1969

Development of an Inventory for Evaluating Sheltered Workshops in the State of Washington

Bruce D. Howell
Central Washington University

DEVELOPMENT OF AN INVENTORY FOR EVALUATING SHELTERED WORKSHOPS IN THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

A Thesis

Presented to

the Graduate Faculty

Central Washington State College

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Education

---

by

Bruce D. Howell

June 1969

APPROVED FOR THE GRADUATE FACULTY

_____

Theodor F. Naumann, COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN

_____

Dohn A. Miller

_____

Howard B. Scott

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express gratitude to the members of his committee, Dr. Dohn Miller and Mr. Howard Scott for their continual interest and assistance. To the chairman, Dr. Theodor F. Naumann, special thanks are in order for the many hours of guidance and support so freely given. Also many thanks to my wife Bev for her continued support and patience.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This study was an attempt to develop an instrument which could be employed in studying to what extent the federal and state vocational rehabilitation objectives for sheltered workshops in the State of Washington were realized in practice. The instrument could be usable in measuring how workshop personnel apply the principles of the stated objectives which will provide the means to evaluate a workshop's functioning or progress.

Need for the Study

Most of the clients found in sheltered workshops are mentally retarded. Traditionally, the major responsibility for the care of the mentally retarded in Washington State has been delegated to the Department of Institutions. However, the state institutions are experiencing such problems as waiting lists, staff shortages, insufficient facilities, and lack of funds. Also, in the domain of public education, experience with the educable mentally retarded has indicated that few could benefit to the maximum degree from rehabilitation services when the pupils were terminated from elementary schools or even possibly at sixteen years of age.

The 1966 Governor's Mental Health and Mental Retardation Planning Committee reports that because of increased community resources as a result of statewide concern for the mentally retarded, effective statewide parent organizations, and federal financial support, the responsibility is now changing from institutional to community-based services for the retarded. Although the need for programs which would provide vocational and educational training for the retarded has long been recognized, implementation of community-based services such as sheltered workshop programs established with the help of the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation is relatively new.

As a result of community programs some of the problems at the state level are decreasing, but not necessarily eliminated. The job of dealing with the problems is simply being transferred to the community. Such services as sheltered workshops need adequate diagnostic procedures, facilities, monies, and trained staff. In addition, there is the difficult problem of communication and coordination among agencies at the local and state level which is complicated by natural geographical barriers and different professional philosophies.

Further study of the sheltered workshop programs may provide an adequate method of assessing what the present conditions in the State of Washington are, and the means for evaluation which must precede well planned change. Workshop

directors need to recognize and initiate appropriate procedures as well as develop new ones. They also need to be aware of inappropriate procedures in order to avoid or eliminate them.

Background Information

Three factors which have contributed to the development of sheltered workshops have been (1) the provision of public education to all children, (2) the limitations of state facilities in caring for the retarded, and (3) the expanding role of vocational rehabilitation.

With the growth of industry since 1900 and the launching of the Russian satellite in 1957 an increasingly greater emphasis has been placed upon those skills directly dependent upon academic proficiency. As the academic demands increased, those students who may be classified as academically retarded or intellectually subnormal became dropouts. The resulting increase in unskilled manpower along with the growth of compulsory school attendance made it more and more necessary for local school systems to establish programs for these individuals.

Stewart (1966) reports that at the same time, problems in caring for the mentally retarded in the institutions have become acute. In 1966 the Washington State Department of Institutions Bureau of Research stated that the total number of mentally retarded individuals in the State of

Washington will increase from approximately 93,000 in 1965 to approximately 101,000 in 1970 and 111,600 in 1975. On June 30, 1966 there were 1,275 persons on the waiting lists of the state institutions for the mentally retarded, and the population trends will continue to increase throughout the State. The figures also stated that about 40 per cent of the retarded residents throughout all the counties in 1966 were under 20 years of age. This suggests that community programs will or may be designed largely for younger persons who may potentially achieve greater success in training, treatment, and other rehabilitative programs.

Obermann (1965) states that vocational rehabilitation is largely a twentieth century development and began as a service for the re-education for employment of persons who have been disabled by disease or accident. Until the 1943 Vocational Rehabilitation Amendments, service was limited to the physically handicapped. Although many feel these initial clients remain the primary responsibility of vocational rehabilitation offices, demands have been made to serve cases such as the mentally retarded and mentally ill. The Vocational Rehabilitation Act-Amendments of 1943 made important changes in the Federal-State programs of vocational rehabilitation. The office of Vocational Rehabilitation was established and many services that had previously been prohibited were authorized. The Second World War brought additional demands, but the next major

legislation did not come until the vocational rehabilitation bill in 1954 was passed by the 83rd congress as Public Law 83-565. Existing programs were strengthened by providing for the extension of the program to states desiring to enter into new fields of rehabilitation. The additional amendments of 1965, and 1967 have permitted program expansions and revisions to meet needs for new services and activities (Carson, 1968).

In the State of Washington the educational, vocational, and institutional problems of the retarded are being considered by statewide taskforce groups and various state agencies which have contributed to a Mental Retardation Facilities Construction Plan and a Statewide Comprehensive Plan for the retarded (Everybody's Children, 1966).

In June of 1960 Washington State's Interagency Subcommittee on Mental Retardation appointed working groups from its membership to formulate recommendations for the State program on Mental Retardation. The final recommendations consisted of a State mental retardation center, a public health approach in both community and clinic studies, multidisciplinary education to be made available to all professional groups that work with mentally retarded people, and long-range planning to provide increased residential and community services.

The long-range statewide comprehensive plan was made available in 1964 as a result of a grant provided by the

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The statewide plan was to determine: (1) what action is needed to combat the problems of mental retardation, (2) the resources available, and (3) the coordination of state and local activities relating to the various aspects of mental retardation and its prevention, treatment or amerlioration.

Within the comprehensive model program designed by the committee the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation and the Employment Services were considered to be an integral part of a total program for the retarded. With the cooperation of public schools, vocational rehabilitation, private agencies, and other organizations there should be made available prevocational and vocational training, post-school vocational training, and vocational counseling, and sheltered workshops (Everybody's Children, 1966).

The State of Washington, through federal grants-in-aid provides some financial support for approximately forty community day care centers and workshops located in or near major population centers (Carson, 1968). This program now promises to assist larger numbers of handicapped children and sometimes older persons who might otherwise receive no form of personal care or professional service outside of the home.

Each workshop's primary objective is to improve the employability of occupationally handicapped minors and adults, most of these being mentally retarded. The majority

of the projects provide work activities designed to supply experiences and training in production techniques. Local business firms usually participate by providing contracts. The participants are paid on the basis of capability and production.

These workshop operations, however, are carried on under different auspices with different methods and depend upon each community's school district, office of vocational rehabilitation, and various contributing agencies. There has been little formal evaluation of many of the projects.

Statement of the Problem

The purposes of this investigation were two-fold: First, to provide workshop personnel with an effective, but time-saving instrument which may be used as an evaluative guide for individual sheltered workshops; second, to provide interested persons with an instrument which will point out basic requirements for a successful workshop.

In response to these purposes, answers were sought to the following questions:

(1) Can a reliable inventory be created which can be applied in evaluating the organization and operation of sheltered workshops?

(2) Can such an instrument be effectively utilized by local workshop personnel?

(3) Does the instrument identify points of strength and weakness in the organization and operation of sheltered workshops?

Limitations of the Study

As planned, pilot instrument and final inventory responses were obtained only from sheltered workshops in the State of Washington. Therefore, no attempt was made to generalize results for other populations. Other limitations resulted from the character of the instrument which has been developed.

Definitions of Terms

Sheltered workshop or workshop means a place where any manufacture or handiwork is carried on, and which is operated for the primary purpose of providing training or gainful employment for the severely handicapped (1) as an interim step in the rehabilitation process for those who cannot be readily absorbed in the competitive labor market; or (2) during such time as employment opportunities for them in the competitive labor market do not exist (Standards for Rehabilitation Facilities, 1967).

Handicapped worker or client means an individual whose earning capacity is impaired by age or physical or mental deficiency or injury, and who is being served in accordance with the recognized program of a sheltered workshop within the facilities of such agency (Carson, 1968).

Organization of the Study

Chapter Two contains a review of the relevant literature concerned with attitude scaling techniques and requirements for successful sheltered workshops. Chapter Three presents the construction and application of the pilot instrument, the "Workshop Attitude Scale." This chapter also includes a description of the sample of workshop directors answering the pilot instrument, and the results of the item analysis. Chapter Four presents the construction of the revised form which is the "Workshop Standards Scale." Chapter Five presents the use and evaluation of the Workshop Standards Scale. This includes the sample of workshop directors surveyed and the statistical procedures used. A general discussion of the results and a summary is found in Chapter Six.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Attitude Scaling Techniques

The ways of looking at objects, persons, acceptance of rules or procedures, forms of readiness, and liking or disliking for objects differ from emotions, but they are related to them. They have been formed into the concept of attitudes which may be defined as a readiness or tendency to act or react in a certain manner. The typical study of attitudes involves a scale or battery of questions for ascertaining certain attitudes (McNemar, 1946).

Thomas and Zanaiecki (1918), two sociologists, first studied social attitudes and approximated the concept of social attitudes currently used by social psychologists. Numerous studies and the development of attitude construction scales have followed. It is possible to group the current attitude scaling techniques into two major subdivisions. The first division consists of the methods of equal-appearing intervals, associated with the name of Louis Thurstone and used since the early 1930's, and the method of summated ratings credited to Rensis Likert. The second division of scaling techniques arose from the concept of "unidimensionality" most commonly associated with the name of Louis Guttman.

A comprehensive review of scaling techniques would constitute a lengthy report and is appropriately discussed in such texts as Techniques of Attitude Scale Construction by A. L. Edwards (1957) and Introduction to Opinion and Attitude Measurement by H. H. Remmers (1954). Therefore, the contributions of Thurstone and Likert will be summarized along with the mention of Louis Guttman's unidimensionality or scalogram analysis scales.

Method of Equal-Appearing Intervals

Thurstone and his associates attempted to develop a "rational" scale based on psychologically defined units. His judgmental procedure has probably been more widely used than any other method of scale construction. Essentially the procedure may be outlined as follows: (1) A large number of statements concerning the object of the attitude in question are formulated. The statements should be as unambiguous as possible, express an opinion rather than a fact, and try to range from extreme unfavorableness to extreme favorableness. (2) The items are then sorted by a sizable number of judges (50 or more) into eleven piles--an eleven-point scale--which appear to the judges to be equally spaced in terms of the degree to which agreement with the item reflects the underlying attitude. For example, positions one and eleven are for statements expressing an extremely unfavorable and extremely favorable attitude,

respectively, toward the attitude object, and position six (the sixth pile) is for statements expressing a neutral attitude. (3) The piles are then numbered one to eleven and the distributions are tabulated for each statement showing the frequency with which it was placed in each of the categories by the judges. (4) The median and interquartile range value are computed as a measure of interjudge variability, and all the items for which there is much disagreement, ambiguity, or irrelevance, are omitted. (5) The attitude scale is now built by choosing a number of items with low Q-values and whose values cover the entire scale as evenly as possible (Remmers, 1954).

> A basic assumption of the method of equal-appearing intervals is that the scale values of the statements are independent of the attitudes of the judges who do the sorting. If the scale of values of statements are not independent of the attitudes of the judges doing the sorting, this would of course, result in difficulties in the interpretation of attitude scores based upon the scales (Edwards, 1957, 106-107).

Investigators such as (Hinckley, 1932; Ferguson, 1935; Cysenck and Crown, 1949) believe their studies support this assumption. Hovland and Sherif (1952) believe that insufficient evidence has been presented that the judging groups, supposedly differing in attitude, do, in fact, include individuals at opposite extremes of the psychological continuum. Edwards and Kenney (1946) feel that the research so far neglects the related problem of ego-involved attitudes and the bearing they might have upon scale values of items.

Hovland and Sherif (1952) also question the grouping of statements by judges with either extremely favorable or unfavorable attitudes. They feel there would be a tendency to concentrate the placement of items into a small number of categories. They are also of the opinion that judges with extreme attitudes would be highly discriminating in the statements they place toward their desired end of the scale, and would show a tendency to lump together statements at the other end of the scale.

Still another criticism by some investigators is that the method of equal-appearing intervals is an absolute scaling method that does not require or force the judges to make fine discriminations (Edwards, 1957).

Methods of Summated Ratings

Likert's scaling technique, like the method of equal appearing intervals, begins with a large number of statements. These statements may be related directly to the attitude object or they may, in the opinion of the investigator, be related to the attitude to be measured. The statements should be as unambiguous as possible and express an opinion rather than a fact.

The items are drawn up in the form of a questionnaire with the items placed so that the more favorable the individual's attitude toward the attitude object, the higher his expected score for the item. Each item is given the chance of multiple response with the categories being: strongly

agree, agree, undecided, disagree, and strongly disagree. Categories are scored by assigning the values of 5, 4, 3, 2, and 1, respectively.

The categories are weighted so that the most favorable attitudes will have the highest possible score. Likert also found the method of assigning single integers to the categories time-saving and as effective as using the normal deviates corresponding to the proportions of the subjects in each response category. Half of the statements should produce a favorable attitude toward the attitude object and the other half should produce unfavorable or "disagree" comments. The instrument is then administered to a number of subjects (usually 100 or more) who are asked to express their own attitudes by checking each item. A subject's score is the sum of the weights assigned to the responses which he made.

Any one of several methods of item-analysis is then used to analyze the items for their discriminatory power with respect to the measurement of the attitude in question. The phi coefficient, multiserial correlation, or the critical ratio based upon the means and the variances of the upper and lower 25 per cent (or 27 per cent) of the distribution of total scores are such examples. Another simple and convenient procedure is to use the difference between the means of the high and low group on the individual statements. The final selection or elimination of items depends upon the

criterion of internal consistency. The most discriminating items are then used to construct the final attitude scale (Edwards, 1957).

Interpretation of Scores

Using Thurstone's method of equal-appearing interval scores, the interpretation of an attitude score by a single subject is absolute in terms of the psychological continuum of scale values making up the scale. The attitude score is taken as the median of the scale values of the statements with which the subject agrees. Each attitude score represents a scale value on the psychological continuum on which the statements have been scaled. An attitude score can then be defined as favorable, unfavorable, or "neutral" depending on where it lies on the continuum. The distribution of scores for a group of subjects is unnecessary for the interpretation of a single score (Edwards, 1957).

In general, this is not the case with the method of summated ragins. The distribution of scores of some defined group is necessary for the interpretation of an attitude score. Only those scores at either end of the scale can be interpreted and the interpretation of scores falling between the two extremes would be quite difficult. This is due to the fact that in the method of equal-appearing interval scores the zero or "neutral" point is assumed to be known and this is not the case with summated ratings. Also, there is no evidence to indicate that the summated-rating scale

necessarily corresponds to the midpoint of the possible range of scores.

However, the lack of knowledge of a zero point is not so important if the researcher is comparing the mean change in attitude scores when introducing some experimental variable, or if in comparing the mean attitude scores of two or more groups. Still another possibility is the correlation of scores on an attitude scale with scores on other scales or with other measures of interest. In these situations, either Thurstone's or Likert's method of scaling may be used successfully (Edwards, 1957).

Reliability of Attitude Scores

Several investigators have studied the reliability of the two scaling methods by having groups of subjects rate a specific set of questions with each technique and then correlating the results. Reliability coefficients have been reported to be over .8 and .9. The discussion of correlation studies of this nature have little bearing upon the question of whether either scaling technique will yield scores of higher reliability.

> The real problem concerns the reliabilities of scales constructed by the two methods, not the reliability of a particular scoring schema isolated from the technique of scale construction of which it is a part (Edwards 1957, 160).

Ferguson (1939) reports his own studies for equal-appearing interval scales ranging from .68 to .89 for the

40 item forms and .52 to .80 for the 20 item forms. He also quotes Thurstone as reporting the reliabilities of scales constructed under his direction as over .8 and .9.

Murphy and Likert (1937) found reliability coefficients for their International Scale, Imperialism Scale, and Negro Scale of .81 to .90, .80 to .92, and .79 to .91 consecutively. Hall (1934) indicates that Likert scales with fewer statements will give high reliability coefficients. Coefficients for his scale of 10 statements measuring attitudes toward religion ranged from .91 to .93.

Probably the most debated issue of the two scaling methods is not the question of reliability, but the need for a judging group versus weighted responses. Many feel that Likert has given the impression that the method of summated ratings does away entirely with the need for a judging group due to the high reliability coefficients obtained with his scaling technique.

Ferguson (1941) debated that Likert based his opinion on statements used in summated rating scales that had already been sifted through Thurstone's procedure. Edwards (1947), in turn, criticized Ferguson for following the same procedures for which he had critized Likert. Edwards believes that Ferguson's studies only demonstrate that Likert's selected statements did not necessarily fall at equally-spaced intervals along the theoretical continuum.

Edwards and Kenney (1946) in their investigations report that the relative ordering of subjects on either of the two scaling methods would for all practical purposes be essentially the same. Studies by other investigators appear to equally support and reject the need for a judging procedure.

Validity of Attitude Scales

The problem of supplying evidence that an attitude scale measures what it is supposed to measure is quite difficult. McNemar (1946) states that the absence of any objective evidence of the validity of a new scale is often overlooked. The scale is named, used, and the author or users too frequently find it convenient to forget that its validity is unknown.

Validity can be ascertained by several methods such as the following:

1. After an attitude scale is administered, it may be followed by intensive and extensive interviews to see if the first expression of the scale holds under cross examination.
2. Occasionally verbal behavior can be checked against nonverbal behavior and a correlation established.
3. Opportunities may arise when it is possible to utilize the ratings of close acquaintances as a criterion for checking validity.

4. Frequently a new scale is checked against an older scale, but too often, the validity of the original scale has never been established (McNemar, 1946).

Some investigators feel that nothing exists beyond the verbal expressions, so there is no problem of validity. Murphy and Likert (1966) give an excellent reply to the question of validity when they state that in any discussion of the validity of attitude scales it might be well to emphasize that at present the investigators are dealing only with verbal behavior and can claim nothing more than the importance of the verbal response.

Undimensional Scales

A score assigned to an individual on a psychological measuring instrument is usually used as an index of the individual's position on the variable the test or scale was intended to measure. If Subject A has a higher score than Subject B on an English achievement test, Subject A is said to know more about English than Subject B. The arbitrary scaling points (scores) however, do not usually allow a finer discrimination among individuals than a rank ordering.

Scores can be made even more ambiguous if additional variables are added to an instrument. For example, if questions about math and chemistry were added to the English

test, it would no longer be possible to say Subject A knows more about English. His score is now a result of one of nine combinations of the three variables.

Louis Guttman's desire was to design a test or scale from which it would be possible to derive a single score which would be a measure of one factor and one factor only. It would be unidimensional. The behavior of an individual would be represented, without ambiguity, by a single quantitative score. It would be possible, knowing the subject's score, to know his response on each and every item. If this criterion could be satisfied in the design of a test, two people obtaining the same score would have the same responses for each statement. It would be impossible for two or more individuals to get the same score by combining differing amounts of two or more factors that may exist within the test. The problem is that in social or psychological measurement it is too much to ask that units have the same meaning throughout the scale (Remmers, 1954).

> Edwards (1957) states Scalogram analysis differs considerably from the methods of constructing attitude scales that we have previously described. In one sense, scalogram analysis is not a method for constructing or developing an attitude scale, although it has been referred to as such by other writers. In practice, scalogram analysis can perhaps be most accurately described as a procedure for evaluating sets of statements or existing scales to determine whether or not they meet the requirements of a particular kind of scale, set forth in some detail by Guttman 172 .

Recommended Standards for Sheltered Workshops

Organization and Administration

The U. S. Vocational Rehabilitation Association estimated that in 1965 there were approximately 800 sheltered workshops in the country, with a total daily population of nearly 33,000 clients. It was further estimated that approximately 40 per cent of the workshops had fewer than 15 clients, and 11 per cent of the workshops had 10 or fewer clients. The general concensus of several investigators was that many people try to initiate a sheltered workshop without adequate planning. They have limited information gathered as to the availability of work and clients, and the administrative knowledge needed to operate a successful workshop.

Wilkenson (1965) expresses the view that the inadequacy of many workshops stems from the fact that they are often started by some group in the community that wanted a workshop tailor-made to specific disabilities. This arbitrarily limits, rather than expands, the scope of the workshop on the basis of disability.

Many of the workshops have come into being because of VRA grants. Because there was a need to provide vocational services that had been lacking, the federal government may have provided vocational grants more on the basis of "who wants one" rather than on the basis of "what

are your specific plans". Consequently, workshop leaders have not always been careful in determining the need for a workshop, its proper size, the availability of clients, or the number of shops needed within a given geographical area.

Before any group begins to plan a workshop they should first find out what is being done in the community by local agencies. Others may have the same interest and everyone's efforts may be consolidated. Secondly, it is necessary to know what a workshop can and cannot do. Planning groups should become familiar with other facilities, programs, and services that may exist or are being planned to help meet the needs of the disabled. Visits should be made to nearby workshops to see how they function. If the interested parties then feel there is still the need for a sheltered workshop they are ready to proceed to three areas of major concern (Wilkenson, 1965).

A. The Initial Planning

1. The workshop planning committee should be representative of the community and the disabled who are to be served.
2. The planning committee should have a clear knowledge of what it will cost to hire staff, purchase equipment, rent space, and appropriate equipment and supplies for the first year's budget.
3. The committee should check on the availability of work to be used in the shop for training and

remuneration, and a guarantee that there will be sufficient work to keep the shop operating.

4. A training program should be provided that will enable successful graduates to be trained for jobs in the community.
5. Consideration will have to be given to the fact that the disabled in the community may represent a wide range of handicaps and some clients will be unable to compete outside of a workshop setting.
6. Consideration will have to be given to all of the legal, insurance and other aspects required to start a workshop.

B. The Availability of Adequate Community Resources

1. To operate a successful workshop it is necessary to have professional assistance in the development of an advisory board whose function will be the establishment of policy. Individuals such as physicians, social workers, psychologists, vocational counselors and lawyers should be contacted to fill these positions.
2. Prominent leaders in education, industry, labor management, employment, manufacturing and accounting should also be contacted for the purpose of forming an active workshop committee to work through the existing board of directors, or perhaps to form a board of directors.

3. Volunteer assistance from industrial engineers, plant foremen, and sales managers is important to help in various technical areas.
4. In order to be successful, a workshop must have support from the community. Radio, television, and the press can help by informing the public of the goals and purposes of a workshop. Picture and story coverage, visits by local dignitaries, open house for the public and help from local health, education and welfare agencies are all means to gain such support.

C. The Availability of Additional Support Factors

Once a workshop is started, there is the problem of continuation and expansion. The following year's budget must always be kept in mind. Voluntary fund drives should be planned to help finance the shop. Public funds may be solicited for training fees or for the expansion of improvement grants. Additional public funds may be available through local, state or federal grants and exploration must be under way for a workshop product that can be remunerative to the clients who produce it (Fraenkel, 1965).

The success of a workshop will depend on how well it does its work and how strong its management and leadership are. The management must plan for the necessary tools and processes to achieve its objectives, as well as organize people to execute the plans and evaluate the results.

The term "management" may be used here to mean the board members, lay officers, and the paid professional executive staff who are responsible for a workshop's financing and policies, and for the execution of such policies in a service program. The latter is primarily the responsibility of the executive director and his associates (Lytle, 1965).

The board of directors should be composed of key people who can speak with authority for the community. They should serve without compensation, except for specific expenses, since they are governing a non-profit agency. Lippincott and Aannestad (1964) believe the board members or the executive staff committee should have at least four meetings annually, including at least two meetings of the board with 50 per cent attendence of the members. Provision should also be made for the rotation of the board membership.

The management needs to secure an adequate staff. Lytle (1965) states there is a need for both rehabilitation specialists and industrial supervisors. He believes social workers, psychologists, and rehabilitation counselors rarely make good industrial supervisors. Conversely, industrial foremen usually lack sufficient knowledge in the areas of health problems, personality dynamics, and community resources. The manager has to effectively bring together the staff, clients and the work needing to be produced.

The manager must secure work, tools, facilities, equipment and furnishings. He is faced with problems of both quantity and quality. Workshops often suffer by association with connotations of charity, second-hand furniture, old clothes and handicrafts. Lytle (1965) states the average capital investment for every job station in the U. S. industrial commercial complex to be approximately $15,000 and in many workshops the capital investment per job station is $100 or less.

The manager is faced with the prospect of old buildings, discarded equipment and tools, and inadequate industrial procedures. The correct capital investment will depend upon the type of work the shop undertakes, but it is necessary to face the fact that a substantial capital investment is needed to make a progressive and productive business.

The management of machines, facilities, tools and material to be worked on involves issues of economy. The manager must secure proper housing, an efficient flow of material, a proper set-up for the necessary jigs and fixtures, efficient production methods and training for clients and workers to meet production deadlines. There must also be an adequate inspection of the work completed and a sufficient income for wages commensurate with the effort expended and overhead costs. These are often neglected and result in the need for excessive subsidy, lower wage rates and a waste of community resources.

To fulfill workshop objectives, the management must have certain norms by which to measure a workshop's performance. Because of the interaction of the various staff members, clients and work situations, performance is often difficult to measure. One usable set of norms is contained in the document developed by the National Institute on Workshop Standards and available from the National Association of Sheltered Workshops and Homebound Programs. The document is far from perfect, but it is a major step in setting up some standards for determining what experiences a client should have and what results those experiences should create. Continuous progress reports on each client will also help the staff to determine the client's vocational needs and evaluate workshop practices (Lytle, 1965).

Management also has to consider the matter of cost, both within the community and the shop. No one is certain yet what a community should pay for the rehabilitation of an individual. Each workshop has, or is developing some norms in this area. Goodwill Industries of America has developed "Success Formulae"[1] which indicates the relative percentage of sales income that can be allocated to each area of operations; administration, promotion, transportation, production, sales and other such areas. Many shops have

---

[1]Goodwill Industries of America, Inc. Goodwill Industries Manual for Financial Records. Washington, D. C.: Goodwill Industries, 1966.

accounting systems which are inadequate. To help correct this difficulty the NASWHP has published a standard accounting manual for sheltered workshops.

The management of a workshop is a complex operation. The manager need not be a psychologist, social worker, or engineer, but he has to coordinate these skills with the client and the work to be done. The manager has to manage.

Services

Many sheltered workshops today are moving toward a transitional workshop setting by modifying vocational programs to prepare disabled persons for employment. Today's workshop is also a vocational adjustment center dealing with problems of vocational development, work identity or social learning which results in an inadequate work personality.

Several workshops operate with a combination of professionally trained people in vocational counseling and rehabilitation, and people with industrial training. Prospective clients are interviewed for the purposes of gathering personal histories and orientating them to the workshop. Ancillary services, such as psychological examinations, are provided by workshop counsultants or a client may be referred to cooperating agencies. The accumulated information is then used to help guide the workshop staff in planning for the client's suitable training program, his disabilities, and possible psychological and health problems.

The workshop program usually allots certain blocks of time for further evaluation and adjustment. Workshop personnel focus on problems of employability, assessment, improvement and social learning. The evaluation of clients should be systematic, periodic and multidisciplinary. Particular attention is paid to vocational behavior, vocational attitudes, work rates and the work personality. Gellman (1965) feels the workshop programs should be incorporated into, and be part of, a vocational counseling program which in turn is integrated into the community pattern of rehabilitation. This would be a multi-agency approach which incorporates concurrent services by other social agencies. Five of these supporting services are: (1) medical--re-examinations, (2) social--casework and family services, (3) counseling and psychological services, (4) rehabilitation training for independent living services, and (5) sensory aid service such as hearing and optical aids and speech therapy.

A good evaluation program will includ such factors as a client's verbal and performance abilities, reading, arithmetic and other academic skills, and the ability to follow directions. Manual and locomotor skills, coordination, self-confidence, appearance, emotional health, social maturity and work habits should also be included (Gellman, 1965).

Techniques of work evaluation include direct observation of the client at work, previous evaluation data, and casework interviews. Workshop foremen, counselors, psychologists, and referring agencies participate in the evaluations. Four of the most common techniques of work evaluation are: (1) the job analysis approach, (2) work sample approach, (3) mental testing, and (4) the situational assessment approach. No single method can do everything; each has its strengths and weaknesses.

The job analysis approach functions in the manner its title suggests. A task is broken down into a series of steps or elements that can be individually evaluated. The building of a box for example, may require the elements of drawing, measuring, sawing and hammering. The difficulty with this approach is that some of its practitioners have been over-analytical. The elements of a continuous process are often more apparent than real and there is the uncertainty of how they fit together. In his effort to reduce factors of human variability to a minimum, the human engineer also often overlooks man's ingenuity.

The development of the work sample approach is an effort to utilize the advantages of both psychometrics and job analysis. An ideal work sample is a mock-up of an actual industrial operation. It is a good appraisal instrument and very concrete, but there are problems of cost and technology. The replicas are expensive to construct and

with the rapid changes in technology, there is the risk of developing an instrument for a job that no longer exists (Gellman, 1965).

The situational approach is similar to the work sample approach, but it is not as expensive or as concrete. It is a work situation as close to real life as the foremen can create, but this factor also makes it virtually impossible to disentangle the variables that together produce the total effect.

The mental testing approach is easy, inexpensive to administer, objective and reliable. Unfortunately, the predictive validity is usually disappointingly low, and the standardization samples seldom display a wide variance in known work capacity.

If a workshop needs a mass screening device for the selection of workers with a minimum of certain abilities for specific employment, then certain psychometric devices may serve quite well. If there is the necessity of knowing what it is a worker actually must do in a given job, then some method of job analysis may be appropriate. Moreover, a situational work sample would allow workshop personnel to assess an individual's ability to master a particular skill, and a simulated work situation would allow them to determine whether a person could work at all. One of the major problems workshops have in improving their evaluation systems is the lack of resources with which to field-test

their procedures. Once the worker leaves the evaluation center it is often difficult to observe his future work behavior (Neff, 1966).

In order to prepare disabled persons for employment, a workshop must provide work. Much of this work is provided by sub-contracts from various business firms within a community. Dolnick (1964) interviewed representatives of 132 industrial firms sub-contracting work to thirty-five sheltered workshops for the purpose of attempting to determine the essentials of good contract procurement procedures.

Of the firms interviewed 21 per cent became aware of sheltered workshops through a salesman or a workshop representative; 20 per cent had a personal knowledge of a workshop through their own activities as a volunteer helper or a board member. Another 29 per cent needed extra labor to meet emergency or peak load situation; 21 per cent found workshops could do the work at a lower price; 27 per cent gave contracts for reasons of sympathy; 9 per cent needed a new source of supplies.

Although a fair percentage of firms provided contracts for reasons of sympathy, all of the people interviewed felt that a sales presentation by a workshop based on the appeal of sympathy or public spirit would receive little attention. Workshops that submitted a written quotation with detailed expense break-downs were highly commended. Contractors stated they frequently awarded contracts because

of their confidence in a workshop's business management and ability to skillfully bid for work, rather than because of lower bids. A few contractors believed that many workshops offered unnecessarily low prices and could raise their bids without fear of losing contracts.

It is necessary for a workshop to have a continuous procurement program if it hopes to provide satisfactory services for the clients. With continuous procurement of contracts a workshop can have the prerogative of selecting the work it will do. Otherwise, it may have to accept contracts that are neither suitable to the workshop's programs or the clients' needs. Nelson (1946) states that four good rules of contract procurement are (1) know what your workshop is selling; (2) know who the potential customers are; (3) organize sales activities; (4) bid correctly. A prospective customer should know what kind of work a shop can do, how fast it can do it, how precise it can be, how much can be stored and what the delivery services are.

A number of the clients may eventually be employed through normal channels of employment, but job placement services will be necessary for the severely disabled clients needing selective placement. Employers will have to be sympathetic and fully aware of a client's abilities and specific needs before he is employed. On-the-job training is an excellent technique for helping clients make the transition from the workshop to competitive employment.

Follow-up counseling will help severely disabled clients to realize and deal with job demands and the work community.

Perhaps the guiding principle in vocational services is the emphasis upon the individual needs of the handicapped person in the workshop. It is necessary to assist him toward a fuller utilization of his vocational capabilities and a better life (Gellman, 1965).

Staff

A major obstacle in the development of a workshop is the acute shortage of trained personnel. This is due, in part, to the relative newness of the workshop movement. There is still only a small body of information from which to reason, and there is a wide spectrum of kinds of workshops. Additional research is needed to determine specific objectives, philosophies and programs for both the various kinds of workshops and the kinds of personnel required to carry on these programs.

At one extreme is the workshop which may be more appropriately called an activity center. It is designed to provide some measure of remunerative employment for people who cannot compete for jobs on the open market. The primary objective of this type of shop is to provide work in a benign and protective environment (Neff, 1965).

At the other extreme is the short-term, transitional workshop which is often known as a rehabilitative workshop.

In this situation the primary objective is an adjustive rather than a protective environment, and the preparation of clients for employment on the open market.

Neff (1965) suggests that the workshop designed to provide long-term protected employment needs only two kinds of personnel; a workshop manager and supporting staff. These personnel, including a workshop foreman who is long in patience and who has sufficient ingenuity to adapt production methods to meet the needs of people with severely impairing disabilities, can run the shop efficiently from the point of business practices and contract procurement.

The short-term transitional facility often has a more demanding set of requirements for staff. In many situations, workshops have developed transitional rehabilitative programs for portions of their clients while other workshops are wholly rehabilitative in structure and function. In both situations, there is an increasing tendency to use professionally trained personnel as contrasted with industrially trained personnel. These professionals usually have master degrees or the equivalent in vocational guidance or rehabilitation counseling. They usually handle the counseling and guidance and job placement while the people trained in industry handle the managerial and work supervision functions (Neff, 1965).

In a few shops such as the Chicago Jewish Vocational Service, the entire workshop staff is required to be

university trained. The rationale for a totally professional staff is based on the belief that the fairly heavy demands on the staff will be met with more flexibility and efficiency. They will have the experience and capability for role-playing and techniques of assessment and evaluation. It is also often easier to induce a professional to play a foreman's role than it is to induce an industrial foreman to acquire the necessary professional skills. To insure that the professional staff members have work experience, they receive on-the-job instruction and rotation with other staff members.

There are several VRA sponsored university training programs for rehabilitation counselors, but there is still a shortage of counselors due to the expansion of public and private rehabilitation agencies. Many of these counselor training programs however, fail to emphasize the problems unique to the rehabilitative workshop. The VRA has also sponsored the establishment of two new university training programs at the University of Wisconsin and the University of San Francisco. These two programs stress training in the managerial, financial, and technical aspects of workshop operations. Goodwill Industries of America conducts recruitment and training programs for new executive directors of local Goodwill Workshops. Trainees are recruited by contact with colleges, personal referrals and classified advertising.

The recruitment of capable people continues to be a problem. This is becoming an age of specialization. Dedicated and trained people are needed, and it is necessary to make workshop staff positions more attractive--in both financial rewards and professional status (Neff, 1965).

Clients

The client is obviously the sole reason for the existence of a sheltered workshop. However, it is possible for prospective clients and guardians to become lost in what may be called a social-service-shuffle. More than one family has sought help only to give up in frustration. A visit to a family physician may eventually end with visits to public assistance, public health, employment, and vocational rehabilitation offices. Additional time is lost if each agency requests detailed information before referring a family on to another agency.

If there is poor coordination between a workshop and other community agencies, or if the workshop does not have satisfactory procedures for locating and admitting clients, success is doubtful. Some of the following suggestions may help individuals overcome some of the difficulties encountered upon entering and adjusting to a workshop setting (Gellman, 1965).

1. Brochures may be distributed to local agencies describing workshop programs. These brochures should

contain the requirements for eligibility, and a step-by-step procedure for referral and admittance.

2. A manual may be distributed which provides information on services, programs, transportation, suitable dress and other matters of interest to the client and his guardian(s).

3. Within the shop the client should be helped to feel a pride and a sense of creativeness for his work, even if the labor is subdivided into rather meaningless tasks. There is a satisfaction in belonging to a group and achieving, both as an individual and as a team member.

4. The worker should be allowed to express his feelings about his program. No one likes to feel something akin to the assembly-line products he may help to produce. Some form of a grievance procedure will probably help the client to have a better relationship with the staff.

5. When a client leaves the workshop, he should be matched to suitable employment and provided the support he will need. An unsuccessful initial placement may undo all of the accomplishments that allow a client to go out into the work world.

6. It may be advisable to discuss a worker's handicap with him from the general public's viewpoint. Feelings of self-worth and confidence may be bolstered if the client is aware he may be functioning under the handicap of a label rather than by poor performance on his part.

> It must be remembered that work alone does not automatically yield positive results for the worker. Workshop personnel should always be aware of the possible incompatibility of aptitudes and job requirements and the insecurity and rejection that may be generated by unsatisfactory relations with fellow workers and supervisors. These factors can help to dilute or destroy the values that should acrue from work (Obermann, 1965, 27).

Records and Reports

The importance of records and reports in a business is obvious. The manager has to be clear in his requests for money for various operations, records have to be kept of wages paid, materials purchased and products sold. Files have to be kept on the clients; the staff must take appropriate safeguards to keep all of the records and reports confidential and protected.

With the exception of the Goodwill's "Success Formulae" and NASWHP's standard accounting manual previously mentioned, sheltered workshop's apparently follow many of the office procedures used in most businesses.

Community Relations

To have effective public relations, a workshop must have a good program or product and the ability to interpret the program to the public.

Many vocational rehabilitation people feel that effective public relations will help to insure a steady flow of work contracts, money to subsidize a good rehabilitation program, decent facilities and equipment for clients, and jobs in the community for trained workers.

Margolis (1965) states that three prerequisites are necessary before a workshop can establish a satisfactory public relations program. The community has to know (1) that a workshop exists, (2) what it does, and (3) what the various citizens and agencies in the community can do to help. It may even be advisable to try and tailor public relations toward specific "publics" to obtain money, material and other items, or to alter certain impressions about workshops and clients.

Phelps (1965) randomly selected 250 service employers in West Virginia to determine their attitudes toward hiring retarded clients. Many individuals believed that retarded persons were naturally stubborn and lazy, their employment turnover was high, and one had to be careful about what was said around them.

Cohen (1967) did not find any significant differences in a similar study of employer attitudes. These studies may, however, suggest the need for various community investigations and the need to change misconceptions about workshops and clients.

The executive director, board president, or other key members of the board can help to insure a maximally effective public relations program. They may represent a portion of the leadership structure of the community or they can personally contact this group of citizens who usually plan and develop the long-range programs for the

community. If these community leaders can be favorably impressed with the workshop movement, they will probably be generous with their time and money. They will be powerful allies in a workshop's effort to help as many of the community's handicapped as possible. The following suggestions may also help a workshop establish favorable public relations, but the list is by no means exhaustive (Margolis, 1965).

1. Make certain the workshop has a public relations committee. If not, one should be started. If the board members have been carefully selected, they should be able to contribute workable ideas.

2. Make certain good public relations start at the workshop. Overly aggressive workshop directors, discourteous receptionists, or incorrectly placed clients can damage a workshop's image.

3. The media of radio, television, and press will be of help. One approach is to have representatives of these media invited to breakfasts, lunches or dinners where prepared talks and workshop tours can be provided for them. If they are impressed with the scope and importance of the work, shop personnel will have little trouble getting their story to the public.

4. Arrange for the board president, workshop director or other staff members to tell about the workshop

in meetings of the local medical society, teachers association, business groups or the local bar association.

5. Bring people to the workshop to see it in operation. Many civic groups are always looking for a new and worthwhile project.

6. Make certain those companies and concerns having appropriate work know about the facilities.

7. Make certain the members of city or state legislators have a chance to tour the workshop and hear about the programs.

8. Encourage people to do volunteer work. They can help raise funds, promote public relations and help with other projects.

9. Effective exhibits at meetings of local service and fraternal clubs and on display in public lobbies and schools can help tell the workshop story.

10. Workshops should have clear, concise and attractive brochures that can be distributed to local agencies and the general public.

Safety

A review of the literature suggests there has been little research completed concerning safety features of sheltered workshops. Many workshops apparently develop their own recommendations for safety or they use the Code of Federal Regulations, Part 50-204 as a guideline.

This investigator had to rely primarily on personal knowledge and discussion with workshop directors for information related to safety requirements of sheltered workshops.

If a workshop is to operate as a business it must have a sufficient number of electrical outlets, lights, and wiring. Shop driveways, doorways and floor levels need to facilitate truck deliveries and departures. Provision has to be made for all raw materials, finished products and combustible items.

Production methods have to be adapted to meet the needs of people with various handicaps such as special jigs for making various products, guards for covering power tools, and nonslip treads on the floor to prevent falling. Accommodations have to be provided for personal physical needs such as drinking fountains and toilets that are constructed to meet the needs of all workers.

To say working conditions in a sheltered workshop are often similar to small industrial firms would be a plausible statement but it would also appear acceptable to suggest that "normal" working conditions are possible only when the physical plant is conducive to the needs of the workshop clients (Gellman, 1965).

CHAPTER III

CONSTRUCTION AND APPLICATION OF THE FIRST SCALE

Formulation of Scale Items

According to Edwards (1957), the first step in making an attitude scale is to collect statements that will represent, in a particular test, the universe of interest thus, sentences and phrases pertaining to sheltered workshops were collected from all available sources. Stubbins's (1965, 1966, 1967) annotated bibliographies Workshops for the Handicapped provided the principal sources of information for textbooks, periodicals and reports relating to workshops. Personal experience and discussions with workshop directors provided additional information. Allan Wood, Assistant Project Director of the Governor's Statewide Planning Commission for Vocational Rehabilitation also contributed several important publications.

The information from these sources was condensed into over 150 brief statements. These were grouped and duplications and inappropriate statements were eliminated. In some cases two or more statements were combined into one. This process reduced the total number to 130.

After representative statements for each of the major divisions had been gathered, each statement was phrased for the use in the assessment instrument.

This procedure yielded the following preliminary sub-scales: (1) 16 items on organization and administration, (2) 48 items on services, (3) 15 items on staff, (4) 11 items on clients, (5) 11 items on records and reports, (6) 15 items on community relations and (7) 14 items on safety.

Construction of the Workshop Attitude Scale

An answer sheet and questions relating to workshop operations, status and objectives were added to the 130 statements to complete the scale. Each item was to be rated on a seven point scale, namely: 1 = Disagree strongly, 2 = Disagree moderately, 3 = Disagree slightly, 4 = Neutral, 5 = Agree slightly, 6 = Agree moderately, and 7 = Agree strongly.

These were the choices given the subject who rated himself as to his beliefs about each item mentioned in the scale. The item numbers of each of the seven subscales of the total attitude scale are identified in the item analysis section at the end of the chapter. A sample of the Workshop Attitude Scale with face and answer sheet is found as Appendix A of this report.

Purposes of Administrating the Workshop Attitude Scale

The main purpose of administrating the Workshop Scale was to make possible an item analysis for the development of a Workshop Standards Scale. Although the statements selected represented requirements and suggestions by the U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare workshop directors, not all of the items could be expected to show discriminatory power of an acceptable magnitude. Item analysis would thus allow the detection of the less discriminating items and allow their elimination in the next scale.

The Sample

General Rules

The main requirements for the selection of subjects were (1) that the person should be a workshop director, and (2) that the director had at least a year of experience in a workshop setting. The latter requirement was a necessary prerequisite for answering realistically the seven subscales.

Description of the Sample

The sample for the Workshop Attitude Scale, a total of 15 subjects, was composed of workshop directors within the State of Washington. A current list of workshops was

made available by David C. Carson, Project Director of the Governor's Statewide Planning Commission for Vocational Rehabilitation. This roster incorporated all of the workshops and activity centers within the State into five geographical regions. A stratified sample was selected by choosing three subjects from each geographical region, and the various agencies sponsering sheltered workshops.

Table I shows the composition of the sample of workshop directors that responded to the Workshop Attitude Scale.

Results of Administration of the Workshop Attitude Scale

The attitude survey was conducted by mail and several of the workshop directors were contacted by telephone after the completion of the survey. The administration of the scale provided several suggestions which were used in the construction of the Workshop Standards Application Scale.

In general, it took workshop directors approximately one hour to answer the scale and the basic workshop information questions. Both oral and written remarks showed that there was some ambiguity in the wording of a few items and several directors suggested words or phrases they felt should either have been included or omitted in the statements.

Any statement left unanswered was given a score of four, a "neutral" response. One subject left four statements

TABLE I

WORKSHOP DIRECTORS ANSWERING WORKSHOP ATTITUDE SCALE

DISTRIBUTED BY SPONSORING AGENCIES

Non-affiliated	7 Directors
Goodwill	1 Director
St. Vincent de Paul	1 Director
Volunteers of America	1 Director
United Cerebral Palsy	1 Director
Hospitals	*
State Institutions	1 Director
	N = 12

*There are no workshops in the State of Washington that are part of a hospital, either public or private.

unanswered, one subject three, two subjects two, and four subjects left one statement unanswered. Only two statements received more than one "neutral" reply. This raised the question of whether these statements were too ambiguous, or if the respondents' attitudes did not vary enough in either direction to warrant a different response. These facts were, therefore, given careful consideration in the item selection for the subsequent Workshop Standards Scale.

A few of the directors were also ambivalent in their feelings to the response choices of Moderately agree and Moderately disagree. Some felt these response choices could have been eliminated while others felt the availability of seven responses to each statement allowed them to make a finer discrimination in their answers. This factor was also taken into account for the development of the next scale.

Item Analysis

Type of Item Analysis Used

The Workshop Attitude Scale was developed as a "pilot" instrument to survey workshop directors' opinions of suitable requirements needed to operate sheltered workshops. After an item analysis, the remaining statements were used to develop a Workshop Standards Scale which was

used to study the extent these remaining requirements were realized in practice.

The difficulty in choosing a suitable method of item analysis lies in the fact that a considerable number, or percentage, of statements are eliminated by the analysis, and the remaining statements are usually employed in the development of a refined attitude scale.

For example, Murphy and Likert (1966) found that a convenient procedure to reject statements was to simply use the difference between the means of the high and low groups on the individual statements as a basis for selecting the 20 to 25 items desired for the final scale. For the current study it was felt that this method of analysis would unnecessarily limit the scope of the instrument.

A correlational analysis was not feasible since too small a portion of the items received markedly unfavorable responses. The nature of the subjects' responses could not be predicted in advance, and couching a large number of statements in terms that would definitely elicit unfavorable responses could not be justified. There was no guarantee that reversing the terminology of the statements for the Standards Scale would have elicited equally favorable responses.

Therefore, the problem was to provide a criterion that would carefully scrutinize the responses, yet allow

the retention of an optimal number of items. A simple, but effective, procedure was to use the means of the numerical scores assigned to each of the seven response categories. A mean score of six (Moderately agree) was set as the acceptable level for the retention of a statement. A mean score lower than six would not have allowed a rigorous enough test of each item, and a higher score would have eliminated valuable statements due to one or two extreme scores. A limited number of items were expressed in negative terms to help limit response set. The scoring procedure was reversed for those items which received a mean score of two or less.

Results of Item Analysis

The data from the Workshop Attitude Scale are presented in Table II for all of the subscales. Each item is listed by the number it received in the Attitude Scale.

Inspection of the scores reveals that the distribution curves are skewed, showing a preference for favorable responses. This suggests the possibility of mutual agreement for a significant number of requirements despite the fact there is a divergence in policies and operations among workshops. It may also suggest that low rated items indicate conditions to be avoided in workshops.

The possible range of scores was determined by the length of each subscale since every item could be rated from

TABLE II

ITEM ANALYSIS: WORKSHOP ATTITUDE SCALE

Item No.	Mean	Range	Times item was not answered
1	6.67	6-7	
2	6.75	5-7	
3	6.92	6-7	
4	6.67	3-7	
5	6.50	1-7	
6	5.91	1-7	
7	7.00	0-0	
8	6.83	6-7	
9	6.92	6-7	
10	6.00	4-7	1
11	6.17	5-7	
12	6.83	6-7	
13	6.08	3-7	1
14	6.58	5-7	
15	5.42	3-7	1
16	4.08	1-7	
17	5.33	1-7	1
18	3.50	1-7	
19	6.25	2-7	
20	5.67	1-7	1
21	6.67	5-7	
22	6.25	3-7	
23	6.92	6-7	
24	5.00	1-6	
25	6.00	5-7	
26	5.67	2-7	
27	6.92	6-7	
28	7.00	0-0	
29	6.58	5-7	
30	6.33	5-7	

TABLE II (CONTINUED)

ITEM ANALYSIS: WORKSHOP ATTITUDE SCALE

Item No.	Mean	Range	Times item was not answered
31	6.42	5-7	
32	6.00	5-7	
33	6.42	3-7	
34	6.33	6-7	
35	6.42	3-7	
36	6.25	6-7	
37	6.25	5-7	
38	4.58	2-7	
39	6.58	5-7	
40	6.00	3-7	1
41	6.67	6-7	
42	6.00	3-7	
43	5.58	1-7	
44	6.83	6-7	
45	6.75	5-7	
46	6.92	6-7	
47	6.58	5-7	
48	7.00	0-0	
49	7.00	0-0	
50	7.00	0-0	
51	6.75	6-7	
52	6.67	2-7	
53	6.00	1-7	
54	2.33	1-5	
55	6.00	1-7	
56	6.00	2-7	
57	6.75	6-7	
58	6.83	6-7	
59	5.95	1-7	
60	6.50	5-7	

TABLE II (CONTINUED)

ITEM ANALYSIS: WORKSHOP ATTITUDE SCALE

Item No.	Mean	Range	Times item was not answered
61	6.17	5-7	
62	4.75	1-7	1
63	6.58	6-7	
64	6.58	5-7	
65	6.58	5-7	
66	7.00	0-0	
67	6.83	6-7	
68	6.00	3-7	1
69	6.92	6-7	
70	6.92	6-7	
71	5.83	1-7	2
72	5.42	2-7	
73	6.41	1-7	
74	4.33	1-7	
75	6.67	5-7	
76	6.75	5-7	
77	5.92	2-7	1
78	3.17	1-7	
79	6.92	6-7	
80	4.92	1-7	
81	6.58	5-7	
82	4.92	1-7	
83	6.17	5-7	
84	6.75	6-7	
85	6.58	5-7	
86	6.67	3-7	
87	6.75	6-7	
88	5.00	1-7	
89	6.00	1-7	
90	7.00	0-0	

TABLE II (CONTINUED)

ITEM ANALYSIS: WORKSHOP ATTITUDE SCALE

Item No.	Mean	Range	Times item was not answered
91	6.33	2-7	
92	5.42	1-7	
93	7.00	0-0	
94	7.00	0-0	
95	6.25	1-7	
96	6.92	6-7	
97	7.00	0-0	
98	6.75	5-7	
99	6.83	6-7	
100	7.00	0-0	
101	7.00	0-0	
102	6.83	6-7	
103	6.92	6-7	
104	6.75	5-7	
105	6.25	5-7	
106	6.92	6-7	
107	6.33	5-7	
108	5.17	1-7	
109	6.67	6-7	
110	6.33	1-7	
111	6.08	2-7	
112	6.67	6-7	
113	6.08	3-7	
114	6.67	6-7	
115	5.17	1-7	1
116	3.50	1-7	
117	6.92	6-7	
118	2.58	1-5	2
119	6.75	5-7	
120	6.92	6-7	

TABLE II (CONTINUED)

ITEM ANALYSIS: WORKSHOP ATTITUDE SCALE

Item No.	Mean	Range	Times item was not answered
121	6.83	5-7	
122	6.75	6-7	
123	7.00	0-0	
124	2.92	1-7	
125	6.08	4-7	1
126	6.83	5-7	
127	6.83	6-7	
128	2.67	1-7	
129	6.83	5-7	
130	5.17	2-7	

Range of total scores: 722-818

one to seven. The data in Table III imply that little use was made of the lower end of the subscales and suggest the preference for favorable responses.

Chapter Summary

A Workshop Attitude Scale was made up of 130 statements referring to requirements for the successful operation of sheltered workshops. The scale was used by 12 workshop directors.

It was found that the directors felt there was ambiguity in a few of the statements. A few directors also felt that seven response choices for each statement were unnecessary, while others found this number of choices desirable.

The scored results were utilized for the analysis of each item of the scale. For this purpose, a modification of the Likert "Discriminatory Power" technique was used. The directors' ratings showed a preference for favorable attitude responses, but also suggested that low rated items may indicate conditions to be avoided in workshops.

TABLE III

COMPARISON OF THE RANGES OF SCORES POSSIBLE ON EACH SUBSCALE AND THE SCORES ACTUALLY OBTAINED BY THE SAMPLE OF TWELVE WORKSHOP DIRECTORS

Subscale	Scores Possible Range	Obtained
Organization and Administration	16-112	101
Services	48-579	296
Staff	15-105	92
Clients	11-77	67
Records and Reports	11-77	74
Community Relations	15-105	88
Safety	14-98	81

CHAPTER IV

CONSTRUCTION OF THE WORKSHOP STANDARDS SCALE

Items of the Revised Form

Item Selection

The items of the revised form, called the Workshop Standards Scale were selected from the best items of the Workshop Attitude Scale. The following criteria were used for the selection of items for the second scale:

(1) The mean response value of each item had to be equal to, or greater than six. This mean was set as the acceptable level of Discriminatory Power (D.P.) and was the most important criterion.

(2) Each item should have been answered by at least 90 per cent of the workshop directors who turned in the answer sheets of the first scale.

(3) Each item which needed revision, should require only a minimum of editing to eliminate ambiguity or add pertinent words.

As a result of the item analysis, 101 statements of the original 130 were acceptable for the second scale. There was no attempt to select an equal number of statements for each of the subscales. Only one item, number 44, with a satisfactory D.P. was omitted from the remaining 101 statements since its contribution appeared negligent.

The following lists show the items from the attitude scale that met the criteria listed above. The numbers shown are those which the statements had been assigned on the original Workshop Attitude Scale.

(1) Organization and administration: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14.

(2) Services: 19, 21, 22, 23, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40, 41, 42, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 55, 56, 57, 58, 60, 61, 63, 64.

(3) Staff: 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 73, 75, 76, 79.

(4) Clients: 81, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 89, 90.

(5) Records and reports: 91, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101.

(6) Community relations: 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114.

(7) Safety: 117, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 125, 126, 127, 129.

The means and ranges of Discriminatory Power for each of these selected groups of items are shown in Table IV.

Revised Items

All of the statements selected for the Workshop Standards Scale were rephrased, however, care was taken not to change the basic and general idea of any of the items.

TABLE IV

MEANS AND RANGES OF

DISCRIMINATORY POWER OF THE REVISED SCALE

Subscale	Mean D.P.	Range of D.P.
Organization and Administration	6.60	6.00-7.00
Services	6.49	6.00-7.00
Staff	6.70	6.00-7.00
Clients	6.56	6.00-7.00
Records and Reports	6.80	6.25-7.00
Community Relations	6.54	6.08-6.92
Safety	6.77	6.08-7.00
Total Inventory:	6.63	6.00-7.00

The word "should" and phrases such as "it would be advisable", "it would seem", and "it is desirable" were omitted since there was no further need to assess attitudes. Additional words or phrases were occasionally added to clarify or strengthen a few of the statements. The acceptable statements that had been phrased to elicit extremely unfavorable responses were restated in positive terms.

Suggestions for item revisions came from written and oral comments by workshop directors who had completed the Workshop Attitude Scale. All of the items selected for the final scale were stated in the first person plural form. Examples of the types of revisions are shown below:

1. "Provision should be made for . . ." became

(1) "We engage in . . ."

8. "To be properly managed, a workshop should have a full-time administrator" became

(7) "We employ a full-time administrator to manage the affairs of the agency in accordance with established policies."

13. "The workshop that resembles a small factory doing light assembly work will be more productive" became

(13) "Our workshop resembles a small factory doing light assembly work."

121. "With todays modern fire departments, fire extinguishers and other fire-fighting equipment are of a minimum of importance" became

(100) "We have fire extinguishers and other fire-fighting equipment in the shop that is readily accessible."

The Subscales

The items selected for the second scale were again organized into seven subscales as follows: (1) 13 items on organization and administration, (2) 37 items on services, (3) 10 items on staff, (4) 8 items on clients, (5) 10 items on records and reports, (6) 12 items on community relations, and (7) 10 items on safety. All of the items were arranged in blocks of five to facilitate answering and scoring. Table V lists the item numbers for the Workshop Standards and the original numbers used in the Workshop Attitude Scale.

The Rating System

The second scale was also a Likert-type instrument. All of the subscales were related on a six point scale, namely ; 0 = Doesn't apply, 1 = Never, 2 = Seldom, 3 = Sometimes, 4 = Usually, 5 = Always.

Chapter Summary

For the Workshop Standards Scale, the best 100 items were selected from the 130 items of the original scale. The main criteria for item selection were (1) item's Discriminatory Power, (2) the frequency with which an item had been answered by the workshop directors to whom the attitude scale had been administered, and (3) only a minimum of editing should be needed for those items needing revision.

TABLE V

OLD AND NEW ITEM NUMBERS

Scale 1 Item No.	Scale 2 Item No.	Scale 1 Item No.	Scale 2 Item No.
1	1	34	26
2	2	36	27
3	3	37	28
4	4	28	29
5	5	47	30
7	6	50	31
8	7	45	32
9	8	46	33
10	9	48	34
12	10	39	35
11	11	49	36
13	12	42	37
14	13	41	38
21	14	52	39
22	15	51	40
19	16	58	41
23	17	55	42
25	18	57	43
32	19	56	44
33	20	53	45
30	21	60	46
35	22	61	47
31	23	63	48
27	24	64	49
29	25	40	50

TABLE V (CONTINUED)

OLD AND NEW ITEM NUMBERS

Scale 1 Item No.	Scale 2 Item No.	Scale 1 Item No.	Scale 2 Item No.
65	51	99	76
66	52	100	77
67	53	101	78
68	54	102	79
69	55	103	80
70	56	104	81
73	57	105	82
75	58	106	83
76	59	107	84
79	60	109	85
81	61	110	86
83	62	111	87
85	63	112	88
86	64	113	89
87	65	114	90
84	66	117	91
89	67	119	92
90	68	120	93
91	69	122	94
93	70	123	95
94	71	125	96
95	72	126	97
96	73	127	98
97	74	129	99
98	75	121	100

For scoring, all items were to be scored on a six point scale. To make answering and scoring easier, all items were arranged in blocks of five.

CHAPTER V

USING AND EVALUATING THE WORKSHOP STANDARDS SCALE

The Workshop Standards Scale was administered primarily to provide statistical data which would indicate the value of the instrument and demonstrate its usefulness.

The statistical data concern the reliability of the seven subscales and the correlations between the subscales. The usefulness of the instrument is indicated by its internal consistency as shown by the respective reliability coefficients of the subscales. Also, a check was made of workshops affiliated with "parent" organizations such as Goodwill Industries, as compared with non-affiliated workshops.

The Sample

As with the original scale, the sample of workshop directors was selected from the list of workshops provided by the Washington State Division of Vocational Rehabilitation. Activity centers were omitted from the list and all of the remaining workshops within the State were included in the sample. There were 18 independent and 20 affiliated workshops in the total sample.

The different workshop directors who returned the answer sheets for the final scale are listed in Table VI.

TABLE VI

WORKSHOP DIRECTORS WHO ANSWERED WORKSHOP STANDARDS SCALE

Group	Number of Directors
Non-affiliated shops	12
American Goodwill	3
United Cerbral Palsy	2
Volunteers of America	1
State Institutions	1
Total sample	19

Three workshops returned the scales unanswered stating they could not be appropriately classified as workshops and two workshop directors did not want to commit themselves on paper.

Workshop directors listed vocational rehabilitation and/or workshop experience from 1 to 17 years in length with a mean of approximately 5.5 years. Most of the workshops provided sheltered work experience and training to persons for the purpose of preparing as many as possible for employment in the competitive labor market, and the workshop operations ranged from salvage operations to customer services.

Reliability of the Instrument

The reliability coefficients for the subscales ranged from .66 to .75. These moderate values indicate fair reliability, but a larger sample may have yielded higher correlation coefficients. The respective figures are listed in Table VII.

The means for the subscales indicate that the individual scores were well above the theoretical midpoints on the zero to five response scale. Four subscales had means above 70 and three subscales had means over 80. The highest mean that could have been obtained was 95. This suggests that the workshop directors found a limited number of standards which they felt either did not apply to their workshops or which they never employed. This means the total sample of directors did not reject the statements chosen by the original sample as satisfactory requirements for the operation of a workshop.

TABLE VII

RELIABILITY OF THE SUBSCALES OF THE

WORKSHOP STANDARDS SCALE

Subscale	Reliability[1]	Mean
Organization & Administration	.70	82
Services	.70	81
Staff	.69	76
Clients	.70	76
Records & Reports	.71	84
Community Relations	.75	75
Safety	.66	74

[1]All reliability coefficients were computed according to Kuder-Richardson & Hoyt's formula as cited in Bruning, J. L. & Kintz, B. L. Computational handbook of statistics. Glenview: Scott Foresman & Company, 1968, 188-190.

Intercorrelations of Subscales

The correlational coefficients among the subscales are listed in Table VIII. They range from .32 to .84. This range may give misleading impressions since 76 per cent of the coefficients were .6 or above.

The highest correlation was between the "services" and "staff" subscales and the lowest was between the "staff" and "records and reports" subscales.

The subscale "organization and administration" received the highest coefficients when correlated with the other subscales and the subscale "records and reports" received the lowest coefficients. The low correlations for this last scale were due to the generally high response scores received for the total sample. The intercorrelations of the subscales was computed by rank-order correlations, and the raw scores of the "records and reports" subscale were clustered at the high end of the zero to five response scale.[1]

Significance of the Correlation Coefficients

The statistical significance of the obtained correlational values is indicated by the confidence levels indicated with the correlation coefficients in Table VIII.

---

[1]Siegel, S. Nonparametric Statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956, 202-213.

TABLE VIII

INTERCORRELATION BETWEEN SUBSCALES

AND CONFIDENCE LEVELS

Subscale[1]	Se	St	Cl	R&R	Cr	Sa
O&A	79**	63**	73**	64**	81**	70**
Se		84**	71**	52*	74**	69**
St			68**	32	66**	54*
Cl				41*	74**	75**
R&R					66**	46*
Cr						60**

* ≤ .05
** ≤ .01

decimal points omitted

[1]The subscales are:
O&A = organization and administration
Se = services
St = staff
Cl = clients
R&R = records and reports
Cr = community relations
Sa = safety

The correlation coefficients of the subscales "organization and administration" and "community relations" with any of the other subscales were all significant at the .01 level. The correlation coefficient between the subscales "records and reports" and "staff" was the only correlation which was significant below the .05 level.

Affiliated and Non-affiliated Workshops

It was possible to divide the total sample into two major divisions, namely, affiliated and non-affiliated workshops. Since the non-affiliated workshops are comparatively new, and may lack some of the advantages or disadvantages of the workshops affiliated with large national organizations, a statistical check was made to determine if there could be a significant difference between the responses on the Workshop Standards Scale by these two groups.

A correlation coefficient between the two groups on the total scale was computed by using the Mann-Whitney U test, and an accompanying Table provided the level of significance.[1] Responses by the directors of the two groups of workshops correlated at the .01 level which indicates no significant difference between their responses.

---

[1]Bruning, J. L. & Kintz, B. L. Computational Handbook of Statistics. Glenview: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1968, 201.

Validity of the Instrument

No valid check can be made of the instrument until criterion can be established. The content validity of the instrument, however, appears to be at least fairly adequate as judged by the comments of the workshop directors and the resources used for developing the scale.

Chapter Summary

The Workshop Standards Scale was mailed to all workshop directors in Washington State. The statistical evaluation showed acceptable reliability coefficients for all of the subscales. The means showed that the workshop directors accepted the statements as satisfactory requirements for workshop operations.

The correlation coefficients between the subscales were all positive. The coefficients were generally the highest when the subscale "organization and administration" was correlated with the other subscales. The highest single correlation was between the "services" and "staff" subscales.

It was found that there was no significant difference between the responses of workshop directors from affiliated and non-affiliated sheltered workshops.

Efforts were made to assure content validity by following workshop directors suggestions and by a careful selection of the items.

CHAPTER VI

GENERAL SUMMARY

This study was undertaken as an attempt to develop a new instrument, the Workshop Standards Scale. The instrument was designed to be used as a research tool for the study of state, federal, and other suggested requirements judged to be necessary for the successful operation of sheltered workshops within the State of Washington. The instrument was also employed to measure how these requirements were realized in practice by workshop personnel.

A Workshop Attitude Scale was first developed and administered to a sample of workshop directors within the State for the purpose of selecting suitable requirements for the operation of sheltered workshops. The results yielded sufficient items with an acceptable discriminative power to create the Workshop Standards Scale.

This second scale had 100 items arranged in seven categories: (1) 13 items on organization and administration, (2) 37 items on services, (3) 10 items on staff, (4) 8 items on clients, (5) 10 items on records and reports, (6) 12 items on community relations, and (7) 10 items on safety.

Summary of Results

1. The Workshop Standards Scale was mailed to 38 workshop directors within the State. Of this group, 19 directors completed the scale and returned the answer sheets.

2. Statistical evaluation showed that the seven subscales had split-half reliability coefficients ranging from .66 to .75.

3. The means for all of the subscales were above the theoretical central points of the response scale. Workshop directors accepted the items as satisfactory requirements for workshop operations.

4. The correlation coefficients between the subscales were all positive. The subscale "organization and administration" received the highest coefficients when correlated with other subscales. The lowest single correlation was between the "staff" and "records and reports" subscales.

5. With the exception of the low "staff" and "records and reports", all of the correlations between subscales were significant at either the .05 or the .01 level.

6. There was no significant difference between the responses of workshop directors from affiliated and non-affiliated workshops.

Major Conclusions and Implications

Although sheltered workshops differ in their purposes, operations, and status; many of their primary objectives are the same. Also, many of the components which constitute successful workshop operations are the same. Additional research, however, is needed to seek out and categorize these common ingredients.

The Workshop Standards Scale is the result of an attempt to develop an instrument that could be used as an evaluative inventory by all workshops in the State of Washington. It has shown itself to be useful and reliable when applied to a small number of workshops.

A few of the workshop directors had low means for the "community relations" and "safety" subscales. Many of the answers on the response scale were marked "never" or "seldom" rather than "doesn't apply". This suggests that the directors were either unaware of the total number of possibilities for these two areas of operation or they have not had the opportunity to take advantage of them. The latter may be especially true with safety factors since many of the directors are forced to use whatever facilities are available.

The majority of the directors were in close agreement in their replies to the Workshop Standards Scale. Some fluctuations were due primarily to the extreme responses of a few individuals. Although these responses must be

considered valid, it raises the question of communication between the various workshops. The Workshop Standards Scale may be used as an educational tool for inter-agency discussions. The scale may also be used for evaluation within individual workshops.

Recommendations

The purpose as originally stated limited the scope of the study. The final instrument represents but a draft of what may be achieved. Further research is indicated by the points listed below.

Research on the Inventory

1. The instrument may be enlarged or perhaps condensed in categories or the number of items. Each subscale may possibly be made up of an equal number of items to facilitate statistical analysis.

2. The items relating to contract procurement, which are found in the "services" subscale, may possibly be enlarged to create an additional subscale.

3. The sample of respondents may be increased. This may include, for instance, all of the West-coast states.

4. A factorial analysis may be made to refine the instrument.

Research with the Inventory

1. The results obtained with the instrument may be studied in relation to the educational or personalities of workshop personnel.

2. Results obtained with the scale may be studied in view of clients' successes or failures.

3. Further study may be made of the differences between various items or subscales.

4. A longitudinal study may be made to investigate changes in workshop operations.

REFERENCES

Anastasi, A. Psychological testing. (3rd ed.) New York: MacMillan Company, 1968.

Carson, D. C., & Welsh, J. B. Rehabilitation in Washington State. Olympia: 1968.

Dolnick, M. Contractor opinions of sheltered workshops. Journal of Rehabilitation. 1964, 30, (4), 19-19.

Edwards, A. L. Techniques of attitude scale construction. New York: Applentio-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1957.

Edwards, A. L., & Kenney, K. C. A comparison of the Thurstone and Likert techniques of attitude scale construction. Journal of Applied Psychology. 1946, 30, 72-83.

Eysenck, H. J., & Crown, S. An experimental study in opinion attitude methodology. International Journal of Opinion Attitude Research. 1949, 3, 47-86.

Ferguson, L. W. The influence of individual attitudes on construction of an attitude scale. Journal of Social Psychology. 1935, 6, 115-117.

Ferguson, L. W. The requirements of an adequate attitude scale. Psychological Bulletin. 1939, 36, 655-673.

Ferguson, L. W. A study of the Likert technique of attitude scale construction. Journal of Social Psychology. 1941, 13, 51-57.

Fraenkel, W. A. Starting a sheltered workshop. Journal of Rehabilitation. 1965, 31, 25-27.

Gardner, M., & Likert, R. Public opinion and the individual. New York: Russell & Russell, 1966.

Gellman, W. Rehabilitation services in a workshop setting. Journal of Rehabilitation. 1965, 31, (2), 34-37.

Governor's Mental Health and Mental Retardation Planning Committee. Everybody's children. A summary of Washington's comprehensive plan to help the mentally retarded, Olympia: 1966.

Hall, O. M. Attitudes and unemployment. Archives of psychology. 1934, No. 142.

Hinckley, E. D. The influence of individual attitude and attitude-intelligence upon scale values of attitude items. American Psychologist. 1932, 3, 283-296.

Hovland, C. I., & Sherif, M. Judgmental phenomena and scales of attitude measurement: Item displacement in Thurstone scales. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology. 1952, 47, 822-832.

Likert, R. A technique for the measurement of attitudes. Archives of Psychology. 1932, No. 140.

Lythle, H. G. Management of the sheltered workshop. Journal of Rehabilitation. 1965, 31, (2), 30-33.

Margolis, D. Effective public relations for the sheltered workshop. Journal of Rehabilitation. 1965, 31, (2), 28-29.

McNemar, Q. Opinion-attitude methodology. Psychological Bulletin. 1964, (4), 289-374.

National citizens advisory committee on vocational rehabilitation. A report to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. (Washington: Government Printing Office. 1968).

Neff, W. S. Training and recruiting workshop personnel. Journal of Rehabilitation. 1965, 31, (2), 50-51.

Neff, W. S. Problems of work evaluation. Personnel and Guidance Journal. 1966, 44, 682-688.

Nelson, N. The economics of a sub-contract and manufacturing workshop. Journal of Rehabilitation. 1964, 30, (4), 18-19.

Obermann, E. C. A history of vocational rehabilitation in America. Minneapolis: T. S. Denison and Company, Inc. 1965.

Remmers, H. H. Introduction to opinion and attitude measurement. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954.

Stewart, R. Reference report. An analysis of significant factors concerning Washington State schools for the mentally retarded. Olympia: 1966, 1-48.

Stubbins, J. Workshops for the handicapped. An annotated bibliography, 1964, No. 1, 1-70.

Stubbins, J. Workshops for the handicapped. An annotated bibliography, 1965, No. 2, 1-69.

Stubbins, J. Workshops for the handicapped. An annotated bibliography, 1967, No. 4, 1-37.

Thomas, W. I., & Znanieki, F. The Polish peasant in Europe and America. Boston: R. C. Badger, 1918.

United States Code. Titles 42-44, 19, 7786-7789.

United States Code. Titles 19-23, 15, 4270-4272.

U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Vocational Rehabilitation Administration. Standards for rehabilitation administration. Standards for rehabilitation facilities and sheltered workshops. (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1967).

United States Department of Labor, Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Division. Special minimum wages for handicapped workers in sheltered workshops. (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1967), 2-5.

Wilkerson, A. M. The sheltered workshop movement. Journal of Rehabilitation. 1965, 31, (2), 20-22.

Wolfbein, S. L. Employment and unemployment in the U. S. Chicago: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1964.

APPENDIX A

COVER LETTER TO WORKSHOP DIRECTORS

SENT WITH WORKSHOP ATTITUDE SCALE

Dear Mr. Workshop Director:

Thank you for your willingness to participate in the sheltered workshop evaluation study. As I mentioned in our telephone conversation, the project has two specific goals.

a. To provide workshop personnel with an effective, but time-saving instrument that may be used as an evaluative guide for individual sheltered workshops.

b. To provide individuals or organizations who are considering the organization of a workshop with an instrument that will point out basic requirements for a successful workshop.

I hope your participation in this study will help to determine what makes the difference between successful and unsuccessful operations.

Two sets of questions are of concern now and one revised set later on. The first two sets of questions will inquire about your workshop organization and your opinions about workshop standards. The last set of questions will inquire about the application of the standards you and others feel to be important to your workshop. Please feel free to comment on any of the items included in the questionnaire or to suggest items that you feel should be included.

Your replies will be kept in strict confidence. You need not identify your workshop. The number on the answer sheet is sufficient for our data analysis. Your name will not appear anywhere in our records. No single workshop will be compared with other workshops. All of the analysis will be done with groups of data.

We believe that you "in the field" can best answer the questions we are investigating. We will look forward to your reply and hope we will be able to communicate with you again in the near future. If you let us know your desire a summary of the final results will be made available to you.

Supervising professor
Dr. T. F. Naumann
Professor of Psychology
Central Washington State College

Sincerely yours,

Bruce D. Howell

WORKSHOP ATTITUDE SCALE

Organization and Administration

1. Provision should be made for long-range planning to assess the changing labor market, and determine community job opportunities for rehabilitation clients.
2. It would seem advisable to have the financial operations of a facility audited annually by an independent accountant.
3. An accounting system will enable a facility to identify the cost of rehabilitation services and other expenses of operation.
4. Available work in the shop should be used for both training purposes and remuneration.
5. The governing body should exercise general supervision and establish policy regarding property, funds, management and operations.

6. The annual evaluation of a facility's program activities should be the responsibility of the governing body.
7. The governing body should write articles of incorporation as a non-profit agency and secure a wage and hour special certificate.
8. To be properly managed, a workshop should have a full-time administrator.
9. Provisions should be made for proper fire, public liability, workmen's compensation, and fidelity bonding insurance coverage.
10. Workshops should make provision for various types of handicapped individuals.

11. The more business-like a workshop becomes, the more it should contribute to the rehabilitation of the disabled.
12. A workshop has a better chance to revise the program if there is a continuous evaluation.
13. The workshop that resembles a small factory doing light assembly work will be more productive.
14. A workshop has two types of activities: (a) work and business activities, and (b) training and rehabilitation activities.
15. The workshop and shop programs will probably be more successful if they are incorporated into a vocational counseling program.

16. The value of a workshop is not necessarily in its counseling program, but in the work that is accomplished within the shop.

Services

17. A minimum age requirement for clients should be eighteen years with preparatory training for the sixteen to eighteen year old group.
18. A tuition would seem advisable for trainees.
19. The intake process will help orient the client to the facility's programs and services.
20. It is desirable to provide a training period in traveling skills from home to the shop or other agencies for many clients.

21. Prospective clients should be screened by personal interviews.
22. It is almost impossible to accept clients without some kind of a written criteria and procedures for admission.
23. An important part of the intake process should be the gathering of case summaries, medical reports, and psychological evaluations.
24. After an intake interview, the client will understand his need for rehabilitation service, and know how the service will aid him.
25. The intake interview will guide the staff concerning a client's disabilities and health problems.

26. The intake interview should help point out any work restrictions or treatment the client may need.
27. Efforts should be made to an accurate appraisal of the worker's vocational potential, suitable training programs, and placement.
28. Many people can profit from a workshop program even if their I.Q. is not too impressive.
29. It would seem advisable to develop a system of work capacity assessment for each client.
30. The evaluation process should include appropriate measures such as written tests, job tryouts, records and reports.

31. A continuous work evaluation during the time the client is in the shop will be more beneficial than periodic evaluations.
32. Candidates for the workshop should not need pre-vocational training.
33. Knowledge of the work world, skill in vocational diagnosis, and skill in interpersonal relations are helpful in vocational evaluation.
34. Means should be used to assess an individual's ability to master a particular skill or skills.
35. The vocational evaluation will guide the staff in assigning clients to appropriate work and in understanding their vocational problems.

36. Means should be developed to determine whether a given person can work at all, or what it is that causes him to work poorly.
37. Screening devices should be available to help select for certain kinds of employment, those persons who possess the required abilities.
38. A successful workshop will have a ratio of training staff to clients of approximately seven clients to one staff member.
39. The number of clients should not exceed those that can be instructed effectively within the shop and with the available staff and equipment.
40. Only a small amount of revising of the training program can be done without follow-up data.

41. Proper lighting, ventilation and other physical and operational factors will help to offer a realistic industrial setting.
42. It would seem advisable to offer a written organized plan of instruction for each training course.
43. Clients should be selected for training in occupational skills on the basis of interest, aptitudes and ability.
44. It is better to emphasize continually the principles of safety than take chances on accidents.
45. Instructional activities should be designed to develop skills, knowledge, and work habits comparable to that required for employment.

46. Work tolerance, self-reliance, and cooperation are among the desirable goals of work adjustment.
47. The client who cannot accept supervision, and relate properly to co-workers will have little success in holding a job.
48. There should be a periodic review of each client in the work adjustment program.
49. A record should be maintained of each client's work progress.
50. The client should develop good work practices (including punctuality and regular attendance, concentration and accuracy).

51. Workshops should submit a written quotation and shop bid when procuring contracts.
52. A workshop should have a continuous procurement program, because it must have the option of selecting the work that is most suitable for its program and clients.
53. Workers should be employed on a trial basis at all times in the workshop and subject to removal if they become a danger to themselves or others.

54. Contractors are more prone to award contracts to workshops based on their skill of bidding than on the price of the bid.
55. Workshops should use a fixed method such as a time standard per unit of production to determine appropriate bids.

56. The simplest way to pay workers according to their productivity would be to pay them on a piece work basis.
57. Workers should be paid individually with a specific and direct relationship to their individual productivity.
58. Appeals for contracts that are made by a good sales presentation are usually more successful than a sympathetic appeal.
59. Vocational rehabilitation should be under a mandate to provide services to all who are handicapped and might wish help.
60. It would be advisable to inform the employer as to the client's abilities and special needs.

61. The client should be observed by workshop staff in his employment situation.
62. Creating employment opportunities for clients should be a continuing project even when there are no workers available for placement.
63. The placement program should be reviewed at least annually by the governing body of the workshop.
64. The placement process should include the orientation of the client to the demands of the job.

Staff

65. The workshop planning committee needs to be representative of the community and the disabled who are to be served.

66. The shop supervisor should remain wary of two extremes; the emotional "do gooder" and the production oriented "whip cracker".
67. Job descriptions are hardly necessary. Each staff member knows what his responsibilities are.
68. In the workshop, the counselor is committed to the ideal of work as the mainstay of a healthy, wholesome, personality.
69. The workshop supervisor should be capable of feeling and displaying a warm interest and concern for his workers without losing his objectivity.
70. Reported causes of vocational failure of various handicapped individuals need regular consideration by the staff for program revisions.
71. The major concern of the rehabilitation counselor is not support, but the modifications of the vocational behavior of workshop clients.
72. It is advisable to have an administrator, plant manager, work foreman, and rehabilitation counselor on the staff.
73. In-service training programs are a waste of time. The staff can get any information they need from available publications.
74. The executive director (administrator) should hold a bachelor's degree and have experience in administrative work.
75. Written personnel policies and practices will help guide each staff member and the governing body.

76. The board of directors should include leaders in education, industry, labor management, engineering, employment and accounting.
77. The governing body needs to have final authority for the approval of personnel policies.
78. The ultimate goal is the placement of workers. Everything else is really secondary.
79. The board of directors should be responsible for securing and evaluating the manager's accomplishments periodically.

Clients

80. Clients should be helped to understand that they may be functioning under the handicap of a label (rather than by their own performance).

81. The workers will probably have a better relationship with the staff if they can have some form of a grievance procedure.
82. It is the responsibility of the governing body to have final authority for the approval of policies affecting the client.
83. The facility should distribute a manual which provides information on services and other matters of interest to the client and his guardian.
84. Counseling enables the client to realize aspects of himself of which he may have been previously unaware.
85. Change in a worker's status is expected, but it is the reviewing of the reasons for change with the worker that makes it successful.

86. The workshop personnel should help match the individual to suitable employment and provide the guidance and support he may require.
87. A well conceived appraisal includes psychological, vocational, and economic factors that bear upon the client's capacities for work.
88. The parent (guardian)-staff relationship can be an important determinant in the vocational and social training of a client.
89. Workshops should provide long-term obligations such as continuity of work, and special counseling for the older disabled clients.
90. Workshops should try to successfully place their clients to insure job satisfaction and to increase the probability of an employer hiring subsequent workers.

Records and Reports

91. If the budget is not specific as to the categories of rehabilitation and business, the director cannot be clear in his requests for money to operate the shop or purchase services.
92. The shop personnel should keep educational and social records that may enable the prediction of successful vocational adjustment and placement.
93. It would seem advisable to maintain a current record on each client (which would include intake, work, medical, and psychological histories).
94. An appropriate payroll record should be prepared and maintained for each client.
95. A written pay statement will enable each client to know his gross pay, hours worked, and deductions.

96. Central files should be maintained and held at all times in a specific location.
97. A production record should be maintained for each client whose productivity can be measured and who is paid at piece rates.
98. For all non-piece rates, there should be a semi-annual report on wages and work performance.
99. It is important to keep records of local prevailing wage rates paid non-handicapped persons for the same or similar types of work done in the shop.
100. Records should be kept of all materials purchased, products sold, and wages paid to the staff.

101. The staff should take appropriate safeguards to keep and protect all records and to insure their confidentiality.

Community Relations

102. Workshop personnel should keep in touch with the customer after a contract is completed (to check for customer satisfaction and future contracts).
103. Prospective customers need to know what level of precision a shop can do, how much can be stored, and what the delivery service is.
104. Prospective customers need to know what kind of work a shop can do, how much it can do, and how fast it can do it.
105. It is important to distribute brochures describing the program to other agencies and groups for the disabled.

106. Programs for presentation to the public should be available (to disseminate misconceptions about handicapped individuals and re-emphasize their potential).
107. Support from press, radio, and T.V. will help the workshop acquire contracts, but it will do little to change public attitudes.
108. Direct volunteer activity with trainees in the shop will increase the public's awareness of workshop services.
109. Effective and cooperative agreements with other community resources will help provide ancillary services as needed by the clients.
110. It really is not necessary to contact existing agencies about the shop. They will know about it within a short period of time.

111. Fund raising activities of a workshop should conform to local standards for social welfare organizations.
112. The rehabilitation counselor should promote his workshop through his varied contacts with his colleagues and community agencies.
113. A survey of employer attitudes toward hiring workshop products or clients will be of little benefit. We seldom change our attitudes.
114. If referral sources are kept posted as to the progress of the clients they refer, they will probably do a lot to help promote the shop.
115. Voluntary efforts should be useful for raising funds through local, state, and federal grants.

116. Parents should be invited to monthly parent-staff meetings to exchange information concerning clients.

Safety

117. The physical plant and equipment should meet all applicable legal requirements for construction, safety and design.
118. With todays building techniques and materials, "dead" spaces (hollow spaces between partitions) offer little threat as a draft for fire.
119. One should strive to provide adequate storage space. It will help production efficiency.
120. Driveways, doorways, and floor levels should facilitate truck deliveries, and with a minimum of interference with shop activities.

121. With todays modern fire departments, fire extinguishers and other fire-fighting equipment are of a minimum importance.
122. Adequately illuminated stairways, corridors, lavatories, and similar spaces should help lower the number of accidents.
123. Accommodations for personal physical needs such as drinking fountains and toilets should be constructed to meet the needs of all workers.
124. Physical plants that are available should be used. If they are not accessible to, and usable by all physically handicapped workers some clients will have to be dropped from the program.
125. A safety feature that should never be overlooked is the marking of all exits with legal exit lights.

126. Making provision for the care and safe storage of all combustible materials is really not all that necessary.
127. Stairs, ramps, and landings should have nonslip treads.
128. Nearly all buildings have a sufficient supply of clean air and proper circulation. It is not necessary to worry about it.
129. It is not necessary to cover power tools with guards or shields. Clients have to work with what they get when they become employed.
130. Spaces under stairways should not be used for storage.

APPENDIX B

COVER LETTER TO WORKSHOP DIRECTORS

SENT WITH WORKSHOP STANDARDS SCALE

Dear Mr. Workshop Director

I am a graduate student completing my M. Ed. degree at Central Washington State College. My thesis involves the development of an inventory for evaluating sheltered workshops within the State of Washington. The project has two specific goals:

a. To provide workshop personnel with an effective, but time-saving instrument that may be used as an evaluative guide for individual sheltered workshops;

b. To provide individuals or organizations who are considering the organization of a workshop with an instrument that will point out basic requirements for a successful workshop.

There are two basic phases in the development of the inventory. First, using the major category headings from Standards for Rehabilitation Facilities of Sheltered Workshops, a 130 statement attitude scale was developed. The scale was mailed to fifteen workshops within the State.

An item analysis of the returns enabled us to develop a second questionnaire which you will find enclosed. I would like to ask for your participation with this final set of questions.

These questions will inquire about the application of the standards you and others feel to be important to your workshop. Your replies will help to statistically check the reliability of the statements, offer additional scrutiny of the questions, for the development of a workshop inventory, and suggest general trends of workshop practice within the State.

Your replies will be kept in strict confidence. You need not identify your workshop. The number on the answer sheet is sufficient for our data analysis. Your name will not appear anywhere in our records. No single workshop will be compared with other workshops. All of the analysis will be done with groups of data. You may complete this alone or with the cooperation of other staff members.

We believe that you "in the field" can best answer the questions we are investigating. We will look forward to your reply and hope we will be able to communicate with you again in the near future. If you let us know your desire, a summary of the final results will be made available to you the latter part of June.

Sincerely yours,

Bruce D. Howell

Supervising professor:
Dr. T. F. Naumann
Professor of Psychology
Central Washington State College

BASIC WORKSHOP INFORMATION

A. Check the status of your workshop as defined below.

___1. Workshop is an independent, non-profit facility.

___2. Workshop is a state operated facility which is not part of any rehabilitation center, hospital or institution.

___3. Workshop is part of a comprehensive rehabilitation center.

___4. Workshop is part of a hospital--public or private.

___5. Workshop is part of an institution--public or private that provides care for individuals with some form of chronic disability such as mental retardation, cerebral palsy, etc.

___6. Other--(please indicate)_____

B. Please read carefully the statements below classifying primary purposes of workshops. Place an (x) by the statement which <u>most nearly</u> defines your workshop's major emphasis, goal, or objective.

___1. Our workshop provides long term sheltered employment for disabled persons too handicapped to compete in the open labor market. Any rehabilitation services offered, aim to assist clients in working successfully within the workshop group.

___2. Along with long term sheltered employment, our workshop provides evaluation and other rehabilitation services to workshop employees or to handicapped persons for whom such services are being purchased by community organizations.

___3. Our workshop provides sheltered work experiences and training to persons for the purpose of preparing as many as possible for employment in the competitive labor market. Substantial work evaluation and other rehabilitation services are available to every employee in the workshop.

___4. Our workshop provides comprehensive work evaluation and/or rehabilitation services to prepare handicapped persons for competitive employment. Definite limits are set upon the time an individual may remain in the workshop. The basic purpose of sheltered employment is to provide an evaluation and therapeutic experience rather than a wage.

___5. Our workshop operates a comprehensive work evaluation and/or rehabilitation unit which provides services to workshop employees as well as clients for whom services are purchased by community organizations. This is in addition to sheltered employment for handicapped persons for the purpose of preparing them for competitive employment.

___6. Other services provided: _____

_____

C. Which of the following identifies the nature of your workshop's operations: (If more than one operation is carried on indicate the relative magnitude in reference to income produced by writing (1) for largest, (2) for second largest, and so on.)

___1. Salvage Operations

___2. Sub-contract work

___3. Direct manufacturing of products

___4. Arts and Crafts for sale

___5. Customer service (Recondition household goods or furniture to order, printing to order, direct mail services such as typing and mimeographing)

___6. Other operation(s) _____

_____

D. Do you operate a single disability workshop? Yes___ No___

E. Which of the following <u>professional</u> staff persons have you used in the past year?

Position	Employed			
	Full time	Part time	Consultant	Voluntary
Psychologist				
Social Worker				
Occupational Therapist				
Vocational Counselor				
Rehabilitation Counselor				
Nurse				
Physician				
Industrial Arts Teacher				
Other				

F. Please indicate the following by placing an (x) by each of the below statements that were studied before you opened a sheltered workshop.

___1. The potential handicapped population and the characteristics of the community were surveyed.

___2. A study of the work the shop was to seek and perform in the community's economy was provided.

___3. An assessment was made of the potential business leadership available in the community for service on the board of directors.

___4. A study was made to determine if there were sufficient additional support facilities available not only to maintain the workshop, but also to expand it when needed.

___5. Other aspects considered:_____

_____

G. 1. During the past year, what was the maximum number of clients served in your workshop at any one time?

_____

2. What, approximately, was the average number of clients served at any given time? _____

3. What was the total number of clients served in the year 1968? _____

4. Approximately, what is your total workshop budget for the year? _____

5. Approximately what per cent of your workshop's income comes from Federal or State grants? _____

6. Approximately what per cent of your workshop's income comes from production and sales? _____

ANSWER SHEET FOR WORKSHOP STANDARDS APPLICATION SCALE

Position _____ Date _____

Workshop experience: _____ year(s) Sex ___ Degree(s) _____

Directions: For each item indicate extent of application by circling the respective scale point value.

Scale points: 0 = Never
1 = Seldom
2 = Usually
3 = Sometimes
4 = Always
5 = Doesn't Apply

No.		No.		No.	
(1)	0 1 2 3 4 5	(31)	0 1 2 3 4 5	(61)	0 1 2 3 4 5
(2)	0 1 2 3 4 5	(32)	0 1 2 3 4 5	(62)	0 1 2 3 4 5
(3)	0 1 2 3 4 5	(33)	0 1 2 3 4 5	(63)	0 1 2 3 4 5
(4)	0 1 2 3 4 5	(34)	0 1 2 3 4 5	(64)	0 1 2 3 4 5
(5)	0 1 2 3 4 5	(35)	0 1 2 3 4 5	(65)	0 1 2 3 4 5
(6)	0 1 2 3 4 5	(36)	0 1 2 3 4 5	(66)	0 1 2 3 4 5
(7)	0 1 2 3 4 5	(37)	0 1 2 3 4 5	(67)	0 1 2 3 4 5
(8)	0 1 2 3 4 5	(38)	0 1 2 3 4 5	(68)	0 1 2 3 4 5
(9)	0 1 2 3 4 5	(39)	0 1 2 3 4 5	(69)	0 1 2 3 4 5
(10)	0 1 2 3 4 5	(40)	0 1 2 3 4 5	(70)	0 1 2 3 4 5
(11)	0 1 2 3 4 5	(41)	0 1 2 3 4 5	(71)	0 1 2 3 4 5
(12)	0 1 2 3 4 5	(42)	0 1 2 3 4 5	(72)	0 1 2 3 4 5
(13)	0 1 2 3 4 5	(43)	0 1 2 3 4 5	(73)	0 1 2 3 4 5
(14)	0 1 2 3 4 5	(44)	0 1 2 3 4 5	(74)	0 1 2 3 4 5
(15)	0 1 2 3 4 5	(45)	0 1 2 3 4 5	(75)	0 1 2 3 4 5
(16)	0 1 2 3 4 5	(46)	0 1 2 3 4 5	(76)	0 1 2 3 4 5
(17)	0 1 2 3 4 5	(47)	0 1 2 3 4 5	(77)	0 1 2 3 4 5
(18)	0 1 2 3 4 5	(48)	0 1 2 3 4 5	(78)	0 1 2 3 4 5
(19)	0 1 2 3 4 5	(49)	0 1 2 3 4 5	(79)	0 1 2 3 4 5
(20)	0 1 2 3 4 5	(50)	0 1 2 3 4 5	(80)	0 1 2 3 4 5
(21)	0 1 2 3 4 5	(51)	0 1 2 3 4 5	(81)	0 1 2 3 4 5
(22)	0 1 2 3 4 5	(52)	0 1 2 3 4 5	(82)	0 1 2 3 4 5
(23)	0 1 2 3 4 5	(53)	0 1 2 3 4 5	(83)	0 1 2 3 4 5
(24)	0 1 2 3 4 5	(54)	0 1 2 3 4 5	(84)	0 1 2 3 4 5
(25)	0 1 2 3 4 5	(55)	0 1 2 3 4 5	(85)	0 1 2 3 4 5
(26)	0 1 2 3 4 5	(56)	0 1 2 3 4 5	(86)	0 1 2 3 4 5
(27)	0 1 2 3 4 5	(57)	0 1 2 3 4 5	(87)	0 1 2 3 4 5
(28)	0 1 2 3 4 5	(58)	0 1 2 3 4 5	(88)	0 1 2 3 4 5
(29)	0 1 2 3 4 5	(59)	0 1 2 3 4 5	(89)	0 1 2 3 4 5
(30)	0 1 2 3 4 5	(60)	0 1 2 3 4 5	(90)	0 1 2 3 4 5

(91)	0	1	2	3	4	5		(96)	0	1	2	3	4	5
(92)	0	1	2	3	4	5		(97)	0	1	2	3	4	5
(93)	0	1	2	3	4	5		(98)	0	1	2	3	4	5
(94)	0	1	2	3	4	5		(99)	0	1	2	3	4	5
(95)	0	1	2	3	4	5		(100)	0	1	2	3	4	5

WORKSHOP ATTITUDE SCALE

Organization and Administration

1. We engage in long-range planning to assess the changing labor market and to determine community job opportunities.
2. We have the financial operations of our workshop audited annually by an independent accountant.
3. We have an accounting system which will enable us to identify the cost of rehabilitation services and other expenses of operation.
4. We use the available work in our shop for both training purposes and remuneration.
5. Our governing body exercises general supervision and establishes policy regarding property, funds, management, and operations.
6. Our governing body has written articles of incorporation as a non-profit agency and has secured a wage and hour special certificate.
7. We employ a full time administrator to manage the affairs of the agency in accordance with established policies.
8. We have made provisions for proper fire, public liability, workmen's compensation, and fidelity bonding insurance coverage.
9. Our workshop offers a program that will be beneficial to various types of handicapped individuals.
10. We have a continuous over-all evaluation of our workshop to enable us to review and revise our operations and objectives.
11. Our workshop is administered as a business to assure its ability to serve the handicapped most effectively.
12. Our workshop resembles a small factory doing light assembly work.
13. Our workshop has two types of activities: (a) work and business activities, and (b) training and rehabilitation activities.

Services

14. We screen our prospective clients by personal interview.
15. We use written criteria and procedures for the admission of clients.

16. We use the intake process, in part, to help orient the client to the facility's programs and services.
17. Our intake process includes the gathering of case summaries, medical reports, and psychological evaluations.
18. We use the intake interview, in part, to help guide our staff in regard to a client's disabilities and health problems.
19. We do not require prospective clients to have prevocational training.
20. Our vocational evaluations are done by staff who have knowledge of the work sorld, skill in vocational diagnosis, and skill in interpersonal relations.

21. Our evaluation process includes appropriate measures such as written tests, job tryouts, records and reports.
22. We use the vocational evaluation to help guide the staff in assigning clients to appropriate work, and in understanding their vocational problems.
23. We have continuous work evaluation for each client during the time he is in the workshop.
24. We try to acquire an accurate appraisal of the worker's vocational potential, suitable training programs, and placement.
25. We use a system of work capacity assessment for each client (which may include such factors as attention span, fatigue, health, and rate of production.

26. We assess an individual's ability to master a particular skill or skills (by methods such as mental tests, work samples, job analysis, or situational assessment).
27. We have developed means to determine whether a given client can work at all, or what it is that causes him to work poorly.
28. We use available screening devices to help select those persons who possess the required abilities for certain kinds of employment.
29. We do not base intelligence requirements too extensively on I.Q. ratings, but upon the ability of the person to profit from our program.
30. We help the client to learn and understand the importance of accepting supervision and relating properly to coworkers.

31. We help the client to develop good work practices (including punctuality and regular attendance, concentration and accuracy).
32. Our instructional activities are designed to develop skills, knowledge, and work habits comparable to that required for employment.
33. We emphasize work tolerance, self-reliance, and cooperation as desirable goals of work adjustment.
34. We carry on a periodic review of each client in the work-adjustment program.
35. We do not allow workshop clients to exceed a number that can be instructed effectively within the shop and with the available staff and equipment.

36. We maintain a record of each client's work progress.
37. We provide a written organized plan of instruction for each training course.
38. We provide proper lighting, ventilation, and other physical and operational factors to help offer a realistic industrial setting.
39. We have a continuous sub-contract procurement program.
40. Our workshop submits a written quotation and shop bid when procuring contracts.

41. We appeal for contracts on the basis of a good sales presentation rather than sympathy.
42. We use fixed methods (formulas) such as a time standard per unit of production to determine appropriate bids.
43. We pay clients individually with a specific and direct relationship to their individual productivity.
44. We pay our workers on a piece work basis whenever possible.
45. We remove workers from the shop if they present a danger, that cannot be remedied, to themselves or to others.

46. We inform employers of a client's abilities and special needs before he is hired.
47. Our workshop staff, or placement officers, observe clients in their employment situations.
48. Our governing body reviews the workshop placement program at least annually.
49. Our placement process includes the orientation of the client to the demands of the job.
50. We secure follow-up data of clients and operations to help plan any revisions that may be needed in the training program.

Staff

51. Our workshop planning committee is representative of the community and the disabled who are to be served.
52. Our shop supervisor is careful to be neither an emotional "do gooder" or a production oriented "whip cracker".
53. We provide each staff member with a job description.
54. Our counselors are committed to the ideal of work as one of the mainstays of a healthy, wholesome personality.
55. Our workshop supervisor displays a warm interest and concern for his workers without losing his objectivity.
56. We give the reported causes of vocational failure of various handicapped individuals regular consideration for program revisions.
57. We have implemented in-service programs for our staff.
58. We have written personnel policies and practices which will help guide each staff member and the governing body.
59. Our board of directors includes leaders in education, industry, labor management, engineering, employment and accounting.
60. Our board of directors is responsible for securing and evaluating the manager's accomplishments periodically.

Clients

61. Our workshop has some form of a grievance procedure for the workers.
62. We distribute a manual which provides information on services and other matters of interest to the client and his guardian.
63. We review the reasons for change in a worker's status with the worker.
64. We help match the individual to suitable employment and provide the guidance and support he may require.
65. Our appraisals include psychological, vocational, and economic factors that bear upon the client's capacities for work.

66. Our counseling services may enable the client to realize aspects of himself of which he may have been previously unaware.
67. We provide long-term obligations such as continuity of work, and special counseling for our older disabled clients.
68. We try to successfully place our clients to insure job satisfaction and to increase the probability of an employer hiring subsequent workers.

Records and Reports

69. Our budget is specific as to the categories of rehabilitation and business, so the director can be clear in his requests for money for various operations.
70. We maintain a current record on each client (which includes such items as intake, work, medical and psychological histories).

71. We prepare and maintain a payroll record for each client.
72. We provide each client with a written pay statement, so he will know his gross pay, hours worked, and any deductions.
73. We maintain a central file system that is held at all times at a specific location.
74. We maintain a production record for each client whose productivity can be measured and who is paid at piece rates.
75. We keep a semi-annual report, for office records, on wages and work performance for all non-piece rates.

76. We keep records of local prevailing wage rates paid non-handicapped persons for the same or similar types of work done in the shop.
77. We keep records of all materials purchased, products sold, and wages paid to the staff.
78. Our staff takes appropriate safeguards to keep and protect all records and to insure their confidentiality.

Community Relations

79. Our workshop personnel keep in touch with the customer after a contract is completed (to check for customer satisfaction and future contracts).
80. We notify prospective customers as to what level of precision our shop can maintain, how much can be stored, and what the delivery service is.

81. We notify prospective customers as to what kind of work our shop can do, how much we can do, and how fast we can do it.
82. We distribute brochures describing our services and programs to other agencies and groups for the disabled.
83. We have programs for presentation to the public (to disseminate misconceptions about handicapped individuals and re-emphasize their potential).
84. We seek support from press, radio, and T.V. to help the shop acquire contracts and emphasize our clients work abilities and other strengths.
85. We have effective and cooperative agreements with other community resources to help provide ancillary services as needed by the clients.

86. We keep in touch with existing agencies, in order to inform them of the services and programs we offer.
87. Our fund raising activities for the workshop conform to local standards for social welfare organizations.
88. Our rehabilitation counselors promote the workshop through their varied contacts with colleagues and community agencies.
89. We survey employer attitudes in the community concerning the hiring of workshop products or clients.
90. We keep referral sources posted as to the progress of the clients they refer.

Safety

91. Our physical plant and equipment meet all applicable legal requirements for construction, safety, and design.
92. We strive to provide adequate storage space.
93. Our shop driveways, doorways and floor levels facilitate truck deliveries, and with a minimum of interference with shop activities.
94. We try to lower accidents by having adequately illuminated stairways, corridors, lavatories, and similar spaces.
95. We have accommodations for personal physical needs such as drinking fountains and toilets that are constructed to meet the needs of all workers.

96. We have marked all of the exits with legal exit lights.
97. We make provision for the care and safe storage of all combustible materials.
98. We have nonslip treads on our stairs, ramps and landings.
99. We cover the power tools with guards or shields in the workshop.
100. We have fire extinguishers and other fire-fighting equipment in the shop that is readily accessible.