

**A PILOT STUDY TO DETERMINE
CONSUMER SATISFACTION IN
VOCATIONAL EVALUATION**

By

Susan M. Hendricks

A Research Paper

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the
Master of Science Degree
in
Vocational Rehabilitation

Approved 2 Semester Credits

Investigation Advisor

The Graduate College
University of Wisconsin-Stout
July, 2003

The Graduate College
University of Wisconsin-Stout
Menomonie, Wisconsin 54751

ABSTRACT

Hendricks Susan M.

A Pilot Study to Determine Consumer Satisfaction in Vocational Evaluation

Vocation Rehabilitation Dr. Robert Peters 7/30/03 44 Pages

American Psychological Association, 5th edition

The purpose of this pilot study was to design a consumer satisfaction survey and to determine the level of consumer satisfaction as it relates to vocational evaluation. Specific objectives addressed included the following: Were participants satisfied with their vocational evaluation experience? Were participants involved in evaluation planning and decision-making? Do the participants have a better understanding of vocational options and knowledge of how to pursue and obtain their vocational goals? This pilot study surveyed individuals with disabilities who participated in vocational evaluations on site at the Stout Vocational Rehabilitation Institute and various counties throughout the state of Wisconsin and South Dakota. The consumers voluntarily completed the survey. The data will be used to determine consumer satisfaction and areas of strengths and weaknesses between participant and vocational evaluator.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

With many thanks to Dr. Bob Peters, my “family” and friends at SVRI and UW-Stout. Your patience, kindness and care helped to make this possible. To Al and Dave for allowing me to do this study and for their support and guidance. To my computer experts; Kara, Bev and Mary Jo, many thanks ladies. To Reggie & Marie; “one touch and a new life began.” To my “bear-men”- Poppa bear Rich, Stephen and Jeff, for the abundance of guidance, strength, and direction. To my children, Stevie, Keri, and Cory who’s lives turned up-side down as I journeyed down this path . The changes and sacrifices have been many. I love you all dearly, many, many, thanks. Most of all to my Spirit Father for giving me this new life and for always being near.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	page
Abstract.....	ii
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	
Introduction.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	1
Purpose of the Study.....	5
Definition of Terms.....	6
Limitations.....	7
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW	
Review of related literature.....	8
The Role of Legislation.....	9
Expansion of Vocational Evaluation Services.....	11
Training & Certification.....	12
Problems in the Field.....	13
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY	
Subjects.....	16
Method of Survey Development.....	16
Data analysis.....	20
CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS	
Results.....	21
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION	
Summary.....	28

Recommendations.....28

REFERENCES.....30

APPENDIX A: Participant Exit Survey (Old
Version).....33

APPENDIX B: Participant Exit Survey (New Version).....35

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

In the past four decades little research has been done to measure consumer satisfaction in the vocational evaluation process. History shows that consumer involvement, opinion; choice and satisfaction didn't exist for individuals with disabilities in the rehabilitation process until recently. Professionals in the field of vocational rehabilitation held the power to decide what they deemed necessary for consumers in regards to employment and training. Thus allowing for rehabilitation programs to take credit for those who succeeded and blame those who didn't. Gratefully, there were those who took a stand and advocated for the rights of individuals with disabilities in the rehabilitation process and in vocational evaluation.

Statement of the Problem

Adelman, Spitznagel & Saxon (1997), reported that few studies in the past have focused on vocational evaluations and follow-up of satisfactory employment. Criticisms from consumers, parents, and advocates included: Evaluators and Counselors see themselves as accountable to the system and not to the consumer, evaluation can be used to screen people out, not enough research available of the effectiveness of vocational evaluation, every consumer receives the same standard evaluation and consumers are not involved in decision-making, (Corthell, & Griswold, 1987). It is through the identification and resolution of such criticism that rehabilitation programs can grow and meet the needs of consumers and professionals.

As empowered consumers voice opinions regarding their service needs, the effectiveness of current services will be of greater interest to providers. Consumers should be involved in the decision making process to enable them to make knowledgeable decisions which involve the evaluation and potential career choice. This lack of input demonstrates the continued devaluing of consumer opinion. Researchers need to continue to develop studies, which include consumer opinions and also as a way to monitor consumer progress in the rehabilitation arena (Richard, 2000. p.37).

A study by Hallenbeck & Campbell (1975) found a considerable relationship between vocational evaluation and successful vocational outcomes. Results indicated that up to seventy-five percent of the participants who did not participate in vocational evaluation were unsuccessful in the rehabilitation process. They suggest that more attention should be given to the vocational evaluation process in achieving successful employment outcomes. Rosenberg & Usdane (1963) found that vocational evaluators were approximately eighty-five percent accurate in predicting consumer outcome. In a survey by Lee, Taylor & Rubin (1994), using the Vocational Evaluation Service Questionnaire (VESQ) designed to gather data from VR counselors discovered, "Most types of evaluation information were perceived as being important by the state VR counselors. Of these types of information, 88% or more of the counselors rated all the items except one "moderately" to "extremely" important" (p.35).

Based on research by Peters, Scalia, & Fried, (1993), successful closure rates were found to be favorably linked with a completed vocational evaluation and subsequent employment recommendations. The need for more research in the field of vocational evaluation and in consumer satisfaction does have positive benefits for rehabilitation programs.

Several studies indicate the need to express consumer opinion and allow for increased participation of consumers in rehabilitation programs. Increased participation can strengthen the relationship of the professional to consumer, and is a critical component to measuring the effectiveness of current program services in vocational rehabilitation. “Client involvement, in conjunction with the increased demand for program accountability and the rise of consumerism, has resulted in a need for rehabilitation programs to demonstrate client satisfaction with rehabilitation services,” (Janikowski, Bordieri & Musgrave, 1991, p.43). “Our responsibilities to broader application of evaluation and assessment must be addressed to ensure effective and ethical service delivery” (Thomas, 1994, p.115). Thus, research demonstrates the need for consumer input, but also the magnitude of the importance of vocational evaluation and consumer satisfaction.

Early consumer satisfaction surveys took place, after the consumer had received services, via the telephone or by mail. Often times the results were poor due to the amount of time that had elapsed between the vocational evaluation and the survey of satisfaction. The need to develop better testing instruments designed to voice consumer opinion prior to the closure of program services was also identified. For precise measures it has been recommended that inquiry should start at the onset of service and continue thru the end. Resulting in an improved ability to measure consumer opinion

“Assessments of opinions are best done in the situation in which the cognitive construct of interest is triggered, such as during service participation. This design would enable researchers to more accurately measure and better understand personal constructs used by consumers in situations of most salience” (Ostrom, 1989, p.8).

The question then became at what point in service participation do we approach the individual and by what means will we use to determine consumer satisfaction. Richard's response was "A reasonable option is to just ask the consumer as a way to determine whether the consumer's needs have been met or not" (Richard, 2000, p38). Numerous instruments were beginning to surface that would allow consumers for the first time to evaluate the services provided. These instruments were multifaceted, multi-dimensional, or developed as a single construct tool. One tool used to measure client satisfaction is the SERVQUAL; a multidimensional questionnaire used in hospital settings, by credit card companies with college student services, with limited testing in rehabilitation settings. Results indicated it was a useful tool in the rehabilitation setting (Richard, 2000).

The Vocational Evaluation Satisfaction Scale (VESS), designed by Sabin, Cuvo, and Musgrave (1987) which examines client satisfaction during and after vocational evaluation services. It consists of a 35-item questionnaire, rated on a four point Likert scale. The purpose was to be specific to the vocational process but basic to other assessment techniques. Initial research results on the VESS led to the conclusion that it was both a reliable and valid instrument to measure consumer satisfaction as a function of program length. According to Janikowski, Bordieri, & Musgrave (1991) surveys such as The Client Satisfaction Questionnaire (CSQ-8), an 8-item tool using a Likert-type scale, was designed to measure global satisfaction with human service programs. Findings suggest that the VESS and the CSQ-8 basically are measuring the same construct. The Client Evaluation of Services (CES) is an 8-item tool using a four point Likert scale, which is an updated version of the CSQ-8, designed to measure global satisfaction with human service programs (Janikowski, Bordieri, & Musgrave, 1991).

Identifying or creating a valid measuring tool that is specific to the evaluation program is another possibility for evaluating program participant satisfaction.

Purpose of the Study

The focus of this research study is to examine consumer satisfaction in the field of vocational evaluation. Thus, rehabilitation services will realize the mission to provide customer centered services and, as a result, service effectiveness will be enhanced ...changes could send a positive message to empowered consumers that rehabilitation service providers are not only interested in consumer opinion but also respond to their concerns when provided with socially valid research information (Richard, 2000. p 41). The following research objectives will be addressed:

1. Were participants satisfied with their vocational evaluation experience?
2. Were participants involved in evaluation planning and decision-making?
3. Do the participants have a better understanding of vocational options and the knowledge of how to pursue and obtain their vocational goals?

The purpose of this pilot study was to develop a new participant exit survey, which includes consumer consent forms, and to determine the level of consumer satisfaction at a vocational evaluation center in western Wisconsin.

Definition of Terms

1. Definition of Vocational Evaluation as defined by The Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1998, Sec.7 (II) (iii):” may include, to the degree needed to make such a

determination, an assessment of the personality, interests, interpersonal skills, intelligence and related functional capacities, educational achievements, work experience, vocational aptitudes, personal and social adjustments, and employment opportunities of the individual, and the medical, psychiatric, psychological, and other pertinent vocational, educational, cultural, social, recreational, and environmental factors, that affect the employment and rehabilitation needs of the individual...”

This particular evaluation center offers three types of evaluations, which will be incorporated in the results of the outcome survey. They are:

1. Vocational Evaluation: A focus on comprehensive vocational evaluation utilizing psychometric testing, work samples assessment, career counseling and development of plans to reach vocational objectives set by the consumer (SVRI literature).
2. Intensive Evaluation: A comprehensive assessment of mobility, transportation, computer resources, communications, and worksite modifications performed in conjunction with vocational evaluation (SVRI literature).
3. On the Road (OTR) Vocational Evaluation utilizing psychometric testing, career counseling and development of plans to reach vocational objectives set by the consumer. Administered on-site throughout the state of Wisconsin, including various Native American reservations.

Limitations:

This study is limited by the geographical area of the populations used in the study, mainly consumers from rural areas throughout Wisconsin and South Dakota. Caution should be taken in generalizing the results of this study to other areas. The results generated from the

vocational evaluation center used in this study should not be generalized to other evaluation facilities. Results will be shared with facility members.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

History of Vocational Evaluation:

This chapter will provide a historical perspective on the evolution of vocational evaluation including the impact it has had to assist individuals with disabilities. During the 1950's and 1960's the profession of vocational evaluation evolved from numerous disciplines; Psychology, the Military, the field of Medicine, Vocational and Industrial Education, the "workshop movement" and occupational therapy. The Vocational Rehabilitation Movement provided the means for vocational evaluation to mix with the varied concepts to become a separate discipline (Pruitt, 1986).

The field of Psychology is credited for the concept of the testing laboratory from early experimental psychologists such as: Oehm, Binet, Boas, Eilbert, Ebbinghaus, Jastrow and Munsterberg (Boring, 1950). The concept of norming we owe to Binet who developed a scale of age norms in his work (Boring, 1950). Hugo Munsterberg the "father of industrial psychology" is credited with developing the first work sample: a simulated trolley car. Standardized administrative procedures and the use of statistics were borrowed and applied to work samples. Even though work samples are the "brain child" of psychologists, they had been unpopular in psychological testing, criticized as being expensive and inefficient (Cronbach, 1949). The most important concept borrowed from psychology is the information collected from evaluative methods or instruments, which are used to understand behavior and make predictions about future possibilities. From industry we receive job analysis techniques, the development of behavioral rating scales, simulated tasks, and job try-outs. Contributions of the military include

the group-testing concept by the Army during WWI (Boring, 1950). The Army Alpha and Beta Intelligence tests were used to screen out individuals of subnormal intelligence. Work samples were used during WWII and include the Link Trainer, a simulated work sample used to evaluate and train pilots. Newer, more sophisticated work samples are still used today to train airplane pilots (Pruitt, 1986).

The Role of Legislation

World War II resulted in growth for the rehabilitation movement. The war created an increased demand for industrial products necessary to maintain the efforts of the war. This opened the doors for persons with disabilities to demonstrate they could do the job even with a disability. This brought about the Barden-Lafollette Act of 1943 that extended federal-state rehabilitation program services to persons with mental retardation, mental illness, and physical disabilities (Rubin & Roessler, 1987).

There was a need in vocational rehabilitation to discover tools and techniques and methodologies for vocational evaluation to measure skills and abilities without discriminating against people with disabilities, as past methods had (Corthell & Griswold, 1987). Legislation in 1965, 1967, and 1968 increased the funding for the development of rehabilitation facility programs, thus increasing the demand for vocational evaluation and work adjustment services.

As more emphasis was placed on providing competitive employment opportunities for people with disabilities in the early 1960's, vocational evaluation became more prominent. A need to formalize the process was based on the dilemma faced by rehabilitation counselors, and

other practitioners who could not obtain reliable productive information solely from standardized psychological measures. Many people with disabilities, especially those with developmental disabilities and severe physical and sensory impairments, had limited exposure to formalized or mainstream education in the 1960s and early 1970s (Wesolek & McFarlane, 1992, p51).

The 1960's heard an outcry for civil rights and equality for all individuals. People with disabilities demanded rights to include a larger population that was in need of services. The *Vocational Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1965* (Public Law 333) included the expansion of services to include persons with socially handicapping conditions such as alcoholism, lack of education and prison records (Pruitt, 1986). The amendments also introduced the concept of extended evaluation to determine individual eligibility for services where feasibility was not easily determined. The intent was to allow rehabilitation counselors to take more risk in serving persons with vocational handicaps, thereby serving more people with severe disabilities. There was a need for new and better ways to evaluate these new consumers in the evaluation process (Pruitt, 1986).

The variety of jobs and length of time needed to obtain sufficient employment data were major limitations that prompted the use of simulated work tasks and work samples. The TOWER system from the International Center for Disabled (ICD) in New York was developed in the 1950s and Jewish Employment and Vocational Services in Philadelphia developed the JEVS system in the 1960s; they were among the first work sample systems marketed for broader use (Wesolek & McFarlane, 1992).

Expansion of Vocational Evaluation Services

Consumers of rehabilitation services affected the growth and development of vocational evaluation services. As vocational rehabilitation agencies expanded services to individuals with developmental disabilities, vocational evaluation services, particularly the methods used, began to change. Doors to rehabilitation services for individuals with various disabilities opened and developers of vocational evaluation tools responded to meet the needs of the service providers. Methodologies were geared toward determining the training needs of individuals with physical disabilities.

The Vocational Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1968 added follow-up service for maintaining a person with a handicap in employment and provided for services to family members. It also gave the authority to provide vocational evaluation and work adjustment services to persons disadvantaged by reasons of age, level of vocational attainment, or ethnic or other factors.

It is generally agreed that vocational evaluation grew as a part of the vocational rehabilitation field. However, it borrowed from other fields including clinical and industrial psychology, education, and counseling. The Vocational Evaluation and Work Adjustment Association (VEWAA), a non-profit organization founded in 1967, came into being out of a need for professional affiliation. It's membership provided services to individuals with disabilities who needed assistance with vocational development and/or career decision-making. Today vocational evaluation is used widely to serve populations such as special need students, individuals with mental illness, physically disabled, those who are chronically ill, the unemployed, and individuals in special employment training programs (Pruitt, 1986).

Training and Certification

In 1966, the first-degree program with an emphasis in vocational evaluation was initiated with federal support at Stout State University (UW-Stout) in Wisconsin under the direction of Paul R. Hoffman (Pruitt, 1986). By the mid 1980s, 12 institutions of higher education offered M.S. or B.S. programs with an emphasis in vocational assessment. The vocational evaluation specialty in rehabilitation was gaining distinctiveness as a separate profession in the field. Professional standards were developed and a certifying process begun through the Commission on Certification of Work Adjustment and Vocational Evaluation specialists (CCWAVES) in 1975 (Wesolek & McFarlane, 1992).

The *1998 Rehabilitation Act Amendments* strengthened services for individuals with disabilities to include a host of services: Sec., 7, (B) “to the extent additional data is necessary to make a determination of the employment outcomes, and the nature and scope of vocational rehabilitation services, to be included in the individualized plan for employment of eligible individual, a comprehensive assessment to determine the unique strengths, resources, priorities, concerns, abilities, capabilities, interests, and informed choice, including the need for supported employment, of the eligible individual, which comprehensive assessment... May include, to the degree needed to make such a determination, an assessment of the personality, interests, interpersonal skills, intelligence and related functional capacities, educational achievements, work experience, vocational aptitudes, personal and social adjustments, employment opportunities of the individual, the medical, psychiatric, psychological, and other pertinent vocational, educational, cultural, social, recreational, and environmental factors

that affect the employment and rehabilitation needs of the individual”.... (Library of Congress, p.2, 1998).

Problems in the Field

The 1998 Rehabilitation Act Amendments brought about a partnership between consumer and professional;

“In the 1980s subtle but important changes began to occur affecting the way vocational evaluation was provided and perceived by those who purchase the service (customers) and those who are served (consumers). Regardless of early theorists claims that vocational evaluation must be sufficiently long in order to provide a comprehensive appraisal of the individual’s assets and needs, shorter-term evaluation (one week or less) becomes the accepted practice. This change, based primarily on cost considerations and accusations of inefficiency with longer term evaluation, caused more practitioners to abandon the use of real work, either facility based or community based, in favor of work samples of short duration and standardized psychometric tests. As this change took place, there was a federal mandate to serve individuals with more severe disabilities along with more emphasis on providing individualized “client-centered” assessments. Individuals with disabilities jointly developed their rehabilitation plan and consequently were more involved in their rehabilitation and assessment process. These changes were incongruent with the use of shorter-term assessments and the use of more trait-factor instruments” (Wesolek & McFarlane, p. 52, 1992).

These changes were based primarily on cost considerations and longer-term evaluations based on community based assessments moved toward shorter standardized psychometric

testing. The emphasis on client involvement in the rehabilitation process has been further strengthened with the passage of ADA (Americans with Disability Act) in 1990. Individualized assessment, including vocational evaluation which prioritized more involvement and more control in the process on the part on the person being served, would be a primary determinant in designing and delivering the services (Wesolek & McFarlane, 1992).

One of the major criticisms of traditional vocational evaluation has been that the consumer (the person involved in the process) does not directly benefit from the service and that information obtained is mainly used to “screen out” rather than include more options for a person with a disability. Many consumers have complained that their personal vocational evaluation experience was an exclusionary process where they were not able to fully demonstrate their true capacities and potentials. Consequently, demand for a “place-train” model of assessment is receiving more attention. The impact of this model is that vocational assessment is becoming more client involved where consumers are not only selecting where they want to go for evaluation, but are highly involved in the planning process, i.e., selecting tests, work samples, and community assessment sites. The former philosophy of diagnosis and prediction is giving way to one of exploration and try-out leading to expanded insight and broader career selection on the part of the person involved in the process. There is a growing realization that psychological, personal and social issues have a significant impact on one’s attitudes, outlook, and self-esteem, which certainly affects work related behaviors (Wesolek, & McFarlane, 1992). Furthermore, effective programs evaluate the satisfaction of participants for reasons of program accountability. Satisfaction as well as consumer input can lead to better recommendations for each person served and assist in developing programs.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this pilot study is to develop a new participant exit survey and examine consumer satisfaction in a vocational evaluation program at the Stout Vocational Rehabilitation Institute Services (SVRI) in Menomonie, Wisconsin. Also, to establish an initial set of reliability criteria for the satisfaction survey. The results of the survey will determine how satisfied participants were with the evaluation services they received. The results of this study and recommendations will be shared with the Director of SVRI as well as facility members at the Center. The survey results will be used to answer the following three research objectives:

- A. Were participants satisfied with the vocational evaluation experience?
- B. Were participants involved in evaluation planning and decision-making?
- C. Does the participant have a better understanding of vocational options and the knowledge of how to pursue and obtain their vocational goals?

Subjects

The subjects for this study included people with disabilities from Wisconsin and South Dakota S. Dakota. Evaluations were conducted on-site at SVRI or at various communities throughout Wisconsin and South Dakota, including numerous Native American reservations.

Method of Survey Development

This study utilizes an existing two-part, eight-item survey instrument; using a Likert scale that was developed at the Center. Pertinent questions specifically related to vocational evaluation were added along with the consumer consent portion. Because it is a pilot study no reliability coefficients have yet been developed. Face validity drawn from information specifically related to the vocational evaluation is included. The old survey had been incorporated years earlier without consumer consent forms and no formal compilation of data had been collected prior to the year 2000.

Each survey is given individually to participants upon completion of services. Clients are provided an office or private place to complete the survey. Upon completion of the surveys, data will be collected and analyzed.

The second part of the survey consists of surveying the referral source. This survey will focus on the participants only and not counselor's response. The old survey consisted of the following eight questions; based on the following Likert scale. The new survey has 19 questions and will be listed under the old questions. The old survey has more than 8 questions but for the purpose of this study the focus will be on questions 13-20 of the old survey referencing vocational evaluation only. The new questions will follow the old question.

Likert-scale-five-point continuum:

Strongly Agree					Strongly Disagree	N/A
<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	

D. Old Survey Question 13: I was satisfied with my experience at the Center. References the participant's satisfaction and involvement with vocational evaluation at SVRI.

New Survey Question 1: I had a positive experience at Stout.

Old Survey Question 14: I have a clear idea of jobs I can do well. Refers to the recommendations identified that were within reason, realistic and for immediate and long-term employment.

New Survey Question 2: I have a better idea of jobs I can do.

Old Survey Question 15: I feel that I have a clear idea of the things I am going to have to do to get what I want. This references the identification of possible resources in the individual's community and the necessary steps that need to be taken in order to achieve employment.

New Survey Question 3: I have a better understanding of what I need to do to accomplish my goals.

Old Survey Question 16: I feel my evaluator assisted me in making vocational decisions or plans. This refers to the consumer taking an active role in the decision making process of both the plan and recommendations.

New Survey Question 4: My Evaluator was available and assisted me in making vocational plans.

Old Survey Question 17: I was involved in planning work samples and projects. Refers to the participant selecting and choosing work samples of interest, trying out new job tasks.

New Survey Question 5: My Evaluator discussed tests and work samples to develop a plan for the week.

Old Survey Question 18: I was involved in making decisions, which led to my evaluator's recommendations. Refers to the participant reviewing tests, work samples, career exploration etc., guided by the evaluator to list realistic options with a potential for success.

New Survey Question 6: I was involved in making decisions, which led to my recommendations.

Old Survey Question 19: I understand the recommendations. References that the participant has a clear idea of what is being recommended.

New Survey Question 7: I understand my skills and abilities clearer now.

Old Survey Question 20: I participated fully in my staffing. References the input the participant had in the staffing, voicing their opinion about the plan.

New Survey Question 8: I understand my vocational plans and job goals.

New Survey Question 9: Recommendations were presented in a clear and realistic fashion.

New Survey Question 10: Prior to program participation, my counselor explained the reasons why I was participating in a vocational evaluation.

New Survey Question 11: A participant handbook was provided to me. Questions and answers were discussed so I had a better understanding of my role and my evaluator's role.

New Survey Question 12: All paperwork was discussed with me prior to obtaining my signature.

New Survey Question 13: My Evaluator spent time with me daily, providing me with tasks to do and overseeing all projects I participated in.

New Survey Question 14: I fully participated in my evaluation and wasted little time.

New Survey Question 15: My accommodations in the dorm were satisfactory.

New Survey Question 16: Dorm advisors in the dorm were courteous.

New Survey Question 17: Dorm advisors were available at all times.

New Survey Question 18: I had the opportunity to participate in evening activities.

New Survey Question 19: Orientation of the dorm was conducted and rules were discussed.

Data Analysis:

A Likert scale as used in the Center's survey will be used for participants to respond along a five-point continuum:

Strongly Agree				Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable (N/A)
<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>

The calculations of data from this scale will provide the standard deviation; mean score of each response, and frequency of each response. Percentages will be calculated from the responses.

Limitations:

This study is limited by the geographical area of the populations used in the study, mainly consumers from rural areas throughout Wisconsin and South Dakota. Caution should be taken in generalizing the results of this study to other areas. The results generated from the vocational evaluation center used in this study should not be generalized to other evaluation facilities. Results will be shared with facility members.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

The purpose of this pilot study was to develop a new participant exit survey and determine the level of consumer satisfaction from consumers who participated in vocational evaluations at the Stout Vocational Rehabilitation Institute in Menomonie, WI. The subjects for this study consisted of individuals with disabilities of various cultures and ages. The evaluations took place at the Stout Vocational Rehabilitation Institute or on-site at various counties throughout Wisconsin and South Dakota.

Questions on the nineteen-item survey were designed to gain more information regarding the following research questions for this study:

1. Were participants satisfied with the vocational evaluation experience?
2. Were participants involved in evaluation planning and decision-making?
3. Does the participant have a better understanding of vocational options and the knowledge of how to pursue and obtain their vocational goal?

A Likert scale, as used in the Center's survey, will be used for participants to respond along a five-point continuum:

Strongly Agree				Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable (N/A)
<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>

The calculations of data from this scale will provide the standard deviation; mean score of each response, and frequency of each response. Percentages will be calculated from the responses.

Results are for the 14 individuals that completed the survey.

Survey Question 1: I had a positive experience at Stout.

Mean response: 4.64, Standard Deviation: 1.08

Frequency: 12 responded strongly agree (85.7%), 1- responded agree (7.1%), 1 – responded strongly disagree (7.1%).

Survey Question 2: I have a better idea of jobs I can do.

Mean response: 4.57, Standard Deviation: 0.51

Frequency: 8 responded strongly agree (57.1%), 6 responded agree (42.9%).

Survey Question 3: I have a better understanding of what I need to do to accomplish my goals.

Mean response: 4.79, Standard Deviation: 0.43

Frequency: 11 responded strongly agree (78.6%), 3 responded agree (21.4%).

Survey Question 4: My Evaluator was available and assisted me in making vocational plans.

Mean response: 4.86, Standard Deviation: 0.36

Frequency: 12 responded strongly agree (85.7%), 2 responded agree (14.3%).

Survey Question 5: My Evaluator discussed tests and work samples to develop a plan for the week.

Mean response: 4.93, Standard Deviation: 0.27

Frequency: 13 responded strongly agree (92.9%), 1 responded agree (7.1%).

Survey Question 6: I was involved in making decisions, which led to my recommendations.

Mean response: 4.86, Standard Deviation: 0.36

Frequency: 12 responded strongly agree (85.7%), 2 responded agree (14.3%).

Survey Question 7: I understand my skills and abilities clearer now.

Mean response: 4.64, Standard Deviation: 0.50

Frequency: 9 responded strongly agree (64.3%), 5 responded agree (35.7%).

Survey Question 8: I understand my vocational plans and job goals.

Mean response: 4.79, Standard Deviation: 0.43

Frequency: 11 responded strongly agree (78.6%), 3 responded agree (21.4%).

Survey Question 9: Recommendations were presented in a clear and realistic fashion.

Mean response: 4.92, Standard Deviation: 0.28

Frequency: 12 responded strongly agree (85.7%), 1 responded agree (7.1%), 1 was missing.

Survey Question 10: Prior to program participation, my counselor explained the reasons why I was participating in a vocational evaluation.

Mean response: 4.54, Standard Deviation: 1.39

Frequency; 11 responded strongly agree (78.6%), 1 responded agree (7.1%), 1 responded not applicable (7.1%).

Survey Question 11: A participant handbook was provided to me. Questions and answers were discussed so I had a better understanding of my role and my evaluator's role.

Mean response: 4.86, Standard Deviation: 0.53

Frequency: 13 responded strongly agree (92.9%), 1 responded neutral (7.1%).

Survey Question 12: All paperwork was discussed with me prior to obtaining my signature.

Mean response: 4.67, Standard Deviation: 0.89

Frequency: 10 responded strongly agree (71.4%), 1 responded agree (7.1%), 1 responded disagree (7.1%).

Survey Question 13: My Evaluator spent time with me daily, providing me with tasks to do and overseeing all projects I participated in.

Mean response: 4.54, Standard Deviation: 1.39

Frequency: 11 responded strongly agree (78.6%), 1 responded agree (7.1%), 1 not applicable (7.1%).

Survey Question 14: I fully participated in my evaluation and wasted little time.

Mean response: 4.85, Standard Deviation: 0.38

Frequency: 11 responded strongly agree (78.6%), 2 responded agree (14.3%).

Survey Question 15: My accommodations in the dorm were satisfactory.

Mean response: 3.40, Standard Deviation: 2.37

Frequency: 6 responded strongly agree (42.9%), 1 responded agree (7.1%), 3 not applicable (21.4%).

Survey Question 16: Dorm advisors in the dorm were courteous.

Mean response: 3.50, Standard Deviation: 2.42

Frequency: 7 responded strongly agree (50.0%), 3 not applicable (21.4%), 4 missing.

Survey Question 17: Dorm advisors were available at all times.

Mean response: 3.20, Standard Deviation: 2.30

Frequency: 5 responded strongly agree (35.7%), 1 responded agree (7.1%), 1 responded neutral (7.1%), 3 not applicable (21.4%), 4 missing.

Survey Question 18: I had the opportunity to participate in evening activities.

Mean response: 2.90, Standard Deviation: 2.23

Frequency: 4 strongly agreed (28.6%), 1 responded agree (7.1%), 1 responded neutral (7.1%), 1 responded disagree (7.1%), 3 not applicable (21.4%).

Survey Question 19: Orientation of the dorm was conducted and rules were discussed.

Mean response: 3.11, Standard Deviation: 2.42.

Frequency: 5 responded strongly agree (35.7%), 1 responded neutral (7.1%), 3 not applicable (21.4%).

Response to research questions:

1. Were participants satisfied with the vocational evaluation experience? Test results indicate an overall response of above average, indicating participants were highly satisfied with services.
2. Were participants involved in evaluation planning and decision-making? Test results indicate an overall response of above average indicating participants were highly active in the directions of their evaluations.
3. Does the participant have a better understanding of vocational options and the knowledge of how to pursue and obtain their vocational goals? Test results indicate the overall response was above average, indicating high awareness in understanding their vocational goals.

Consumer's completing the survey were provided space where they could write their own comments that would help improve the vocational services they received. The names of the evaluators will not be listed; instead evaluators will be referred to as Evaluator. Comments are as follows:

“I’m glad I went through this program. I’m much clearer now about what I can & cannot do.”

“I had a wonderful time, I had lots of fun both at the dorms & at the institute. I would recommend this to whoever needed this service. It helped a lot.”

“It was a pleasure to meet Evaluator and her staff. If it were anyone (else but Evaluator) her and I have similar backgrounds I don’t think I would have had the positive and sense of accomplishment that I do now.”

“I had a great time! Thanks for having me here. I was happy to play some pool with dorm staff. Thank you anything for me got there on Sunday.”

“Didn’t answer question 15 thru 19 because I live in Menomonie.”

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Several studies indicate the need to express consumer opinion and allow for increased participation of consumers in rehabilitation programs. Increased participation can strengthen the relationship of the professional to consumer, and is a critical component to measuring the effectiveness of current program services in vocational rehabilitation. “Client involvement, in conjunction with the increased demand for program accountability and the rise of consumerism, has resulted in a need for rehabilitation programs to demonstrate client satisfaction with rehabilitation services,” (Janikowski, Bordieri & Musgrave, 1991, p.43). “Our responsibilities to broader application of evaluation and assessment must be addressed to ensure effective and ethical service delivery” (Thomas, 1994, p.115). Thus, research demonstrates the need for consumer input, but also the magnitude of the importance of vocational evaluation and consumer satisfaction.

The purpose of this pilot study was to develop a new participant exit survey and determine the level of satisfaction from individuals with disabilities using vocational evaluation services through the Stout Vocational Rehabilitation Institute. Specific objectives addressed included the following: Were participants satisfied with their vocational evaluation experience? Were participants involved in evaluation planning and decision-making? Does the participant have a better understanding of vocational options and the knowledge of how to pursue and obtain their vocational goals? The subjects in this pilot study were individuals with various disabilities, of all ages, color and cultural backgrounds. The goal of this chapter is to discuss the results of the data analysis and make future recommendations to this study.

In summary, this study found that the consumers, who participated in vocational evaluation services from the Stout Vocational Rehabilitation Institute, overall rated their satisfaction of services as above average thus concluding that all research objectives were met with average to above average responses.

Recommendations

As a result of this study, the following areas are recommended for future research:

1. A yearly study to determine consumer satisfaction, vocational evaluation strengths, weaknesses, and areas of improvement for evaluators.
2. Insert a statement on the survey after question 14 such as to skip questions 15-19 if you did not stay in the dorms for more accurate statistics.
3. Survey participants upon arrival and then at the end of the week to see if and how their opinions changed.

Currently Stout Vocational Rehabilitation Institute (SVRI) does not use a consent form when collecting data from participants. It is recommended that they include a consent form with their survey form when collecting participant data. This way, the participant's rights are protected. After all of the data is collected and analyzed SVRI may benefit from sharing the results with current and prospective referral sources. Consumer feedback is critical to SVRI services. Their feedback has a direct impact on how vocational evaluations are conducted. Feedback is one way of holding the evaluator accountable for service delivery. Without feedback, it is impossible to know what areas need to be improved upon.

REFERENCES

- Adelman, E. J., Spitznagel and R, J., Saxon, P. (1997). The Effects of Vocational Evaluation on the Vocational Rehabilitation of Clients with Disabilities. *Vocational Evaluation and Work Adjustment Bulletin, Summer/Fall*, 30, 74-79.
- Boring, E. (1950). A History of Experimental Psychology (2nd ed.). In Pruitt, W.A. (1986), *Vocational Evaluation* (2nd ed). Menomonie, WI: Walt Pruitt Associates.
- Corthell, D W. & Griswold, P. (1987) The Use of Vocational Evaluation In Vocational Rehabilitation. Menomonie, WI: Materials Development Center, Stout Vocational Rehabilitation Institute, University of Wisconsin-Stout. *Institute on Rehabilitation Issues, Research and Training Center, University of Wisconsin-Stout*. Pp.6.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1949). Essentials of Psychological Testing (4th ed.). In Pruitt, W.A. (1986). *Vocational Evaluation* (2nd ed). Menomonie, WI: Walt Pruitt Associates.
- Hallenbeck, P.N. & Campbell, J.L. (1975) Evaluator Recommendations and Subsequent Performance: A Follow-up of Work Evaluations and Clients. *Vocational Evaluation and Work Adjustment Bulletin*, 8, 21-27.
- Janikowski, T. P., B., Bordieri, J. E., & Musgrave, J. (1991, Summer). Dimensions of Client Satisfaction with Vocational Evaluation Services. *Vocational Evaluation and Work Adjustment Bulletin*, 43-48.
- Lee, D.Y., Taylor, D, W. & Rubin, S. E. (1994). Rehabilitation Counselors Perceived Value of Vocational Evaluation Information. *Vocational Evaluation and Work Adjustment Bulletin Summer 1994*, 33-37.

Library of Congress, (1998), *The Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1998*, p.2.

WWW.ed.gov/offices/OSER/RSA/RehabAct.html.

Ostrom, R. L. (1989). Interdependence of Attitude Theory and Measurements in A Discrepancy

Model for Measuring Consumer Satisfaction With Rehabilitation Services, Richard

Michael, (2000) *Journal of Rehabilitation Oct/Nov/Dec 2000*, 66 37-43.

Peters, R.H., Scalia, V.A., & Fried, J.H. (1993). The Effectiveness of Vocational Evaluation

Program Recommendations and Successful Outcome by Disability Type. *Vocational*

Evaluation and Work Adjustment Bulletin, 26, 47-52.

Pruitt, W.A. (1986). *Vocational Evaluation*. Menomonie, WI: Walt Pruitt Associates

Richard, M. A. (2000). A Discrepancy Model for Measuring Consumer Satisfaction with

Rehabilitation Services. *The Journal of Rehabilitation, Oct/Nov/Dec*, 37-43.

Rosenberg, B., & Usdane, W. M. (1963). The Tower system: Vocational Evaluation of the

Severely Handicapped for Training and Placement. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*,

42, 149-152.

Rubin, S. E., & Roessler, R. T. (1987) *Foundations of the Vocational Rehabilitation Process*.

Austin, TX: PRO-ED, Inc.

Sabin, M.C., Cuvo, A.J., & Musgrave, J.R. (1987, Fall). Developing a Client Satisfaction in a

Vocational Evaluation Setting. *Vocational Evaluation and Work Adjustment Bulletin*,

107-113.

Stout Vocational Rehabilitation Services Brochure – *University of Wisconsin Stout, Menomonie,*

WI 54751

Thomas, S., W. (1994). Vocational Evaluation: Dynamics, Politics, and Creative Application.

Vocational Evaluation and Work Adjustment Bulletin, 115-118.

Wesolek, J. & McFarlane, F. (1992). Vocational Assessment and Evaluation: Some Observations

From the Past and Anticipation for the Future. *Vocational Evaluation and Work*

Adjustment Bulletin, 51-54

APPENDIX A
PARTICIPANT EXIT SURVEY (OLD VERSION)

Vocational Development Center
Participant Exit Survey

Client Name: _____
Counselor Name: _____
Evaluator Name: _____
Date: _____ ID No. _____

13. I was satisfied with my experience at the Center.

Strongly Agree			Strongly Disagree		N/A
<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>

14. I have a clear idea of jobs I can do well.

Strongly Agree			Strongly Disagree		N/A
<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>

15. I feel that I have a clear idea of the things I am going to have to do to get what I want. (training, medical help, education, etc.)

Strongly Agree			Strongly Disagree		N/A
<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>

16. I feel my evaluator assisted me in making vocational decisions or plans.

Strongly Agree			Strongly Disagree		N/A
<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>

17. I was involved in planning work samples and projects.

Strongly Agree			Strongly Disagree		N/A
<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>

18. I was involved in making decisions, which led to my evaluator's recommendations.

Strongly Agree			Strongly Disagree		N/A
<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>

19. I understand the recommendations.

Strongly Agree			Strongly Disagree	
<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>

20. I participated fully in my staffing.

Strongly Agree			Strongly Disagree		N/A
<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>

IF YOU STAYED IN RESIDENCE HALL:

21. I enjoyed living in the Dormitory.

Strongly Agree			Strongly Disagree		N/A
<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>

22. Floor advisors were courteous and available.

Strongly Agree			Strongly Disagree		N/A
<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>

23. I had the opportunity to participate in evening activities.

Strongly Agree			Strongly Disagree		N/A
<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>

24. Compared to when I first came here, my vocational plans or job goals are clearer to me.

Strongly Agree			Strongly Disagree		N/A
<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>

25. Compared to when I first came here, I understand my abilities more clearly.

Strongly Agree			Strongly Disagree		N/A
<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>

APPENDIX B

PARTICIPANT EXIT SURVEY (NEW VERSION)

**Stout Vocational Rehabilitation Institute-Services
Consent Form**

RIGHT TO WITHDRAW OR DECLINE TO PARTICIPATE

Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary. You may choose not to participate without any adverse consequences to you. Should you choose to participate and later wish to withdraw from the study, you may discontinue your participation at this time without incurring adverse consequences.

NOTE: Questions or concerns about the research study should be addressed to, Susan M. Hendricks, (715) 232- 2453 the researcher, or Dr. Robert Peters, (715) 232-1983 the research advisor. Questions about the rights of research subjects can be addressed to Sue Foxwell, Human Protections Administrator, UW-Stout Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research, 11 Harvey Hall, Menomonie, WI, 54751, phone (715-232-1126).

I attest that I have read and understood the above description, including potential risks, benefits, and my rights as a participant, and that all of my questions about the study have been answered to my satisfaction. I hereby give my informed consent to participate in this research study.

Signature_____

Date_____

Stout Vocational Rehabilitation Institute
New Participant Exit Survey

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. I had a positive experience at Stout. | 2. I have a better idea of jobs I can do. |
| <u>5</u> <u>4</u> <u>3</u> <u>2</u> <u>1</u> <u>0</u> | <u>5</u> <u>4</u> <u>3</u> <u>2</u> <u>1</u> <u>0</u> |
| Strongly Strongly NA | Strongly Strongly NA |
| Agree Disagree | Agree Disagree |
| 3. I have a better understanding of what I need to do to accomplish my goals. | 4. My Evaluator was available and assisted me in making vocational plans. |
| <u>5</u> <u>4</u> <u>3</u> <u>2</u> <u>1</u> <u>0</u> | <u>5</u> <u>4</u> <u>3</u> <u>2</u> <u>1</u> <u>0</u> |
| Strongly Strongly NA | Strongly Strongly NA |
| Agree Disagree | Agree Disagree |
| 5. My Evaluator discussed tests and work samples to develop a plan for the week. | 6. I was involved in making decisions which led to my recommendations. |
| <u>5</u> <u>4</u> <u>3</u> <u>2</u> <u>1</u> <u>0</u> | <u>5</u> <u>4</u> <u>3</u> <u>2</u> <u>1</u> <u>0</u> |
| Strongly Strongly NA | Strongly Strongly NA |
| Agree Disagree | Agree Disagree |
| 7. I understand my skills and abilities Clearer now. | 8. I understand my vocational plans and job goals. |
| <u>5</u> <u>4</u> <u>3</u> <u>2</u> <u>1</u> <u>0</u> | <u>5</u> <u>4</u> <u>3</u> <u>2</u> <u>1</u> <u>0</u> |
| Strongly Strongly NA | Strongly Strongly NA |
| Agree Disagree | Agree Disagree |
| 9. Recommendations were presented counselor
In a clear and realistic fashion. | 10. Prior to program participation, my
Explained the reasons why I was
participating in a vocational evaluation. |
| <u>5</u> <u>4</u> <u>3</u> <u>2</u> <u>1</u> <u>0</u> | <u>5</u> <u>4</u> <u>3</u> <u>2</u> <u>1</u> <u>0</u> |
| Strongly Strongly NA | Strongly Strongly NA |
| Agree Disagree | Agree Disagree |
| 11. A participant handbook was provided | 12. All paperwork was discussed with me prior |

to me. Questions and answers were
were discussed so I had a better
of my role and my evaluators role.

5 4 3 2 1 0
Strongly Strongly NA
Agree Disagree

13. My evaluator spent time with me daily,
providing me with tasks to do and
overseeing all projects I participated in.

5 4 3 2 1 0
Strongly Strongly NA
Agree Disagree

15. My accommodations in the dorm were
Were satisfactory.

5 4 3 2 1 0
Strongly Strongly NA
Agree Disagree

17. Floor advisors were available at all times.

5 4 3 2 1 0
Strongly Strongly NA
Agree Disagree

19. Orientation of the dorm was conducted
and rules were discussed.

to obtaining my signature.

5 4 3 2 1 0
Strongly Strongly NA
Agree Disagree

14. I fully participated in my evaluation and
wasted little time.

5 4 3 2 1 0
Strongly Strongly NA
Agree Disagree

16. Floor advisors were courteous to me.

5 4 3 2 1 0
Strongly Strongly NA
Agree Disagree

18. I had the opportunity to participate in
evening activities.

5 4 3 2 1 0
Strongly Strongly NA
Agree Disagree

5 4 3 2 1 0
Strongly Strongly NA
Agree Disagree

My Evaluator's name: _____

COMMENTS:
