

**JOB SATISFACTION IN SUPPORTED EMPLOYMENT:
CURRENT KNOWLEDGE AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS**

Marjo-Riitta Liimatainen

Master's thesis

January 2001

Department of Special Education

Jyväskylä University

ABSTRACT

Liimatainen, M.R. 2001. Job satisfaction in supported employment: current knowledge and future directions. Department of Special Education, Faculty of Education, Jyväskylä University.

Based on a review of all (seven) empirical studies on job satisfaction of people with disabilities in supported employment found in the employment literature from 1986 to 2000, I classified measures that have been used to assess job satisfaction of people with disabilities, evaluated the process of assessing job satisfaction of people with disabilities and aggregated findings that describe the job satisfaction of people with disabilities. Findings were analysed in the light of theories on job satisfaction of non-disabled employees. The majority of the studies looked at satisfaction with various facets of the work that I grouped into four broader categories, namely work itself, rewards, context and others, overall job satisfaction and the indices of job satisfaction. All the studies highlighted the importance of looking at job satisfaction as an outcome of supported employment and asking people with disabilities themselves about their satisfaction with their work in order to develop the supported employment model towards more customer-driven approach. People with disabilities in supported employment were very satisfied with their jobs, and reported higher levels of job satisfaction and higher self-esteem than those in sheltered workshops. It also seemed that competitive employment produces the same level of satisfaction for people with disabilities and non-disabled workers. Despite the fact that people with disabilities were found to be very satisfied with their jobs and various features of their jobs, the findings revealed important points that have to be taken into account both in research and practice.

TABLE OF CONTENT

INTRODUCTION.....	3
1 SUPPORTED EMPLOYMENT.....	6
1.1 Definition of supported employment.....	6
2 JOB SATISFACTION	8
2.1 Approaches to job satisfaction	8
2.2 What produces job satisfaction?.....	9
2.2.1 Work itself.....	11
2.2.1 Rewards.....	12
2.2.3 Context.....	13
2.2.4 Others.....	14
2.2.5 Individual factors and job satisfaction.....	15
2.3 Assessing job satisfaction	18
2.3.1. How to measure job satisfaction?.....	18
2.3.2 Assessing job satisfaction of people with disabilities.....	19
3 METHOD	22
3.1 Design of the literature review.....	22
3.2 Search procedure.....	22
3.3 Analysis procedure.....	24
4 RESULTS.....	26
4.1 Demographic variables.....	26
4.2 The research methods used to assess job satisfaction.....	32

4.3 Assessed measures of job satisfaction.....	33
4.4 Patterns of job satisfaction.....	35
4.4.1 Job satisfaction in supported employment.....	35
4.4.2 Satisfaction with work itself.....	36
4.4.3 Satisfaction with rewards.....	37
4.4.4 Satisfaction with context.....	38
4.4.5 Satisfaction with others.....	38
4.4.6 Individual factors and job satisfaction	39
DISCUSSION.....	41
REFERENCES.....	50

INTRODUCTION

Supported employment appears to be a successful employment model providing growing numbers of people with disabilities an entry point to the open labour markets, with carefully documented positive employment outcomes. (Revell, Kregel, Wheman and Bond, 2000). In terms of wages, supported employment has dramatically increased the earning power of people with disabilities and generates wages superior to those created by segregated employment options. As Kregel's and Wehman's (1997) analysis shows, virtually every cost-benefit analysis conducted prior to 1997 indicated that supported employment significantly improved individual's economic self-sufficiency. Supported employment also costs less than adult day programmes, and thus generates savings for taxpayers, too. The taxpayer benefit-cost analyses have, however, not been consistent in their results, but still tend to support the cost-effectiveness of supported employment (Wehman, West and Kregel 1999). Specifically, many studies have shown that the cost-efficiency of supported employment programmes increases with each year of operation, and that supported employment becomes cost-efficient for tax-payers around the fourth year of operation. (Kregel, Wheman, Revell, Hill and Cimeria 2000).

In addition to earnings, job tenure, that is the length of time an individual remains at one job, is a commonly used measure of successful employment outcomes for people with disabilities. It is assumed that a good job lasts for a long time and reasonable pay attracts employees. While the number of people with disabilities unable to maintain long-term employment generally tends to remain high, supported employment has succeeded in providing long-term employment. Approximately two-thirds to three-

fourths of supported employment participants in the USA retain their jobs for at least one year after the initial placement, and half remain employed three years after the placement (Kregel and Wehman 1997).

It is obvious that supported employment has, in many respects, been able to generate outcomes that are superior to other employment models for people with disabilities from the disabled person's as well as the taxpayer's point of view (Wehman, West and Kregel 1999). However, are the quantitative outcomes the most relevant way of measuring the success of supported employment? As Fabian (1992) points out, the less frequently reported qualitative outcomes such as life satisfaction or job satisfaction associated with participation in supported employment are equally important. As an increasing number of people with disabilities are working in supported employment, it is indeed important to consider the type of environment they are moving into and how disabled people themselves feel about the jobs that are found for them. Regardless of the extensive interest in quantifiable outcomes of supported employment and even more extensive interest in non-disabled workers' job satisfaction, the issue of job satisfaction as an outcome of employment of people with disabilities and the actual work experience of workers with disabilities have remained relatively under researched. (Kregel 1997; Fabian 1992; Moseley 1988; McAfee 1986).

In this study I reviewed the current knowledge base on job satisfaction in supported employment by looking at empirical studies conducted on the theme since the first supported employment programmes in the eighties. I consider this important for a number of reasons. First, by identifying and assessing common variables across the studies and aggregating findings one can evaluate what the critical elements of job satisfaction in supported employment are. Assessment of how employees feel about their jobs and how they react to various aspects of the jobs is important in order to evaluate what kind of support is needed and to what extent job satisfaction contributes to the success of employment tenure. Second, the possible reasons for lack of satisfaction could be analysed to further develop and improve the supported employment model. Third, the identified variables of job satisfaction in supported employment could be used to evaluate progress and outcomes of supported employment as well as to determine future programmes and policy efforts.

What is a good job for a person with a disability who might be entering the world of work for the first time and whose abilities and skills may be most suited for those

unskilled jobs that seem to offer little satisfaction? What makes a person with a disability happy at work? What is the purpose of his or her employment? To work in an integrated setting and earn a decent salary, or just simply to gain a meaningful experience? Is it the nature of the workers abilities, or the characteristics of the tasks that determine how satisfactory a job is? These questions are guiding this review of empirical studies from 1986 to 2000 on job satisfaction of workers with disabilities in supported employment.

1 SUPPORTED EMPLOYMENT

1.1 Definition of supported employment

Supported employment started in the United States through the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act of 1984 and the Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1987, though its history dates back well into the 1970s (Barbour 1999). The concept of supported employment refers to a work environment where an employee with a disability is paid a fair wage for full- or part-time work in a normal work setting, is provided ongoing support to help him or her keep the job on an as-needed basis and his/her co-workers are predominantly without disabilities (Schalock & Kiernan 1997: 5). The support is given by a job coach who assists in finding a job and then training and supervising the person at the workplace. Initially, supported employment programmes served primarily people with mild or moderate disabilities, but in recent years they have evolved to also serve people with mental illness, helping them to find and maintain a job in a mainstream environment in competitive employment (Wehman, Revell & Kregel 1998). If not provided with the option of supported employment, these people would often work in sheltered workshops. (Kregel 1997.)

In the United States supported employment has maintained a steady rate of growth offering many individuals with disabilities real jobs with improved incomes in their local communities (Wehman, West and Kregel 1999; Kregel 1997.) The model of supported employment has spread from the United States to other countries, each country steering the model according to its national conditions and needs. For

instance, in Norway supported employment refers to job coach services that are offered only for a maximum of three years and in New Zealand the supported employment programmes provide salary subsidies for a period of two years (see Saloviita 2000).

2 JOB SATISFACTION

2.1 Approaches to Job Satisfaction

What does job satisfaction mean in practice? Simply, it can be defined as how people feel about their jobs and different aspects of their jobs or as the extent to which people like or dislike their jobs. Job satisfaction is also associated with the extent to which individual's job related needs are met at the job. (Spector 1997.) Locke (1983: 1300) defines job satisfaction, drawing various theories on job satisfaction, 'as a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experience'. Moseley (1988) points out that worker's job satisfaction involves the match between the characteristics of the job and his or her personal and social needs, feelings of usefulness, significance and worth, and expectations for working experience.

Job satisfaction can be approached from the humanitarian perspective to the work life: people deserve to be treated fairly and with respect; to some extent job satisfaction is a reflection of good treatment in the workplace and a strong indicator of a worker's emotional well-being and psychological health (Spector 1997, Clark 1996). Job satisfaction can also be looked at from the utilitarian perspective: often job satisfaction studies are driven by a desire to increase productivity and efficiency in the workplace as well as to reduce absenteeism. Satisfied employees are more likely to behave in a way that affects an organisation' functioning positively.

Also such desirable behaviour that may go beyond the formal requirements of the workplace, like being punctual, helping others, making suggestions to improve situations, not wasting time at work can all be results of employees being satisfied with their work. In turn, dissatisfaction with work may lead to less desirable behaviour at the workplace (Spector 1997). For example, the link between the level of job satisfaction and turnover has been established, and the studies have been

reasonably consistent in their results (Spector 1997). Taking this into account when deciding on job placement for a person with a disability can significantly increase the potential of success of employment. Xie, Dain, Becker and Drake (1997) show in their study on job tenure among persons with severe mental illness that job satisfaction, and in particular the first positive perceptions of the work environment, predict longer job tenure. Also in Reiter's, Luba's and Freeman's (1985) study on job satisfaction of mentally retarded adults working in a residential facility, absenteeism was significantly correlated with work dissatisfaction. By evaluating and improving the work environment, and by increasing employee's skills to adapt to stressful situations in the workplace employers may increase employees' job satisfaction and improve job tenure and reduce absenteeism (Xie, Dain, Becker and Drake 1997).

2.2 What produces job satisfaction?

'job satisfaction results from the appraisal of one's job as attaining or allowing the attainment of one's important values, providing these values are congruent with or help to fulfil one's basic needs. These needs are two separable but interdependent types: bodily or physical needs and psychological needs, especially the need for growth. Growth is made possible mainly by the nature of work itself.'

(Locke 1983: 1319)

Job satisfaction can be considered as a global feeling about one's job or as a constellation of attitudes about various aspects or facets of the job. Global job satisfaction is an overall assessment of all the satisfactions associated with the job and the global approach to job satisfaction is normally utilized when the general attitude of an employee is of interest, or if one is in the process of determining the effects of job satisfaction or job dissatisfaction. The facet approach is most commonly used to find out which parts of a job produce satisfaction and dissatisfaction and what employees' attitudes towards various aspects of the job are. (Spector 1997; Taber and Alliger 1995). This approach is useful for organizations to identify areas in which they can introduce changes to improve employees' job satisfaction. Table 1 introduces the facets that can most commonly be found in the

measurements of job satisfaction (Spector 1997).

Table 1. Common job satisfaction facets.

Common job satisfaction facets:	
Appreciation	Supervision
Communication	Pay
Co-workers	Personal Growth
Fringe benefits	Promotion Opportunities
Job conditions	Recognition
The work itself	Security
Organization	Organization's policies
itself	and procedures

Employees can differ in their satisfaction across the facets, and there are individual differences within the meaning and value an individual attaches to the various facets of job satisfaction. S/he may, for instance, like the co-workers but dislike the pay. In addition the facets are seen to be only modestly correlated to one another. This suggests that employees do not have a global feeling about their job that would produce the same level of satisfaction with every job aspect but that they have distinctively different feelings about the various facets of their jobs. (Spector 1997)

The facets can also be looked at from the viewpoint of whether they are of intrinsic or extrinsic value for the employee. The intrinsic factors at the workplace, so called motivators, relate to the content of the work and stem from the individual's needs for self-realization and psychological growth. Behaviour is intrinsically motivated and the person performs the task for internal rewards, such as interest or mastery. Thus, satisfaction with the facet 'work itself' is particularly important as it concerns the intrinsic features of the job, such as variety, interest, challenge, status, flow and autonomy in the job (Taber and Alliger 1995). The extrinsic factors, called hygiene factors, are often perceived to be beyond individuals' control, and thus perceived as extrinsic. The task or job is performed because it is not interesting itself but rather for an external reward (e.g. pay or recognition), or to comply with an external constraint. (Deci and Ryan 1985; Locke 1983). However, often extrinsic and intrinsic factors are interconnected and one contributes to another. There may also be individuals who have, through their life and work experience, learned to react to hygiene factors such as appraisal or recognition, and have consequently become hygiene-seekers, that is they are constantly seeking an external reward.

Many studies have tried to determine the underlying structure of job satisfaction facets and reduce large number of facets to underlying dimensions of job satisfaction (Spector 1997). Locke (1983) approaches the facets by looking at them from two different levels, namely from the perspective of *events* or *conditions* at the workplace (work itself, pay, promotion, recognition, benefits, working conditions etc.) or that of *agents* (supervisors, co-workers, management). *Events* or *conditions* are ultimately caused by an *agent*, that is somebody or something. Thus, Locke encourages the study of the role of *events*, *condition* and *agents* in job satisfaction not only separately, but also as interacting factors contributing to job satisfaction. Furthermore, *events* and *conditions* can be categorized into three broader classes that are *work*, *rewards* and *context*. *Agents*, in turn, can be classified into two categories, namely *others*, including supervisors, co-workers and the management and *the person him/herself*.

2.2.1 Work itself

Work attributes that have been found to enhance interest and satisfaction with one's job include ability to use skills, opportunity for new learning, creativity, variety, difficulty, amount of work, responsibility, non-arbitrary pressure for performance, control over work methods and pace (autonomy), job enrichment (responsibility and control) and complexity. For instance, numerous studies have shown that job satisfaction increases with the task complexity. While the various work attributes are conceptually distinguishable from each other, they all share one element in common - the element of mental challenge. In the absence of mental challenge, a person often experiences boredom. An adequate level of challenge that involves the employee and allows for the experience of improvement, progress, achievement and success is essential in terms of job satisfaction. Furthermore, an important precondition for job satisfaction is that the employee finds the work itself interesting and likes it for its own sake. (Locke 1983; Spector 1997).

In the absence of research on job satisfaction of people with disabilities a number of assumptions regarding the type of employment that would be best suited to their abilities appear to be based on conjecture (Moseley 1988). Workers with disabilities are often believed to be successful in low level and repetitive jobs that are often characterised with high turnover and thus a high vacancy rate. As high turnover is related to low job satisfaction it is questionable to place workers with disabilities, who

have considerable need for support even in the best of circumstances, into these positions. For example, it has been suggested that workers with mental disabilities enjoy and find challenge, by virtue of their disability, in performing routine and repetitive tasks that nondisabled workers find boring. However, research by Brown, Shiraga, York, Kessler, Strohm, Rogin, Sweet, Zanella and Van Deventer (1984) shows the contrary: workers with mental retardation perform best in an environment allowing them to do various meaningful tasks during their working hours.

In the study of Reiter, Luba and Freeman (1985) the externally mediated factors, such as supervision and working conditions seemed to have more value for adults with mental retardation than internally mediated factors, such as interest in the work itself. However, as the authors point out, there was no relationship found between the vocational interest of the participants and the actual work done. This could explain the low relevance of the work itself for these people. This finding was further strengthened by a significant positive correlation found between intrinsic factors such as achievement, interest, responsibility, recognition and those activities these people were involved with in their free time, but which were not considered as work, for instance handicraft. In this study those who claimed more dissatisfaction with their work valued more the extrinsic attributes of their jobs, such as supervision and working conditions.

As many supported employment placements do involve repetitive tasks in unskilled or semiskilled categories that tend to allow few possibilities for control and to experience completion, it is important to consider options that would allow seeing the results of the efforts, give a sense of completing a task rather than work on an assembly line and offer regular feedback on the results and at least some control over the content of the work. As Moseley concludes (1988: 215) “the need of the worker with disabilities for complexity on a job is really no different than it is for the non-handicapped worker”.

2.2.2 Rewards

Rewards include fair pay, promotion opportunities and verbal recognition. The amount of pay plays a complex role in the satisfaction derived from a job. For some the nature of the job offers the primary satisfaction, whereas for others the pay offers possibilities

to look for satisfaction somewhere else by purchasing comforts and pleasures. Money can also be interpreted as a sign of respect and recognition. (Spencer 1997; Moseley 1988). Locke (1983) points out the importance of fairness of justice in the distribution of rewards. He states (1983: 1322) that "it is clear that individuals who believe they are inequitable paid are dissatisfied with their pay". The concept of fairness and justice concerns also promotion, the desire for which, however, may ultimately be rooted in the desire for psychological growth, higher earnings or social status.

The equitable and commensurate payment for the work is one of the most important aspects of supported employment. There have, however, been some arguments concerning the importance given to equal pay, on one hand, and on integration, on the other, in the hierarchy of needs in the vocational training of people with disabilities (Moseley 1988). Those who argue for better pay point out that the amount of wages does not only affect persons' self-respect but also enable him or her to go into the community and purchase services and goods in a normal fashion (Wehman & Moon 1985). In a study on the role of wages in the job satisfaction of workers with disabilities in supported employment the pay turned out to be an important factor but did not necessarily overcome dissatisfaction with the job. For these workers work derived its' meaning from the possibilities to take charge of the activities and perform. Moseley (1988) concludes that the issue of pay needs to be given attention in supported employment, but not at the expense of the nature of the work. The concept of fairness is important - an increase in the production or better quality of work should be rewarded by an increase in pay.

In addition rewards such as praise and verbal recognition, which also relate to supervision are important to virtually every employee. Locke found (see Locke 1983) in his studies on job satisfaction that recognition was one of the single most frequently mentioned events causing job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. In addition, verbal recognition plays an important role in providing feedback concerning the competence of one's work performance. Recognition is often also related to the need to build positive self-esteem or a positive self-concept. It is clear that many people seek the approval of significant others in an attempt to gain self-esteem. (Locke 1983.) This may be true in particular in the case of workers with disabilities.

2.2.3 Context

Context refers to physical and psychosocial working conditions and benefits, all aspects

of which cannot be discussed here in detail. Temperature, humidity, lighting, noise, adequate tools and equipment, buildings, safety, cleanliness, location of the workplace, hours of work, pauses, workplace conflicts, discrimination, harassment or violence at the workplace and pace of work are all examples of factors that constitute the working conditions. The basic need underlying employee's preference for pleasant working conditions is the desire for comfort and conditions that facilitate the attainment of his or her goals related to the work itself. Often physical working conditions are taken for granted unless they are very poor or extremely good. (Locke 1983.)

A frequently cited reason for a placement failure is the inability of the worker with disabilities to adjust to the work environment (Moseley 1988). Both workers with disabilities and they non-disabled co-workers may need assistance in adjusting to the new social situation when a worker in a supported employment programme enters into a regular work setting. (Moseley 1988.) Every workplace has a culture of its own, including the unofficial code of rules and ethics that set the range for acceptable behaviour. This code of rules is also tightly linked to the unofficial reward mechanism which bridges the gap from the official reward mechanism to the range of required activities. An employee with a disability may follow the official set of rules while his or her co-workers are following another set of rules. This may lead to a situation in which the employee with a disability may become excluded and prevented from becoming accepted in the social groups at the workplace. On the other hand, if a person starts to follow the unofficial set of rules, it is unclear whether s/he will be able to differentiate between the occasions when this is appropriate and when not.

2.2.4 Others

Others refer firstly, to co-workers, including their friendliness, helpfulness and competence, secondly, to supervision, including supervisory style and influence, technical supervision, human relations and administrative skills etc. and thirdly, to management in terms of the overall concern for the employee as well as the company policies with regard to for instance pay, promotion and benefits. Teamwork and working with others to accomplish a common goal are important aspects of job satisfaction. (Locke 1983.) Job satisfaction has been shown to increase with the degree to which employees believe that they are a part of a team working to

accomplish a common assignment. (Moseley 1988.)

Relationships at work can stem from a professional basis and be functional of their nature - that is, the person is valued for what s/he can do for the others. Thus, the bond is between services the employees can provide, rather than between the individuals. Relationships at work can also be based on friendship and a mutual liking of an other person. Both these types of relationships exist between co-workers as well as between supervisors and subordinates. In many jobs, in particularly those that require less skill and ability, the social features of the work and the bonds between various agents at the workplace become a very important aspect of employee's satisfaction. (Locke 1983.) With respect to supported employment, one of its' main aims and benefits is the opportunity to participate in the social networks in the work settings at both professional and friendship level, and to interact regularly with co-workers. (Kregel and Wehman, 1997.)

With respect to management, the organisation has more ultimate control over the employee than the supervisor in the end, as it can determine the workload, the degree of responsibilities, the rate of pay and the physical conditions of work. An important feature of organizational policies is the clarity of the roles the employees are assigned to. (Locke 1983.) Role ambiguity and role conflict can negatively affect the employee's level of job satisfaction. Role ambiguity refers to unclear tasks whereas role conflict in the workplace can mean, for instance, differing instructions from two supervisors (intra-role) or conflict between one's role at home and at work (extra-role). It has been shown that conflict between work- and family-roles correlates significantly with the level of job satisfaction. (Spector 1997.)

2.2.5 Individual factors and job satisfaction

In addition to the above explained job satisfaction facet clusters, namely work itself, rewards, context and other people, the level of job satisfaction is affected by personal attributes and worker's personality (Spector 1997, Clark 1996.) Some research has shown that job satisfaction remains relatively stable in people who have changed

jobs. This suggests that job satisfaction is caused by personality rather than the different features of the job. In turn it seems likely that not everybody responds favourably to jobs that in principle should be satisfactory with satisfactory conditions.

First of all, work carries different value to different people, and people react differently in satisfying and dissatisfying conditions. Dissatisfaction with one's job or tasks can lead some people to give an increased emphasis on leisure activities and social aspects of the work in a search for more stimulating and pleasing activities. Some people may prefer to change their job even though they report high job satisfaction whereas others may stay for a long time in conditions that they find unsatisfactory. It is also likely that a person may enjoy one aspect of his/her work and dislike another, and the strength of these feeling may vary daily. In addition, a person's tendency to experience negative emotions, gender, health, age and marital status all affect the experience of job satisfaction. (Spector 1997; Siegel and Gaylord-Ross 1991.)

Women, for instance, are found to be more often satisfied with their jobs than men. This can be due to the type of work they are most often involved in or differences in values. In Clark's study (1997) men were more concerned with the extrinsic aspects of work, such as pay and promotion, whereas women were more likely to value intrinsic returns to work, for instance the work itself, hours of work and good relations which are more important factors in terms of job satisfaction. Regarding work values, those who indicated pay and promotion opportunities to be the most important aspects of their work were the least satisfied whereas those who valued most the relations at work and the hours of work reported higher levels of job satisfaction (Clark 1996). However, Clark (1997) suggest that women's higher level of job satisfactions is strongly related to their lower expectations with regard to their situation in the labour markets (Clark 1996). Those who expect less from work will be more satisfied with any given job. Lower expectations in turn reflect the poorer working conditions and jobs that women have held and been used to in the past. This would suggest that women's high satisfaction with their jobs is a transitory phenomenon, and caused by women's improving situation in the labour market. Once

the women's labour market situation stops improving, or improves with the same rate as that of men, women's job satisfaction should be identical to that of men's.

A significant correlation between age and job satisfaction is apparent in the research. For instance, a meta-analysis of research on age and job satisfaction by Brush, Monch and Pooyan (1987) showed that job satisfaction tended to increase with age. This can be related to the facts that expectations change over time, and older workers often have better jobs and more developed skills. Also Clark's (1996) findings amongst the British labour force point to the same; those in their twenties or thirties were the least satisfied, and those in their sixties or fifties the most satisfied. Employees' physical and psychological well-being as well as more general satisfaction with life are also related to job satisfaction. Those reporting good physical health tend to be more satisfied with their jobs and those who are married report the highest overall job satisfaction of all groups (Clark 1996).

Research both on the non-disabled population and people with disabilities highlights the independence of work and non-work domains even if work occupies a central position in people's lives. As Fabian (1992) points out, competitive employment is not always a panacea for individuals with disabilities in terms of their overall quality of life. Rather, it is one aspect of the overall quality of life. Employees are influenced by events and situations outside of their workplaces, which may affect their job satisfaction, and conversely, behaviour and feeling about various arenas of life outside work are influenced by experiences at work. According to Fabian's (1992) study a person with disability changing from sheltered employment to supported employment may experience such stresses and losses related to the changes in work, daily structure and social networks during the initial job transition that his or her perceived quality of life may decrease. These experienced losses may even outweigh the gains experienced as a result of employment, and potentially lead to dissatisfaction with the job and even a job loss.

Siegel and Gaylord-Ross (1991) show in their study on factors associated to employment success of youth with disabilities that job match is significantly related to

employment success whereas issues such as work rationalization and support services play a small role. They argue for the importance of vocational assessments that can better place individuals in appropriate jobs, suggest accommodations and tailor the type and intensity of services needed to maintain employment. They conclude by saying that a job match between the individual characteristics and job demands is critical in designing supported employment.

2.3 Assessing job satisfaction

2.3.1. How to measure job satisfaction?

Job satisfaction is usually measured with interviews or, most often, with questionnaires. As Spector (1997) points out, the easiest way to assess job satisfaction is to use some of the several existing scales, such as Job Descriptive Index (JDI)¹, the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ)² and the Job Diagnostic Survey (JDQ)³, the reliability and validity of which has been tested. Reliability in job satisfaction research refers to the consistency in measurement. The measurement is reliable if the job satisfaction of a certain employee is repeatedly measured and the level of job satisfaction remains the same - assuming that his/her level of job satisfaction does not actually change. Validity refers to what the scales actually measure. (Spector 1997). Locke (1983) points out that validation is a major problem when measuring a job attitude as it is with a measurement of any mental state. He introduces the concept of 'logical validation'. He (1983: 1337) explains "for a measurement to have logical validity, it must be integrated in non-contradictory fashion with all pertinent information relevant to the phenomenon being measured".

¹ The JDI by Smith, Kendal and Hulin (1969) is one of the most carefully developed and validated as well as popular facet scale among organizational researchers. The scale assesses five facets: work, pay, promotion, supervision and coworkers.

² MSQ by Weiss D.J., Davis R.V., England, G.W & Lofquist, L.H (1967) is another commonly used facet scale among researchers. It is more specific than other scales, covering 20 facets divided into two subscales, intrinsic and extrinsic ones. Extrinsic scale refers to those aspects of work that have little to do with the job tasks or work itself, such as pay. Intrinsic satisfaction concerns the nature of the work and how people feel about their work.

³ JDS by Hackman & Oldham (1975) was developed to study the effects of a job on people. It contains subscales that measure the nature of job and job tasks, motivation, personality and

While using the existing scales to measure job satisfaction has many advantages (reliability and validity tested – yet Locke’s remark of logical validation remains relevant, it saves time and money necessary to develop a new scale etc.), it also carries certain disadvantages. The existing scales will not include more specific areas of satisfaction or dissatisfaction that could be of interest to a particular organization. (Spector 1997.) These could include satisfaction with particular policies, events, individuals or health insurance - all issues that need to be given attention while studying job satisfaction of people with disabilities in supported employment.

2.3.2 Assessing the job satisfaction of people with disabilities

Methods of determining the job satisfaction of workers with disabilities must be able to describe the meaning of events from the viewpoint of the person with a disability and be responsive to the subjective nature of the experience. Moseley (1988) recommends the utilisation of qualitative research techniques such as participant observation, in-depth interviews, ethnography and review of case history information in order for the researcher to understand how individuals perceive their work and what meanings they attach to their job. The aim is to describe what the research subjects do, and the meaning they make of it and to come to understand the experience from the perspective of the individual involved. Qualitative measures are labour-intensive, as the researcher has to spend substantial time in the environment under study in order to gain informants' trust and to understand their lives.

Language, written or oral, plays a central role in qualitative research, as the emphasis lies on symbolic understanding and communication. This raises questions about how methods, such as in-depth interviews, can be adopted to study people with disabilities whose communication skills may be limited. Biklen and Moseley (1988) point out several problems and issues that should be taken into account in the preparations of

interviews and while interviewing people with disabilities. First, misunderstandings between the interviewer and the interviewee are common. It is often difficult to establish mutual understanding, find a common language and understand the concepts the other one uses. Open-ended questions might be too confusing for disabled respondents, and thus should be avoided and a structured interview approach is recommendable. Respondents may try to use the same phrase over and over again in response to different questions or the respondent may try to answer what s/he expects the researcher wants to hear. It is also essential to find an environment where the informant feels comfortable. Interviewing significant others, the important people in the lives of informants, may provide further information but it has certain advantages as well as disadvantages. Significant others may provide new aspects and help to overcome some language related problems, but they may also filter the information.

However, it is possible to study a situation from a perspective of person with a disability nonverbally, by observing. Observations can help to get unfiltered responses and further verify information gathered in interviews. In addition, researchers who interview people with disabilities often point out that observation is an important part of the interviewing process. (Biklen and Moseley 1998; Moseley 1998.) With regard to observations, Biklen and Moseley (1998) point out that they should be carried out over a period of time in varied settings as the informants may behave very differently in different settings. Spending time with respondents in their natural environment prior to observations is important: it is a way to get to know the respondent. Involving significant others in observational study may also be useful: it is important to compare official notes about informant's life with people familiar to the informant.

In addition to the factors related to conducting research with participants who are disabled, there are other issues that Moseley (1998) recommends to be taken into consideration when specifically studying job satisfaction of people with disabilities. Firstly, to be satisfied with something implies a comparison with something else, some other experience that is either more or less desirable than the current one. People with

disabilities are likely to have limited work experience and thus not be able to compare their current work experience and level of satisfaction with previous experiences. For instance, according to Turner (1984) people in sheltered workshops were content with their jobs and not willing to move to less restrictive environment whereas Selzer (1984) shows that individuals who previously worked in sheltered workshops were not willing to move back there once in competitive employment. Secondly, the context in which the person is talking has to be kept in mind. A person with a background in a structured environment may try to please by their answers to questions concerning their satisfaction. It is not clear how people with disabilities, who may not have any experience of the world work and who may have lived some parts if not their whole life cut off from the mainstream society actually relate to and identify with their jobs.

3 METHOD

3.1 Design of the Literature Review

Designing this review of studies involved selecting empirical studies on job satisfaction in supported employment. Recognising that there are studies that measure the outcomes of supported employment not only in terms of previously discussed quantitative terms, but also in social integration, communication or quality of life, it was the intent of this review to include studies that specifically focus on job satisfaction as an outcome of a supported employment. Based on these studies, my purpose was to

- identify measures that are used to assess job satisfaction of people with disabilities in supported employment, and critically evaluate their appropriateness for their outlined purpose;
- aggregate findings that describe job satisfaction in supported employment and to compare these findings with the theories on job satisfaction among non-disabled employees; and
- evaluate the current knowledge base on job satisfaction among people with disabilities in supported employment.

3.2 Search Procedure

The decision-making process in selecting the studies for the review was based on the following selection criteria:

- a) the study utilised subjective assessment methods (interview) to assess job satisfaction;
- b) the target population of the study was either adults or adolescents with disabilities / and non-disabled co-workers;
- c) the study was conducted in a physically integrated work setting and fulfilled the criteria of supported employment; and
- d) the study was published in a refereed journal.

To minimize possible bias in the selection process and to secure the most representative pool of studies, I used multiple methods to identify the studies that met the selection criteria. Finding the studies began with a computer search of the Educational Resources Information Center ERIC⁴, PsychLit⁵ and ProQuest⁶ Databases for references from the early days of supported employment to the beginning of this year, that is from 1986 to 2000. Selected search terms and descriptors such as supported employment, job satisfaction, people with disabilities, meaning of work, quality of life, well-being, life satisfaction, consumer satisfaction, work environment, programme effectiveness, work preference, employee attitudes, work attitudes and social integration were used. To illustrate the rarity of the studies on this theme, the search of ERIC with the descriptor 'job satisfaction' resulted in 2444 hits, but once the descriptor 'job satisfaction' was limited with the descriptor 'supported employment', the result went down to 16 hits.

Next, I manually reviewed the journals *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation and Education and Training in Mental Retardation*. It would have perhaps been beneficial to review manually more journals, but this was not possible due to time constraints. In addition, the Central Library of the International Labour Office⁷ performed a

⁴ ERIC is the world's largest source of education information, with more than 1 million abstracts of documents and journal articles on education research and practice. See <http://askeric.org/Eric/>

⁵ PSYCLIT covers the professional and academic field of psychology and related disciplines including medicine, psychiatry, nursing, sociology, education, pharmacology, physiology, linguistics, and other areas worldwide from 1887. See <http://milton.mse.jhu.edu/dbases/psychlit.html>

⁶ ProQuest is Bell & Howell Information and Learning's online information service providing summaries of articles from over 8,000 publications, with many in full text. See <http://www.umi.com/proquest/>

⁷ ILO Central Library located in Geneva, Switzerland, is the world's leading library in the field of labour and labour issues. The Library's collections include books, periodicals, reports, journal articles, legislation and statistics covering labour relations, employment, child labour, social security,

search on the above mentioned descriptors. Finally, I performed an ancestral search of the reference lists from the articles identified by the process described above in order to identify additional resources.

An initial pool of some 16 articles resulting from the search process was identified. All the identified articles were reviewed to determine which ones met the selection criteria described above. Finally, I selected a total of seven articles for the review. One of the selected articles did not define the type of employment very clearly, but described the work-setting 'integrated' (Nisbet and York 1989) and was therefore included in this review. Some of the studies identified during the search procedure were not included in the review because they for instance studied job satisfaction in a more restricted work environment than supported employment (e.g. Conte, Murphy and Nisbet 1989), or they mainly focussed on the quality of life or life satisfaction (e.g. Sinnott-Oswald, Gliner and Spencor 1991; Inge, Banks, Wehman, Hill and Shafer 1988) or they were not empirical study reports (Moseley 1988 and McAfee 1986). Nonetheless, all these articles provided valuable information for this review.

3.3 Analysis Procedure

The studies were initially analysed to identify firstly, demographic variables used (participant characteristics and workplace settings), secondly, the methods used to assess job satisfaction and thirdly, the facets of job satisfaction assessed in those studies that stemmed from the facet - approach. Five of the seven studies stemmed from the facet-approach to job satisfaction; that is, they were concerned with satisfaction with various aspects of the jobs. (Jiranek and Kirby 1990; Lam 1986; Melchiori and Church 1997; Parent and Kregel 1993; Test, Bond, Solow and Keul 1993). One of the studies approached job satisfaction as a global feeling in relationship to self-esteem (Griffin, Rosenberg, Cheney and Greenberg 1996) and one focused on examining the indices of job satisfactions (Nisbet and York 1989). Subsequently, I aggregated and compared findings related to job satisfaction in supported

employment by utilising Locke's grouping of job facets to structure the analysis with respect to those studies that used the facet-approach. One of the studies (Lam 1986) did not give detailed information about the results with respect to various facets of job satisfaction that it looked at. In addition, the results of those two studies that looked at job satisfaction from a different perspective were analysed.

4 RESULTS

4.1 Demographic variables

Mainly, the participants of the studies were young adults in their late twenties or early thirties, though some younger and older ones were included in the studies. It was not possible to calculate the mean age of the participants due to varying information given in the studies, which is presented study by study in Table 2.

Table 2. Age of the participants.

Age of the participants in the studies (N: 613)	
Griffin David K. & Rosenberg H, Cheyney W & Greenberg, B. 1996.	The participants (N= 200) were aged between 21 and 40.
Jiranek, D. and Kirby, N. 1990.	73 participants, aged between 20 - 25.
Lam C. S. 1986.	First group of participants employed in sheltered workshops (N=50), mean age 35. Second group of participants (N=50), employed in supported employment, mean age 28.
Melchiori, L. G. & Church, A.T. 1997	First group of participants employed in supported employment (N=45), mean age 32. Second group of participants, coworkers, (N=45) mean age 36.5.
Nisbet, J. and York, P. 1989	Six participants, aged between 20 and 21.
Parent, W & Kregel, J. 1996.	The mean age of the group of 110 participants: 32 years.
Test, D.W, Bond Hinson, K, Solow, J. & Keul, P. 1993.	34 participants of whom 1 participant aged 18 – 19; 28 participants aged 20 –30; 4 participants aged 31 – 40; 1 participant aged 41 – 50.

The other participant characteristics, namely gender and type of disability, are summarised in Table 3. Two of the studies did not give gender specific information. Of the total of 613 participants, 539 (88%) had disabilities, two of studies having included a comparison group without disabilities. Majority of those with disabilities (n= 332, 61.6 %) were persons with mild or borderline disability.

Table 3. Demographic Information

Participants						
Variables:	With Disabilities		Without Disabilities		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Gender						
Male	278	45.3	38	6.2	316	51.5
Female	155	25.3	36	5.9	191	31.2
Not identified	106	17.3			106	17.3
					613	100
Disability						
Bl/Mild MR	332	61.6				
Mod/Sev. MR	68	12.6				
MR (no level specified)	52	9.6				
CP	37	6.9				
DownSyndrome/ TBI/Autism/BEH	29	5.4				
Mental Illness	21	3.9				

Bl=borderline; Mod= moderate; Sev.= severe; MR = Mental Retardation; CP = Cerebral Palsy;
TBO = Traumatic Brain Injury; BEH = behaviour and emotionally handicapped

The participants and the settings of the seven reviewed studies are described in the Table 4. Job satisfaction in supported employment was studied in multiple settings, representing a variety of unskilled or semiskilled jobs, including manufacturing or product assembly, janitorial services, recycling, food service, restaurants, motels, retail customer service, offices and child care. Apart from one study (Griffin, Rosenberg, Cheney and Greenberg 1996) some information concerning the type of

participants' jobs was given, and four studies referred to participants' previous working experience (Griffin, Rosenberg, Cheney and Greenberg 1996; Melchiori and Church 1997; Parent and Kregel 1996; Test, Bond, Solow and Keul 1993). Three of the studies indicate the working hours, which referred to part-time jobs (Melchiori and Church 1997; Parent and Kregel 1996; Lam 1986).

One study included a comparison group of co-workers (Melchiori & Church 1997), and one study compared supported employees with sheltered employees and unemployed people with and without disabilities (Jiranek and Kirby 1990). Two other studies compared supported employees with workers in sheltered workshops (Griffin, Rosenberg, Cheney and Greenberg 1996; Lam 1986). Those employed people without disabilities who participated in the studies, were in equivalent jobs to those of the disabled workers in the same studies. One study which compared job satisfaction in supported employment and sheltered workshops described the sheltered workshop as large and modern, offering a wide range of work options to its employees and being committed to placing its workers in competitive employment (Jiranek and Kirby 1990). The two other studies did not specify the conditions of sheltered workshops.

Four of the studies indicated how long the participant had been in their jobs. In Griffin's, Rosenberg's, Cheney's and Greenberg's (1996) study the participants had hold their positions for the minimum of three months. In Parent's and Kregel's study the mean length of employment tenure was two years and three months and in Jiranek's and Kirby's (1990) the supported employees had worked in their jobs on average for one year and one month, those in sheltered workshops for two years and nine months and those unemployed had been without work on average for two years and one month. In addition, three of the studies took notice of participants' type of residence (Griffin, Rosenberg, Cheney and Greenberg 1996; Nisbet and York 1989; Test, Bond, Solow and Keul 1993). In two of the studies the majority of the employees lived with their natural families whereas in one study the majority of the participants was living semi-independently.

Table 4. Selected features of the studies on job satisfaction in supported employment.

STUDY	PARTICIPANTS & SETTING	JOB SATISFACTION ASSESSMENT METHODS	APPROACH TO JOB SATISFACTION
<p>Griffin David K. & Rosenberg H, Cheyney W & Greenberg, B. 1996.</p> <p>A comparison of self-esteem and job satisfaction of adults with mild mental retardation in sheltered workshops and supported employment.</p>	<p>Two groups of 100 participants each with the primary diagnosis of mental retardation.</p> <p>One of the groups participated in sheltered workshop, the other one in supported employment. The type of work is not specified.</p>	<p>A modified version of Vocational Programme Evaluation Profile, selected due to its prior successful use with people with mental retardation.</p> <p>Questionnaire.</p> <p>+ Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory.</p> <p>If any of the respondents was unable to read the questions independently, the questions were read to them and assistance provided in recording the answers.</p> <p>Gender, ethnicity and type of residence were controlled.</p>	<p>The study looks at overall job satisfaction in relation to self-esteem.</p>
<p>Jiraneck, D. and Kirby, N. 1990.</p> <p>The job satisfaction and/or psychological well being of young adults with an intellectual disability and nondisabled young adults in either sheltered employment, competitive employment or unemployment.</p>	<p>73 participants, including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 44 persons with borderline or mild intellectual disability of whom 15 were working in the community, 14 were unemployed and 15 worked in sheltered workshops. Those working, were employed in semi-skilled or unskilled jobs such as operator, factory or cleaner. • 29 nondisabled persons of whom 14 were unemployed and 15 employed. The employed participants were in unskilled or semi-skilled jobs. 	<p>A questionnaire including a job satisfaction scale developed by Warr, Cook and Wall (1979) which was completed only by those who were actually employed either in competitive or sheltered employment.</p> <p>Slight modifications, such as simplified language and a reduced number of answer choices, were made.</p> <p>The verbally administered questionnaire interviews took between 20 and 45 minutes. For nondisabled participants the questionnaire was sent by mail.</p>	<p>Facet approach: physical work environment; freedom to make decisions; relationship with co-workers; recognition for good work; relationship with boss; amount of responsibility; pay; opportunity for skills; relationship with management; promotional opportunities; management of firm; attention paid to suggestions; hours of work; variety in work; job security; overall job satisfaction; mean of all job satisfaction scores.</p>

<p>Lam C.S. 1986.</p> <p>A comparison of sheltered and supported work programmes - A pilot study.</p>	<p>50 participants with mental retardation working in sheltered workshop (tasks subcontracted by local industries) and;</p> <p>50 participants with mental retardation working in supported employment (restaurants, motels, hospitals and offices).</p>	<p>Job Satisfaction Scale (JSS) adopted from the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) using two subscales to assess intrinsic and extrinsic sources of job satisfaction</p> <p>+ Functional Assessment Inventory (FAI) assessing limitations in sensory, motor, psychological, intellectual, social and environmental areas of functioning.</p> <p>Participants were interviewed individually.</p>	<p>Facet approach: including items</p> <p>1. related to work itself, achievement, activity and variety (The Intrinsic Satisfaction Scale), and</p> <p>2. related to job insecurity, advancement, company policies and practices, supervision, compensation, recognition, co-workers and working conditions (The Extrinsic Satisfaction Scale).</p>
<p>Melchiori, L. G. & Church, A. T. 1997.</p> <p>Vocational needs and satisfaction of supported employees: the applicability of the theory of work adjustment.</p>	<p>45 participants (28 men and 17 women) mainly with mental retardation, working in manufacturing or product assembly, janitorial services, recycling, food service, retail customer service, office work, research support and child care.</p> <p>+ A comparison group of 45 (21 men, 24 women) co-workers/support workers without disabilities.</p>	<p>Modified Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ). In addition the employees were asked a global question: 'overall, how do you like your job?' Questions were answered by selecting a relevant facial expression drawing with a text written above</p> <p>+ Vocational needs: Revised Minnesota Importance questionnaire (MIQ)</p> <p>+Vocational reinforces: Modified Minnesota Job Description Questionnaire. Supervisor filled this questionnaire.</p>	<p>Facet approach:</p> <p>Activity; Independence; Variety; Compensation; Working Conditions; Ability utilization; Achievement; Creativity; Responsibility; Advancement; Recognition; Co-workers; Social service; Supervision technical); Supervision (human relations) and Policies and Practices.</p>

<p>Nisbet, J. and York, P. 1989.</p> <p>Indices of job satisfaction of persons with moderate and severe disabilities.</p>	<p>Six 20- and 21-year old men and women who had attended classes for students with moderate and severe disabilities and/or autism, working in libraries or restaurants.</p>	<p>Interviews based upon extensive review of the literature on job satisfaction and retention were conducted with the employees, employers, parents and service providers + teachers (overall 22 people) A separate questionnaire for employees and for the others.</p> <p>This was done with the aim to explore indices that seem to be related to the job satisfaction of young adults.</p> <p>The recorded interviews took 30 minutes each.</p> <p>Observations, at least six one-hours observations to collect additional information and to validate some of the data collected in the interviews.</p>	<p>Interview with the employee in order to find out about overall satisfaction with work and friends.</p> <p>In the observations attention was paid to: Attendance/punctuality; reports to worksite without prompting; Facial expressions; acceptance of instruction; on task behaviour; prompts required to remain on task; refusal to work; interaction with co-workers and supervisors; initiating conversations with co-workers and supervisors; and beginning assigned tasks promptly.</p>
<p>Parent, W. & Kregel, J. 1996.</p> <p>Consumer satisfaction: A survey of individuals with severe disabilities who receive supported employment services.</p>	<p>110 participants - 66 men & 44 women, with mental retardation (30%), mental illness (19.2%), traumatic brain-injury (20%), cerebral palsy and other physical disabilities (30.9%) working as a office worker, stock clerk, dishwasher, janitor, machine operator, an assembler, landscaper or in human service or laundry business.</p>	<p>A Consumer Satisfaction Survey developed by people with disabilities, administered through face-to-face interviews, including 25 open-ended questions and 44 multiple choice questions to obtain both quantitative and qualitative data on job satisfaction, consumer satisfaction and choice-making in the workplace.</p> <p>Verbally administered interviews varied from 15 minutes to over 1 hour.</p> <p>All the data was reviewed for completeness and accuracy by supported employment staff.</p>	<p>Facet approach: pay and benefits; supervision; relationships and teamwork, job conditions; overall job satisfaction.</p>

<p>Test, D.W, Bond Hinson, K, Solow, J. & Keul, P. 1993.</p> <p>Job satisfaction of persons in supported employment.</p>	<p>34 participants, 27 male and 7 female, mainly with mild or moderate disabilities. (The type of work not specified, custodial tasks and recycling mentioned.)</p>	<p>Verbally administered, recorded interviews following a 20-item questionnaire including both open-ended and binary forced choice (yes/no) questions. When possible the workers were asked to elaborate their yes/no answers.</p> <p>Items used were developed by examining Nisbet's and York's (1990) predictor items and revising the questions used by Test et al (1990).</p>	<p>Facet approach: work history and job preference; job coach satisfaction; job information (e.g. preferred tasks, money); non-co-worker relationship; on-the-job friendships (patterns of socializing and interaction); level of fit and independence (getting along with supervisor, whom to go when problems occur).</p>
--	---	---	---

4.2 The research methods used to assess job satisfaction

The research methods utilised to assess job satisfaction are summarised in Table 4. In two of the studies the authors had developed (Nisbet and York 1989; Test, Bond, Solow and Keul 1993) the interview questions for their studies based on literature review on job satisfaction and retention or following examples and recommendations given by researchers who had prior to them conducted research on the theme. The other five studies measured job satisfaction with some of the existing scales, often with modifications. The scales used were Vocational Programme Evaluating Profile, Minnesota Job Satisfaction Scale which was used in two studies, a job satisfaction scale by Warr, Cook and Wall and a Consumer Satisfaction Survey. Five of the seven questionnaires were administered verbally, two were in written format but assistance for those not able read or write was provided. The interviewing time varied from 15 minutes to more than an hour.

Five of the seven studies mentioned having checked reliability using statistical measures. In those studies using an existing scale with modifications, the reliability and validity of the modifications was checked by the authors. Additional job satisfaction assessment methods, namely observation and interviewing significant others were used in combination with interviewing in two of the seven studies (Jiranek and Kirby 1990; Nisbet and York 1989). In addition, three studies used other assessment methods to assess self-esteem, vocational needs and vocational reinforces and/or functionality

(Griffin, Rosenberg, Cheney and Greenberg 1996; Lam 1986; Melchiori and Church 1997).

4.3 Assessed measures of job satisfaction

The measures of job satisfaction of those five studies that used the facet approach and the two other studies are listed by study in Table 4. Summary of the measures assessed across studies is provided in the Table 5, in which the facets are also grouped according to Locke's (1983) broader categories of facets explained earlier. The Table 5 also includes the total number of studies that focussed on overall job satisfaction or looked at it in addition to various facets. The results of the study that aimed to identify the job indices are presented in the Table 6.

Table 5. The job satisfaction facets.

Assessed job satisfaction facets + overall job satisfaction			
Work			
Autonomy	4		
Opportunity for skills use	3		
Responsibility	3		
Variety in work	3		
Achievement	2		
Creativity	2		
Rewards			
Pay	5		
Recognition	3		
Promotional opportunities, advancement	3		
Attention paid to suggestions	1		
		Context	
		Working conditions	4
		Company policies and practices	2
		Job security	1
		Management of firm	1
		Hours of work	1
		Social Security	1
		Others	
		Relationship with co-workers	5
		Supervision/Relationship with boss	5

		Overall job satisfaction	5

The grouping of facets shows that of the 18 facets assessed in these five studies, those facets related to *others*, that is, to co-workers and supervisors, were most unanimously

measured (in five of the seven studies). With respect to facets related to *work itself*, various facets were studied, 'autonomy' being measured in four, and 'opportunity for skills use', 'responsibility' and 'variety in work' in three of the studies. Concerning rewards, the importance of pay was looked at in five studies, and recognition as well as promotion opportunities in three of the studies. Context-wise, the impact of working condition on job satisfaction was studied in five of the studies and company policies and practices in one.

Table 6. The indices of job satisfaction. (Nisbet and York 1989)

Indices of job satisfaction of persons with mild and moderated disabilities.
Consistently attends work
Reports to worksite without prompting
Begins assigned tasks promptly
Shows positive facial expressions
Accepts instruction/supervision
Works consistently
Interacts positively, verbally/non-verbally, with co-workers and supervisors and accepts instruction, expresses satisfaction with job verbally/non-verbally at home/school/other
Takes responsibility for work related items (uniform, lunch, bus tokens, money for breaks)
Maintains acceptable quality of work
Demonstrates acceptable behaviour
Increases the frequency of communicative behaviour
Communicates positive aspects of job with others at work
Communicates positive aspects of job with others outside of work
Responds positively toward going to work
Dresses promptly and appropriately for work
Demonstrates adult like behaviour
Demonstrates skills learned at work at home
Maintains a positive physical appearance
Exhibits positive response towards pay check
Communicates verbally/nonverbally when work is cancelled

Nisbet and York (1989) list the indices of job satisfaction based on the interviews of supported employees, their parents or residential service providers, teachers as well as employers and on observational data. The interviewing of significant others provided several remarks concerning job satisfaction of people with disabilities that were mentioned separately. Parents and residential service providers mentioned 'new skilled learned as a result of a job such as knowing at what time to get ready for

work, learning to dress independently, taking public transport independently and coin recognition. It was also mentioned that the workers talked about their jobs at home, looked forward to going to work, and that they had become more mature and self-confident as an outcome of being employed. The employers indicated 'independent job performance, quality of job performance, interaction with co-workers, decreases in interfering behaviour, information learned, facial expressions and lack of complaints' as signs of job satisfaction.

4.4 Patterns of Job Satisfaction

4.4.1 Job satisfaction in supported employment

Overall job satisfaction was looked at in five studies yet in all of these seven studies people with disabilities expressed high satisfaction with their jobs in supported employment. For example, in Test's, Bond Hinson's, Solow's and Keul's (1993) study a majority, 67.6 %, were satisfied with their jobs and liked their jobs. Of those who had prior work experience in a sheltered workshop all but one preferred their current supported employment placement to their previous jobs. Parent and Kregel (1996:9) concluded in their study that the participants "were overwhelmingly satisfied with their jobs"; 90 % of the supported employees reported liking their job. In Lam's study (1986: 78) the participants expressed a high level of job satisfaction.

In terms of comparisons between job satisfaction in supported employment and in sheltered workshops the results of the studies varied whereas the comparisons between job satisfaction of co-workers and supported employees point to the same direction. Jiranek and Kirby (1990) compared job satisfaction of disabled young adults who were either competitively employed, employed in sheltered workshop or unemployed with that of non-disabled adults who were either employed or unemployed. According to the study, the job satisfaction scores of employed disabled persons were not significantly different from those of non-disabled employed

persons, but significantly higher than those of sheltered workshop employees. However, job satisfaction in sheltered workshops was still generally rated as neutral or positive. Griffin's, Bond's, Solow's and Keul's study (1996: 148) supports this finding: 'those in supported employment scored significantly higher than those in workshop settings', those living semi-independently being most satisfied. Lam's (1986) study, on the contrary, did not show any significant differences in job satisfaction between the participants in sheltered workshops and the participants in supported employment. However, as he points out, both groups expressed a high degree of job satisfaction and were happy with their jobs. Melchiori and Church (1997) compared the job satisfaction of supported employment employees and their coworkers, and found that though the majority of both supported employees and coworkers were satisfied with their work, the supported employment workers expressed higher levels of job satisfaction on average than their co-workers.

4.4.2 Satisfaction with work itself

With respect to satisfaction with work itself, attention was paid to autonomy, opportunity for skills use, responsibility, variety in work, achievement and creativity in the work. In Parent's and Kregel's (1996) study the most common reason for liking the job was mentioned to be the job duties or the type of job, or simply just having a job. In Test's, Bond's, Solow's and Keul's study (1993) 29.4 % of the participants indicated liking everything about their job. However, when asked to mention something that the participants did not like in their jobs, disliking some job tasks was mentioned most often.

In Melchiori's and Church's study (1997) supported employees were more satisfied with the variety of their work tasks, opportunity for advancement, achievement and ability utilization than their co-workers. However, supported employees (1997) had lower responsibility and creativity needs than their co-workers. The authors point that this may be due to limited experience with independent decision making in a work setting. In Jiranek's and Kirby's study (1990) sheltered workshops and competitive

employment produced same levels of job satisfaction with the facet 'opportunity for skills use' regardless of whether the person had a disability or not, but supported employees were significantly more satisfied with their independence, responsibilities and variety of work than those in sheltered workshops.

4.4.3 Satisfaction with rewards

Satisfaction with pay was assessed in five of the studies, and generally supported employees were satisfied with their rewards. In Lam's study (1986) the average hourly wage for supported employees was \$1.79, in Test's, Bond Hinson's, Solow's and Keul's (1993) study \$4.35 and in Parent's and Kregel's study (1996) \$5.70. The other studies did not specify the level of income. In Lam's study (1986) those in sheltered workshops had lower hourly wages than those in supported employment. However, there was no difference in total earnings as the sheltered workshop employees worked higher number of hours than supported employment employees. In Test's, Bond Hinson's, Solow's and Keul's (1993) study 76.5 % were satisfied the money they earned. In those studies comparing supported employees and their co-workers, satisfaction with pay did not differ significantly between the participants. (Jiranek and Kirby 1990; Melchiori and Church 1997).

In Melchiori's and Church's study supported employees placed more value on praise and credit for the work they do than their co-workers. One of the coaches who was interviewed in the study noted that the employee he was supporting was too dependent on praise. The authors point out that the greater importance placed on recognition as well as satisfaction with management by supported employees may reflect the ongoing monitoring and evaluating that is often a part of supported employment programmes.

The issue of promotion opportunities is highly related to career development. In Jiranek's and Kirby's (1990) study supported employees and sheltered employees

expressed the same level of job satisfaction with the promotion opportunities. However, in Parent's and Kregel's study (1996) supported employees commonly wished to change jobs in the future and felt that their current job was not their preferred permanent career regardless of the high levels of job satisfaction.

4.4.4 Satisfaction with context

Satisfaction with job context was studied in four of the studies. In Parent's and Kregel's study (1996) supported employees were satisfied with their working conditions. In Melchiori's and Church's (1997) study the supported employees expressed satisfaction with their working condition and were more satisfied with them than their non-disabled co-workers. With respect to satisfaction with policies and practices, social service or job security, they were no differences between the supported employees and co-workers. In Jiranek's and Kirby's (1990) study the participants, whether in sheltered or competitive employment, with or without disabilities, were equally satisfied with their working conditions and job security.

4.4.5 Satisfaction with others

Relationships with other people and team-work in the workplace was used to assess job satisfaction in five of the studies. The studies indicate that supported employees were very satisfied with their social networks at the workplace. In Test's, Bond Hinson's, Solow's and Keul's (1993) study almost all (97.1 %) of the participants were satisfied with their the job coach as well as reported having friends at work. Furthermore, 20.5 % of the participants stated that 'having a friend' was what they liked best about their jobs. In Parent's and Kregel's study (1996: 7) 'the majority of the participants reported that their co-workers treated them the same as all the other employees' and over half them stated that they got along great with their co-workers.

Jiranek's and Kirby's results (1990) indicate that regardless of whether in competitive employment or sheltered workshops, those with a disability were more lonely, felt that they had less control over events, were more depressed and spent more time doing nothing than the equivalent group of non-disabled. Jiranek and Kirby (1990) refer to previous research noting that the transition from sheltered employment to competitive employment may bring new demands and challenges. While the job placement might be satisfactory, learning new skills, meeting new people and adjusting to the new environment might be stressful and temporarily lessen psychological well-being.

Parent's and Kregel's (1996) study the supported employees, apart from one, had a positive relationship with their supervisors. Approximately half of the participants felt that their supervisors treated them the same as anyone else. In Jiranek's and Kirby's (1990) study competitively employed people with disabilities were significantly more positive with respect to their supervisors than were those in sheltered employment or non-disabled employees in equivalent jobs. Melchiori and Church (1997: 409) found in their study 'the availability of quality supervision was more important to nonsupported workers than to supported workers'. They also point out that supervisors performed better in estimating the satisfaction of the co-workers than the supported employment workers. However, overall, supervisors did poor work in estimating the satisfaction of their employees.

4.4.6 Individual factors and job satisfaction

Two of the studies indicated that the participant characteristics did not seem to have influenced satisfaction with work (Lam 1986; Parent and Kregel 1993). Griffin, Rosenberg, Cheney and Greenberg (1996) mention that gender did not appear to affect either self-esteem or job satisfaction. Griffin, Rosenberg, Cheney and Greenberg (1996) found in their study that those in supported employment had significantly higher self-esteem than their peers in sheltered workshops. Amongst supported employment participants, those living semi-independently had the highest

scores of self-esteem and level of job satisfaction, and in turn, those living with their family had the lowest. The authors conclude that 'this study suggest that the type of employment we find for the person with mild mental retardation does make a difference in their overall self-esteem and job satisfaction' (Griffin, Rosenberg, Cheyney and Greenberg, 1996: 149).

In Jiranek's and Kirby's (1990) study any of the satisfaction variables did not correlate significantly with the length of employment in supported employment. In the case of workers in sheltered workshops, a significant link was found in the length of employment tenure and recognition for good work; the longer the time spent in sheltered employment, the more recognition was given for good work.

DISCUSSION

In this study I have reviewed the empirical studies conducted on job satisfaction of people with disabilities in supported employment. Table 5 represents the facets that have used to measure job satisfaction of people with disabilities, and Table 6 lists indices that have been identified to reflect the job satisfaction of people with disabilities. Based on the studies that were looking at various facets of satisfaction, it was possible to aggregate findings that describe the satisfaction of people with disabilities with work, rewards, others and work context. The aggregated findings provide important and encouraging information about job satisfaction in supported employment as well as allow me to draw conclusions for research and practice, as follows.

First, the most evident and consistent point that these seven studies made was that people with disabilities in supported employment are very satisfied with their jobs. However, as the authors of one study point out (Parent and Kregel 1996), a major factor contributing to disabled people's high levels of job satisfaction may simply be the fact that they are working. Women's high level of job satisfaction is to some extent caused by their low employment expectations due to their previously poor labour market position (Clark 1998). This may apply alike to people with disabilities and their high level of satisfaction, whether they work in supported employment or in sheltered workshop. As the unemployment figures of people with disabilities remain persistently high and when employed, they often find themselves in jobs of poor quality (Murray 2000), they are easily satisfied with less than those whose labour market position has been good over a long period of time. Correspondingly, once the labour market position of people with disabilities stops improving, their job

satisfaction will supposedly stay at the same level as that of non-disabled workers in equivalent jobs.

The studies also support McAfee's earlier (1986) conclusion about the causes of job satisfaction: workers with disabilities express job dissatisfaction for similar reasons as non-disabled workers, such as pay, participation in decision-making, leadership behaviour, hours and relationships with co-workers. Across those five studies that looked at various facets, 18 different facets were studied. Satisfaction with respect to relationships with both colleagues and supervisors and pay were most unanimously used measures of job satisfaction. As social integration and decent pay are the most defining features of supported employment, paying attention to them is only natural. However, satisfaction with these features of employment are related to extrinsic motivation and do not necessarily reflect the true interest in the work itself (Locke 1983). Yet various facets related to satisfaction with work itself, deriving from the intrinsic motivation, were equally given attention to. Every study asked something about each border category of job satisfaction facets, namely work itself, rewards, others and context - that is, the categories were replicated across the studies regardless of whether the study used one of the standard scales or the authors had developed the questionnaires themselves. Replication of measures across studies may represent high consensus among researchers and suggest widespread agreement in the vast employment literature regarding job satisfaction in general. Two of the studies used a scale (MSQ) that is commonly used and popular among researchers.

However, despite high agreement concerning disabled people's job satisfaction across these studies, it is not guaranteed that the assessed facets are the only valid indicators of job satisfaction of people with disabilities. For instance, the studies did not elaborate the role of learning or additional benefits such as health care in job satisfaction. Asking people with disabilities themselves about their feelings about and satisfaction with their jobs is crucial, but maybe interviewing significant others and observations would provide useful information in this under-researched area of study. As Nisbet and York (1989) point out, such indices as talking about their jobs in a positive fashion with significant and eagerness to go to work in the mornings can

indicate satisfaction with work but do not necessarily come across while interviewing people with disabilities themselves.

With regard to the list of indices of job satisfaction, some criticism may be relevant. While some of the indices clearly signify satisfaction, some of them may mainly reflect what is desired behaviour, which does not necessarily derive from job satisfaction. Behaviour such as 'consistently attends work', 'reports to worksite without prompting', 'begins assigned tasks promptly', 'shows positive facial expressions' or 'accepts instruction/supervision' may reflect fear of losing the job or just simply showing respect to authorities rather than indicate satisfaction with work.

Second, job satisfaction with various facets or the relevance of indices of job satisfaction may strongly be related to the type of work. These studies studied job satisfaction various setting, some of which allow more for social interaction, some jobs may pay better, some involve office work whereas some are carried outside. Also different type of behaviour is expected in different types of jobs, some allowing for more creativity and some setting strict codes of behaviour. Workplace culture may differ considerably from a workplace to another placing persons with disabilities often with little or no work experience to very varying work environments. In order to determine job satisfaction in a particular type of job, ecological assessment of specific workplace setting should be conducted.

Third, there were some discrepant findings across the studies with regard to comparisons of job satisfaction levels between supported employees and employees in the sheltered workshops as well as between supported employees and their non-disabled co-workers. In Griffin's, Rosenberg's Cheyney's and Greenberg's (1996) and Jiranek's and Kirby (1990) studies supported employees were significantly more satisfied with their jobs whereas in Lam's (1986) study there was no difference in the levels of job satisfaction between these two groups. In Jiranek's and Kirby's (1990) study disabled and non-disabled employees had the same levels of job satisfaction. Melchiori's and Church's (1997) study show, that people with disabilities were more satisfied with respect to every studied aspect of the work.

In addition to job satisfaction, two of the studies looked at self-esteem in relation to employment and were discrepant in their findings. Griffin's, Rosenberg's, Cheyney's and Greenberg's study (1996) shows that those in supported employment had higher level of self-esteem than those who were in sheltered employment whereas in Jiranek's and Kirby's study (1990) the self-esteem was at the similar level both in supported an sheltered employment, but was considerably higher than that of the unemployed persons. Work builds up a person's self-esteem, but it is likely that those people with disabilities who get selected for supported employment programmes have higher self-esteem in the first place and thus are more attractive to programme co-ordinators and employers. In Griffin's, Rosenberg's, Cheyney's and Greenberg's study (1996) those supported employees who lived independently had higher levels of both job satisfaction and self-esteem than those who lived with their families. Those, who worked in sheltered workshops and lived at home, had the lowest scores of job satisfaction and self-esteem. This result draws in the impact of individual characteristic and issues that are out of the reach of an employer but that contribute to job satisfaction and possibly job performance.

The discrepancies explained above may be related to contextual variables that were not accounted for in the assessment of job satisfaction in the studies. Contextual variables such as worker characteristic (e.g. communication skills, educational background, previous work experience) and type of the job and working environment affect job satisfaction but were not fully taken into account in these studies. Furthermore, the discrepancies may relate to the fact that the findings were presented in group-averages. Analysing by individual employee rather than groups may have revealed situation specific information accounting for the varying patterns of job satisfaction. In addition, the interviewing times varied greatly with respect to these particular studies, ranging even in one study from 15 minutes to over an hour.

Fourth, regarding the measurement of job satisfaction of people with disabilities, a few points are worth further discussion. To begin with, all the authors fully support the importance of asking disabled people themselves about their job satisfaction. As

Melchiori and Church (1997) point out, too often

the success of their [supported employees] is being evaluated in terms of the extent that the worker meets the needs of the job, with little regard to the extent that the worker meets the needs of the supported employee. This highlights the importance of asking supported employees directly about their satisfaction. Agencies and employers should not rely on informants or preconceived programmatic determinations of what is important or satisfying to individual supported workers.

The authors raised several points concerning the actual research process. Melchiori and Church (1997) stressed the importance of a teaching or discussion session a few weeks prior to the administration of the questionnaire to help the worker to understand the possible abstract concepts used and allow some time for self-evaluation and reflection. In addition, they recommended including a measure of stability to provide parameters for the interpretation of studies. Nisbet and York (1989) highlighted the importance of including an observational component to address the needs of those persons who do not possess an adequate level of communication skills and to verify the information collected in interviews. Lam (1986) referred to the problem of pleasing, identified by Biklen and Moseley (1988); participants may want to appear agreeable when asked about their job satisfaction. Lam (1986) also mentioned that employees in sheltered workshops may have been more institutionalized than those in supported employment, doubting strongly their ability to move into competitive employment and seeing their sheltered workshop placement as a terminal place of employment. This may have contributed to their reported level of job satisfaction.

Fifth, in terms of identifying ways to improve and develop supported employment model, a few points arise despite the fact that supported employees did not report dissatisfaction with anything. Jiranek's and Kirby's (1990) findings concerning the loneliness of people with disabilities both in sheltered and competitive employment reinforce the need for social opportunities and support. The findings also show that psychological well-being did not increase after leaving sheltered employment for competitive employment. Jiranek and Kirby (1990) agree with other authors concerning the demands related changing jobs: 'while job placement might be satisfactory,

adjustments requiring making new friends and learning new skills might be expected to at least temporarily lessen psychological well being'. Social skills learning and the use of colleagues from work as mentors might be needed to support individuals in particular during the transition phase. Also Melchiori's and Church's (1997) finding concerning supervisor's poor skills in evaluating the satisfaction and needs of their employees, both disabled and non-disabled, should be paid attention to. Workers need to also be encouraged to ask for advice and guidance, specify their needs, give criticism or complain. Open communication and trust is important in guaranteeing that both employees' and employers' needs are met.

In addition, the studies further confirm the previous findings suggesting that the role the employees play in choosing their jobs contributed to the high degree of job satisfaction. For example, in Parent's and Kregel's study (1996) people with disabilities had a moderate choice in selecting their jobs and in Test's, Bond Hinson's, Solow's and Keul's (1993) study the participant had 'a voice in choosing their job'. As Reiter, Luba and Freeman (1985: 26) have previously argued, 'being free to exercise choices and being involved in jobs in which one is interested is an important aspect of the quality of life for handicapped and non-handicapped individuals'. This also means that many types of employment opportunities must be available to choose from. According to Lam (1996) 'no one particular program would best meet the needs of all clients, and having different, alternative programs provides clients with choice'. If job placements are to be successful, each candidate must be given as much autonomy and control as possible in the development and selection of his or her employment. Griffin, Rosenberg, Cheney and Greenberg (1996) add that sheltered workshop can serve a very positive function and train the individual for competitive employment but should be considered as a temporary placement. As all persons with disabilities are not able to start in competitive employment often due to a lack of technical or social skills or poor self-esteem, sheltered workshop model should be developed to specifically equip people with these skills that would allow them to eventually transfer to competitive employment. Sheltered workshops should really serve as a 'temporary placement' providing training rather than as a workplace.

Offering alternatives is not enough, though. As Barbour (1999) argues, the service providers must accept and believe that people with disabilities can make choices, and furthermore, help them to make informed choices. In the new vision of outcomes of employment, an individual is empowered to pursue an individually determined satisfying life. Therefore, future efforts should be directed toward ensuring that disabled people are provided with adequate information about their employment options and helped to express their own opinions and feelings which have to be listened and taken into account in planning, organising and providing employment services. People with disabilities must not only be given a voice but the voice must be listened to.

Career development is strongly related to the issue of free choice. Parent's and Kregel's (1996) study shows that even if participants in supported employment seem to be satisfied, for many their current positions do not fulfil their ambitions in the long run. Being satisfied does not straightforwardly translate to having found a dream job; 'as with entire population, actually working at a real job provides one of the best ways of gaining personal insight into the type of career and job characteristics that one is interested in' (Parent and Kregel (1996:9). The importance of career advancement and job mobility in supported employment need to be given further consideration.

Finally, in terms of future research needs, the studies raise several issues that require further elaboration. Firstly, Lam (1986) recommends that consistent and operational definitions should be developed for concepts 'supported employment', sheltered workshop, transitional employment and competitive employment programmes. He points out that often substantial differences exist between one supported employment programme and another competitive employment programme, yet the two programmes are referred to interchangeably. This may be of particular concern for those countries that have recently adopted the model of supported employment. For instance, as Saloviita (2000) points out, in Finland the concept of supported employment is often used to refer to a variety of support options for people in disabilities in the workplace. Test, Bond Hinson, Solow and Keul (1993), for their part, recommend determining what is meant by quality supported employment

services, and to develop more consumer-driven services. Quality consumer-driven services, I believe, would empower people with disabilities in choosing the jobs they are interested in, but are not easy to realise. Nisbet and York (1989) express their concern with the relevance of existing questionnaires to measure the job satisfaction of people with disabilities, and suggest studies that would advance the development of accurate assessment methods. I agree with this point – as earlier stated, assessing job satisfaction of people with disabilities is a challenging task.

The authors of the studies also suggest further studies on comparing job satisfaction of those in sheltered workshops and those in supported employment. Lam (1986) argues that comparison studies are needed in order to indicate the impact of sheltered and supported employment on various populations in terms of job satisfaction and quality of life. I find the connection between job satisfaction and quality of life interesting, too. Jiranek and Kirby (1990) recommend longitudinal studies where the individuals are followed from sheltered workshops to competitive employment in order to determine the effect of the type of employment. This I think could be linked to the overall quality of life to see how the type of job and job satisfaction empowers people with disabilities in other frontiers of their lives, or in turn if satisfaction with other aspects of life increases the job satisfaction of people with disabilities regardless of the type of their employment. For instance, would transition from a sheltered workshop to supported employment eventually lead to independent living or changes in marital status?

Further studies comparing satisfaction of non-disabled workers and workers with disabilities are recommended, too, in order to evaluate the effectiveness of supported employment in comparison to the job satisfaction of non-disabled workers who are working in similar positions at the same types of jobs. Also more research is needed in order to determine the specific elements of work situations and specific job types that influence feelings about work. Melchiori and Church (1997) recommend to systematically study differences and similarities in the needs of supported employees and their co-workers with respect to varying facets of job satisfaction in order to explain the patterns of job satisfaction. This, I think, would benefit from carefully

documented individual characteristics. In addition, combining the analysis of job satisfaction with the analysis of vocational interest and needs could provide useful information in order to develop the supported employment model to better respond to the needs of people with disabilities as well as employers, and to find satisfying job matches.

This study represents and summarises the research conducted on job satisfaction in supported employment. Despite the high level of job satisfaction, some points requiring further elaboration both in research and practice are raised. People with disabilities are entitled to vocational training and employment that provide truly integrated, meaningful work experience and equitable wages. As Moseley (1988) argues, "feelings of satisfaction, hope, and accomplishment that come from a person's work have to do with the nature of the experience, not whether the individual happens to have a disability". People with disabilities are entitled to freely-chosen jobs of decent quality which they themselves are satisfied with.

REFERENCES

Barbour, W.C. 1999. Supported Employment: The Coming of Full Circle. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*. Vol. 13, No. 3, 165 - 174.

Biklen Knopp Sari and Moseley Charles R. 1988. "Are you Retarded?" -"No, I'm catholic". *Qualitative Methods in the Study of People with Severe Handicaps*". *Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps*. Vol. 13. No. 3, 155 - 162.

Brown L., Shiraga B., York J., Kessler, K., Strohm, B., Rogin, P., Sweet M., Zanella, K. and VanDeventer., P.1984. Integrated Work Opportunities for Adults with Severe Disabilities. The Extended Training Option. *The Journal of the Association for Persons with severe Handicaps*. No. 9, 262 - 269.

Brush, D.H., Monch, M.K. and Pooyan, A. 1987. Individual Demographic Differences and Job Satisfaction. *Journal of Occupational Behaviour*, 8, 139 - 155.

Clark, A.E. 1998. Measures of Job Satisfaction. What makes a good job? Evidence from OECD countries. *Labour Market and Social Policy - Occasional Papers No. 32*. Directorate for Education, Employment, Labour and Social Affairs, Employment, Labour and Social Affairs Committee. Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development.

Clark, A.E. 1996. Job Satisfaction in Britain. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*. Vol. 34. No.2, 189 - 217.

Clark, A.E. 1997. Job Satisfaction and Gender: Why Women are so Happy at Work? *Labour Economics*. Vol. 4. No. 4, 341 - 372.

Conte, L. Murphy, S.T. and Nisbet, J. 1989. J. A qualitative study of work stations in industry. *The Journal of Rehabilitation*. Vol. 55. No. 2, 53 - 62.

Cooper, H. 1998. *Synthesizing Research. A Guide for Literature Reviews*. Third Edition. Applied Social Research Methods Series. Volume 2. SAGE Publications.

Deci, L.E. and Ryan, R.M. 1985. *Intrinsic Motivation and Self-Determination in Human Behaviour*. New York: Plenum Press.

Fabian, E.S. 1992. Supported Employment and the Quality of Life: Does a Job Make a Difference? *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin*. Vol. 36. No. 2, 82 - 97.

Griffin D. K. & Rosenberg H, Cheyney W & Greenberg, B. 1996. A Comparison of Self-esteem and Job Satisfaction of Adults with Mild Mental Retardation in Sheltered Workshops and Supported employment. *Education and Training in Mental Retardation*. Vol. 31. No. 2, 142 - 150.

Inge, J.I., Banks, D., Wehman, P., Hill, J.W., and Shafer, M.S. 1988. Quality of life for Individuals who are Labeled Mentally Retarded: Evaluating Competitive Versus Sheltered Workshop Employment. *Education and Training in Mental Retardation*. Vol. 23. No. 2, 97-104.

Jiranek, D. and Kirby, N. 1990. The Job Satisfaction and/or Psychological Well being of Young Adults with an Intellectual Disability and Nondisabled Young Adults in either Sheltered Employment, Competitive Employment or Unemployment. *Australia and New Zealand Journal of Developmental Disabilities*. Vo. 16. No. 2, 133 - 148.

Kiernan, W.E and Schalock R.L.1997. *Integrated Employment, Current Status and*

Future Directions. Washington: American Association of Mental Retardation.

Kregel J. Wehman P, Revell G., Hill J. and Cimera, R. 2000. Supported Employment Benefit-Cost Analysis: Preliminary Findings. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*. Vol. 14, No. 2, 153 - 161.

Kregel J. 1997. Supported Employment. *Remedial and Special Education* Vol. 18:4. P. 194-196.

Kregel J., and Wehman P. 1997. Supported Employment: A Decade of Employment Outcomes for Individuals with Disabilities in W.E, Kiernan, and R.L. Schalock: *Integrated Employment, Current Status and Future Directions*. Washington: American Association of Mental Retardation.

Lam, C. S. 1986. A comparison of Sheltered and Supported Work Programmes - A pilot study. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin*. Vol. 30. No.2, 66 - 82.

Locke, A.E. 1983. The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M.D. Dunnette (ed), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. Second Edition. New York. John Wiley & Sons.

McAfee, J.K. 1986. The handicapped worker and job satisfaction. *Vocational Evaluating and Work Adjustment Bulletin*. Spring, 23 - 27.

Melchiori, Lori Galpin & Church, A. Timothy. 1997. Vocational needs and satisfaction of supported employees: the applicability of the theory of work adjustment. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*. Vol. 50, 401 - 417.

Moseley C. R. 1988. Job Satisfaction Research: Implications for Supported Employment. *The Journal of the Association for Persons with severe Handicaps*. Vol. 18. No. 3, 211 - 219.

Murray, B. 2000. *Managing Disability in the Workplace*. An unpublished Draft of the ILO Code of Practice.

Nisbet, J. and York, Prudence. 1989. Indices of Job satisfaction of persons with Moderate and Severe Disabilities. *Education and Training in Mental Retardation*. Vol. 24. No.3, 274 - 280.

Reiter S., Friedman L. and Molcho, M. 1985. Motivation, Vocational Interests and Job satisfaction of Mentally Retarded Adults. *International Journal of Rehabilitation Research*. Vol. 8 (1), 19 - 29.

Parent, W & Kregel, J. 1996. Consumer Satisfaction: A Survey of Individuals with Severe Disabilities Who Receive Supported Employment Services. Focus on Autism & Other Developmental Disabilities. Vol. 11. No 4, 207 - 223.

Reid, D.H, Green, C.W. Parsons, M.B. 1998. A Comparison of Supported Work Versus Center-based Program Services on Selected Outcomes for Individuals with Multiple Severe Disabilities. *Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps*. Vol. 23. No.1, 69-76.

Revell G, Kregel J. Wehman P and Bond G.R. 2000. Cost Effectiveness of Supported Employment Programs: What Do We Need to Do to Improve Outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*. Vol. 14, No. 2, 173 - 178.

Rhodes L., Ramsing K., and Hill, M. 1987. Economic Evaluation of Employment Services: A Review of Applications. *Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps*. Vol. 12. No. 4, 175 - 181.

Saloviita T. 2000. Supported Employment as a Paradigm Shift and a Cause of Legitimation Crisis. *Disability and Society*. Vol. 15. No.1, 87 - 98.

Selzer, M.M. 1984. *Patterns of Job Satisfaction Among Mentally Handicapped Adults*.

Applied Research in Mental Retardation, 5, 147 - 149.

Siegel S. and Gaylord-Ross R. 1991. Factors Associated with Employment Success Among Youths with Learning Disabilities. Journal of Learning Disabilities. Vol. 24. No 1, 40 - 47.

Sinnot-Oswald, M., Gliner J.A. and Spencer, K.C. 1991. Supported and sheltered employment: Quality of life issues among workers with disabilities. Education and Training in Mental Retardation. Vol.26. No.4, 388 - 397.

Spector P.E. 1997. Job Satisfaction. Application, Assessment, Causes and Consequences. Advanced Topics in Organizational Behaviour. SAGE Publications.

Taber T.D and Alliger, G.M. 1995. A Task-Level Assessment of Job Satisfaction. Journal of Organizational Behaviour. Vol. 16. No.2, 101 - 123.

Test, D.W, Bond Hinson, K, Solow, J. & Keul, P. 1993. Job Satisfaction of Persons in Supported Employment. Education and Training in Mental Retardation. Vol. 28. No. 1, 38 - 46.

Turner, J.L. 1984. Ethnographic Observations in a Work Setting for Retarded Adults. In R.G. Edgerton & M.J. Begab (Eds.) Ethnological Perspectives in Mental Retardation. Baltimore: University Park Press.

Xie, H., Dain, B. J., Becker, D.B. and Drake, R.E. 1997. Job Tenure among people with severe mental illness. Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin. Vol. 40. No. 4, 230 - 239.

Wehman P., West M. And Kregel J. 1999. Supported Employment Programme Development and Research Needs: Looking Ahead to the Year of 2000. Education and Training in Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities Vol. 34 No. 1, 3 - 19.

Wehman P., Revell G., & Kregel J. 1998. Supported Employment: a Decade of Rapid Growth and Impact. *American Rehabilitation*; Spring, 31 - 43.

Wehman P. and Moon, M.S. 1985. Critical Values in Employment Programmes for People with Disabilities. In P. Wehman & J.W. Hill (Eds.) *Competitive Employment for Persons with Mental Retardation. From Research to Practice*. Richmond: Virginia Commonwealth University.