

## Record

195

## File Number

10166

Author: Brown, Lou

Title: Integrated work: A rejection of segregated enclaves and  
mobile work crews

Original source: Unknown

Resource type: Written

Publication Date: N/A

Publisher info: -

**Abstract**

The article puts forward the point that while segregated workshops and activity centres will soon be historical footnotes, some are unfortunately being replaced by segregated enclaves and mobile work crews. Any benefit that can be realised through these options can also be realised in individually appropriate integrated work environments, but many benefits realised in these integrated work environments cannot be realised in segregated work options. The article discusses arguments and the underlying values of the options. **Keyword:** Employment

◇ CHAPTER 12 ◇

**Integrated Work**

*A Rejection of Segregated Enclaves  
and Mobile Work Crews*

LOU BROWN  
ALICE UDVARI-SOLNER  
ELISE FRATTURA-KAMPSCHROER

LOUANNE DAVIS  
CHARLOTTE AHLGREN  
PATRICIA VAN DEVENTER  
JACK JORGENSEN

*University of Wisconsin -Madison and Madison Metropolitan School District,  
Madison, Wisconsin*

When people who are not intellectually disabled are of concern, the a priori cultural assumption is that they should be integrated into all aspects of community life. In fact, complex legal and political safeguards have been established to ensure that citizens without intellectual disabilities function in integrated environments to the greatest extent possible. When people with severe intellectual disabilities are of concern, the a priori cultural assumption is that they must start segregated and then earn or otherwise justify their way into integrated community life. The issue here is the need for the resources and safeguards necessary for all citizens to participate fully in one extremely important part of integrated living - the workplace.

Since World War II, the life expectancies of almost all people in North America have increased dramatically (Siwolop & Mohs, 1985). The cultural solution to the problem of what to do with increasing numbers of adults with severe intellectual disabilities was to confine them to segregated day programs. In 1950, only 6 sheltered workshops were operative ' n the United States, in 1984 there were almost 5,000 (Buckley & Bellamy, 1985; Nelson, 1971). Davis (1987) reported growing waiting lists and many efforts to increase the capacity of existing facilities and to build new ones. Obviously, the majority of adults with severe intellectual disabilities who enter segregated facilities do not move to integrated environments. In fact, studies of the movement of workers from segregated to integrated settings reveal that only 1%-3% actually do so (California Department of Finance, 1979; Minnesota Developmental Disabilities Council, 1982; Zivolich, 1984). In effect, the placement of an adult who is severely intellectually disabled in a segregated day facility has been a sentence to confinement for life. Furthermore, the vast majority of those so confined have regressed and

---

<sup>o</sup> This paper was supported by Grants #G008630388 and # H029D80019 to the University of Wisconsin and the Madison Metropolitan School District from the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Divisions for Educational Services and Personnel Preparation. An expanded version is contained in Brown, L., Udvari-Solner, A., Frattura-Kampschroer, E., Davis, L., & Jorgensen, J. (Eds.). (1987). *Educational programs for students with severe intellectual disabilities. Vol. XVII* Madison, WI: Madison Metropolitan School District.

underachieved, and have been denied opportunities to experience interactions with nondisabled people in a healthy variety of integrated environments.

In the early 1970s, the treatment of people with intellectual disabilities was analyzed, and insightful and valid observations that they were unnecessarily excluded, devalued, denied, overprotected, and harmed were made. In response, it was concluded that if such individuals were to be allowed a decent chance in life, many of the attitudes, values, expectations, laws, and regulations associated with their rights, abilities, and opportunities had to change. One way to guide the needed changes was to attempt to live by what became known as the “principle of normalization,” which requires that an individual with disabilities be treated and respected as a typical person and integrated into the normal rhythms of everyday life (Nirje, 1969; Wolfensberger, 1972).

The ideology of integration is now being applied to the world of work. In fact, each year more parents/guardians, advocates, and others realise: 1) that the people they represent must be given the chance to do real work next to nondisabled co-workers, 2) that segregation is becoming tremendously expensive and taxpayers are clamouring for more cost-efficient options, and 3) that governmental units are changing laws and regulations and making opportunities and resources available so people with severe intellectual disabilities can be given access to integrated work (Will, 1984a, 1984b).

### **DAYTIME OPTIONS CURRENTLY UTILIZED**

The nine major daytime options experienced by adults with severe intellectual disabilities are.

1. Home
2. Institution
3. Nursing home
4. Activity center
5. Sheltered workshop
6. Retarded business
7. Mobile work crew
8. Enclave
9. Individually appropriate integrated work environment

Since the goal here is to enhance quality of life through integration, absorption, and support, options 1 through 8 are judged inherently unacceptable. Arguments against the use of the ubiquitous sheltered workshop and activity center options have been articulated elsewhere (Brown, Shiraga, Ford, et al., 1986; Brown, Shiraga, York, et al., 1984; The Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 1983). Soon segregated workshops and activity centres will be historical footnotes. Unfortunately, some of them are being replaced by segregated enclaves and mobile work crews.

Any benefit that can be realised in segregated enclaves or crews can also be realised in individually appropriate integrated work environments (option 9) However, there are many benefits that can be realised in individually appropriate integrated work

environments that can never be realised in enclaves or crews. Thus, enclaves and crews are unnecessarily restrictive.

Trach and Rusch (1987) defined an enclave as “a group of six to eight persons who work as a team at a specific location in a community business or industry” (p. 5); a mobile work crew is referred to as “a small group of three to five persons who work out of a van at several locations in the community with the supervision of a job coach” (p. 5) While variations in size and other characteristics exist across professionals (Bellamy, Rhodes, Mank, & Albin, 1987), these two definitions seem reasonable for purposes here.

Brown, Udvari-Solner, et al. (1987) offered three basic characteristics of an integrated work environment. *First*, if mathematically possible, the general work environment must be naturally proportioned. That is, since approximately 1% of the general population is considered severely intellectually disabled, no more than approximately 1% of all workers who function in a general work environment can be severely intellectually disabled. *Second*, no more than two people with disabilities can function in any immediate work environment. *Third*, a worker with disabilities must function within sight, sound, and reasonable distance of nondisabled co-workers.

Rigid adherence to the natural proportion criterion may be difficult and actually inappropriate under some circumstances. Nevertheless, it is better to err on the side of a natural proportion than it is to accept, tolerate, or attempt to justify violations. A factory, which is considered a general work environment, may employ 500 non-disabled people and, 5 with severe intellectual disabilities. A superficial analysis might result in the judgement that the environment is naturally proportioned and therefore integrated. However, a more careful analysis might reveal that the five people with disabilities are: confined to a separate area, supervised 100% of the time by paid professionals, allowed only segregated lunches and breaks, and restricted to social situations in which individualised interactions with nondisabled people are improbable. Thus, while the factory may be naturally proportioned, the immediate work and related environments are segregated and must be redesigned so that no more than two people with disabilities function in sight, sound, and reasonable distance of nondisabled co-workers.

## **COMPARING THE INTEGRATED WORK ENVIRONMENT AND ENCLAVE OPTIONS**

As enclaves and mobile work crews are considered ideologically interchangeable, so the term *enclave* is used here to represent both. A three-step strategy is used to contrast the enclave and the individually appropriate integrated work environment options:

*First*, five important dimensions that can be used to evaluate aspects of the life space of a worker with severe intellectual disabilities are considered: 1) nature and cost of supervision, 2) nature and cost of transportation, 3) opportunities for work enhancement, 4) opportunities for social relationships, and 5) personalized matching of a worker to a work environment. *Second*, ideological values associated with each dimension are presented. *Third*, the dimensions and the associated values are

discussed to contrast the enclave and the individually appropriate integrated work environment options.

### **Nature and Cost of Supervision**

Supervision refers to the time, instruction, assistance, and other personal supports for a worker with severe intellectual disabilities to function effectively in integrated work and related environments. *Artificial supervision* refers to the supports provided that are not available to nondisabled co-workers. In addition, artificial supervision is paid for with tax and other dollars to which nondisabled co-workers do not have access. *Natural supervision* refers to a worker functioning acceptably with supervision provided primarily by nondisabled co-workers and employers as unobtrusive parts of their typical work routines.

#### *Values*

1. Prior to entrance, a prospective environment must offer reasonable opportunities for co-workers without disabilities to assume natural supervisory responsibilities as unobtrusive parts of their typical work routines.
2. When a worker first enters an integrated environment, paid professionals must provide artificial supervision. In addition, the worker should have access to the same training opportunities available to co-workers, if appropriate.
3. The nature of the artificial supervision initially provided must be systematically faded, but can rarely, if ever, be terminated.
4. The goal must be to provide the highest quality of natural supervision and the least artificial supervision at the most reasonable costs over long periods of time.

#### ***Discussion***

A paid job coach typically provides supervision in enclaves, which is artificial supervision. Bellamy et al. (1987) described supervision in an enclave as “a group of persons with disabilities work[ing] in sufficient proximity to make co-ordinated training and support services available at all times, not just during the initial training period” (p. 22).

In any work environment that contains more than two people with disabilities the probability of developing natural supervision is limited and the need for long-term and cost-inefficient artificial supervision is maximised for four major reasons. *First*, continuous supervision by paid job coaches prohibits co-workers without disabilities from learning and assuming natural supervisory responsibilities (Hagner, 1988). In fact, the mere presence of a special someone who is paid to supervise often signals to others that it is not their role to be involved. *Second*, a nondisabled co-worker would in all likelihood be unwilling and/or unable to assume natural supervision for more than two workers with disabilities. Even if a nondisabled worker did agree to supervise a group of workers with disabilities, it would almost always disrupt and

detract from his or her own productivity. *Third*, when workers with disabilities receive artificial supervision “at all times,” many receive it regardless of whether it is needed. *Fourth*, since the nature of an enclave impedes the involvement of nondisabled co-workers in natural supervisory activities and since a job coach is always present, supervision costs rarely decrease over time (Thompson & Wolf, 1989).

Individually appropriate integrated work environments allow reasonable opportunities to develop high-quality, cost-efficient supervision because the process of arranging for a worker with disabilities to function in an integrated environment requires the job developer to evaluate the possibilities of unobtrusive natural supervision. If the development of unobtrusive natural supervision is not feasible, an alternative environment is sought. In addition, the job coach and the employer agree that the artificial supervision provided at the outset will be faded and replaced with individually appropriate amounts and kinds of natural supervision. However, even though supervision by nondisabled co-workers develops and the need for a paid job coach is reduced, the job coach is rarely, if ever, completely removed. The time and money once used for continuous paid supervision can then support other job coach functions, such as providing opportunities for work enhancement and building social relationships in the workplace. Further, as natural supervision increases, more workers can be served by one job coach, which can reduce the average cost of supervision over time

### **Nature and Cost of Transportation**

Complementary and efficient relationships between where one lives and where one works are important for success in the workplace. Thus, any discussion of transportation to and from work must include information about the nature of the associated domestic environment. Supported family-style homes and apartments that contain no more than two unrelated people with disabilities are the clearly preferred domestic options (Johnson, 1985; Taylor, Racino, Knoll, & Lutflyya, 1987). Conversely, group homes and other domestic environments that contain more than two unrelated people with disabilities are rejected. In addition to containing only one or two people with disabilities, supported apartments and homes must be distributed naturally within a community. A neighbourhood or area of approximately 1,000 people should contain no more than two geographically dispersed supported homes or apartments.

### **Values**

1. Work environments should be as close as possible to a worker's home.
2. Working is so important to personal dignity and cultural respect; anything reasonable must be done to ensure that an individual can get to and from a decent job
3. Every community has a finite amount of financial and other resources that can be devoted to the vocational functioning of adults with severe intellectual disabilities. Thus, the less money spent on transportation to and from work, the more money available for other important services or to serve others.
4. If a worker truly needs a personal attendant, a specialised vehicle, and/or other extraordinary and relatively costly services to get to and from work, so be it.

5. Whenever reasonable, a worker should use the transportation systems and services used by others who are not disabled.
6. The supervision and social relationships experienced going to and from work should be the same as those available to nondisabled people, whenever appropriate.

### ***Discussion***

When adults with severe intellectual disabilities live in supported homes and apartments that are naturally dispersed geographically, but work in enclaves, it is rare that more than one or two will live close to their place of work. This causes travel to become complicated, lengthy, and costly, and almost always requires artificial supervision. Unfortunately, a common reaction to such travel problems is to extend segregated thought and practice. That is, instead of using public buses, integrated car pools, walking, or other typical modes of transportation, a “special” van or bus is arranged. The image of a cluster of adults with disabilities riding in a cost-inefficient “retarded van” to and from their “retarded enclave” is ideologically unbearable.

Using special buses and vans allows workers with disabilities to be gathered from a wide variety of locations and delivered to an enclave. However, travel time is almost always unnecessarily excessive. Expending the least amount of time in transit is extremely important because many adults with severe intellectual disabilities also experience muscle contractions, spasticity, skin sensitivities, and other physiological difficulties. Functioning in mobility-limiting situations for long periods of time is often unhealthy and in some cases harmful. In addition, when given long periods of time with nothing meaningful to do, some engage in maladaptive actions.

One way to reduce the problems associated with excessive travel time is to create unnatural living environments close to the enclave (e.g., a group home). This close geographic proximity reduces travel time, but again there is the unnecessary, demeaning, and unwanted reality of six to eight adults with disabilities living in a group home and riding to and from an enclave in a “retarded van.”

When adults with severe disabilities live in supported homes and apartments that are naturally dispersed geographically and work in individually appropriate integrated environments close to their homes, the least costly and the most typical transportation modes can be utilised. While a few will always need relatively costly specialised transportation options, such as adapted vans, most can learn to walk, wheel, share cabs, ride public buses, or ride in car pools with nondisabled people under natural supervisory conditions.

Certainly it could be argued that adults with disabilities could walk, ride public buses, and travel in integrated car pools to and from their segregated enclaves. They can. In fact, Rhodes and Valenta (1985) reported that all-8 members of an enclave at a biomedical equipment company learned to travel to their enclave in city buses. However, if they can learn to travel in the community with nondisabled people, they can learn to work next to nondisabled co-workers in integrated environments.

### **Opportunities for Work Enhancement**

Work enhancement refers to opportunities to grow vocationally over time. *Horizontal* enhancement refers to opportunities to learn and perform increasing numbers of tasks

within a particular difficulty range. Vertical enhancement refers to opportunities to learn and perform more complex and possibly higher paying tasks in a slightly more demanding difficulty range.

### ***Values***

1. Every worker should be given the opportunities and supports necessary to participate in at least two different activities per half-day of work.
2. Every worker should be given the opportunities and supports necessary to learn increasing numbers of tasks within a particular difficulty range (horizontal enhancement).
3. Every worker should be given the opportunities and supports necessary to learn to participate in work activities within a more demanding difficulty range (vertical enhancement). If a worker cannot function efficiently in a more demanding range, so be it; but opportunities for vertical career advancement must be accessible.
4. If a particular work environment does not allow for reasonable horizontal and vertical enhancement, it can rarely, if ever, be considered acceptable as a permanent placement.

### ***Discussion***

Some enclaves offer neither horizontal nor vertical enhancement. For example, there are enclaves in which workers with disabilities are required to put jackets on books or to construct one part of a wooden pallet during their entire workdays and careers. In these situations, the range of tasks within a particular level of difficulty is extremely circumscribed and opportunities to learn more complex tasks at the next level of difficulty are essentially non-existent.

Some enclaves offer horizontal, but not vertical, enhancement. A group of eight adults with intellectual disabilities cleaning the fifth floor of an office building or removing litter from a rest area along a road are examples. In these instances, a worker often has an opportunity to perform an array of tasks within the same level of difficulty such as sweeping, washing windows, picking up trash, and emptying wastebaskets. However, he or she must engage in the same activities over extended periods of time, regardless of whether he or she wants, needs, or is capable of a vertical career move. In fact, in some enclaves a contractual arrangement is made for workers with disabilities to perform specific rudimentary tasks. Learning to perform tasks within a higher difficulty range is not allowed because a contract has not been negotiated to do so or because nondisabled workers are performing those tasks.

Integrated work environments offer better opportunities to learn new and more complex tasks over time than enclaves for three major reasons. *First*, as part of the initial job development process, the tasks available in a business are considered in relation to the short- and long-term enhancement needs of an individual. An environment that offers reasonable opportunities for horizontal and vertical enhancement is selected over one that does not. *Second*, all parties can agree upon an individualised enhancement plan before work begins. During initial job development,



the employer and job coach can select a cluster of tasks considered within the worker's current difficulty range. The worker then begins by learning to perform one task and adds to his or her repertoire until at least two can be performed per half-day of work. Subsequently, an individualised vertical enhancement plan can be designed and implemented. *Third*, one of the best ways to realise horizontal and vertical enhancement is to have an individual with disabilities work within sight, sound, and reasonable distance of a large number of nondisabled co-workers who are engaging in a wide variety of tasks. In such settings, nondisabled co-workers, job coaches, and others are likely to identify new job opportunities.

### **Opportunities for Social Relationships**

Five positive personal interactions between a worker with severe intellectual disabilities and nondisabled co-workers are of concern.

1. *A work companion* is a nondisabled co-worker who teaches, monitors, or helps a worker who is disabled as he or she performs real work in an integrated environment. This assistance includes, but is not limited to, creating adaptations that enhance work performance, dispensing corrective feedback, checking the quality of completed work, and providing needed physical assistance.

2. *A lunch/dinner/break companion* is a nondisabled co-worker who functions with a worker who is disabled during lunch, dinner, or break times. While the nature of the relationship is primarily that of companionship, assistance may be provided.

3. *A before-work companion* is a nondisabled co-worker who socialises with a worker who is disabled before work begins.

4. *A friend* refers to a nondisabled co-worker who develops and maintains a personal relationship with a worker who is disabled. The relationship is reciprocal, shared, mutually satisfying, and extends to nonwork hours and days. The relationship is primarily social in nature and must be nurtured by frequent contacts over extended periods of time.

5. *A travel companion* is a nondisabled person, who may or may not be a co-worker, who travels in a car pool or on a public bus or train, or otherwise functions with a worker who is disabled as they go to and from work.

### **Values**

1. The more disabled a worker, the more important it is that a wide variety of social relationships with nondisabled co-workers be developed.

2. Prior to the selection of a work environment, reasonable opportunities to develop at least the five kinds of social relationships previously delineated must be verified. If an environment disallows or impedes the development of these social relationships, an alternative must be secured.

3. Once a worker enters an environment, individualised, systematic, and long-term strategies that result in the development and maintenance of at least the five kinds of social relationships previously delineated must be designed, implemented, and evaluated.

4. Systematic interventions by paid supervisors will be necessary to arrange and verify some social relationships. However, the role and presence of paid supervisors should be faded so that relationships are maintained and enhanced by nondisabled co-workers and the worker with disabilities.

5. Social relationships should not be confined to the days, hours, and places of work. They should also be expressed at office parties, office softball and bowling games, picnics, outings, banquets, and other functions that are parts of the camaraderie and spirit of the workplace.

### ***Discussion***

When a worker with severe intellectual disabilities functions in an enclave, the development of social relationships with nondisabled co-workers and others is unacceptably restricted for three major reasons. *First*, as the number of people with disabilities in an environment increases, the probability of nondisabled co-workers becoming personally involved with an individual decreases. Since enclaves contain more people with disabilities than almost any social environment can absorb, acceptable ranges of social relationships between enclave members and co-workers without disabilities rarely develop. *Second*, social relationships often emanate from sharing similar experiences gained in common environments and activities. As members of an enclave are set apart from nondisabled workers, many of the typical ways social relationships develop simply cannot be actualised. *Third*, social relationships develop best from individual knowledge, frequent personal contacts, and unique combinations of interpersonal styles, privacy, sharing, and trust. Enclaves with their “special boss” are perceived as unnatural in that they are dramatically different from conditions under which nondisabled workers function. These different conditions engender feelings of separateness and groupness, a sense of “us versus them,” and social barriers few can overcome.

When a worker functions in an individually appropriate integrated work environment, developing the five kinds of desired social relationships is more probable because the social milieu of a work environment is examined carefully prior to selection. If the development of a reasonable range of social relationships is improbable, the environment is not considered for use. In addition, no more than two workers who are disabled function in the immediate work environment. Under such conditions, nondisabled co-workers who are able and willing to interact are identified, and calculated actions that facilitate the development of social relationships are made. Then, a plan for fading specialised interventions in order to allow the maintenance, monitoring, and enhancement of the relationships is designed, implemented, and evaluated.

### **Personalized Matching of a Worker to an Environment**

The process of determining the unique characteristics of a worker with disabilities and then arranging for effective functioning in an integrated environment that is complementary, enhancing, and supportive is referred to as *personalized matching*. Three personalized matching strategies are of concern.

1. In the *natural match strategy*, comprehensive and valid information about a particular worker is gathered. Then, with the specific worker in mind, comprehensive and valid information about a large number of potential work environments and activities is gathered. If the information clearly indicates the characteristics of the work environment are compatible with the characteristics of the worker, the environment is selected for use. That is, as substantial changes either in the environment or in the worker does not seem necessary, a “natural” match is considered to exist.

2. In the *change the environment strategy*, comprehensive and valid information about a particular worker is gathered. Then, with the specific worker in mind, comprehensive and valid information about a large number of potential work environments and activities is gathered. In some cases, a particular environment is not quite acceptable for use. However, specific changes that will make it more compatible with the unique characteristics of the worker can be made efficiently and expeditiously. The changes are made, an acceptable match is engineered, and the environment is then considered usable.

3. In the *change the worker strategy* comprehensive and valid information about a particular worker is gathered. Then, with the specific worker in mind, comprehensive and valid information about a large number of potential work environments and activities is gathered. After considering both clusters of information, it is determined that the demands of a particular environment are inflexible. However, if specific changes in the worker can be made, a compatible match can be generated and so the environment is selected for use. Teaching a worker to use a specialised device that allows the completion of a task within required rate and quality standards and assisting a worker to choose clothing in accordance with company dress codes are examples of this strategy.

### ***Values***

1. Comprehensive and valid information about the personal preferences and other unique physical, intellectual, social, and behavioural characteristics of a worker must be gathered.

2. Then, with a particular worker in mind, comprehensive and valid information about a large number of potential vocational environments and activities must be gathered.

3. Finally, after considering all information gathered, a personalized match between a worker and a work environment must be arranged.

### ***Discussion***

When personalized matching is considered, enclaves are particularly unacceptable for two major reasons. First, only a very restricted range of work environments can

tolerate enclaves. Thus, thousands of businesses and even entire communities are overlooked as viable work options because they simply cannot absorb a group of individuals with disabilities. *Second*, when the procedures used to arrange most enclaves are examined, personal and family preferences and other unique characteristics of a worker rarely guide the selection of the work environment and activities. In most instances, the work environment and tasks are pre-selected and then an individual is forced to fit in. In fact, a strategy typically used to develop enclaves has been outlined by Rhodes and Valenta (1985) and Trach, Rusch, and DeStafano (1987). Specifically, a job developer conducts a community survey to identify potential work environments. Then, specific businesses are contacted and the possibility of employing a group of people with disabilities is discussed. When an employer expresses a willingness to employ a group of workers with disabilities, a contract is negotiated. The work environment is then examined to determine the work performance criteria and social skills necessary to function therein. Workers are then secured to perform the agreed-upon tasks. This strategy almost always lacks the individualisation so necessary for personalized job matching. In fact, it is the inverse of the strategy recommended here.

Meaningful personalized matching is more likely in integrated work environments because businesses that can absorb one or two individuals with disabilities are more numerous than those that can absorb a group are. If a job coach has access to large numbers of potential work environments, the chances of arranging an acceptable personalized match increase. In addition, personalized matching is inherent to the procedures used to find and develop integrated work environments. That is, comprehensive and valid information about the worker and a variety of vocational environments and activities is gathered. Then, the personal preferences and other unique characteristics of the worker drive the selection of the environment and activities. When a job is developed with an individual worker in mind, the chance of a successful match is greater than when an environment is secured and then a worker is required to meet the associated demands.

## **SUMMARY.AND CONCLUSIONS**

On the one hand, consider the young woman with severe intellectual disabilities who rides to and from her job at a local bank in a car pool with nondisabled neighbours. When she arrives at the bank, she “hangs out” with her friends until it is time to punch in. She engages in work activities that were selected based upon her preferences and abilities next to her nondisabled co-workers. She is the only worker with disabilities there and almost all of the supervision she receives comes from nondisabled co-workers. However, a job coach provides occasional assistance. Initially, she learned a small set of tasks, but over time she took advantage of opportunities to learn several tasks that were more complex and difficult. She has developed a wide range of social relationships with her co-workers that are actualised before, during and after work. In sum, she enjoys her job, performs it acceptably, and cherishes her interactions with the nondisabled people with whom she works, is safe and comfortable in the surroundings, and is looking forward to the future.

To some, the fact that she has severe intellectual disabilities and works in a bank is remarkable because the cultural stereotype requires that we view her as non-

productive, in need of shelter and someone who is paid to watch her at all times. Fortunately, we now know that individuals with severe intellectual disabilities can and should function in the integrated world of work and that to deny them the opportunity is unfair. Finally, one of the most important purposes of a 21-year public school career is to prepare a student with severe intellectual disabilities to live, work, and play in integrated environments throughout adulthood.

On the other hand, consider the ideological and curricular absurdities of a longitudinal special education program designed to prepare a young woman with severe intellectual disabilities for functioning in an enclave. We could teach her to ride a public bus, to function in an integrated car pool, or to traverse busy streets in her wheelchair. But why bother? When she graduates, a special van with six other people with disabilities will pick her up and take her to and from her enclave. We could teach her to function in a socially acceptable manner with nondisabled students prior to the start of school. This might help her function with nondisabled co-workers prior to the start of work. But why bother? In her enclave she will interact only with six other people with disabilities. We could teach her to work next to nondisabled co-workers. But why bother? In her enclave she is going to be in a special area of the workplace and only six other people with intellectual disabilities will be near her. We could teach her to function in response to the guidance and assistance offered by nondisabled people who are not specifically paid to monitor her. But why bother? A job coach will be in her enclave watching her all the time. We could teach her to take breaks, eat lunch, and go to parties and other social functions with nondisabled people. But why bother? The disabled members of her enclave will eat, take breaks, and socialise together, and they will be unable to establish meaningful social relationships with nondisabled co-workers. In sum, we could teach her to be a citizen in an integrated world, but if she is going to be segregated for life in an enclave, why bother?

## REFERENCES

Bellamy, G.T., Rhodes, L.E., Mank. D.M., & Albin, J. M. (1987). *Supported employment: A community implementation guide*. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

Brown, L., Shiraga, B., Ford, A., Nisbet, J., Van Deventer, P, Sweet, M., York, J., & Loomis, R. (1986). Teaching severely handicapped students to perform meaningful work in non-sheltered vocational environments. In R. Morris & B. Blatt (Eds.), *Special education: Research and trends* (pp. 131-189). New York: Pergamon Press.

Brown, L., Shiraga, B., York, J., Kessler, K., Strohm, B., Rogan, P., Sweet, M., Zanella, K., Van Deventer, P., & Loomis, R. (1984). Integrated work opportunities for adults with severe handicaps: The extended training option. *Journal of The Association for Persons With Severe Handicaps*, 9(4), 262-269.

Brown, L., Udvari-Solner, A., Shiraga, B., Long, E., Davis, L., Verban, D., Van Deventer, P., & Jorgensen, J. (1987). The Madison strategy for evaluating the vocational milieu of a worker with severe intellectual disabilities: Version II 1988. In

L. Brown, A. Udvari-Solner, E. Frattura-Kampschroer, L. Davis, & J. Jorgensen (Eds.), *Educational programs for students with severe intellectual disabilities* (Vol. XVII, pp. 1- 372). Madison, WI: Madison Metropolitan School District.

Buckley, J., & Bellamy, G.T. (1985). National survey of day and vocational programs for adults with severe disabilities: *A 1984 profile*. In P. Ferguson (Ed.) *Issues in transition research: Economic and social outcomes* (pp. 1- 12). Eugene: University of Oregon, Specialised Training Program.

California Department of Finance. (1979). *A review of sheltered workshops and related programs (Phase II): To Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 2067* (Vol. II, Final Report). Sacramento: State of California.

Davis, S. (1987). *A national status report on waiting lists of people with mental retardation for community services*. Arlington, TX: Association for Retarded Citizens of the United States, National Headquarters.

Hagner, D. (1988). *The social interactions and job supports of employees with severe disabilities within supported employment settings*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY.

Johnson, T.Z. (1985). *Belonging to the community*. Madison: Wisconsin Council on Developmental Disabilities.

Minnesota Developmental Disabilities Council. (1982). *Policy analysis series: Issues related to Walsch v. Noot* (Paper No. 9). St. Paul, MN: Author.

Nelson, N. (1971). *Workshops for the handicapped in the United States*. Springfield, IL: Charles C Thomas.

Nirje, B. (1969). The normalization principle and its human management implications. In R. Kugel & W. Wolfensberger (Eds.), *Changing patterns in residential services for the mentally retarded* (pp. 179-195). Washington. DC: President's Committee on Mental Retardation.

Rhodes, L.E., & Valenta, L. (1985). Industry-based supported employment: An enclave approach. *Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps*. 10(1), 12-20.

Siwolop, S., & Mohs, M. (1985, February). The war on Down syndrome. *Discover* pp. 67-69.

Taylor, S., Racino, J, Knoll, J. & Lutfiyya, Z. (1987). *The non-restrictive employment., On community integration for people with the most severe disabilities*. Syracuse, NY: Human Policy Press.

The Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps (1983). *Position statement on employment for persons with severe handicaps*. Seattle, WA: Author.

Thompson, L., & Wolf, S. (1989). *Supported employment in Michigan: Impact upon persons with severe disabilities - interim report*. Kalamazoo: Western Michigan University. College of Arts and Sciences, The Supported Employment Evaluation Project.

Trach, J.S., & Rusch, F.R. (1987). *Supported employment in Illinois: Program implementation and evaluation (Vol. I)*. Urbana-Champaign: University of Illinois, Secondary Transition Intervention Effectiveness Institute.

Trach, J.S., Rusch, F.R., & DeStafano, L. (1987). Supported employment program development: Degree of implementation manual. In J.S. Trach & F.R. Rusch (Eds.), *Supported employment in Illinois: Program implementation and evaluation (Vol. I)*, pp. 17-50). Urbana-Champaign: University of Illinois, Secondary Transition Intervention Effectiveness Institute

Will, M. (1984a). *OSERS programming for the transition of youth with disabilities: Bridges from school to working life*. Washington, DC: U.S. Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services.

Will, M. (1984b) *Supported employment services: An OSERS position paper*. Washington. DC: U. S. Department of Education.

Wolfensberger, W (1972). *The principle of normalisation in human services*. Toronto. National Institute on Mental Retardation.

Zivolich, S (1984). *Regional Center of Orange County survey of day activity programs and developmental centres*. Unpublished manuscript, Regional Center of Orange County, Anaheim. C.A.