

Everybody's Doing It: A National Survey of the Use of Natural Supports in Supported Employment

By Michael West, John Kregel, Ana Hernandez, & Thomas Hock

Abstract

This article reports findings from a survey of 385 supported employment provider agencies on their use of natural supports in time-limited and extended services. An overwhelming majority of 85% of all respondents reported that natural supports are emphasized by their agency in the delivery of supported employment services and have generally been successful and useful for all individuals on their caseloads. Among the problems identified by the respondents were resistance to natural supports by employers and coworkers, as well as difficulty in locating natural supports at the job site. Results are discussed in terms of the need for quality assurance procedures in supported employment programs.

The enhancement and individualization of natural supports for persons with disabilities has received much attention in recent years (Bradley, Ashbaugh, & Blaney, 1994; Nisbet, 1992). "Natural supports" refers to the resources inherent to community environments which can be utilized for habilitative and supportive purposes (Kiernan, Schalock, Butterworth, & Sailor, 1993). Using natural supports has been advanced as a cost-effective means of achieving maximum integration at school, work, and other community settings for individuals with severe disabilities (Nisbet, 1992; Nisbet & Hagner, 1987).

The use of natural supports has added significance for individuals receiving services under the Federal/state Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) program. Supported employment combines both intensive, time-limited services funded by the VR agency with ongoing support and follow-along (i.e., extended services) funded by a non-VR source. This VR option is intended for individuals with the most severe disabilities who would otherwise not be able to work in competitive jobs. The 1992 Amendments to the Rehabilitation Act (PL 102-569) endorse natural supports as a source of extended services for individuals receiving supported employment (Sec. 635[b][6][C][iii]). For many groups of potential supported employment participants, particularly those with disabilities acquired in adulthood, access to supported employment may have been limited because no source of funding for extended services was available at the time of VR enrollment (West, Revell, & Wehman, 1992).

Natural supports within the VR service context was intended to be a broad term meant to include (1) individuals at the job site, such as employers, supervisors, or coworkers; (2) friends or family members who provide supportive roles; or (3) volunteers or mentors from work or the community (Senate Report 102-357). Recently, several writers in the field have further broadened the context of natural supports to include other types of community and workplace resources, such as employee assistance programs, transportation providers, community service organizations, recreational and social associations, and govern-mental supports that are not limited to persons with disabilities, such as subsidized housing, income tax assistance, etc. (Albin & Slovic, 1992; Parent, Unger, Gibson, & Clements, 1994; Rheinheimer, VanCovern, Green, Revell, & Inge, 1993; Rogan, Hagner, & Murphy, 1993).

The role of employers and coworkers in supporting employees with severe disabilities has emerged with potential to improve supported employment outcomes. However, there is little data about the impact of natural supports. In a com-prehensive review of research literature on the effectiveness of natural supports in supported employment, Test and Wood (1996) found that (1) the concept of natural supports often poorly defined or not defined at all, (2) natural support strategies are often nebulous and difficult to replicate, and (3) little empirical evidence exists to justify the wide-spread use of natural supports and the incorporation of the concept into federal employment policy.

The available information to date about natural supports in supported employment is almost exclusively qualitative

information and case studies. These case studies offer an appealing array of what is possible in the typical employment of people in supported employment and the roles that employer personnel can play in supporting the employment of people with severe disabilities. These studies (e.g., Hagner & Dileo, 1993; Murphy, Rogan, & Fisher, 1994) show an increase in the integration and stability of supported employment participants when coworkers are involved with the employee with severe disabilities. For example, a recent report from a demonstration project for enhancing natural supports for individuals with severe mental illness (West & Parent, 1995) included the number and type of support needs that were identified and addressed.

At the same time, however, some professionals (e.g., Test & Wood, 1996) are concerned the lack of quantitative information on the efficacy of natural supports does not provide a sound empirical basis for policy and program decision-making. Only recently has quantitative information begun to be available about typical features of employment and natural supports. Mank, Cioffi & Yovanoff (1996a, b) have constructed a data base of nearly 500 individuals (from eight states) in supported employment placed in jobs by programs thought to be implementing natural supports in the work place. These data show a positive relationship between high wages, higher patterns of interaction with employees without disabilities and the "typicalness" of the features of their employment (when compared to coworkers without disabilities). This data set provides one of the first broader, quantitative data sets that can provide useful information to consumers, community rehabilitation providers and policy-makers on the efficacy of natural support strategies.

Some professionals have expressed caution about the directions that the natural supports initiative might take. Kregel (1994) and West and Parent (1995) note that natural support methods are being advanced as alternatives to the traditional "job coaching" model of supported employment, when in fact coworker and supervisor involvement has been a component of "best practices" since the program's inception. The controversy over the use of natural supports in supported employment has significant implications for the long-term future of the program (DeLeo, 1995; West, 1992). Wehman (1993) and West (1992) both express concern that the research base on social acceptance of persons with disabilities in the workplace does not support programmatic dependence on coworkers and supervisors.

Clearly, if natural supports strategies are to become the foundation of employment service delivery for individuals with significant disabilities in supported employment, then investigations into the nature and effectiveness of supported employment strategies must be expanded. This study is to our knowledge the first attempt to conduct a large-scale examination of the current use of natural support technology in supported employment operated by local community rehabilitation programs throughout the United States. The specific questions which were addressed include:

1. How extensively are natural supports utilized in the field?
2. What do provider agencies consider to be "natural" supports?
3. What types of problems have been encountered in developing and utilizing natural supports for supported employment participants?
4. What if any effects has the increasing use of natural supports had on the provider agency and staff?

Participants

Sample selection. The survey sample was drawn from the population of providers of supported employment services as defined and funded under Title VI(C) of the Rehabilitation Act. State vocational rehabilitation (VR) agency staff responsible for their respective state supported employment programs were contacted and requested to provide a current list of public and private agencies vendored for supported employment services in accordance with applicable state and federal VR regulations and policies. The lists were reviewed upon receipt to insure that

they were of recent origin, and appeared to contain only names of sup-ported employment providers. Follow-up contacts were made for state lists that failed to meet these criteria. A total of 40 usable vendor lists was ob-tained. The survey sample was drawn through ran-dom selection with replacement. An average sample of 20% of confirmed providers was sur-veyed, with sample sizes ranging from a minimum state sample of 10% to a maximum sample of 25%.. The survey sample was drawn from the population of providers of supported em-ployment services as defined and funded under Title VI(C) of the Rehabilitation Act. State voca-tional rehabilitation (VR) agency staff responsible for their respective state supported employment programs were contacted and requested to provide a current list of public and private agencies vendored for supported employment services in accordance with applicable state and federal VR regulations and policies. The lists were reviewed upon receipt to insure that they were of recent origin, and appeared to contain only names of sup-ported employment providers. Follow-up contacts were made for state lists that failed to meet these criteria. A total of 40 usable vendor lists was ob-tained. The survey sample was drawn through ran-dom selection with replacement. An average sample of 20% of confirmed providers was sur-veyed, with sample sizes ranging from a minimum state sample of 10% to a maximum sample of 25%.

The survey participants were representa-tives of 385 randomly selected supported employ-ment provider agencies in 40 states. The mean supported employment caseload of responding agencies was 47.6 consumers. Additional charac-teristics of these agencies, their services, and con-sumers are presented in Table 1. Respondents were typically coordinators of the supported employ-ment program or executive directors of the agency.

Instrumentation

The data for this investigation were collected through the Natural Supports Section of the National Supported Employment Provider Survey, conducted by the Rehabilitation Research and Training Center on Supported Employment at Virginia Commonwealth University (VCU-RRTC).

Table 1

Characteristics of the Agencies Surveyed

1. Type of service catchment area:	
Urban	17.9%
Suburban	3.4%
Rural	38.8%
Mixed	39.8%

2. Disability groups served:	
Single disability groups	32.5%
Multiple disability groups	67.5%
3. Specific disability groups served (agencies serving single groups only):	
Mental retardation	69.9%
Mental illness	23.6%
Other disabilities	6.5%
4. Supported employment service models utilized:	
Individual placement only	50.4%
Group placement only	1.3%
Individual and group placement	48.3%

the VCU-RRTC to elicit information via telephone on a number of issues pertaining to supported employment service delivery, such as unserved and underserved populations, funding issues, use of Social Security Work Incentives, and natural supports. The main survey requested demographic information for the agency, followed by a single item pertaining to each of the major issues. A "yes" response on the main survey indicated that the appropriate section should be completed. For the purposes of the Natural Supports Section, the main survey item was: "Does your program emphasize the use of natural supports in the delivery of supported employment services?"

The Natural Supports Section, along with all elements of the National Provider Survey, were developed through multiple levels of item submission and review both internally and externally. A pilot version of the National Provider Survey was administered by telephone to representatives of 10 supported employment agencies in Virginia, who were then requested to give their impressions of the face validity and response difficulty for the items. The final version of the Natural Supports Section contained 10 items relating to (1) the types of natural supports that the agency had utilized; (2) the use of natural supports within the service delivery process; (3) the respondent's perceptions of the efficacy of using natural supports for the program's caseload; (4) estimates of time and effort developing natural supports; and (5) problems encountered in accessing and using natural supports for their supported employment clients.

Procedure

Telephone surveys - Due to the extensive nature of the survey, telephone surveys were conducted over the course of approximately eight months by eight telephone interviewers. A survey script was developed that provided a consistent method for interviewers to identify appropriate respondents to the various sections and determine convenient times to conduct the interviews. Most surveys required multiple telephone contacts to schedule and complete, and required from approximately 10 minutes to 2 hours (mean 47 minutes), depending on the number of sections that were indicated from the main survey. - Due to the extensive nature of the survey, telephone surveys were conducted over the course of approximately eight months by eight telephone interviewers. A survey script was developed that provided a consistent method for interviewers to identify appropriate respondents to the various sections and determine convenient times to conduct the interviews. Most surveys required multiple telephone contacts to schedule and complete, and required from approximately 10 minutes to 2 hours (mean 47 minutes), depending on the number of sections that were indicated from the main survey.

Data management and analysis. Quantitative data were aggregated using spreadsheet and analytical software, Microsoft Excel 5.0. Data analysis included computation of descriptive statistics, means and frequencies. Responses to open-ended items were analyzed and interpreted qualitatively, through inductive content analysis and analyst-constructed typologies (Patton, 1990). . Quantitative data were aggregated using spreadsheet and analytical software, Microsoft Excel 5.0. Data analysis included computation of descriptive statistics, means and frequencies. Responses to open-ended items were analyzed and interpreted qualitatively, through inductive content analysis and analyst-constructed typologies (Patton, 1990).

Of the 385 agencies surveyed , 328 (85.2%) respondents indicated that their agency emphasized natural supports in the delivery of supported employment services. Respondents were also requested to identify the service phases in which natural supports were typically utilized. Almost all indicated that natural supports were used in job site training (93.3%) and extended services phases (96.0%). Fewer reported that natural supports were used in consumer assessment (66.1%) or job development activities (78.3%). As follow-ups to this item, respondents were asked to further quantify use of natural supports in various program phases. Responses to these items are included in Table 2 below.

Table 2

Use of Natural Supports in Various Program Phases

Survey Item	Mean

Approximately what percent of your consumers' jobs were found through the social networks and contacts of consumers, their families and friends?	15.9%
Approximately how much observation time is spent on average at a job site prior to a consumer's first day on the job?	9.1 hrs.
What percent of your caseload have you used coworkers or supervisors to provide initial training in work skills and behaviors?	41.5%
With what percent of your caseload have you used coworkers or supervisors to provide ongoing monitoring and follow-along services?	56.3%
With what percent of your caseload have you modified a job to build in opportunities for social interactions with coworkers?	21.9%

Respondents were asked if natural supports had generally been useful and relevant for all individuals on their supported employment caseload, with the overwhelming majority (266, 81.8%) indicating that they had found this to be so. As a follow-up, those who responded negatively (59, 18.2%) were asked to identify up to two cases or examples where natural supports had not been useful. Their responses are summarized in Table 3 below. The most frequently occurring response was that some types of workplaces were not conducive to enhancing existing supports, such as those which are fast-paced, highly competitive, or generally non-supportive. Different types of consumer characteristics were also identified as inhibiting natural support development, such as consumer behavioral, medical, or social characteristics, consumer disability classification, or the severity of consumers' disabilities.

Table 3

Examples of Cases Where Natural Supports Were Not Useful (n=59)

Reason	Number	Percent
--------	--------	---------

Based on type of job or workplace (i.e., high pressure or competition)	20	33.9%
Based on consumer characteristics (i.e., behaviors, needs, etc.)	13	22.0%
Based on disability classification (i.e., mental illness)	9	15.3%
Based on severity of disability	9	15.3%
Based on other reasons	8	13.6%

Types of Natural Supports

Respondents were requested to provide up to three types of natural supports which they had used in service delivery and the functions for which they had been utilized. Most often, respondents reported using coworkers (70.1%), followed by family or friends (43.9%), employer resources such as employee assistance programs (34.1%), community involvement such as service organizations (19.8%), consumers' own resources such as earnings and automobiles (7.3%), and other persons or organizations such as churches or governmental agencies (3.4%). Frequently reported functions included transportation (46.1%), job site training (40.4%), ongoing monitoring (27.0%), social skills training or social support (20.2%), community or residential support (16.9%), job development (7.9%), and other functions (4.5%).

Problems in the Use of Natural Supports

Respondents were asked if they had encountered any major obstacles or problems in using natural supports, with over one-half (51.5%) indicated that they had. As a follow-up, those who had responded affirmatively were asked to describe up to three problems. These responses are summarized in Table 4 on the following page. Most frequently, respondents reported that they had encountered active resistance from others on the job site to performing training and support functions. Slightly more than a third (35.9%) indicated that they had experienced difficulty in locating either individuals or resources at the job site for support functions, but without active resistance. Twenty-eight respondents (16.8%) indicated that sometimes natural support providers could not perform their responsibilities as effectively or as efficiently as the job coach, and 11 (6.6%) believed that their consumers' job retention had been reduced as a result of increased reliance on natural supports.

Table 4

Problems Encountered in Developing and Using Natural Supports (n = 167)

	Frequency	Percent
Resistance from employers, supervisors, or coworkers	71	42.5%
Difficulty locating natural supports at job site	60	35.9%
Reduction in program effectiveness or efficiency	28	16.8%
Resistance from families	13	7.8%
Dissatisfaction from employers	11	6.6%
Lower job retention	11	6.6%
Lack of consumer advocacy on the job	8	4.8%
Dissatisfaction from consumers	5	3.0%
Difficult to place/maintain consumers with very severe disabilities using natural supports	5	3.0%
Other problems	12	7.2%

Effects of Natural Supports on the Provider Agency

Respondents were asked if the role of the agency or its staff had changed substantially since it began to emphasize natural supports. Over half (51.5%) indicated that changes had occurred. As a follow-up, respondents were requested to describe the changes that occurred. These responses are summarized in Table 5. Most frequently, respondents reported that the functions of staff had changed in that they engaged in less direct job site training and monitoring, and more time facilitating coworker training and other supports. Approximately one-third (32.5%) indicated that staff spent less time at the job site, either in terms of reduced presence during the consumers' daily work hours or a reduction in duration of time-limited services. Approximately a fourth (23.5%) indicated they had made modifications in the types of commitments or promises that had been made to employers during job development, such as reduced crisis management. A small number of agencies (13.3%) indicated they had changed their staff job descriptions to emphasize facilitation of natural supports.

Table 5

Changes in Agency or Staff Roles Due to Emphasis on Natural Supports (n = 166)

	Frequency	Percent
Staff/agency functions or responsibilities	74	44.6%
Staff time on job site	54	32.5%
Staff/agency commitments to employer	39	23.5%
Changes in staff job descriptions	22	13.3%
Other changes		
Unable to specify	11	6.6%
	12	7.2%

Before discussing the findings of the survey, some caveats are in order. First, the survey respondents were selected from supported employment provider agency lists which were received from state VR agencies. Current and complete lists were not obtained from 10 states. This raises the possibility of sampling error for the survey; however, to the best of our knowledge and abilities to define the population, a random sample of provider agencies was obtained. Second, on a number of questions respondents were requested to estimate quantitative data, such as percentages and number of hours. No controls could be instituted regarding the accuracy of these estimates. Still, the findings have usefulness in that they represent the respondents' perceptions of the extent and value of natural supports in their overall service delivery, and key issues regarding the use of natural supports in the workplace.

Extent of Use of Natural Supports

The use of existing community and workplace supports in the vocational habilitation of persons with severe disabilities is a fairly recent idea (Nisbet & Hagner, 1987). Yet, the findings of this survey indicate that the natural supports concept has been embraced by the field of supported employment and is used extensively in almost all phases of service. Over 85% of the agencies surveyed indicated that they emphasize natural supports in the delivery of supported employment. Those agencies that emphasize natural supports reported that they have used coworkers or supervisors for initial training for an average of 41.5% of their consumers; for ongoing monitoring and support, this increases to over half (56.3%) of their consumers. Natural supports appear to be used far less frequently in job development and placement, although the family-and-friends network is the typical avenue for early employment experiences for most persons starting out in the work world.

These findings give clear and powerful support to the argument made by Test and Wood (1996) that the lack of a clear and concise definition of natural supports makes it difficult to conduct research into the effectiveness of these important strategies. When 85% of all programs indicate that they "emphasize the use of natural supports" in service delivery, the dichotomy of "natural supports vs. the job coach" of supported employment is no longer relevant. It is unequivocally clear that virtually all programs are using components from a number of different supported employment models in the design and delivery of services. Natural support strategies have become an integral component of supported employment.

Limited View of Natural Supports

There appears to be consensus among provider agencies regarding what constitutes a natural support. However, the natural supports that are being utilized for supported employment agencies appear to be limited in scope. When local programs describe their use of natural supports, they are almost always talking about the involvement of coworkers in the provision of job skill training or ongoing monitoring. Programs are far less likely to describe efforts at involving employer resources (i.e. employee assistance programs), family members or friends, consumer resources, or community involvement (e.g. civic groups, professional organizations, churches, etc.) in the natural support effort. In addition, most programs seem familiar with using natural support strategies during the training and follow-along stages of supported employment. Natural supports are used far less frequently during the consumer assessment, job development, and job placement phases of supported employment.

Programs implementing supported employment services should give greater attention to efforts to include family members, friends, neighbors, and members of the community at large in the implementation of supported employment. This is particularly true when attempting to assess consumer job preferences and identify potential jobs. Family members and relatives can provide valuable insight into a consumer's likes and dislikes, skills and limitations. This information can be used, not to exclude an individual from employment, but rather to focus subsequent job development efforts on employment options that may be relevant and satisfying to the consumer. Similarly, friends and neighbors can be tremendous resources in identifying available jobs, providing job leads and making informal contacts on behalf of the consumer. Parent and her colleagues (1994) have developed several effective methods of involving family members and friends in consumer assessment and job development activities.

Services to Individuals with the Most Significant Disabilities

As noted previously, some professionals have expressed concern about the growing emphasis on natural supports and the impact on persons with very severe disabilities. For example, West (1992) cautioned that the system's movement toward models of natural supports might serve to further exclude individuals with extensive support needs which are beyond the capabilities of coworkers or supervisors. These are individuals who are largely

underserved in supported employment already (Kregel & Wehman, 1989), and who might find access to services even further limited.

The findings of this survey do not directly answer this question, but they do point to the potential impact of natural support methodologies on service access for these individuals. An encouraging finding is that better than eight of ten respondents indicated that they had found natural supports to be useful and relevant for all members of their caseload, including, presumably, those who are the most difficult to place, train, and maintain in employment. Among those reporting to the contrary, the primary reason was based not on the types of individuals served, but by characteristics of the employment settings into which individuals were being placed. Among the reported instances where natural supports did not "work" were such factors as fast-paced or high stress jobs or environments, highly competitive businesses, and workplaces that weren't particularly friendly to any worker, disabled or not.

However, a number of agencies reported they did not find natural supports to be useful for consumers based on specific problems or limitations, disability labels, or disability level. It is impossible to determine from present data whether or not their experiences contributed to any appreciable degree to the selection of clients for the program or specific job openings, but this is an important question that should be addressed. The lack of participation by individuals with significant disabilities was one of the major reasons cited by Nisbet and Hagner (1987) to justify the importance of natural support strategies. Wehman, Revell, and Kregel (1997), however, recently reported that little has been done since 1988 to increase the rate of participation in supported employment by individuals with severe cognitive disabilities, autism, cerebral palsy or dual diagnoses. Future research should continue to investigate the extent to which the increasing use of natural support strategies has facilitated or hindered efforts to promote participation of individuals with significant support needs.

Problems in Accessing Natural Supports

Most programs feel that the use of natural supports has contributed to the overall success of supported employment. However, two-thirds of programs using natural supports indicate they have experienced problems implementing natural support strategies. These problems overwhelmingly fall into two areas. First, employers are unwilling to implement natural support strategies recommended by the supported employment program and are "resisting" the notion that they should assume sole responsibility for the training, supervision and support of the employee with a disability. Second, local programs are having a difficult time identifying staff members with skills necessary to implement natural support strategies, as well as providing training to current staff members in the use of natural support techniques.

The development of close working relationships with employers and the availability of highly skilled staff members are important issues for all supported employment programs. The findings described above illustrate the difficulty involved in separating problems inherent within the natural support model from implementation issues that affect all types of supported employment programs, regardless of the specific support strategies or service delivery models used. Consider, for example, a local supported employment program which seems to place unreasonable expectations on the role an employer can or should play in supporting an individual in a work setting, such as demanding that the employer free up supervisors and coworkers for several hours per day for several weeks to provide training to new supported employee. This is more accurately a reflection of the overall quality of the local supported employment program, rather than an indication that natural supports may not work. Similarly, in some parts of the country, full-time employment specialists make as little as \$12,000 per year in what are considered to be essentially paraprofessional positions. In these situations, it is difficult to expect the employment specialist to be thoroughly experienced in skills such as program marketing, job carving, person centered planning, and other specialized strategies. This problem may be more a reflection of a state or agency's view of the role of employment specialists, rather than a shortcoming in the natural support model.

Impact on Service Quality

Taken in total, the perceptions of the respondents clearly illustrate the changing nature of supported employment service delivery. Natural supports have become so interwoven with all facets of supported employment implementation that it is no longer relevant to discuss the efficacy of natural supports versus the success of the job coach model of supported employment. It is no longer helpful to criticize natural support programs that place individuals into situations without providing sufficient support to enable the individual to retain employment for an extended period of time, or chastise "job coach" programs that create un-necessary employer dependence on the presence and assistance of the job coach. Instead, it is now time to focus our energies on identifying those global program characteristics that contribute to a program's ability to generate high quality, satis-fying employment outcomes for individuals, regardless of the philosophical orientation of the program.

At the level of the local supported employment program, there are really no longer "pure" natural support programs or job coach programs. In reality, most local supported employment programs use a variety of different service delivery techniques. Far more important is the recognition that some supported employment programs are far more successful than others in terms of their ability to generate high quality employment outcomes for the consumer receiving services. Understanding the factors that contribute to individuals in one supported employment earning higher wages, retaining their jobs for a longer period of time, experiencing a larger degree of integration in their work setting and expressing greater satisfaction with their job is a complex activity. It involves a close examination of the demographic and functional characteristics of the individual consumers, the characteristics of the service program, and the monetary and non-monetary outcomes experienced by the individual consumer.

While identifying these factors is a complex process, its potential contribution to state and local supported employment programs is enormous. State agencies may use this information to assess differences in employment outcomes across various agencies and provide technical assistance designed to enhance service quality. Local programs can use this information to implement self-evaluation and quality assurance procedures, as well as market their efforts to individual consumers and funding agencies. Consumers and their families can begin to use this type of information to analyze the likely outcomes of supported employment participation and choose among various service provider agencies.

The local supported employment programs participating in this study are emphasizing the use of natural supports in the design and delivery of supported employment services. The majority of these programs indicated that natural support strategies are highly effective. Natural supports are used most often in the job training and monitoring phase of supported employment. Relatively little emphasis has been placed on the use of natural supports in the consumer assessment and job development phases of the program. A small but significant percentage report problems in the implementation of natural support strategies, particularly related to the willingness of employers to participate in job training, supervision and monitoring activities at a level necessary to sustain employment.

Research is needed to determine the key elements of supported employment service delivery that most effectively allow individuals to obtain and maintain jobs of their choice. Is the agency totally committed to the delivery of integrated employment services? Have efforts been made to recruit, train and retain highly skilled, dedicated staff members? Are consumer choices and preferences the basis of service delivery and are consumers satisfied with the services they receive? Does the program market its services aggressively and make changes to program design based on feedback from consumers, family members, employers and other organizations in the community? In the end, these types of quality indicators will likely represent the factors that most accurately determine the effectiveness and success of a supported employment program.

References

- Albin, J., & Slovic, R. (1992). *Resources for long-term support in supported employment*. Eugene, OR: University of Oregon, The Employment Network.
- Bradley, V. J., Ashbaugh, J. W., & Blaney, B. C. (Eds.). (1994). *Creating individual supports for people with developmental disabilities: A mandate for change at many levels*. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.
- DeLeo, D. (1995). *The risks of misapplying natural supports in the workplace*. Supported Employment InfoLines, 6 (8), 4-5.
- Hagner, D., & Dileo, D. (1993). *Working together: Workplace culture, supported employment and persons with disabilities*. Brookline, MA: Brookline Books.
- Kiernan, W. E., Schalock, R. L., Butterworth, J., & Sailor, W. (1993). *Enhancing the use of natural supports for people with disabilities*. Boston: Children's Hospital, Training and Research Institute for People with Disabilities.
- Kregel, J. (1994). *Natural supports and the job coach: An unnecessary dichotomy*. Richmond, VA: Virginia Commonwealth University, Rehabilitation Research and Training Center.
- Kregel, J., & Wehman, P. (1989). *Supported employment: Promises deferred for persons with severe disabilities*. Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 14, 293-303.
- Mank, D., Cioffi, A., & Yovanoff, P. (1996a). *The consequences of compromise: An analysis of natural supports, features of supported employment jobs and their relationship to wage and integration outcomes* : Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Mank, D., Cioffi, A., & Yovanoff, P. (1996b). *Patterns of support for employees with severe disabilities* : Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Murphy, S., Rogan, P., & Fisher, E. (1994). *Diversity or confusion? National survey of SE natural supports*. Supported Employment InfoLines, 5(4).
- Nisbet, J. (Ed.). (1992). *Natural supports in school, at work, and in the community for people with severe disabilities*. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.
- Nisbet, J., & Hagner, D. (1987). *Natural supports in the workplace: A reexamination of supported employment*. Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 13, 260-267.
- Parent, W., Unger, D., Gibson, K., & Clements, C. (1994). *The role of the job coach: Orchestrating community and workplace supports*. American Rehabilitation, 20(3), 2-11.
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Rheinheimer, G. B., VanCovern, D., Green, H., Revell, G., & Inge, K. J. (1993). *Finding the common denominator: A supported employment guide to long-term funding supports and services for people with severe disabilities*. Richmond, VA: Virginia Commonwealth University, Rehabilitation Research and Training Center on Supported

Employment.

Rogan, P., Hagner, D., & Murphy, S. (1993). *Natural supports: Reconceptualizing job coach roles*. Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 18, 275-281.

Test, D. W., & Wood, W. M. (1996). *Natural supports in the workplace: The jury is still out*. Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 21, 155-173.

Wehman, P. (1993). *Natural supports: More questions than answers?* Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation, 3, 1-3.

Wehman, P., Revell, G., & Kregel, J. (1997). *Supported employment: A decade of growth and impact*. Richmond, VA: Virginia Commonwealth University, Rehabilitation Research and Training Center on Supported Employment.

West, M. (1992). *Job retention: Toward vocational competence, self-management, and natural supports*. In P. Wehman, P. Sale, & W. Parent (Eds.), Supported employment: Strategies for integration of workers with disabilities (pp. 176-203). Stoneham, MA: Andover Medical Publishers.

West, M., & Parent, W. S. (1995). *Community and workplace supports for individuals with severe mental illness in supported employment*. Psychosocial Rehabilitation Journal, 18(4), 13-24.

West, M., Revell, W. G., & Wehman, P. (1992). *Achievements and challenges I: A five-year report on consumer and system outcomes from the supported employment initiative*. Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 17, 227-235.