This chapter briefly reviews several issues involved in doing research with people with developmental disabilities and how, in JRB Associates’ use of a multi-method approach, we have attempted to address these issues within the context of the transition of Jackson clients from institutional to community living environments. Many of the practical issues related to developing the initial design and conducting the survey in the institutions are only summarized here; they were treated more fully in the Year 1 Report. Instead, the discussion of implementation issues focuses principally on our visits with individuals in the community.

**Communication**

As noted in Chapter 1, the Jackson Longitudinal Study (JLS) goes beyond earlier efforts in seeking the input of the clients themselves regarding their level of satisfaction about their living environments and their sense of well-being. Although the importance of doing this has been recognized at least since the Pennhurst longitudinal study (begun in 1980), methodological problems have prevented most researchers from doing so consistently. For instance, in the Pennhurst study, the only persons interviewed were those known beforehand to be able to respond to a verbal interview, even though the researchers knew that about half the residents were nearly or completely non-verbal.

Our approach is somewhat different. First, where the person is partially or completely non-verbal, we interview the person and a "helper" together, allowing the person to respond to the extent he or she is able, and the helper to "speak for" the person when the person cannot or will not do so. (This is further discussed in the section "Using the Helper as Proxy for the Mover," below.) Second, we observe the person in his or her own living environment, taking note of behavior and conditions which can be compared to observations made earlier or later in the study, providing indirect evidence of changes in quality of life.

**Consistency**

Research has suggested that some people with developmental disabilities respond inconsistently to interview questions. For instance, given a choice among three alternatives, some may choose the last one offered - echoing the interviewer's last statement ("echolalic" response); some may always answer "yes" when a yes-
The multi-method approach provides internal checks on the consistency of our data.

Consent and Respect for the Individual

We sought consent to participate in the JLS from each individual and from a parent or guardian.

or-no response is asked for. Such problems could seriously affect data reliability.

Our interview design anticipates this possibility. In the interview process we do this in three ways. First, we make questions as "concrete" as possible. Second, the instrument asks similar questions in a number of different ways, requiring different types of responses. Third, we encourage our interviewer-observers to rephrase questions and to probe where a vague response has been offered.

Beyond these techniques, of course, stand the other data-gathering modalities mentioned above: the presence of the person's helper in the interview situation, and observation of the person in his or her living environment. We believe that by using all these methods, we have developed a system which provides adequate safeguards against possible distortion of the data.

Our effort to measure changes in individual Jackson class members' quality of life (QoL) necessarily involves direct contact with the people affected. It thus raises issues of respect for their rights and privacy, as well as questions of whether the interview process itself could possibly have damaging effects on a person's health or psychological wellbeing.

We determined that where a person could give consent directly to participate in the study, we should ask for consent and not proceed if the person was unwilling to be interviewed. Beyond that, we decided that it would be appropriate to obtain the permission of every Jackson client's parent(s) or legal guardian before including that person in our study. In a limited number of very clear-cut cases, we decided that it would be appropriate to go ahead with interview visits without obtaining guardian consent when clients agreed on their own to participate. Our decisions on this matter influenced the JLS design as well.

We determined to interview and observe only a "stratified, representative sample" of the population within the institutions in part because we suspected that it would be difficult to obtain guardian permission to visit every mover prior to the time of the person's transition to the community. (This proved to be correct.)

Our caution on this issue stems primarily from our concern for the privacy rights of Jackson clients and the ethical implications of studies involving people with developmental disabilities. As the Pennhurst researchers noted in 1985, "[I]n past years, people living in institutional settings have been part of studies that would never been approved if the subjects had not been labeled mentally retarded."
In addition, we were anxious to contact parents and guardians and explain the study to them. We recognized that the climate created by court-mandated deinstitutionalization was litigious, and we wanted to allay any suspicions that our study was inherently biased in favor of one position with regard to the question of community placement.

**SAMPLING THE JACKSON POPULATION**

Our research design is based on a "pre-test post-test" model. The pre-test involved interview-observation visits with a sample of the Jackson population while they were still residents at Los Lunas and Fort Stanton. The post-test involved subsequent interview visits with all (or as many as possible) of the Jackson class members after they had moved into a community living arrangement in New Mexico. The same questions are asked and the same types of observations are made during the pre-move and the post-placement visits.

Why did we decide to select a sample of Jackson clients to visit before they moved? Why not interview everyone? Several considerations were at work. One was simply timing. During the first three months of the project it was necessary to construct and test the instruments and obtain guardian permission to begin the visits in the institutions. By then, several individuals had already moved. Second, we expected that early movers would be likely to be higher functioning individuals with fewer needs for supports in their new homes in the community. If so, the most reliable way to discover the "pre-moving" levels of satisfaction and quality of life of the Jackson class as a whole would be to visit a representative cross-section of the entire population in the institutions. To do this we constructed a "stratified, representative sample" consisting of people scheduled to move after May 1, 1993 (our target date for beginning the survey). We decided to visit each of them in approximately the order in which they were scheduled to move, depending also on whether we were able to obtain guardian consent. (Characteristics of the population and the basis for choosing the sample are discussed in Chapter 3.)

**USING THE HELPER AS PROXY FOR THE MOVER**

We first learned about the "helpers" assigned to Jackson class clients in the institutions from the Jackson Management Manual, after the JLS contract had been awarded in January 1993. Once an individual had been recommended for community placement, a helper - identified as "the person most capable of assisting the individual to understand and communicate throughout the process" - was made a member of the individual's Transition Interdisciplinary Team (TIDT).

The idea of involving the individual's helper in our interviews was suggested as we were building the research design.
observers were instructed to seek helper responses when the individual being interviewed was unable to provide an understandable response to a question. The individual usually remained present for all or part of the interview. The interviewer-observer instructed helpers participating in the interview to put themselves as nearly as possible into the position of the individual as they answer questions. As the helper (as "proxy") responded to questions, the interviewer-observer monitored the quality of the interaction between that person and the individual, checking to see whether the individual exhibited any behavior that suggested disagreement with a response from the helper.

Despite these attempts to approximate the notion of the helper as "proxy" for the individual, we are aware that no one is able to speak totally for another, and that there may be considerable variance between proxy-answered interviews and those in which individuals answer for themselves. We therefore coded interview instruments as answered by the individual, by the individual with less than 50% "proxy" help, by the proxy with less than 50% input by the individual, and by the proxy alone. This enabled us to test for the significance of differences between data obtained from Jackson class members and from helpers.

DEVELOPING AND TESTING THE INSTRUMENTS

The dimensions of consumer satisfaction and Quality of Life that formed the basis for the Jackson Longitudinal Study stemmed from the Final Report of the Quality Assurance Task Force. Our interview questions and observational guides were drawn largely from prior work in other states, including the Pennhurst Longitudinal Study referred to above. A list of references used in developing the instruments is found in Appendix C to the Year 1 Report.

As already suggested in Chapter 1, the concept of Quality of Life is necessarily subjective. Establishing and consulting the JLS Working group helped greatly in dealing with this reality. Three meetings of the group were held during the first three months of 1993 as we developed the instruments. Members raised concerns about an individual would communicate with the interviewer and about the subjectivity of the interviewer's understanding of the individual's perceptions. These discussions helped us to make our questions more concrete. The Working Group also endorsed the idea of using "proxy" responses from the individual's helper where needed. Two representatives of the self-advocacy group People First were members of the Working Group. They allowed us to "pre-test" some of the interview questions with members of People First at one of their meetings, and then provided helpful feedback about the interview process, the questions and the way they were phrased.
The observation element of our multi-method approach grew in significance as we learned more about the difficulties we would have in gathering data through face-to-face interviews with Jackson class members. The Working Group helped us define our observational indicators more precisely and operationally, which resulted in our developing a separate instrument for recording observation data.

CONDUCTING THE INTERVIEW-OBSERVATION VISITS

Our Senior Research Associate anchors the field research team.

In our first year, JRB Associates engaged the services of a Senior Research Associate (SRA), a highly qualified counseling psychologist who has considerable experience working with people with developmental disabilities. She was involved in the latter stages of development of the interview and observation instruments, and conducted all of the Year 1 interview-observation visits. Having one person make all the visits provided the advantage of eliminating for the first year the problem of "inter-coder reliability." For subsequent years this problem has been mitigated by having the SRA - based on her experience during the first year - develop a detailed set of interview and observation guidelines and assist in providing training for additional Research Associates brought onto the JLS team in Year 2.

Because of increased workload and geographical factors, at the start of Year 2 JRB Associates hired two additional Research Associates (RA) under contract to undertake interview-observation visits with Jackson clients who have moved to communities in the north/west and south/east parts of the state. Although more than half of the movers in the study reside in the Albuquerque metropolitan area, the remainder live in widely scattered sites all over New Mexico. The RAs have extensive backgrounds in counseling (one in clinical psychology) and in working with individuals with developmental disabilities. They underwent two days of training with JRB Associates' evaluation specialist and the SRA, which included observing a visit and then conducting actual interviews and observations under her guidance.

During Year 1 the SRA conducted interview-observation visits with 32 individuals prior to their moving from Los Lunas and Fort Stanton. (We designated these pre-move visits as "baseline" or "To" data.) An additional 28 To visits were conducted in Year 2. The procedures used in arranging and conducting these visits established the pattern for later visits with individuals in the community.

First it was necessary enlist the cooperation of the institution's administration. Jackson transition coordinators were critical to the process by arranging for time, location and the presence of each individual's helper for each appointment. The interviewer-observer
Procedures for the visits were designed to build trust, as well as to gather data.

Visits in the Community

The first visit was made only after the individual had had time to settle into his or her new home.

Research associates must be flexible in arranging for visits, to work around less predictable schedules.

assumed responsibility for determining the order of visit activities. She established a pattern of asking the individual early on to show her where he/she lived. This informal "tour" of the resident's living environment enabled her to establish an informal relationship with the individual and the helper, as well as to observe and gather data about the individual's "home" (usually the room), which she would later record.

She began each visit by explaining who she is. She described the JLS as an effort to find out how individuals' lives are affected by the transition. She stressed that the study is not part of the legal process, and that she is not a state employee. She emphasized that the interview is confidential and that they could say whatever they want to. If possible she obtained the individual's affirmative consent. Interviews are held where individual wants to be. At the close of the interview she briefly reviewed the individual's case file in conjunction with taking time to record her observations. She checked for consistency between what she had been told by the individual and staff and the documentation in the person's Individual Program Plan goals and objectives, activity log, incident reporting, etc. Before leaving, she mentioned that she or someone else on our team (depending on where the individual moves) would visit the person each year during the next 4 years.

Visits with individuals in the community are always made at the resident's home (rather than at work or training), since we have chosen in this study to focus primarily on the home environment. The first visit (called "Ti") was not scheduled until the person had been living in the community for at least four months. This allowed time for the individual to settle in and for the formal transition process to be completed. In cases where the individual moved again prior to our T1 visit, we waited until four months after that move before conducting the visit. The next visit, T2, was conducted close to the first anniversary date of the individual's move, and subsequent visits occurred annually (T3 at the second anniversary, T4 at the third anniversary, etc.).

The procedure for T1 and subsequent visits was patterned on that described above for the T0 visit with the sample in the institutions. However, a great deal of flexibility was required in adapting to the variations in community residential settings. Here the RAs had far less control of the environment - the time of day the visit could be made, interruptions by other clients or visitors, variations in routine, etc. Community living is often less predictable than life in the institution. Since the study design called for visits to all of the initial Jackson class members living in New Mexico for whom we had guardian consent, T1 was often their first contact with the JLS team.
High staff turnover requires us to re-explain the study constantly.

Moreover, because of high rates of residential staff turnover, even subsequent visits required the RAs to explain the study and often overcome initial resistance in order to gain the cooperation of provider staff.

Because there was no central staff as in the institutions, the RA was responsible for arranging visits on an individual basis. This was usually done at the time of initial telephone contact with someone at the individual's home, by asking, "Who knows the person best in his/her living environment?" Besides identifying an appropriate person who could act as a proxy, JLS interviewer-observers tried to determine the best time of day to conduct the visit, taking into account the individual's day program schedule and energy level, and when the helper could be present.

Helpers in the Community

High staff turnover in the community-based homes complicated the question of whether a "helper" can act as a reliable "proxy."

Even for the To visits in the institution, it sometimes proved impossible for the individual's helper (i.e., the person so identified as a member of the individual's TIDT) to be present for the JLS visit, and another staff member who knew the individual frequently substituted for the helper. This was unavoidable, and contributed to uncertainty about the reliability of proxy-supplied data. On the other hand, even the designated helper was often someone not in the individual's everyday environment (not front line staff in a cottage).

Once the individual has moved into a community living arrangement and his or her TIDT is dissolved, the matter of who could act in the "proxy" role was further muddled. Residential provider staff tend to change often, and often at T1 the individual's "helper" had known the client for four months or less. Even at T2 and later visits, staff or provider changes meant that the helper was often someone relatively new. When the helper had to act as the client's proxy in answering interview questions. The basis for those answers was not experientially very deep, and there could conceivably be quite a bit of variance in the data supplied, depending on the helper's prior experience, familiarity with the mover, level of education, etc.

However, a consistent pattern of findings from several sources provides reassurance about the reliability of our data.

In light of these highly variable factors, it has been encouraging to discover that when data on specific individuals are followed from T0 through T5, a consistent pattern of findings about the direction of an individual's development tends to emerge. With this final report we resume our practice of using individual case histories to illustrate our findings. We also look more analytically at the patterns that emerge from the survey data. In Chapter 3 we report on our findings from the interview and observation visits. The case studies are presented in chapter 4. Chapter 5 summarizes the conclusions we have been able to reach about the outcomes of the Jackson transition process as a result of our five years of research.
NOTES TO CHAPTER 2
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One additional RA candidate received initial and follow-up training but withdrew after review of two sets of his initial efforts indicated that he was having problems being sufficiently "objective" and non-judgmental in obtaining interview and observation data in the field. His experience illustrates the difficulty of gathering valid qualitative data in emotion-laden circumstances and ensuring inter-coder reliability.

One variable we have not found possible to control in the visit schedule is that the two newer research associates have schedules which permit them to visit the clients only on weekends. Often this means doing without the presence of staff who "know them best."