, 1990). Choice and control are central themes in the Americans with Disabilities Act as well as in both Vocational Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1992 and 1998 (Thoma & Sax, 2003).

Third, there is a trend for states to direct their adult providers of employment and residential services to become less controlling and more customer-driven in their delivery of services. Abery and Stancliffe (1996) state that "service delivery principles have, at least philosophically, begun to stress rights and freedom, personal choice, and individual decision making." Thus, there is ample support and justification for professionals in disability services to support the development, acquisition, and use of self-determination skills.

Yet, due to complexity, the field has been slow in advancing the practice of self-determination. Self-determination is an ecological process that requires behavioral changes for individuals with disabilities, people who provide support, and systems that pay for the support as well as structures and processes designed to implement the support (The Alliance for Self-Determination, 2003). Ward (Ward & Powers, 2003) stated that "the acquisition of self-determination should not be assumed to be a natural occurrence but rather the result of purposeful strategies, properly implanted, to achieve the desired outcome of independence."

Actualizing this emphasis requires a major change in the current approach to planning, educating, and supporting people with disabilities.

Organizationally, the issue of self-determination is central to the manner in which services are designed and delivered by adult community-based providers. This includes the roles of professionals, support service staff, individuals, and family members. The systems to which people with disabilities must turn for support in education and employment too frequently foster dependency and hinder personal growth (Sands & Wehmeyer, 1996). Organizational structure and service processes continue to operate in a traditional framework where choice and voice are not valued by the organization. Many times the only choices available to the job seeker are to accept what is available or to not accept it at all. Callahan and Mank (1998) state that “Real choice means that the options, the process of decision making, and the control of the resources move from the system’s control to the person’s control.”

Supported employment has brought choice through a broader range of employment possibilities for people with significant disabilities. Once limited to employment in restricted settings such as day activity and sheltered work, choice now includes the broader possibilities of employment through an individualized job in the community. As employment has become less scarce in the community, employment professionals and job seekers are learning that it is necessary to take control of careers and negotiate employment that meets the needs and preferences of both job seekers and employers (Callahan & Mank, 1998).

The purpose of this paper is to describe the development of a self-determination instruction and career planning process and to share the findings of a study on the effectiveness of the process in assisting job seekers in securing community employment with support from community providers. Specifically, the study focused on two questions:

1. What effect did the self-determination instructional and career planning process have on the ability of job seekers to self-direct their community employment search?
2. To what extent have community rehabilitation providers incorporated the self-determination instruction and career planning process into their array of services?

Self-Determined Career Planning Process Development

Instructional Model

A four-part approach was followed to develop the instructional model: (a) observations of other programs and centers providing self-determination training, (b) research and study of existing principles and curricula, (c) interviews and interaction with consumers, staff, parents, and advocates, and (d) a grassroots-focused forum for individuals to speak out about employment, home life, and community living. Based on information gleaned from these four approaches, a skills building self-determination instructional “model” was designed. The model contains two self-paced curriculum guides that include 19 content areas accompanied by scenarios, activities, and handouts for job seekers and direct support trainers.

The first curriculum guide, *The Basics of Self-Determination*, was written for staff and parents/families. This guide contains 11 modules and focuses on the explanation and necessity of self-determination. It also elaborates on the role of staff and families to empower job seekers in obtaining a strong self-advocacy position.

The second curriculum guide, *Self-Advocacy*, contains eight modules written to instruct job seekers. The content focuses on the individual and his/her rights to become a self-advocate, to seek information and resources about decisions, to make informed and responsible decisions, and to take responsibility for the decisions made. The self-advocacy instruction is delivered in a

comfortable environment for job seekers so as to encourage discussions about real life situations. Eight 2-3 hour sessions are offered biweekly, or as scheduling allows.

The foundation of this curriculum is based on five self-determination principles. Principle one: Before a person can fully have the *freedom to choose*, he/she must have a personal understanding of what he/she likes or dislikes, what options are, and what it means to make a decision. Three modules were developed to assist participants in (a) becoming a self-advocate, (b) making choices, and (c) making responsible choices. Module 4 (Deciding What I Want) gives participants information about what a choice is, types of choices, and possible consequences that may follow choices.

To achieve principle two, *Authority to control*, a person must realize what and whom they are controlling. Participants were encouraged to practice making decisions, starting with small ones, such as choosing a daily community activity, and advancing to decisions that may have a larger impact on their lives, such as employment. In Module 5 (Determining If I Can Have Anything I Want), participants are introduced to tips on being self-determined such as asking, What control do I have or should I take? How do I balance and share control? What does it mean to compromise? Participants are asked to begin listing the *Support* (principle three) they may need to pursue decisions they are making about life choices. Participants are asked to identify people and things they want or need for support and, then, to begin thinking of the people in their lives who are important to their success in pursuing the decisions they are making.

Training in principle four, *Responsibility to accept a valued role in the community*, is offered in Module 6 (Getting People to Listen to Me), Module 7 (Changing My Mind), and Module 8 (Handling Disagreements). At this point in the process, participants usually know what they like and what skills they have, are aware of their opportunities, and have selected people to

support them in their decisions. Participants learn how to express their desires to a group that is organized to assist them in pursuing their decisions. Instruction is provided on speaking up for yourself, being assertive, and becoming an active listener. The fifth principle – *Confirmation, living life as dreamed* – is realized by assisting the participants in recognizing their own success in having the freedom to make a decision and the authority to express choice, enlisting support to pursue the decision, taking responsibility for the consequences of that decision, and celebrating their confirmed success.

Self-Determined Career Planning Process

CRP employment staff were encouraged to learn about self-determination along with job seekers and, after the sessions, to assist job seekers in their job search. Career planning engaged job seekers in a process that complemented the self-determination instruction by offering each one the opportunity to explore preferences. First, the career planning process served as a reminder for employment staff and job seekers to establish a group of selected people – a circle of supports – who may positively influence the job search. Second, the process guided employment staff and job seekers through exploring various workplace situations for job task preferences and environments that the job seeker may enjoy and want to be a part of. Opportunities to explore job tasks and environments gave job seekers the information necessary to consider each desired job. Employment staff were encouraged to select only job explorations that were valued by job seekers and employers. Throughout the process, job seekers were coached in seeking and obtaining information and advice about employment options and possible employment supports needed to perform desired jobs. The career planning process aided the employment staff in determining what employment services and supports were both available and adequate.

Method

Participant Selection

Participants were selected from two distinct groups: provider staff and job seekers with significant disabilities. Providers in Tennessee who had received or were in the process of receiving technical assistance to increase community employment services while downsizing day or sheltered work services were offered the opportunity to participate in the Self-Determination Career Planning Process. Eight providers self-selected to be a part of the study to determine the effectiveness of the self-determination process. All provided a full range of day services, including community employment and residential, to individuals with intellectual and other developmental disabilities. A Tennessee one-stop career center in the process of developing “customized employment services” elected to incorporate the process in its array of service options. The one-stop career center provided employment services to job seekers with significant work challenges and developmental disabilities through customized employment services. Geographical distribution of community providers was equal, with four in urban and four in rural settings. Service recipient size ranged from 100 to 450.

Job seekers selected to participate in the study were receiving services from one of the eight selected CRPs, had completed the self-determination process, and had provided informed consent. From the 133 participating job seekers, a stratified, random sample of 42 was selected (5 to 6 from each CRP) to participate in the study. These study participants experienced intellectual or other developmental disabilities. They ranged in age from 18 to 35 with 17 females and 25 males. Prior to self-determination instruction, most of the participants were receiving day habilitation services in either day activity or sheltered employment, or they had

recently exited school and were waiting to receive community employment services while living with family.

Instrumentation and Procedure

Data collection instruments were developed specifically for this study and organized around two main themes: (a) impact of the self-determination career planning process on job seeker employment and, (b) extent to which self-determination practices had been incorporated into services delivered by CRPs. Further questions were designed to determine the employment status of the job seekers. The data collection instruments were field tested with staff and job seekers at two CRPs representative of the study participants. Results were reviewed, and alterations were made to the questions to yield clearer responses.

Multiple procedures were used to collect data. Data collection procedures included (a) telephone interviews with provider representatives, (b) face-to-face interviews with job seekers, and (c) focus groups with each CRP. Content development for each data collection instrument is described as follows.

The researchers conducted telephone interviews with the selected representative of the eight providers to gather pertinent quantitative employment data about participating job seekers. Data were collected on (a) number of job seekers employed, (b) employment settings for job seekers who were employed, (c) number of job seekers not currently employed but seeking, and (d) barriers that prevent job seekers not currently employed, but seeking, from being employed.

Face-to-face interviews with 42 job seekers were conducted by project staff. The purpose of the interview was to gather data to determine if the self-determination and career planning process contributed to the job seeker's attainment of his/her goal of employment. Interview questions were based on the learning competencies of the self-determination instructional model

and organized by the five principles of self-determination (Imagine Enterprises, <http://www.imagineenterprises.com/self.html>). The interviewers used a standard set of open-ended questions. It should be noted that the questions may have been rephrased or explained to accommodate the language comprehension levels of the job seekers. Possible response categories for each question were derived from the self-determination curriculum to facilitate a response from the respondent.

Focus groups were conducted with five to six staff from each of the eight providers that included the executive director, program director, and employment coordinator. The interview questions were designed to determine if, and to what extent, the self-determination and career planning process had been incorporated into their service practices. The thematic content categories for generating questions included (a) staff participating with job seeker in the process, (b) staff trained to facilitate the process, (c) new staff oriented to the self-determination process, (d) process offered as a service to job seekers, (e) process incorporated into everyday work practice, and (f) use of career plans to assist job seekers in determining interests and actions to be taken to pursue employment. Questions were structured to elicit a yes or no response. Probing questions followed to allow participants the opportunity to comment on their response.

Quantitative employment background data were aggregated, and descriptive statistics such as frequencies and proportions were calculated. Responses to open-ended questions were recorded and classified according to inductive, analyst-constructed typologies (Patton, 2002).

Results

The results presented are descriptive in nature. Interview findings are organized in three major areas: (a) employment status of job seekers, (b) impact of the self-determination process on job seeker employment, and (c) use of self-determination practices by CRPs.

Of primary interest was to determine the employment status of the job seekers after participating in the self-determination instruction and career planning process. Number of job seekers employed or not currently employed but seeking is shown in Table 1. Information on type of employment settings for job seekers who were employed is found in Table 2. Table 3 describes the results on barriers that prevent job seekers not currently employed, but seeking, from being employed.

At the time of the study, 19 job seekers were employed, 22 were seeking employment, and 1 job seeker chose not to be employed. Of those employed, 32% were employed in the hospitality industry, 32% in retail, 16% in janitorial, 5% were performing clerical duties in office settings, and 5% were employed in manufacturing. The remaining 10% reported that they were either self-employed or working in assisted living or education settings.

The 22 individuals seeking employment at the time of interview reported that a number of barriers were keeping them from being employed. CRP representatives reported that over one-third (36%) thought that there were problems related to moving through the VR process to receive services or that individuals had not been determined eligible, 18% were having difficulty in locating their job of choice, 9% reported that parents were not interested in their son/daughter being employed, 5% experienced health related problems that interfered with job seeking activities, and 18% were not interested in seeking employment at this time. Other barriers to employment included companies restructuring and not hiring, lack of transportation to work, and social security management problems. One person was volunteering to explore new work interests, and self-employment did not work out for another.

Next, job seekers were asked to respond to a series of open-ended questions about their involvement in planning their careers and securing employment. In some instances, additional

questions were needed to assist the job seeker in identifying his/her response. As a result, response categories were defined de facto. Table 4 describes the results of the responses to these questions that are ordered by the self-determination principles: freedom to choose, authority to control services, necessary supports received to obtain choices, taking responsibility to accept a valued role in the community, and confirming the truth of wanting, getting, and living your dream.

The results indicate that most of the job seekers felt that they were exercising the freedom to choose and plan their life events. When asked *Who decided you should work?*, 58% responded by saying that others influenced them in choosing to work. However, 54% felt that they chose the job that they have. The job seekers stated that they obtained their jobs by sampling different jobs (35%), visiting different companies (23%), interviewing (15%), and talking to employees where they would like to work (11%). An overwhelming majority (95%) thought that they could choose to get a different job if they wanted to do so, and 75% wanted a harder job or a different type of job. Most of the job seekers recognized that they could count on others such as paid support workers (25%), family members (22%), friends (11%), and coworkers (10%) to help them in being successful at work. Some (14%) felt that they could count on themselves. The majority (86%) expressed that they could tell people on their own that they were satisfied with the support they were receiving. Regarding authority to control services, 57% felt that others (family, paid support workers, or VR counselor) decided on the services they received. However, 83% felt that they have the authority to change supports or providers if they wanted to do so.

The job seekers reported most frequently that they received job coaching (28%), support from their circle members (25%), career planning (21%), and ongoing support (19%). They also stated that they would like additional support in meeting friends outside the job (31%) and while

on the job (27%). Assistance with budgeting and other living needs was indicated by 28% as a support need. All were aware of what was preventing them from getting additional supports. Lack of information, availability of staff to deliver supports, and funding issues were frequent responses. Most job seekers knew the support staff with whom they had direct contact: job coach (69%) and agency case manager (55%). However, 83% did not know their VR counselor, and 55% were not familiar with their external case manager (independent support coordinator).

To determine how job seekers were taking responsibility for their own actions, they were asked to describe the kinds of things they do in the community. A variety of activities were stated including shopping, hair care, sports and recreational activities, church, entertainment, and banking, indicating their level of community involvement. Over 90% were aware of organizations available in the community such as churches, bowling leagues, civic clubs, and volunteer work opportunities (e.g., Meals on Wheels, Habitat for Humanity).

The job seekers were asked to confirm if they felt that they were living their lives as they wished or as they had dreamed. Eighty-six percent stated that they were satisfied with their job decision, and 100% expressed that working made their lives better.

Finally, providers were asked how they may have incorporated the self-determination and career planning process into their array of services. Responses to a series of questions designed to address this concern are found in Table 5.

Overall, the providers indicated that they were in the early stages of incorporating self-determination into their practices. While staff participated in the self-determination instructional process along with the job seekers, at the time of the study only one-third of the providers initiated the process on their own. The providers thought that one-half of their staff were trained to deliver this service, and all (100%) thought it should be a part of new staff orientation.

Provision of this service on a quarterly basis and through their case managers was stated by 50% of the providers. The remaining 50% indicated that they would like to provide the training and would like to include the process with their job club activities. Benefits of incorporating the self-determination process, as stated by 67% of the providers, included “allows us to engage in person-directed services” and “it’s useful in initiating circle meetings and in planning activities.” When asked if the self-determined career plans were used to assist job seekers in determining employment interests, 60% of the providers stated “yes” and indicated that the plans provided direction during the assessment and job development phases and assisted the circle of support members in determining job trials or situational assessment sites. Of the providers who had not begun to use the career plans (40%), all planned to use them in the future and generated a list of benefits: “could provide us with more information about the individual’s interests and skills,” “empowers the job seeker in self-discovery and learning,” “shifts more responsibility to the job seeker,” and “gives staff a defined role in the process.” Over 60% of the provider staff had followed up on actions steps that were a part of the career plan and found that the process had proven to be very successful in assisting job seekers in pursuing their employment interests. It is important to note that over one-third of the provider staff consistently stated that they needed more training to help them incorporate the process into everyday practice.

Discussion

Overall, the results of the study indicate that the participants thought that the self-determination instruction and career planning process had a positive impact. Job seeker responses indicate a strong sense of control over, and the ability to self-direct, their employment process. And further, CRPs clearly believe in the importance of facilitating the process for job seekers with disabilities with whom they work.

There are limitations to this study and, therefore, to the conclusions that can be drawn. First is that participants were selected based on their involvement in an organizational change and self-determination demonstration project and were receiving or had received technical assistance. Inferences may be made only to organizations that have made the commitment to change from segregated to community-based employment services. Second, the fact that this research relied on participant self-reports can be a problem. There is a tendency to reflect what one hopes to do or what one believes the interviewer wants to hear rather than what actually occurred.

All job seekers confirmed their satisfaction with their job decision and felt that work had improved their lives. Job seekers had incorporated the practices learned to make decisions about work, recognized that they have the freedom to voice their interest in receiving employment services, and believed that they had the authority to change providers if not satisfied. At the same time, they recognized that the people who supported them were critical to their success at work. They appeared to be informed about how the employment process works since they could describe what types of supports were needed. This alone illustrates how these study participants demonstrated their awareness about their own support needs that can be attributed to the knowledge gained by participating in the self-determination process.

The participants indicated that they were not content with the social aspect of their lives. They desired to have supports in meeting friends on the job and off the job. Indications are that they are experiencing social isolation, which can lead to discontent with their employment setting.

While the participants indicated their strong link with internal support staff, such as their job coach (69%), they were just as unfamiliar with their rehabilitation counselor (83%) and

independent service coordinator (55%). More investigation is needed to understand this perception, but it can be inferred that our external service systems may not allow the time needed for a familiar relationship to grow between client and staff. This may also indicate that conventional practices of communication are in place between internal and external staff on behalf of the job seeker. Thus, job seekers may have a false sense of authority to control their employment services. External service system staff could benefit from training sessions on understanding their role in assisting job seekers in self-determining their careers.

CRP direct support staff and management realized the potential impact that self-determination could have on their organizational and programmatic practices. They expressed commitment to make the process a service offered to job seekers, and they indicated a commitment to incorporate awareness of the process into their new staff orientation. It can be stated that they understand how to use the process on a personal level, case by case. However, on a systemic level, they are struggling to understand how this process fits into what they are already doing. The one-stop career center embraced self-determination and incorporated the process into its array of customized employment services offered to job seekers with disabilities. In addition, the career center offers self-determination instruction to all job seekers. However, it was expressed by one provider that if our funders created a fee for service for the process, then they would have to deliver it in order to receive reimbursement. While the intent of our self-determination teachings was to see the practices begin to permeate and change the organizational culture so that job seekers might realize customer-directed services, providers were just beginning to understand that they will need to take action so that self-determination is systematically incorporated into their array of services.

As the researchers for this article have found through their organizational change research and development (Martin Luecking & Verstegen, 2004), there are many changes at various system levels that need to occur before job seeker self-determination can be realized. Further study is needed to describe the ecological changes that occur among service providers, families, and job seekers and the systemic strategies that facilitate job seeker self-determination. As well, there are strong indications that providers feel they are at the mercy of delivering services that funding systems will allow. Further investigation is needed on how the external systems support or hinder the practice of self-determination.

References

- Abery, B., & Stancliffe, R. (1996). The ecology of self-determination. In D. J. Sands & M. L. Wehmeyer (Eds.), *Self-determination across the life span: Independence and choice for people with disabilities* (pp. 111-145). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.
- Callahan, M., & Mank, D. (July 1998). *Choice and control of employment for people with disabilities: A white paper*. University of New Hampshire: The Self-Determination National Program Office of the Institute on Disability.
- Center for Self-Determination. URL <http://www.self-determination.com>.
- Imagine Enterprises. URL <http://www.imagineenterprises.com/self.html>.
- Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). (1990). P.L. 101-476, 20 U.S.C. §§1401(a)(19).
- Martin Luecking, D., & Verstegen, D. (2004). *Breaking out of the box: A study of community provider employment changeover (Vol. 2)*. University of Tennessee: Center on Disability and Employment.
- Patton, M. (2002). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*, 3rd ed. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Sands, D. J., & Wehmeyer, M. L. (1996.) Future directions in self-determination: Articulating values and policies, reorganizing organizational structures, and implementing professional practices. In D. J. Sands & M. L. Wehmeyer (Eds.), *Self-determination across the life span: Independence and choice for people with disabilities* (pp. 331-344). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.
- The Alliance for Self-Determination. (October 1999). *Summary of Proceedings and Draft Principles from the National Leadership Summit on Self-Determination and Consumer-Direction and Control*.

- The Alliance for Self-Determination. (2003). *Self-determination requires an ecological approach*. Center on self-determination, The Oregon Health and Science University's Child Development and Rehabilitation Center. Portland, OR.
- Thoma, C. A., & Sax, C. L. (2003). Self-determination: What do rehabilitation counseling students know and where do they learn it? *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation, 19*(2), 89-94.
- Ward, M., & Powers, L. (January 2003). *Identifying person-centered outcome indicators of self-determination*. National Center for Self-Determination. Oregon Health and Sciences University: Oregon Institute on Disability and Development.
- Ward, M. J. (1996). Coming of age in the age of self-determination: A historical and personal perspective. In D. J. Sands & M. L. Weyhmeyer (Eds.), *Self-determination across the life span: Independence and choice for people with disabilities* (pp. 1-16). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.
- West, M. D. (1996). Promoting self-determination for individuals with severe disabilities in employment services. In D. J. Sands & M. L. Wehmeyer (Eds.), *Self-determination across the life span: Independence and choice for people with disabilities* (pp. 311-328) Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

Table 1

Employment Status

Employed		Not Employed, Seeking		Total ^a	
Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
19	46%	22	54%	41	100%

^aOne job seeker chose not to be employed.

Table 2

Type of Employment Settings of Employed Job Seekers

Type	Number	Percent
Hospitality	6	32%
Retail	6	32%
Janitorial	3	16%
Office/Clerical	1	5%
Manufacturing	1	5%
Other ^a	2	10%
Total	19	100%

^aOther: self-employed; working in assisted living or education settings.

Table 3

Barriers to Employment

Barriers	Number	Percent
VR	8	36%
Job Development	4	18%
Job Seeker	4	18%
Parental	2	9%
Health	1	5%
Other ^a	3	14%
Total	22	100%

^aOther: companies not hiring, transportation, social security, self-employment didn't work, volunteering

Table 4

Self-Determined Career Planning and Job Acquisition as Viewed by Job Seekers

Questions & Responses	Percent
Freedom to choose	
<i>Who decided you should work?</i>	
I did	42%
Family, direct support worker, VR counselor, friend	58%
<i>Who chose the job you have?</i>	
I did	54%
Family, direct support worker, VR counselor, friend	46%
<i>How did you obtain your job?</i>	
Working different jobs	35%
Visiting different companies	23%
Interviewing for jobs	15%
Talking to employees where I would like to work	11%
Being allowed one job choice	8%
Talking with my friends	4%
I don't remember	4%
<i>Could you do a different job if you wanted to do so?</i>	
Yes	95%
No	5%

Instead of your current job, what would you would like?

A harder job	50%
A different type of job	25%
No changes in my current job	25%

Who can you count on to help you be successful at work?

Agency support workers	25%
Family	22%
Myself	14%
Friends	11%
Coworkers	10%
Community contacts	9%
Neighbors	6%
Rehabilitation counselor	2%
State funding source	1%

How do you let people know that you are satisfied with the supports you are receiving?

Telling them on my own	86%
Smiling; doing nice things	8%
Telling them when they ask me	6%

Authority to control services

Who decides what supports/services you receive?

I decide	43%
Family, direct support worker, VR counselor, friend	57%

Can you change supports or providers if you wanted to so do?

Yes 83%

No 17%

Did your paid supports/services help you get a job and work?

Yes 100%

Support to obtain choices

What supports did you receive to help you get a job?

Job coaching 28%

Circle of support 25%

Career planning 21%

Ongoing support 19%

Job development 4%

Other: volunteer work experience, parents 2%

No response 1%

What other things would you like to be supported in doing?

Help outside my job meeting friends 31%

Help me at home with budgeting and other living needs 28%

Help on the job meeting friends 27%

Other: transportation, new living arrangements, recreation, social 10%

Other: no other services needed 2%

Other: getting a better job 2%

What prevents you from getting necessary supports?

Lack of information	46%
Lack of available supports	32%
Lack of available funding	22%

Do you know your support staff?

Job Coach

Yes	69%
No	31%

Agency Case Manager

Yes	55%
No	45%

Independent Support Coordinator

Yes	45%
No	55%

Rehabilitation Counselor

Yes	17%
No	83%

Responsibility to accept a valued role in the community

What kinds of things do you do in the community?

Shopping	20%
Hair care	17%
Sports and recreational activities	17%
Church	16%

Entertainment	16%
Banking	13%
Other (library, rent movies)	1%

Do you know about community activities and organizations that are available for you to participate in?

Yes	98%
No	2%

I know about the following activities:

Social/recreational clubs (i.e., church, bowling leagues)	40%
Volunteer work (i.e., Meals on Wheels)	39%
Civic clubs (i.e., Habitat for Humanity)	16%
Other (bake cookies for people, visit people in nursing homes, go to library, rent movies)	5%

Confirmation, living life as dreamed

Are you satisfied with your job decision?

Yes	86%
No	14%

Has working made your life better?

Yes	100%
-----	------

Table 5

CRPs' view on incorporating self-determination into their array of services

Questions & Responses	Percent
<i>Did staff participate in the training on the self-determination process?</i>	
Yes	100%
<i>Are staff conducting the self-determination process on a regular basis?</i>	
Yes	33%
No	67%
<i>Are all staff trained in the self-determination process?</i>	
Yes	50%
No	50%
<i>Is an overview of self-determination a part of new staff orientation?</i>	
Yes	33%
No	67%
<i>If no, are there plans to make self-determination a part of new staff orientation?</i>	
Yes	100%
<i>Is the self-determination process a service that is provided to job seekers?</i>	
Yes	50%
No	50%
<i>Have staff incorporated the self-determination process into their everyday work practice?</i>	
Yes	67%
No	33%

Are self-determined career plans used to assist job seekers in determining employment interests?

Yes 60%

No 40%

If no, are there plans to use self-determined career plans in the future?

Yes 100%

Have staff followed up on action steps that are a part of the career plan?

Yes 67%

No 33%

Author Note

Debra Martin Luecking, Center on Disability and Employment, The University of Tennessee; Elizabeth M. Fussell, Center on Disability and Employment, The University of Tennessee.

The development of this paper was supported in part by the Boling Center on Developmental Disabilities, Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities, through a grant from the U.S. Administration on Developmental Disabilities. The views expressed in this paper are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views and policies of the U.S. Administration on Developmental Disabilities. The opportunity to interview job seekers and support professionals was critical to the success of this project. The authors wish to express their gratitude to the participants of this study.

Comments about this paper should be sent to Debra Martin Luecking, Center on Disability and Employment, The University of Tennessee, 1914 Andy Holt Avenue, B025 HPER Building, Knoxville, Tennessee 37996-2750. E-mail: dlueckin@utk.edu.