An Analysis of the Systemic Aspects of Rights Training for People with Intellectual Disabilities

Laura Mullins, B.A.

Centre for Applied Disability Studies

Submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

Faculty of Social Sciences, Brock University
St. Catharines, Ontario

© *July, 2009*

Abstract

Individuals with intellectual disabilities (ID) as a group have been subject to abuse. Individuals with ID need to be made aware of their rights. The 3Rs: Rights, Respect and Responsibility Human Rights Project is promoting rights awareness in individuals with ID, their caregivers and family members. To be effective, abuse prevention must include support from the whole organization and its processes. This research evaluated the impact of the 3Rs initiative on the organization. It focused particularly on descriptions of organizational change perceived by full-time staff and managers in response to the initiation of the 3Rs Project. Behavioural interviews were conducted and a thematic analysis was used to describe changes in the organizational culture and behavioural mechanisms maintaining these changes. Systemic barriers to change were also explored. The results indicate that the Association is effectively implementing and supporting the rights-based philosophy.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

An Analysis of the Systemic Aspects of Rights Training for People with Intellectual Disabilities

Introduction

Although individuals with intellectual disabilities (ID) are at an increased risk of abuse (Sobsey, 1994), they are often not aware that they have the right not to suffer this abuse (Mazzucchelli, 2001). In an attempt to educate individuals with intellectual /developmental disabilities about their rights, Community Living Welland Pelham (CLWP; an Association for Community Living), in alliance with researchers from Brock University, developed the 3Rs Rights, Respect and Responsibility Human Rights Project. The 3Rs Project has gone beyond CLWP and has been implemented in other community organizations that support individuals with intellectual disabilities.

The primary focus of the 3Rs research 3Rs Project has been on evaluating human rights educations programs for individuals with disabilities, their care providers and family members. In order to be effective, change initiatives that focus on abuse prevention, such as the 3Rs Project, must have broad based organizational support (Wadsworth, 2008). For this reason, the 3Rs Project has attempted to incorporate a systemic approach to rights education (Tarulli, et al., 2004). Until now, however, a full evaluation of this systemic approach has not been undertaken. Thus, the purpose of the current research was to gain insight from the full-time staff and managers at CLWP as to how the 3Rs Project is being supported within the Association. This was accomplished by conducting semi-structured behavioural interviews with the full-time staff, managers and supervisors from CLWP, which focused on describing changes in the organizational culture and behavioural mechanisms maintaining the 3Rs initiative. Although other fields of study are discussed, this research is predominantly situated in the field of Organizational Behaviour. Insights from the examination of the organizational impact of the 3Rs Project on CLWP may assist other community organizations in the implementation and support of similar rights-based approaches to service delivery.

Disability Human Rights

All human beings have rights and generally, this is woven into the deeper structure of humanity. The concept of human rights implies entitlements to basic human needs; including food, shelter, physical safety, security, and health; and other things that enrich one's life, for example, access to knowledge, work and freedom of conscience, expression and association (Bayles, 1981, as cited in Griffiths et al., 2003). Rights are guaranteed to all people as members of the human race. They cannot be taken away. They are not dependent on any previous conduct or social status. However, the extent to which the promotion and protection of these rights is enacted varies around the world and between social groups.

Public awareness of the rights of people with intellectual disabilities has grown through the last decades of the twentieth century and into the twenty-first. In 1974, the issue of "right to treatment" (Bailey & Burch, 2005, p. 53) for individuals living in institutions became publicly recognized. The *Wyatt v. Stickney* (1971) case in Alabama, clarified the right for patients to either receive treatment or be discharged from mental institutions. From this case, a "paradigm shift had occurred" (Bailey & Burch, 2005, p. 53) within all fields of services for individuals with disability that highlighted patients' rights surrounding their treatment. In Canada, the protection of rights has been guaranteed by law in the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms (1982). The United Nations has provided leadership in ensuring rights protections through the seminal United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948), the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Mentally Retarded Persons (1971), the Declaration on the Rights of Disabled Persons (1975) (Griffiths et al., 2003) and the 2006 United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.

Although these protections exist, individuals with intellectual disabilities as a group have been subject to abuse. In fact, the rate of sexual abuse of people who have intellectual disabilities has been estimated to be one and a half times greater than that of the general population (Sobsey, 1994). What is more startling than the higher rate of abuse is, compared to persons without disabilities, people with intellectual disabilities are less likely to feel negatively about sexual abuse (McCabe, Cummins & Reid, 1994). According to Mazzucchelli (2001), these individuals may "feel powerless and be unaware that it is their right not to suffer abuse" (p. 115).

When Sobsey and Varnhagen (1988) reviewed the literature and conducted surveys to explore the relationship between sexual abuse and individuals with disabilities, they found evidence that individuals with disabilities have increased risk of being sexually abused. However, individuals with disabilities are not predominantly at risk of abuse because of their disability itself. In fact, they noted that for many of the abuse cases reported, the risk appeared to be more related to "society's expectation and treatment of people with disabilities" (Sobsey & Varnhagen, 1988, p. 7) than to the specific nature of their disability. Many factors within society influence the risk of abuse among individuals with disabilities. Some of these factors have been explored in previous literature and will be discussed in the next section.

Why are Individuals with Disabilities Still at Risk of Abuse? A Systemic Perspective

There are many systemic factors that influence the risk of abuse of individuals with disabilities. Some of these factors can be interpreted within a behavioural perspective including issues of control and counter-control (Sobsey & Varnhagen, 1988), the use of some behavioural treatments (Sobsey & Varnhagen, 1988) and the prevalence of informal behavioural treatments (Feldman, Atkinson, Foti-Gervais & Condillac, 2004). There are also systemic factors that relate to issues of authority and power within the care-giving environment. These reflect the lack of authority given to staff members (Wendell, 1996) and the lack of clearly outlined and generally accepted guidelines and a code of ethics for staff to follow (Owen et al., 2001).

To account for the increased risk of abuse among individuals with disabilities, Sobsey and Varnhagen, (1988) took a behavioural perspective. Specifically, Sobsey and Varnhagen used Skinner's (1953) model of counter-control as a possible explanation for the increased risk of abuse. Control can be viewed negatively and it can elicit a fearful response because of its association with power. The act of controlling others is negative when the controller is positively reinforced for the control and when the effects of control are immediately aversive and exploitive (Skinner, 1953). From the behavioural perspective, these elements are present when the person experiencing the control cannot establish counter-control by pushing against or escaping from the control. In this situation, control is both negative and troublesome. Individuals with disabilities often lack the ability to resist against control due to deficits in communication skills (Sobsey &

Varnhagen, 1988). In addition to Sobsey and Varnhagen's discussion, even if communication was not an issue, individuals with disabilities may also be limited in their ability to establish counter-control because they do not typically pay for their support staff directly. If they were responsible for distributing wages, then the control in the relationship would be in the hands of service consumers, preventing abuse by ensuring that the staff provide service adequate for the individuals (Bailey & Burch, 2005). Since salary distribution, in most service agencies, rests with the organization's administration processes rather than with the individuals that they support, the consumers' opportunity for counter-control is limited.

Additionally, Sobsey and Varnhagen (1988) present the argument that even some of the behavioural treatments that are used with individuals with disabilities create an increased risk of abuse. For example, "the cumulative index for the Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis (1987) lists over 80 articles published over the past 20 years on the importance of teaching generalization (most with disabled subjects) [and only] four focus on discrimination skills" (Sobsey & Varnhagen, 1988, p. 6). As a consequence, individuals are "trained to comply with the instructions of any adult and that protest or resistance are punished" (ibid, p. 6). Although current trends in articles in the Journal of Applied Behaviour Analysis encourage autonomy by focusing on independence (Bailey & Burch, 2005), many adults with disabilities already have a firm history of previously learned contingencies for compliance.

To build on the issues raised by Sobsey and Varnhagen, it may be said that individuals with disabilities are at risk of abuse if they are given behavioural treatments that are not formally implemented by a Certified Behaviour Analyst and implemented in accordance with current ethical guidelines. Feldman, Atkinson, Foti-Gervais and Condillac (2004) completed a study to examine the prevalence of the use of informal interventions for treatment of individuals with intellectual disabilities who exhibit disruptive or challenging behaviours. They conducted interviews with caregivers in community and institutional residences for persons with intellectual disabilities and found that over fifty percent of the interventions in place were informal. In addition, some agencies allowed the use of intrusive non-therapeutic crisis intervention strategies even though they had policies against intrusive behaviour modification programs. Some of these intrusive and abusive methods include heavy sedation, restraint chairs and seclusion rooms. Many informal interventions are in place because of poor intervention accountability, lack of adequate training and supervision. These deficits do not provide staff with the skills to develop appropriate and effective interventions for people with challenging behaviours.

People with disabilities are also at a greater risk of abuse because of issues of authority and power. There is an intimate relationship between care providers and those they support. People supported by community agencies are dependant on their caregivers to provide assistance for survival. As Wendell (1996) discusses, those who are reliant on assistance for basic needs may receive such help, but under conditions that require them to relinquish control over their lives. In our society, power is credited to individuals who provide healing (Smith & Fitzpatrick, 1995, p. 501). Care providers have the power and control to choose to balance the promotion of support and acceptance of the rights and freedoms of the people they support. Choice is not always available for individuals with intellectual disabilities; they are reliant on the virtues of their caregivers. This creates an inevitable paradox. Individuals with intellectual disabilities might submit to their support staff, even if they would prefer not to, because they want the best possible care. The relationship may be intimate but it is not equal.

In addition to its intimacy, the relationship between support staff and individuals with disabilities is also influenced by the system in which they operate. Barbara Hillyer (1993, as cited in Wendell, 1996), who is an advocate for people with disabilities, comments on the status of caregivers for people with disabilities. She notes that although support workers provide the most personal care, they are paid the least. They provide the day-to-day care for the people they support, but are at the bottom of the hierarchy of the organizations providing services for individuals with disabilities. In addition, the direct support staff often are not empowered to make policy decisions or to change organizational procedures. Hillyer refers to this as "responsibility without authority" (Wendell, 1996, p. 142). With their direct relationship to service consumers, staff have insights into possible changes that could benefit the people they support. However, within the organizational structure they are unable to implement these changes directly. This could create feelings of frustration. Some caregivers may seek to gain power from those whom they are employed to serve. By projecting their feelings of inferiority onto individuals whom they view as subordinate, they are attempting to assert power over individuals who cannot speak for themselves. These social conditions could provide some explanation as to why a minority of caregivers unintentionally abuse individuals with intellectual disabilities. For example, staff may request additional support in order to take individuals on a special outing for a particular individual but, due to budget restraints, additional staffing is not available. After this outing has been canceled, the staff could refuse to plan other special outings in retaliation for the denial of the requested supports.

Finally, within many agencies, the roles of staff and guidelines concerning the nature of appropriate relationships between support staff and those they serve are not made explicit. Owen et al., (2001) discuss that this "confusion may be a contributing factor in abuse of persons who have developmental disabilities" (p. 152). Role confusion and boundary issues may heighten the risk of abuse among individuals with disabilities supported by agencies because support staff are "expected to fulfill different roles (e.g., friend, confidante, counsellor, parent, teacher) ... [and] must shift rapidly from one role to another which may lead to confusion and ambiguity regarding intimacy boundaries" (Owen et al., 2000, p. 47).

Mitchell and Hastings (2001) explored the emotional relationships and coping strategies of staff who support individuals with challenging behaviours. They demonstrated that along with other variables, role ambiguity has been associated with increased stress in staff. In addition, these researchers found that when staff had emotional reactions to their clients' challenging behaviours, they reported developing depersonalization and emotional exhaustion, two known components of burnout. Depression and anger in response to challenging behaviours were also found to be predictors of depersonalization, which they defined as the "development of negative and cynical attitudes toward residents" (Mitchell & Hastings, 2001, p. 453). They discussed how these two dimensions directly influence client care in that "one would expect a depersonalizing attitude to result in depersonalizing treatment of residents and for emotional exhaustion to result in a general avoidance of interaction" (ibid, p. 456). Thus, the researcher concluded that client care is compromised when staff members develop either of these feelings. However, it is important to note that these maladaptive coping strategies were found in only a small number of staff and the results from this investigation indicated that most staff reported using adaptive strategies.

According to Barnett et al (2007), in their code of ethics, psychologists are advised against engaging in exploitive multiple relationships with their clients. Dual relationships can be especially harmful when there is a power differential between the care providers and those they serve (Smith & Fitzpatrick, 1995). However, not all multiple relationships are exploitative and therefore unethical. Before engaging in a multiple relationship, a psychologist must evaluate whether the relationship poses any foreseen harm or exploitation. Paradoxically, avoiding some multiple relationships may be potentially harmful for the client. For example, as Barnett (2007) discussed, attempting to avoid crossing some boundaries "is not seen as realistic or practical, and the result would likely be a sterile and artificial relationship that lacks much of what helps it to be a clinically effective one" (p. 403). Dual relationships are more likely to exist in agencies in smaller communities (Smith & Fitzpatrick, 1995), for example, when family relationships occur because a support staff member is employed by the same agency that serves a member of that person's family. Other relationships occur when both staff and consumers attend similar community events. Therefore, choosing to engage in and addressing existing dual relationships is a difficult decision. The issues surrounding multiple relationships are similar for psychologists and support staff, especially when the staff are placed in the role of implementing treatments. However, whereas psychologists have a number of guidelines to help them make the decision as to engaging in a multiple relationship, community agency staff serving people who have intellectual disabilities are not typically trained in how to address these considerations. Typically, they do not receive systematic professional training in ethical principles and codes of conduct.

Unfortunately, no single accepted code of ethics exists that guides the support of individuals with intellectual/developmental disabilities (Owen et al., 2001). Owen and her colleagues (2001) discuss the issue of developing a code of ethics in community agencies. It is essential for agencies to develop a code of ethics or standard of care because of the complex nature of the supported environment.

> "From a constructivist perspective, the core question for those working in community services for persons with developmental disabilities is to establish what the fundamental nature of the care giving relationship is. Are community professionals working in local Associations for Community Living and other community-based services primarily professional interventionists, friends, or advocates? The answer to this question is far from simple. It demands a close examination of the expectations of consumers, community professionals, managers and senior administrators of community services for persons with developmental disabilities. However, a clear answer would help to define the nature of these services and help to establish the professional identity of community professionals who work in these settings" (ibid, p. 158).

The roles and responsibilities of a professional discipline can become clearer through the process of developing a code of ethics (Lindsay, 1996 as in Owen et al., 2001). In order to develop an ethical code, a definition of what is expected from service providers must be established. If a generally accepted code of ethics were to be developed within the field of service for individuals with intellectual disabilities, then the complex issues that staff face could be discussed openly. According to Owen et al., (2001) a code of ethics allows for open discussion and aids staff in making difficult decisions. Work towards developing a code of ethics for support workers of individuals with disabilities has begun. In 2001, the National Alliance for Direct Support Professionals (NADSP) assembled a national panel, representing many groups that support individuals with disabilities, to develop a code of ethics. Following revisions by focus groups and surveys, the Code of Ethics includes nine ethical guidelines. These include:

1. Maintain a primary allegiance to the individuals receiving support: Person-Centered Supports
2. Promote physical and emotional well-being of individuals with disabilities
3. Support the integrity and responsibility of the profession to assist individuals receiving support
4. Maintain confidentiality
5. Promote and practice justice, fairness and equity in accordance with the human rights of individuals with disabilities.
6. Respect the human dignity, uniqueness and value of individuals with disabilities
7. Assist in the development and maintenance of relationships for individuals with disabilities
8. Assist individuals with disabilities to engage in self-determination
9. Advocate for justice, inclusion and full community participation (NADSP, 2001)

Although this code of ethics has not been adopted at an international level, it is promising work towards providing some ethical guidance for direct support workers.

Owen, Griffiths, Feldman, Sales, and Richards (2000) were so concerned about the system factors that influenced the risk of abuse among individuals with disabilities supported by community agencies that, in alliance with Community Living Welland Pelham, they developed a study examining how these perceptions differed for staff and individuals with intellectual disabilities. They believed that difference in perceptions of appropriate social approach behaviours could be contributing to abuse. They interviewed twenty individuals with intellectual/developmental disabilities who were consumers of services provided by Association for Community Living (ACL) and twenty support staff from the same Association. The interviews consisted of a semi-structured ethnographic format and progressively targeted different levels of social relations (from general social interactions to intimate sexual relationships). From the major themes that emerged from these interviews, they developed questionnaires for both consumers and staff. Their results indicated that consumers had different and more accepting views on physical social approach behaviours than their staff. Specifically, although staff felt that it was unacceptable to kiss consumers on the lips, "consumers said that it was acceptable for familiar staff to affectionately touch and kiss them" (ibid, p. 34). These findings are alarming. If individuals with intellectual disabilities are unaware of acceptable boundaries then they will be less likely to be able to differentiate appropriate and inappropriate approaches from staff. They are more likely to be abused, as they will be less likely to identify abusive situations. This stresses the importance of developing programs to make individuals with intellectual disabilities aware of acceptable boundaries and their rights.

Changing Staff Roles

The rights movement for persons with disabilities represents a major paradigm shift in the relationship between community agencies and the people they support. This new relationship creates an ethical dilemma for the staff with no easy answers (Owen et al., 2003). Caregivers must attempt to balance the requirement to provide basic support and protection from harm with the need to acknowledge the rights and freedoms of the individuals they support. The role of community support staff has changed. For example, staff must shift their thinking from not allowing an individual to go out alone because of safety concerns, to educating the individual of the possible safety concerns and putting in place supports that allow the individual the freedom to leave his/her home at will. This balance is difficult to attain and has been examined in the literature (Bannerman, Sheldon, Sherman, & Harchik, 1990; Feldman, 1990; Owen et al., 2003). According to Owen et al. (2003), this process must begin with "training in ethical, rights-sensitive decision-making" (p. 44) for agency managers and staff. In order to attempt to maintain this balance, each situation must be examined individually and within the context of the care giving environment. Staff must begin to shift their view of the individuals they support away from seeing them as clients and move toward seeing them as individuals with the right to make decisions about their own lives. This represents a shift from "encouraging compliance to fostering self-determination" (ibid, p. 52).

As part of the rights promotion paradigm staff need to be informed that it is beneficial to encourage the people they support to make decisions about their own lives. In fact, Bannerman, Sheldon, Sherman and Harchik (1990) evaluated the arguments for and against 'allowing' individuals with developmental disabilities to make choices.

Within this population, choice is difficult to assess due to a previous history of reinforcement of compliance and punishment of non-compliance with staff demands. When reviewing the arguments for choice, they found that choice had the benefit of increased participation in more activities and that it reduced problem behaviours. Therefore, individuals with disabilities must be made aware of their rights and be shown how to assert these rights within a context of social and personal responsibility. Special rights education programs have been developed to make individuals with intellectual disabilities aware of their everyday rights.

3Rs Project: Rights, Respect and Responsibility

The 3Rs: Rights, Respect and Responsibility project focuses on promoting a shift from care delivery to support for self-determination that is, in many ways, revolutionary. However, no revolution can occur in a vacuum. Change must be implemented across the whole organization. With this as an impetus, in alliance with researchers from Brock University, the Executive Director and managers from Community Living Welland Pelham (CLWP; an Association for Community Living), the 3Rs Community University Research Alliance was formed to foster the promotion of human rights in a systemic way. CLWP is one of four hundred Associations for Community Living across Canada that provide a variety of community supports and services for people who have intellectual disabilities (Canadian Association for Community Living, 2009). The 3Rs program provides education for the people served by Associations for Community Living and other similar organizations. It also provides rights education for staff, managers and members of the Boards of Directors of these organizations. It has attempted to incorporate a systemic approach to human rights training within the whole organization so that "all levels in the community organization ... [are] involved in the supporting of human rights training initiatives" (Tarulli, et al., 2004, p. 175). In order to accomplish this, in addition to the rights training program, Community Living Welland Pelham has developed a Human Rights Facilitation Committee to adjudicate rights concerns raised by staff and the people they support. This project is not only systemic, it is also dynamic and transformative (Owen et al., 2003). The program includes a feedback loop, where evaluations from the training and information from the Rights Facilitation Committee are incorporated back into the Association's policies and procedures. Furthermore, a second feedback loop provides for changes in policy and procedures to be incorporated back into the training for organizations that choose to use the training as an ongoing mechanism for change (Owen et al., 2003). This dynamic and transformative program also incorporates a cascade training system, i.e. in order to facilitate organizational change, the researchers train the agency staff to facilitate future 3Rs training (Owen et al., 2003).

The Human Rights Statement

The development of CLWP's Human Rights Statement was the first step in the 3Rs process. The Right Statements includes elements from the Rights for Individuals with Disabilities laid out by Accreditation Ontario's Enhancing the Rights and Personal Freedoms of People with Disabilities (2000) (Owen et al., 2003). Specifically, the Rights Statement is based on the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. The first eleven items in the statement relate to the Canadian Charter and include:

- Right to equal treatment without discrimination
- Freedom of conscience and religion
- Freedom of opinion and expression

- Freedom of peaceful assembly and association
- Right to vote
- Right to enter, remain in or leave Canada or any Province
- Right to life, liberty and security
- Right not to be deprived of one's life, liberty, or security except in accordance with the principles of fundamental justice
- Right not to be subjected to any cruel and/or unusual treatment or punishment
- Right to be secure against unreasonable search or seizure
- Right to equal protection and equal benefit of the law (Owen et al, 2003, p. 49-50)

The Rights Statement then goes beyond the Canadian Charter by addressing specific needs of the individuals supported by CLWP. This includes:

- Right to equal treatment under the law
- Right to participate in affirmative action programs designed to ameliorate the conditions of individuals or groups who are disadvantaged
- Right to contract for, possess, and dispose of property
- Right to income support
- Right to an education
- Right to sexual expression, marriage, procreation, and the raising of children
- Rights to privacy
- Rights to adequate health care
- Right to equal employment opportunities
- Right to appropriate support services of the individual's own choosing (Owen et al, 2003, p. 50-51)

This statement is used as a guide by other agencies that participate in the 3Rs Project. Some community organizations develop their own rights statements to reflect their organizational vision. The statement developed by CLWP is an extensive, but not exhaustive, list of human rights for individuals with intellectual disabilities.

The Human Rights Facilitation Committee

Once the organization had adopted the Human Rights Statement, it then developed a process whereby individuals with intellectual disabilities, who feel their rights are being violated or staff members who feel the rights of people they are supporting are being violated can bring these concerns for adjudication. The Human Rights Facilitation Committee is a key element in the systemic rights movement and is in place to insure that any rights violation identified by any of the organization's members can be addressed (Owen et al., 2003). The committee is comprised of voting members including a representative from the organization's Board of Directors, a lawyer, a police officer, a minister, a psychologist, behaviour analysts and an individual supported by the Association, and non-voting members including the Executive Director, a manager responsible for outcomes tracking, and three elected representatives from part-time staff, full-time staff, and management. Staff and people supported by the organization are encouraged to bring forth any rights concerns they may be experiencing or have witnessed. These concerns are reviewed by the Association's Executive Director. Some concerns are rectified immediately at this level or are redirected to appropriate management staff. These concerns and their remediation are reviewed later by the Rights Facilitation Committee. If the concerns cannot be immediately rectified, they are brought forward to the Committee for arbitration. Perspectives from all members of the

Committee are heard and the Committee makes recommendations to the organization's Executive Director about strategies that may be used to remediate the concern.

Rights Education Programs

Rights Education Staff and Managers.

The 3Rs Project also provides education about the rights of individuals with intellectual disabilities to staff and managers working in the agency. Most of the sexual abuse prevention programs to date have focused on providing training to individuals with disabilities who are the targets of abuse. Yet the results from these preliminary studies by Owen et al. (2000 and Griffiths et al. (2003) have indicated that abuse prevention must include the staff who support individuals with intellectual disabilities. It has been discussed previously that the relationship between the caregivers and service users is an intimate one. It is imperative that staff be trained to balance safety and the rights of those they support and to be aware of rights restrictions they are imposing while attempting to preserve safety. Training the consumers to assert their rights without training the staff about their duty to uphold these rights is unethical. As Sobsey (1994) discussed, training individuals with disabilities about their rights should be done in the context that supports the application of rights. Without this context, rights become nothing more than empty words. Without support in their homes, the individuals "may become frustrated, confused, and feel that the human rights principles about which they have learned are nothing more than a myth" (Owen et al., 2003, p. 55).

The staff training program introduces the key concepts of rights, respect, and responsibility, then reviews each principle included in the organization's Human Rights Statement. Further, the training reviews the Human Rights Facilitation Committee, its role and the responsibilities of staff to help people they support to identify rights concerns. The focus of the training is on helping staff to understand the organization's rights statement and on how to be better advocates for those they support. A preliminary evaluation of the effectiveness of the staff training showed significant differences on a pre to post test of rights knowledge, however change effects were small to medium (Owen et al., 2003). A more extensive evaluation is required in the future, that attempts to determine the applied significance of the rights training for staff and managers, and what mechanisms are present within the organization that help staff to support the rights of the people they support.

Rights Education for Individuals with Intellectual Disabilities.

As was discussed previously from the work of Owen et al., (2001), if individuals with intellectual disabilities are unaware of appropriate social boundaries, they are not only at risk of sexual abuse, but also of more general rights violations. In order to develop an appropriate human rights education program, it is necessary to determine whether rights violations are actually occurring in an organization. Griffiths et al., (2003) conducted an initial survey to identify what, if any, rights violations were occurring in an Association for Community Living (specifically CLWP). To gather information about possible rights violations, a sixty-nine item questionnaire was developed that addressed all aspects of life for individuals with intellectual disabilities and each area covered in the human rights statement. Part-time Support staff and Primary staff (full-time, Senior Support Workers) filled out the survey and returned it to researchers. All individuals supported by the agency, in any form, were given the opportunity to complete the survey via interviews. Following a factor analysis, four categories of rights concerns emerged;

Access & Autonomy, Relationship & Community Support, Safety, Security & Privacy, and Control & Decision Making. They found that rights violations were occurring within the Association. The frequency and nature of these restrictions differed by respondent group. Direct support staff reported more rights restrictions than the consumers did. Additionally, there were differences in the number of restrictions reported by people receiving different types of support. The two types of support where individuals reported the highest number of rights restrictions were in the Family Home settings and Group Home settings. Fewer restrictions were reported by those supported in the Specialized Group Homes (SGH) and even fewer by those in Supported Independent Living (SIL). This is perhaps due to the individual focus of the SIL and SGH programs, and the fact that the Group Home and Family Home settings focus on congregate living. They also found differences in the type of restrictions reported. Where both part-time and full-time staff identified concerns around Control & Decision Making and Access & Autonomy, the support staff also perceived rights restrictions around Safety, Security & Privacy. However, service consumers described rights restrictions relating to Relationship & Community Support. The results of this investigation were used to develop an organization-wide rights education program.

Training individuals with intellectual disabilities about complex concepts, such as rights, respect and responsibility is difficult. Three factors must be considered in order to design a socially valid abuse prevention program; "knowledge, generalization and the social value placed on the use of the skill by the consumers support system" (Griffiths et al., 1996, as cited in Owen et al., 2000). Other rights-based training programs have been developed and evaluated.

Sievert, Cuvo, and Davis (1988) developed and evaluated a program to teach self-advocacy skills to young adults with mild disabilities. They focused on teaching participants to discriminate among legal rights violated in certain situations, the process to address rights violations and strategies for advocating for their rights. Sievert, Cuvo and Davis identify four general categories of legal, personal, community, human services and consumer rights. Participants were trained on these general categories and all specific requirements of that situation, for example, everyone has the right to get married, but in order to get married, you require a marriage certificate, documentation and must pay the fee. They were also trained to use appropriate remediation strategies to correct the violation. To assess whether the participant could discriminate rights violations from non-violations, they used a multiple probe design across their four general rights categories. Scenarios were developed under each category that depicted hypothetical interpersonal situations where characters were denied a request (either justified based on failure to meet requirements of the situation or not justified). For each scenario, a parallel scenario was designed to address the same category, but focusing on a different requirement related to the situation. Parallel scenarios were used in testing to assess generalization of the concepts. In addition to scenario testing, in vivo tests were also completed. To assess the participant's ability to remediate the situation the participant's case manager temporarily violated participants' rights. Results indicated that, in hypothetical situations, participants were able to learn to discriminate when rights were and were not violated and how to remediate a rights violation appropriately. In addition, participants demonstrated generalization of these skills when tested in community settings (Sievert, Cuvo, & Davis, 1988). Even though Sievert, Cuvo, and Davis's rights' training is more specific in its focus, it provides an effective model for training individuals with intellectual disabilities, which was followed in the 3Rs education program.

Current Form of Training.

In order to continue the investigation of methods for educating individuals with intellectual disabilities about their rights, various rights curricula have evolved over several research foci in the 3Rs Project (Owen et al., 2001; Tarulli et al., 2004; Tardif-Williams et al., 2007). Originally, the 3Rs training program for individuals with intellectual disabilities was a discussion-based program (Owen et al., 2003). The present form of the 3Rs training is in the format of a board game. This has evolved from the Tardif-Williams et al., (2007) study, that compared the use of discussion-based training and a CD-ROM training program to facilitate rights education and to aid testing. Although the current format of the training has evolved, the message remains the same, i.e. training the participants to be aware of their rights and shown how to assert these rights within the context of respect and responsibility. The game format allows for a finer grained analysis of the process of concept retention. This method of training will make it possible to evaluate the number of trials to acquisition. The design of the study is a large group comparison between training groups and wait list control groups. The trainers facilitate the participants in small groups to engage training related to rights, respect and responsibility. Pre, mid and post knowledge and generalization tests are used to evaluate the impact of the program.

The content of the game includes several different types of training activities: icebreakers, examination of taped rights scenarios, and role plays. Following an initial session of icebreakers, the trainers engage the participants in activities that explain the concepts of rights, respect and responsibility. The next section involves training the participants about their rights through the presentation of video-taped scenarios. The participants view short video clips pertaining to rights (rights that are either restricted or not restricted) and they then answer questions about what they have viewed. If the participants answer any of these questions incorrectly, they will be presented with the same scenario again in the next class. In the next viewing, the correct answer is modeled for the participants. Role plays follow and are an important aspect of the training because they require the participants to engage in rights restriction scenarios and scenarios that include violations of either respect or responsibility. The participants rehearse how to assert their rights respectfully and responsibly. Modeling is used if participants answer questions incorrectly.

Assessing the Rights Knowledge of Individuals with Intellectual Disabilities.

Included in the 3Rs Human Rights Project is a research project designed to assess the change in rights knowledge for individuals with intellectual disabilities resulting from the 3Rs rights training described above. The research project has a repeated measures design where group mean scores can be calculated for participants who received training compared to a wait list control group. All participants, including those in the waitlist, receive repeated measures of knowledge change and measures of how this knowledge has been generalized into the participants' daily lives.

In order to evaluate whether participants were able to incorporate the rights training into their daily lives, in vivo probes were used. Other studies have used in vivo probes to assess training programs with individuals with intellectual disabilities

(Haseltine & Miltenberger, 1990; Sievert, Cuvo, & Davis, 1988). In order to evaluate their self-protection program for individuals with intellectual disabilities, Haseltine and Miltenberger (1990) used in vivo probes to assess skill acquisition rather than focusing solely on knowledge. In the 3Rs research, the in vivo probes consist of research assistants, who are not known to the participants, imposing a rights restriction on a participant while he/she is at home or in a community setting. The research assistants record whether the participant is able to assert his/her rights and then provide debriefing on the probe for the participant. Two baseline probes are used prior to training, two immediately following training and one more as a three month follow up.

In addition to the in vivo probes, participants are also tested on their knowledge of the core concepts of rights, respect and responsibility. Participants receive scenario-based testing before, during (mid-point) and following training. The test consists of 16 scenarios, half of which the participant reviewed in training addressing all three concepts, with both violations and non-violations. Once the research aspect of the 3Rs Project is complete, grouped knowledge change scores will be calculated. In addition to an assessment of the rights knowledge gained by the training program, an evaluation of how the rest of the 3Rs Human Rights Project is being implemented across the whole Association is necessary. There needs to be an evaluation of how the program has created a change in the way that the rights of individuals with intellectuals are protected. This evaluation must begin with an understanding of the organizational change literature.

Organizational Change Literature

The awareness of a need for systemic thinking in the implementation of change has grown with the emergence of programs aimed at improving the services provided to individuals with disabilities. It has become increasingly clear that implementing programs "aimed at delivering services to vulnerable populations is likely to either fail or not be sustained in the long run if the surrounding context and supporting systems do not shift in order to support the goals of this effort" (Wadsworth, 2008, p. 155). Systemic thinking attempts to bring structure and movement together by thinking of the organization as both 'productive organs' and 'change processes' (Wadsworth, 2008). Thus, the whole organization is a living system. Wadsworth (2008), refers to Katz and Kahn's work in which the authors explain that (1966) "a self-organising system's attempts to absorb threats and restore the status quo at the same time as defending replicative expansion, were less likely to change unless challenged from elsewhere" (p. 158). The 3Rs initiative is such a challenge to the status quo of many community organizations. Thus, in order to support the rights initiative, the Association must develop a structure to facilitate rights promotion and also be flexible to allow for movement to adapt to the new direction. In turn, it is not possible to monitor and analyze whole systems by setting rules on interpretation, using predetermined targets and small indicators (Wadsworth, 2008). Rather, in order to plan action, one must first watch how the system operates and how it responds to change and innovation.

Undertaking a practical, day-to-day commitment to the enactment of human rights from a systemic perspective requires a commitment to what Peter Senge (1994) has called organizational learning. Learning organizations should be founded on three principles: "(1) a culture based on transcendent human values of love, wonder, humility, and compassion; (2) a set of practices for generative conversation and coordinated action; and (3) a capacity to see and work with the flow of life as a system" (Kofman & Senge, 1993,

p. 16). According to Senge (1994), a learning organization incorporates a focus on the human 'component technologies' including; personal mastery, mental models, building a shared vision, team learning, and systems thinking. Furthermore, these five technologies can be conceptualized at three levels; "practices (what you do), principles (guiding ideas and insights) and essences (the state of being of those with high levels of mastery in the discipline)" (Kurpius, 1993, p.31). Thus, each of these technologies addresses the human influence and their influences on the reality of the organization.

The 3Rs Human Rights Project has been built on a conceptual foundation of organizational learning and the related concept of servant leadership (Owen et al, 2009). A servant leader takes a collective approach rather than a hierarchical one and is a systems thinker who can differentiate between espoused and enacted theory, "recognizing the level of congruence between articulated values and beliefs and the extent to which they are enacted in daily life" (ibid, p. 269). Owen et al., stress the importance of this differentiation of principle and action for promoting the human rights of individuals with disabilities.

> "While it is likely that most human service providers would identify themselves as supporting the human rights of the people they serve, when faced with a difficult decision, how many would rationalize a rights restriction as providing protection for people they support in the moment without considering an innovative alternative? Further, how many would be supported in this decision by their managers and supervisors? It is likely that Senge would argue that working through this dilemma is an opportunity for learning" (ibid, p. 269).

Thus, if members of the Association actually address rights restrictions head on, instead of rationalizing them, the organization can learn how to put its principles into practice. According to Owen et al., (2009), the best way to work through Senge's questions and concerns is in an open environment, one that includes individual perspectives from across the whole organization (Owen et al., 2009).

Learning organizations must engage in 'transformational learning,' where "Static notions of who we are [are] checked at the door" (Kofman & Senge, 1993, p. 19), and by continually integrating organizational values and missions through the component technologies at each conceptual level. Essentially, in order to be a learning organization, leaders must be constantly "chipping away at the ground [they] walk on," (Owen et al., 2009, p. 268) that is, to constantly question the ways in which services are offered in order to make them better. In turn, these organizations can better adapt to change than traditional organizations (Kofman & Senge, 1993). Reid, Kneafsey, Long, Hulme and Wrights (2007) discuss that in addition to a learning organization, an important prerequisite for a successful change initiative is the presence of a transformational leader. It is essential that this leader "provide a clear vision to all stakeholders and to exemplify the values and beliefs underpinning the mission of the new project" (ibid, p. 63). Furthermore in order to initiate change, the transformational leaders utilize "a whole-system approach to change" (ibid, p. 63); they understand that organizational systems are interdependent and thus must incorporate the sharing of "ideas, information and resources" (ibid, p. 63) with members of the whole organization.

From the perspective of an Executive Director (ED) of an Association for Community Living implementing the human rights movement, there are many such organizational challenges. The systemic nature of the project means that the whole organization, including its ED, makes decisions that support the rights of the individuals they serve. However, there are times when problems arise due to practical resource limitations. For example, at any given time there are limited numbers of residential options available to support individuals with intellectual disabilities. While all individuals have the right to choose where they live, an ED may be forced to support the placement of an individual in a group home that is not a preference of the individual but is the only space available at the time. The only way to balance an issue like this is by being aware that this is a problem and by being self-critical in the sense that Senge (1994) would suggest rather than simply rationalizing that the person has a place to live regardless of personal preference or 'fit.' The ED must acknowledge the fact that this is, in fact, a rights restriction and must acknowledge the direct care staff members' role in questioning the decision of placing someone in a setting that is not his or her choice. Giving staff a voice in the agency's decision making is an important factor in ensuring that rights infringements are recognized. If a more desirable residential setting for the individual can be made available, then this individual should be given the opportunity to move. It is only through acknowledging the problem that it may be rectified in the future.

Kofman and Senge (1993) discuss how to build a learning organization in their article, *Communities of commitment: The heart of learning organizations*. They argue that becoming a learning organization involves shifting the organizational culture by changing the thoughts and behaviours of the whole organization. However, there are obstacles that must be overcome in order to achieve this shift in perception. These obstacles include the concepts of fragmentation, competition and reactivity. These concepts are difficult to overcome because they have been learned throughout our human evolution; but, it is possible to construct a different orientation to these concepts by developing a culture of systems. From this perspective, "Fragmentation, competition, and reactiveness are not problems to be solved—they are frozen patterns of thought to be dissolved" (ibid, p. 6). These obstacles are being addressed and dissolved through the implementation of the 3Rs Project. These obstacles and the implications of how they are being addressed in Community Living Welland Pelham will now be discussed.

Fragmentations.

Our society is made up of fragmentations of knowledgeable such as professionals called specialists. Even in the medical profession, special physicians attempt to treat the symptoms related to their area of interest, rarely inquiring as to the overall well being of the individual. We have learned to use fragmentation since childhood, breaking problems into parts in order to solve them, then attempting to put multiple solutions back together to form a whole. Within organizations, fragmentation is used to address specific areas of service. Community organizations for individuals with disabilities are broken up into small service units such as "residential services and vocational support services, services for children, youth and adults living at home, consultation services, training services, and research units that develop new programs" (Owen et al., 2009, p. 267). These agencies make use of fragmentation in terms of providing services; each service is part of the total support given to individuals. An individual may use several of these services offered by the organization. Therefore, each service must collaborate in a systemic way to provide the best care.

Competition.

Our society is founded on a philosophy of competition. In evolutionary terms, this philosophy is based on the notion of survival of the fittest. In accordance with the competitive philosophy, many organizations rank "performance on the basis of management-by-objectives" (Kofman & Senge, 1993, p. 9). Managers outline these objectives in their staff job descriptions and specific expectations. Staff members attempt to achieve positive evaluations by reaching these expectations. In learning organizations, however, employees need to work collectively to provide the best support for their consumers. Staff members need to work with staff from different shifts and services to ensure that the service provided to individuals with intellectual disabilities is cohesive. Furthermore, preserving the rights of individuals with intellectual disabilities requires staff to work cooperatively with those they serve. Within CLWP, it is important to examine whether staff are actually taking on more of a cooperative approach when they support individuals with disabilities. It is important to determine how the staff are adapting to this new rights based service delivery in order to gain insight into the sustainability of the 3Rs Project.

Reactiveness.

Reactivity, or reaction in response to, is an inhibitor of true learning. Reacting only in response to external forces impedes the ability to engage in "aspiration, imagination, and experimentation" (Kofman & Senge, 1993, p. 10). This means that there is no longer any attempt to act in order to improve; instead, action only occurs in response to a problem. Therefore, without imminent danger or crisis we remain stagnant. In some organizations, managers attempt to problem solve. This type of manager is likely only to act in order to alleviate problems that arise. Learning organizations have managers who attempt to create; they attempt to bring into being new and better ways of behaving. Senge (1994) also uses the term 'metanoia,' meaning a shift of mind. The shift is in seeing the world as a whole instead of as a series of parts, where individuals are active agents who influence their reality instead of reactors to their environment. This term is an appropriate descriptor for both the purpose and the implementation of the 3Rs human rights project. Staff members need to undergo a metanoia in terms of their view of their role as supporters to individuals with disabilities. The individuals supported by the organization are able to be active agents in their lives. For those involved with transformative initiatives such as the 3Rs Project, especially for leaders in organizations committed to implementing this approach to human rights as a foundation for agency practice, the question becomes, is this actually happening within the Association? Are the staff members viewing their daily support of individuals with disabilities as consistent with the rights vision for the organization? Is it consistent with the organization's culture? On the other hand, are the staff simply justifying or rationalizing daily rights restrictions or are they being proactive in addressing rights concerns and preventing future restrictions?

Preparing an Organization for Change

Developing a learning organization can be difficult. It requires that all employees are ready for change. Traditionally, "Employees are resistant to change only when it will adversely affect them … but if the change does not threaten their jobs, they are more likely to accept and even welcome the change" (Burns, 2008, p. 14). It is important to prepare employees properly for change, carefully discussing the implications the change will have to their job.

Armenakis, Harris and Mossholder (1993) discuss the concept of change readiness. Readiness is one factor that contributes to the effectiveness of an organizational change program. Resistance to a new program will be reduced if an organization is ready for change; this in turn will increase the program's effectiveness and employees' productivity (Armenakis, Harris & Mossholder, 1993). Readiness "is the cognitive precursor to the behaviors of either resistance to, or support for, a change effort" (ibid, p. 681-682). Continual and systemic readiness for change is a characteristic of a learning organization. The organization's readiness needs to be maintained in a larger change initiative since they require several smaller changes across the whole organization. Armenakis, Harris and Mossholder (1993) discuss that, "creating readiness involves proactive attempts by a change agent to influence the beliefs, attitudes, intentions, and ultimately the behavior of a change target" (p. 683).

In order to create these changes in an organization, Armenakis, Harris and Mossholder (1993) present an excellent model for influencing an organization's readiness for change. In this model, the primary mechanism for creating readiness is the "message for change" (ibid, p. 684). This message needs to be circulated through out the organization. To be effective, the message should speak to the need for the change and the efficacy to implement the change. The 3Rs: Human Rights Project has included both a message for change and has addressed how this change can be accomplished across the organization. To demonstrate the need for change, the message should include the discrepancy between "where the organization is currently, where it wants to be, and why that end-state is appropriate" (p. 685). In order to implement the 3Rs Project, the message for change has been to promote the rights of individuals with intellectual disabilities. The end state is an Association that includes staff and people using agency services who are fully aware of their human rights and where a commitment to enacted human rights is the foundation for all interaction. The discrepancy between the organization's commitment to rights and their enactment in everyday life was demonstrated by the results from Griffiths' et al., (2003) initial survey identifying the presence of rights restrictions occurring within the Association. This study described the very different perceptions of rights restrictions presented by people supported by the organization, and various groups of staff who supported them. It is important to note that no rights education program will eradicate all rights restrictions since, in any social interaction, upholding the rights of one person may result in the restriction of the rights of another. For this reason, the enactment of a rights philosophy must include not only awareness and education, but also the existence of an accessible and effective mechanism for addressing rights concerns within the organization.

To demonstrate the employees' efficacy, both as individuals and collectively, the message for change should articulate how the individuals will be able to implement the change (Armenakis, Harris & Mossholder, 1993). Addressing how the employees can achieve this change will help to build confidence in the employees' ability to reduce the discrepancy (Armenakis, Harris & Mossholder, 1993). The 3Rs Project has attempted to inform the staff of their ability to reduce the incidence of rights violations by providing Rights Education to all staff and managers within the Association. In addition, the organization's Human Rights Facilitation Committee acts as an adjudication mechanism for rights concerns identified both by people supported by the organization and by organization employees.

It is important to be aware that there is a difference between individual and collective readiness. Creating organizational readiness for change includes changing the beliefs, attitudes and intentions of employees both individual and collectively (Armenakis, Harris & Mossholder, 1993). These authors identify the social information processing and the mass communications perspectives that aid in an understanding of how groups of individuals interpret and react to organizational change initiatives. According to the social information processing perspective, individuals within an organization collectively influence one another. Within an organization, "collective readiness is constantly being influenced by the readiness of the individuals [that comprise] it" (ibid, p. 686). Social exchange influences how individuals within the organization will interpret change. The mass communications literature provides an understanding of how the social dynamics of an organization influence change through the application of three theories: the individual differences theory, the social relationships theory and the social differentiation theory (Armenakis, Harris & Mossholder, 1993). According to individual difference theory, individuals will develop their own interpretation of a change initiative based on their previous dispositions and cognitive structures. The social relationship theory focuses on networks of relationships and suggests that an individual's interpretation of a change initiative will reflect that individual's relationships. For example, if an individual has a good relationship with his/her supervisor, any change initiative proposed by that supervisor may be received favorably. Finally, social differentiation theory proposes that change initiatives will be influenced by the organization's culture. Beliefs, attitudes and intentions are mediated by the culture of the group. How organizational culture influences change will be discussed in the next section.

With this understanding, Armenakis, Harris and Mossholder (1993) discuss three strategies for influencing individual change readiness: persuasive communication, active participation and management of external sources of information. Again, the 3Rs Project has included all of these strategies in its implementation. First, persuasive communication includes personal delivery of the message for change. This can be in the form of presentations. In CLWP, the staff and managers receive a full day of training given by a knowledgeable research assistant working through the Association on the 3Rs Project. Although the message for change initially stems from the Board of Directors and Executive Director, through the 3Rs training employees are informed about the 3Rs program and are introduced to skills such as cuing, modeling and reinforcing, that they can use to support individuals' learning. The training includes information about the organization's rights statement, the nature of the rights education provided to individuals with intellectual disabilities and how to address a rights concern.

The message should also include active participation. This is a sort of self-discovery of the need for change. This method is effective, as "individuals tend to place greater trust in information discovered by themselves" (Armenakis, Harris & Mossholder, 1993, p. 689). Active participation is used in the 3Rs staff training, where staff members are led through activities relating to discrimination and individual rights.

The final strategy involves the management of external sources of information. In order to lend credit to a change initiative, outside sources of information can be used.

These sources can be perceived as more objective and thus can be more persuasive. CLWP collaborated with Brock University researchers to implement the rights project. The incorporation of the research specialties of the researchers on the 3Rs Project provides a mechanism for external evaluation of project, which lends to the general credibility and objectivity of the project.

Todnem (2007) examined the application of Armenakis, Harris and Mossholder's change readiness model in the UK tourism industry. Todnem used interviews to evaluate managers' perceptions of change management, readiness and the change readiness framework. They were also asked about their experience and approach to managing change within their organization and the extent to which they believed there was a correlation between change readiness and successful management of change. The results supported the model of change readiness. In addition to the importance of a readiness for change, the managers also stressed the importance of making conscious decisions regarding change. Conscious decisions are those that are proactive and driven by the organization's change program, including concerns for the culture and structure of the organization. Todnem suggested that these findings could be generalized to other organizations that operate within a constantly changing environment, such as social service agencies. Community Living Welland Pelham has been operating in a fluctuating internal and external environment, i.e. staff turnover, changing accreditation standards and government policy, volatile economy, etc.

Further, in spite of all the best efforts to implement a change initiative that follows Armenakis, Harris and Mossholder's (1993) model, unplanned factors can influence employee readiness for change. Factors such as "unplanned media information, existing organizational conditions, and significance of the change effort" (Armenakis, Harris & Mossholder, 1993, p. 691) can have detrimental effects on readiness. Therefore, it is best to assess an organization's readiness for change. Since the 3Rs Project evolved from earlier abuse prevention research and from the organization's examination of accreditation standards, a specific assessment of CLWP's readiness for change was not completed prior to its implementation. However, all of the components discussed by the Armenakis, Harris and Mossholder's model for creating and circulating an effective change message were used in the implementation of the 3Rs Project. Thus, while attempting to obtain a full understanding of how the 3Rs Project was initiated and is currently being supported within CLWP, the current research focuses on a retrospective examination of this change process and a description of the behavioural manifestations of the change in action in the everyday life of organization members.

The Influence of Organizational Culture on Change

As mentioned earlier, the culture of an organization influences change. For this reason, organizational culture has become an important concept in Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behaviour Management (Olson, 2003; Schein, 1990). In fact, "Many organizational change programs that failed probably did so because they ignored cultural forces in the organizations in which they were to be installed" (Schein, 1990, p.118). According to Schein culture is defined as,

> "(a) a pattern of basic assumptions, (b) invented, discovered, or developed by a given group, (c) as it learns to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, (d) that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore (e) is to be taught to new members as the (f)

> correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems" (p.111).

According to Schein (1990), culture is learned beliefs and values that guide behaviours to help the group solve problems within an external environment. This learning is shared and transmitted to all members within the organization. Cultures are strongest, when they exist in organizations that have been around for a long time, when their members have undergone intensive shared experiences, when members receive rewards for consistency and when they are guided by a clear leader (Schein, 1990).

Schein presents two mechanisms for facilitating the learning that occurs within organizations: norm formation around critical incidents and identification with leaders. In norm formation around critical incidences, cultural norms and beliefs are formed through shared experiences of these events. In addition, learning occurs through identification with organizational leaders. Leaders influence culture through what Schein calls "Primary embedding mechanisms" and "Secondary articulation and reinforcement mechanisms" (p.115). The primary embedding mechanisms include

> "(a) what leaders pay attention to, measure, and control; (b) how leaders react to critical incidents and organizational crises; (c) deliberate role modeling and coaching; (d) operational criteria for the allocation, of rewards and status; and (e) operational criteria for recruitment, selection, promotion, retirement, and excommunication" (p.115).

The secondary articulation and reinforcement mechanisms refer to "(a) the organization's design and structure; (b) organizational systems and procedures; (c) the design of physical space, facades, and buildings; (d) stories, legends, myths, and symbols; and (e) formal statements of organizational philosophy, creeds, and charters" (p.115). As the organization grows and evolves, the organizational culture will also develop through the discrimination and generalization of contingencies of learning. "The group then learns from its own experience what parts of the "founder's" belief system work for the group as a whole ... joint learning then gradually creates shared assumptions" (p.115). Thus, one way to produce change within an organization is for its leaders to systematically change the contingencies under which rewards and punishments are awarded by rewarding employees attempts to follow new directions and punishing their adherence to old ones (Schein, 1990).

How can organizational culture be changed? The concept of organizational culture is an important variable that influences organizational change in that cultural variables are "agents of behavior and/or performance change at the individual and group levels of analysis" (Olson, 2003, p.472). Olson presents two perspectives on how organizational culture can be changed and refers to the traditional view of organizational culture, as presented by Schein. As Schein has suggested, it is possible to view culture from the cognitive perspective, where the determinate of feelings, attitudes, and values and in turn, behaviours is the individual. However, it is difficult to target these internal mechanisms for change. On the other hand, the behavioural perspective focuses on overt and verbal behaviours that demonstrate organizational culture. From this perspective, individual internal mechanisms are influenced by environmental contingencies. The causal path runs from "contingencies first, public behavior second, and private behavior last" (Olson, 2003, p. 473). Thus, it is possible to change the organizational culture by manipulating the external contingencies of punishment and rewards. Changes in these contingencies will change individuals' overt and verbal behaviour thereby shifting the organizational culture. It is possible to redefine the internal concepts allowing them to be targets for change. Where beliefs are no longer intangible notions, they become "if/then rule statements about relationships between practices, values, and organizational and individual level consequences (Olson, 2003, p. 476). Values are the learning outcomes of conditioned consequences, both reinforcers and punishers. Practices can be defined as "the form, rate, and strength of a type of behavior and/or the form and rate of a type of work process across a class of people in an organization" (p.476). With these definitions, all internal concepts can become targets for change. The current research attempted to gain consensus on these internal mechanisms in order to determine whether they have changed in response to the initiation of the 3Rs Project. The presence of change in these internal and external tasks provides some evidence of cultural change within the Association.

The field of Organizational Behavior Management extends this perspective further by incorporating a systemic approach to improving organizational performance (Olson, 2003). Any individual change to an environment will influence the organizational context. As such, "If change initiatives are implemented without concern for the greater organizational context, the overall health and adaptability of the organization may not benefit and might actually be harmed" (p. 475). This systemic approach allows initiators of change to evaluate how changes are integrated across the whole organization. For example, if the new direction involves changing the contingencies for reinforcement among direct support staff, then managers need to be informed as to how to evaluate and reward this new behaviour. Furthermore, upper management may need to reallocate funding if the changes in contingencies include financial compensation. Without full organizational support, a new initiative will not influence the organizational culture fully because it has not provided support for the changes. To address this, the current research attempted to determine what managers and supervisors are doing to promote rights supporting behaviours in their staff.

Finally, it is possible to analyze an organization's culture using the behavioural perspective. Olson (2003) refers to Skinner's (1981) work and states that there are two levels through which consequences dictate organizational practices; the group or organizational level and the individual level. Consequences at both levels influence individual behaviour. The group level influences how the culture of the organization will survive and the individual level influences how the culture is transmitted by and to its members. Olson poses four ways to examine the organizational culture:

1. The effects of organizational level consequences within the greater socio-cultural context on organizational practices
2. The effects of individual level consequences within the organizational context on the transmission of practices among individuals
3. Analyses of the development of formal and informal contingencies that shape and maintain cultural practices
4. How consequences at the organization level affect consequences for individual behaviors and accomplishments (p. 479)

By examining all these elements, a full picture of how the culture operates within an organization appears.

Schein (1990) argues that the best means of determining an organization's underlying beliefs and values is through open-ended interviews. This allows an outside interviewer to engage members in deep self-analysis to the underlying assumptions within that organization. An interviewer should target both the 'external adaption tasks' and 'internal integration tasks.' Through this type of interview, "assumptions can be brought to the surface, but the process of inquiry has to be interactive, with the [interviewer] continuing to probe until assumptions have really been teased out and have led to a feeling of greater understanding on the part of both the outsider and the insiders" (ibid, p. 112). This research has utilized the open-ended interview approach to gain an understanding of the organizational culture.

Management Styles Influence Change Initiatives

Many authors have discussed the importance of leadership styles in supporting organizational change (Hewitt et al., 2004; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, & Bommer, 1996; Schein, 1990; Schmid, 2006; Reid, Kneafsey, Long, Hulme & Wright, 2007). Schmid (2006) discusses that, in order to achieve any desired change, it is the leader's role to create a supportive environment. The top six competencies among supervisors in community living settings, as identified by Hewitt et al., (2004), are "(a) enhancing staff relations; (b) providing and modeling direct support; (c) facilitating and supporting consumer support networks; (d) planning and monitoring programs; (e) managing personnel; (f) leading training and staff development activities" (p. 129). There are different types of leadership styles and organizations differ in their cultures and goals. It is important that the leadership style and organizational structure complement each other or the goals of the organization may not be achieved (Schmid, 2006). That is "if there is a conflict between the demands and contingencies faced by the organization and the pattern of leadership, or if the leaders' demands and expectations conflict with the behavior and expectations of their followers, the organization may encounter difficulties that prevent it from achieving its declared goals" (ibid, p.182).

In order to illustrate this interaction, Schmid describes how different leadership styles support different human and community service organizations. One type of organization discussed is residential boarding institutions, both for disadvantaged children and individuals with intellectual disabilities. He refers to this type of setting as "closed systems or total institutions" (ibid, p. 183-184). Throughout the whole organization, there are control and monitoring mechanisms. The staff members are rewarded for being effective at an organizational level and they also receive satisfaction from peers and those they support. There is also a high level of formality, coordination, supervision and limited autonomy. According to Schmid, a transactional leadership style is best for this type of organization. A transactional leader "assigns tasks to employees, delivers rewards, and promises rewards for further efforts. This type of leader sets goals, clarifies desired outcomes, provides feedback and exchanges rewards for accomplishments" (p. 182). Transactional leaders clearly outline objectives and conditions for reinforcement. There is a high level of formalization within the organization and leaders typically maintain centralized authority. Within this style of leadership, the leader is responsible for allocating rewards for on task behaviour of their staff members. Schmid explains that, in order to implement a change program within this type of organization, programs must be initiated slowly with moderate and gradual changes.

Other types of organizations discussed by Schmid include the "community service organization, which provides social services according to age groups and areas of specialization" (p. 183) and the home care organization, which provides services within the home setting to vulnerable populations, individuals who "are highly dependent on others" (p. 184). The residential services within Associations for Community Living appear to be a combination of these two organizations. Specifically, as a whole, these Associations are community service organizations, developed to provide services to individuals with intellectual/developmental disabilities across the lifespan and across a range of services (including employment, residential, etc.). In addition, within the residential group home settings, the Association encompasses more of a home care organization. Within this setting, care providers have a direct relationship with their clients and the services provided are related to daily living. Employees in this setting are typically characterized as having low levels of formal education, professional training and lower salaries (Schmid, 2006).

According to Schmid, the most appropriate leadership style for community service organizations, such as Associations for Community Living, is a transformational leader. This type of leader is characterized as one who relies on the delegation of tasks and utilizes specialized skills of team members with the organization. They also rely on the knowledge and information of staff members in making decisions; thus, the "act of leadership is considered an interaction between the leader and a group of people with whom and for whom he or she works" (p. 181). These leaders attempt to transform employees' "thought[s] and imagination, beliefs, and values by teaching them to conceptualize, contemplate, and cope with abstract contents, thereby heightening their capacity for problem awareness and problem solving" (p. 181). Furthermore, Podsakoff et al. (1996) identified six dimensions of a transformational leader, which include articulating a vision of the future, fostering the acceptance of group goals, communicating high performance expectations, providing intellectual stimulation, modeling appropriate behavior, and displaying supportive leader behavior. On the other hand, within the residential setting, Schmid discusses that it is important for leaders to maintain authority and to provide a task orientation. Within this type of organization, higher levels of satisfaction are found in employees the more training they receive, the better their working environments are, when they perceive their treatment as fair and when they perceive themselves as having control (Schmid, 2006).

Schmid proposes that in order to effect change and reach organizational goals individuals may have to adapt their leadership patterns. Leaders are responsible for creating supportive environments and providing direction as to how to reach the desired goals of the organization. However, they will have a difficult time "achieving the desired goals without cooperation from staff members" (p. 181). This is especially true within human and community services that are characterized by a continual state of transition and change. Fortunately, an individual's environment, including other individuals, group membership and organizational culture, can influence the internal characteristics of organizational leaders. Therefore, in addition to determining the Association's readiness for change and evidence of cultural change in response to the 3Rs Project, this research also focused on determining the leadership style of the management within CLWP.

Evaluating Change within Services for Individuals with Disabilities

The previous literature review lends insight into the systemic aspects that must be considered when implementing change in organizations. Now it is important to review some of the literature where change initiatives have been undertaken in community service organizations for individuals with disabilities. Although the process of initiating a rights based organizational change within an Association for Community Living has yet to be examined in the literature, initiation of other changes in organizations for individuals with disabilities has been examined (Caton et al., 2007; Forbat, 2006; Mansell, 2006; Mansell & Elliott, 2001; Parsons, Daniels, Porter & Robertson, 2008).

Parsons, Daniels, Porter and Robertson (2008) evaluated the implementation of information and communication technologies (ICT) for adults with intellectual disabilities throughout a whole organization. They attempted to evaluate what sort of barriers might impede the use of these technologies. Using Ertmer's (1999) model, they identified two types of barriers that must be overcome. These include first and second order barriers. First-order barriers "are typically resource-related and include lack of access to computers and software, insufficient time and inadequate support" and second-order barriers are less tangible and refer to "beliefs about teaching/instruction, computers, established practices and an unwillingness to change" (Parsons, et al., 2008, p. 20). Specifically, beliefs about the purpose, usefulness and importance of ICT, organizational culture, enthusiasm, motivation and confidence were the identified second order factors. Parsons and colleagues found that the more progressive and person-centered service sites regularly used the ICT service with those they supported. These results suggested that ICT was fully integrated into sites that had addressed and overcome these second-order barriers. Although this study focused on the implementation of ICT, the results can be generalized to other change initiatives. Attitudes and beliefs can influence staff performance and the quality of service that staff provide to those they support. Therefore, within CLWP, support for the rights initiative will be significantly decreased if the Association is not able to overcome, or at least influence, both these first and second order barriers.

Mansell (2006) reviews the progress of the deinstitutionalization movement in several countries. Her main point is that, although deinstitutionalization is best for individuals with disabilities, the significant differences in care and outcomes between institutions and community living settings are not uniformly realized. The general finding that community based living provides better service for individuals with disabilities has gone a long way to change government policies and funding. However, if this care is not uniformly better, then this bring into question the decisions around the ideology of community based living. Mansell proposes two reasons for this variation in care. There is the view that overcoming the culture that was present in institutions and continues in some group homes can only be achieved by providing supported independent living settings. Others view that there may be problems with the execution of care in community living settings. An additional reason, not mentioned by Mansell, could relate to the aforementioned different leadership styles required to match the needs of different types of organizations. Specifically, transactional leaders fit with the needs and culture of institutions and the transformational leader with community service organizations (Schmid, 2006). Either way, in order to ensure supportive care, staff members need to be provided with organizational support. Unfortunately, as Mansell and

Elliott (2001) found, the current motivational framework, may not be present within these residential settings.

Mansell and Elliott (2001) examined the reported contingencies of direct staff supporting individuals with intellectual disabilities in residential settings. During in-depth interviews, participants were asked if they had or had not engaged in different types of activities, what type of consequences they received and from whom. Staff reported that their managers provided the most potent consequences for their behaviour. In fact, of the staff who had been working for more than five years, none reported positive consequences from the residents. Managers and coworkers are more likely to influence staff members' behaviour. Unfortunately, the results also indicate that managers were more likely to provide consequences for administrative type tasks instead of those that were client-enabling.

Mansell and Elliotte proposed that the knowledge of these consequences would mediate action in a form of 'rule-governed behaviour'. These findings, however, do go a long way to supporting the need for managers to provide reinforcement to staff for engaging in client-enabling tasks. This could be extended to staff performing client-enabling tasks with relation to respecting client choice and rights. Therefore, changing the motivational framework through direct implementation of reinforcement for service will help support staff to engage in activities that provide this type of superior care. Therefore, the current research attempted to gain insight into the actual consequences provided to staff for supporting rights.

Caton et al., (2007) reviewed responses from a survey given to Commissioners and care providers of the North West region in England relating to the responsiveness and appropriateness of services for people with learning disabilities [ID] from minority ethnic communities. They surveyed a wide range of service providers and conducted a thematic analysis of the responses to their open-ended questions. The broad themes were systematically organized from the macro level (accounting for influences including legislative and guidelines) to the micro level (individual programs). The results indicated that even though there was no specific policy of equality it was, nonetheless, an important issue. This indicates that care providers' practices were a part of the organizational culture rather than outlined in a policy. Thus, in order to initiate a change initiative within an organization, such as the 3Rs Project, one must go beyond simply enacting a policy to supporting the change movement through influencing the culture.

Perhaps the work most related to an evaluation of the initiation of a rights based service delivery is the work by Forbat (2006). Forbat (2006) evaluated how Valuing People (Department of Health, 2001), a document outlining the treatment of individuals with intellectual disabilities, was being addressed in England. Forbat conducted interviews with policy makers and practitioners in an attempt to understand how the individuals responsible for the development and implementation of policies were addressing the initiative's four key principles: choice, independence, rights and inclusion. Forbat hypothesized that if these concepts were perceived as being important, then practitioners' would refer to them when discussing policy and practice. Therefore, participants were not asked directly about the key principles, rather they were asked to discuss their work and their process for implementing policies. From these interviews, a thematic analysis was used to identify the concepts of interest. The results indicated a scarcity of direct mention of the four key principles. Participants did not refer to choice, independence, rights and inclusion as being "important underlying ideological" (ibid, p. 253) principles that informed how policies were implemented or developed. Using this type of analysis it was possible to identify broader themes relating to choice, independence, rights and inclusion (Forbat, 2006).

Forbat reported an alarming finding with respect to the concept of rights. Apparently, the participants' concept of rights varied significantly from that proposed within the Valuing People document. Instead of relating to equal treatment and ensuring choice, rights appeared to be presented as more of a problematic concept. In fact, one participant reported that choice might be inappropriate for some individuals:

> I'm very concerned about how we interpret a lot of this stuff for people who are very severely profoundly multiply handicapped. Who don't really, you know, get so much of a look in this 'cos they're not verbal. It's all very well and good saying you know 'we want to be person centered and we'll talk to the person' but if you've got multiple handicaps you're not going to be doing that (ibid, p. 254).

What is most alarming about this statement is that this is the view of a policy maker, an individual responsible for dictating how rights and other principles are implemented within organizations. If this is the view of rights at this level, then the preservation of rights may not be put into practice at the service level.

The results from Forbat's evaluation show that "the principles are a long way from being embedded in the way people talk about intersections of policy and practice" (p. 258). This further indicates that if the leaders and policy makers are not focusing on the four key principles of a policy, then the direct support staff members are not likely to either. Here again the results stress the fact that simply developing policy will not ensure its implementation. A new initiative needs to be imbedded into the organizational culture. Movements of this nature must focus on changing the perceptions of people involved in care systems as well as in the community at large around the rights and choices available to individuals with disabilities.

A Systemic Approach to Promoting Human Rights

The practical implications of a commitment to rights are profound in terms of both human and material resources that are needed to address individual needs and preferences. If an organization is truly committed to the promotion and protection of the rights of the people it supports, Boards of Directors, managers and staff must be prepared to accommodate individual rights assertions. As Bogomolny (2004) discusses, human rights complaints can be difficult both emotionally and financially. No matter the size of the organization, a rights complaint in an organization will feel like a personal attack. Bogomolny lists several key steps an organization should follow when dealing with such a concern. These include; taking the complaint seriously, attempting to deal with the complaint with speed and discretion, completing a full investigation that includes consulting both the accused and complainant, documenting everything and finally, resolving the complaint and informing everyone involved. Bogomolny (2004) notes, "If a policy is unfair, it needs to be changed; but sometimes actions as simple as relocating an employee or altering schedules will fix a situation" (p. 97). The most important way to deal with human rights complaints is to prevent them. Lauren Bates, a senior policy analyst with the Ontario Human rights Commission, stated that is it is better to prevent a rights complain than to have to deal with one (Bogomolny, 2004).

While embracing a philosophy founded on preserving human rights, organizations must examine all aspects of their operation. Without such an evaluation, an organization can inadvertently permit abuse through non-reinforcement of prevention behaviour (Sobsey, 1994). It is essential that organizations identify the behavioural mechanisms that support organizational policy and procedural changes, and changes in staff behaviour pursuant to rights training.

As was noted earlier, the 3Rs Human Rights Project is a collaboration between researchers from Brock University and Community Living Welland Pelham (and more recently other Universities and organizations that support individuals with intellectual disabilities). Within all aspects of the project, the 3Rs Research team has attempted to incorporate the voices of its partner agencies and the individuals supported by them. As Tarulli et al., (2004) discussed that the "3Rs Human Rights Project is perhaps best characterized as an emergent participatory research project" (p. 171). This participatory research is important as it allows for persons with intellectual disabilities can "speak out and have their voices heard" (p. 171). In addition, the participatory dimension also incorporates the collaboration with the staff and supervisors of CLWP. Their participation has been informative into all aspects of the training programs. Reciprocally, the information gained through the initiative has been incorporated back into organization through changes in policies and procedures (Owen et al., 2003). Reid et al., (2007) address the benefits of incorporating the members of the organization in research. Reid colleagues use the term "Action Research" to describe the "the study of a social situation carried out by those involved in that situation in order to improve both their practice and the quality of their understanding" (Winter & MunnGiddings, 2001 as cited in Reid et al., 2007, p. 63). Through the participatory nature of the research, both researchers and organizational members gain insights in to "the development and implementation of service improvement" (p. 63). Together, organizational members are empowered through the research process to "understand their own situation" (p. 63), reflect and actively initiate further change in practice. Furthermore, it is important that members from the organizations understand that the role of the research is to enhance the provision of care rather than to cast judgments onto the performance of the individual members (Reid et al., 2007).

Reid, Kneafsey, Long, Hulme and Wrights (2007) utilized the action research approach when evaluating the implementation of a new service agency care management model, which included drastic changes across a whole organization that provided care to ageing populations with growing disabilities. This change included a new way for service to be delivered while maintaining the existing organizational structures. Reid and colleagues demonstrated how the action research evaluation facilitated a better understanding of the change initiative. Their results indicated that the individuals involved in the research from the organization found the experience to be positive. They indicated that the process allowed them insight into how they had changed and allowed them to look on the process objectively. An additional benefit to this research approach was that by providing an understanding of what had to be overcome in order to initiate change, other members of the organization also transformed. Thus, the impact of the insight from those involved in the research leads to changes in members across the organizations.

Until now, the primary focus of the 3Rs research has been on evaluating the impact of the training program on people who have intellectual disabilities. However, the current research project focused on the broader systemic aspects of the 3Rs human rights project. This research investigated the extent to which the rights education program has been implemented throughout the whole Association. To determine this, behavioural interviews were conducted with the staff, managers and supervisors within community agencies. The project evaluated the employees' readiness for change, organizational culture and the behavioural mechanisms that supported staff and managers to follow organizational changes pursuant to rights training, and changes in staff behaviour with respect to rights preservation. To determine readiness, staff and managers' current attitudes and opinions related to the rights project were evaluated. This research project is consistent with the spirit of participatory research approach. By using open-ended questions, staff and managers were given a voice for their perspective of the initiation of the 3Rs Project. Furthermore, the results from the research will be provided back to the Association's leaders who may make changes to support the utility and sustainability of rights based service delivery. As was discussed previously, the rights based philosophy represents a paradigm shift. This shift is not limited to one single Association for Community Living. As such, the 3Rs Project is currently, and will continue to be, implemented in other community organizations that provide support for individuals with intellectual disabilities. These results should provide valuable insights into how other Associations and other similar community organizations that support people with intellectual disabilities can create organizational readiness and support the maintenance of the 3Rs Human Rights program.

Researcher's Perspective

It is important at this point to discuss the individual perspective of the researcher conducting this research. Within this perspective are several demand characteristics that could represent possible inherent biases. These biases will inevitably influence the way that the research was developed, collected, analyzed and interpreted.

One of these demand characteristics is that I am an individual with an invisible disability. Invisible disabilities are impairments that are not always apparent or presented, such as learning, mental and medical disabilities. Not every instance will expose the disability, some days or situations might be better than others. This means that, a person with an invisible disability often has a choice to disclose his/her disability status. Sometimes it is said that these individuals can 'pass' as normal (Wendell, 1996). It appears as if there is a choice to identify with either the non-disabled or the disabled community. It is not possible, however, to pass as non-disabled all the time. Exposure of one's disability is inevitable. Although it may seem like a good thing to have the choice of identification, this choice does not represent one of innate power. As an individual with an invisible disability, I can attest to the fact that there is a constant struggle of identification. I must confess, I have a desire to be a part of the non-disabled community and to not have to accept the limitations of my disability. However, if I choose to operate solely within the normal world, I feel like an impostor. There is no security. I feel as if at any moment, my position within this normal community can come under question and my membership can be revoked. Identification within the disability community is more comforting. There is an acceptance of my disability. In return, I feel a great responsibility to support and advocate for other individuals with disabilities. It is important for individuals with invisible disabilities to identify with the disability community because, if they do not, they identify with the rest of society, who may be contributing to the stigmatization and oppression of the disabled. As an individual with a disability, I must continually choose to identify with the disability culture in order to represent and support our group as a whole. Thus, I feel I must support, fight for and defend those within the community who cannot advocate for themselves.

In addition, I have another bias that has influenced this research project. For many years, I have had the opportunity to work as a direct support staff within different Associations for Community Living. It is important to note that these were other Associations and I have never worked as a staff member at CLWP. This bias, however, has influenced this research project. I have an intimate knowledge of the roles and responsibilities of a direct support staff. I greatly understand the difficult balance of supporting rights while being responsible for the health and safety of those we support. In fact, I am almost certain that at many times, I naively and ignorantly restricted the rights of the individuals I was hired to support. Thus, I believe that this bias is actually an important characteristic to have as someone who is researching such sensitive issues as the protection and possible violation of the rights of individuals with intellectual/developmental disabilities. I have insight into the formal and informal way that Associations operate. In addition, with my experience, I am able to have a better understanding of and sensitivity to the participants' comments. I believe that this bias has allowed me to provide a more accurate representation of the participants' voices with regards to the way they support individuals with intellectual/developmental disabilities.

Method

Purpose of the Research

The purpose of this research was to provide evidence of cultural and behavioural change across the Association in response to the implementation of the 3Rs Human Rights project. Semi-structured interviews were used to attempt to describe the organizational culture, readiness and supports in response to the introduction and maintenance of the 3Rs Project within a community agency. To evaluate the systemic nature of the 3Rs Project, the behavioural mechanisms that support a rights based service focus in an Association for community living were determined. The main focus was on the examination of the changes having occurred in response to the implementation of the 3Rs Human Rights project. Specifically, this research addressed the following questions:

1. What change mechanisms are active in this organization?
2. How do staff members describe behaviour changes in themselves, their colleagues and managers following implementation of the rights initiative?
3. How do managers describe behaviour changes in themselves and in the staff they supervise?
4. What internal reinforcers are in place for staff and managers to support the rights initiative?
5. What extrinsic reinforcers are in place for staff and managers to support the rights initiative?
6. What punishers inhibit staff and manager support for the rights initiative?

Interview questions were developed from these research questions, for example questions addressed: how the program is being perceived and followed by the employees of the

Association at each level of the organization. Were the staff and managers provided with enough information about the 3Rs Project to be able to put its principles into action? Are the staff being provided with enough extrinsic contingencies sufficient to influence staff behaviour around supporting the rights and choices of the individuals they support? Are the staff embracing their new role in supporting the rights and choices of individuals with intellectual disabilities? Please see Appendix 3 for the complete list of interview questions.

Interviews

Using similar methods to those used in Owen et al., (2000), Forbat (2006), and Mansell and Elliott (2001), participants were given semi-structured behavioural interviews. The focus of the interview items was on describing behavioural change processes associated with the initiation of the 3Rs rights project. Interviews were audio taped and transcribed. From these transcripts, a thematic analysis was conducted to identify themes that reflect the behavioural mechanisms representing organizational changes pursuant to rights training, and that describe respondents' perceptions of changes in staff behaviour with respect to rights promotion and preservation.

Interview Participants.

The participants in the study were drawn from three groups from CLWP, namely: full-time support staff (senior support workers), supervisors (managers) and directors. All employees of CLWP in these three positions were given an invitation letter to participate in the study (see Appendix 1). Stratified random sampling was used to select representatives from each group. Specifically, from the individuals who volunteered to participate, two participants were randomly chosen from each group. Thus, a total of 6 interviews were conducted. All participants had been employed by the Association for between 15 and 35 years. The participants included two Directors with 10 to 20 years of experience in their current position, two Supervisors of Adult Services with between seven and 20 years of experience in their current positions and two Senior Support Workers who had less than five years of experience in their current positions. The interviews were conducted in the main office of Community Living Welland Pelham or at Brock University depending on participants' preferences.

Interview Format.

Prior to each interview, the researcher provided participants with a list of the interview questions (see Appendix 3). This allowed participants to review the material and have a chance to prepare their answers. At the beginning of the interview, the consent forms were reviewed and the researcher answered any questions the participants had. Once the participants gave informed consent by signing the consent form (see Appendix 2), the interview commenced.

The interviews began with a discussion about the culture of the Association and any changes that have occurred in response to the 3Rs Project (see Appendix 3A). Schein (1990) proposes that an organization's culture can be illustrated by developing consensus on the external and internal factors that influence the whole organization. External tasks relate to an understanding of the core mission, function and purpose of the agency; the agency's goals; how these goals are accomplished; the criteria for measuring success; and remedial strategies used when the goals are not achieved. Internal tasks relate to criteria for group inclusion; the allocation of status, power and authority; roles and boundaries among and between staff and those they support; and the contingencies for rewards and punishment. Participants were asked about these concepts and asked how these concepts have changed in response to the 3Rs Project.

The next section of the interview focused on change readiness. The participants were asked questions relating to the organization's focus on rights prior to and following the 3Rs initiative, where the rights focus came from, how they were informed of the change, the rights training and their current feelings, attitudes and opinions about the 3Rs human rights project (see Appendix 3B). Participants were asked whether the 3Rs training equipped them to support the rights of the individuals that they support. Participants were also asked how their behaviour and the behaviour of others (specifically, staff members, individuals supported by the agency and their supervisors) and how rules have changed in response to 3Rs Project. Overall, these questions were used to indicate how participants were equipped and motivated to support the rights of the individuals they support and provide evidence of changes that have occurred within the Association in response to the 3Rs Project.

In order to determine the presence of behavioural contingencies maintaining the protection of human rights for individuals supported by the agency a method similar to Mansell and Elliott (2001) (see Appendix 3C) was used. Participants were asked to recall a time when the rights of an individual they supported were (and could have been) violated. The participants were then asked to describe their actions and the consequences of these actions. Whereas Mansell and Elliott were only able to code the consequences as either positive or negative (reflecting their topography), it was anticipated that these questions would lead to a determination as to whether the consequences were, in fact, reinforcing or punishing. To accomplish this, participants were asked if they were likely to engage in the same behaviour again the next time an individual they support experiences a potential rights violation.

Questionnaires

Questionnaires were developed to triangulate the themes derived from the interviews with representatives from the rest of the Association (Esterberg, 2002). The questionnaires were given to members of the Association who were eligible to participate in the interviews (specifically from the three positions, namely: full-time support staff, supervisors and directors). These participants were asked to provide feedback and verification of how these themes were consistent with their responses to the 3Rs Project. Questionnaires were distributed, along with information letters (see Appendix 4) and consent forms (see Appendix 5), through the organization's mail system with a return envelope provided for each participant to use to send the questionnaires and consent forms back to the researcher at Brock University.

Participants were asked how much they agreed with each statement using a Likert-type scale (see Appendix 6). Following most statements space was provided for the participants to explain their responses. A content analysis was used on the questionnaires to determine the frequencies of agreement with the manifest content in the themes (Esterberg, 2002).

Results

Results of Interviews

Analysis of Interviews

A thematic analysis was conducted on the open-ended questions relating to organizational culture and readiness in order to determine the presence of broad themes

(Owen et al., 2000; Caton, et al., 2007; Forbat, 2006). The themes developed were reflective of the extant literature (Berg, 2004). Theories relating to Organizational Change, Change Readiness and Organizational Culture are encompassed under the Organizational Change Mechanisms theme. The Organizational Change Mechanisms theme was examined at the latent level where participants' responses are interpreted based on their "underlying ideas, assumptions, and conceptualizations" (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 84). The Changes in Behaviours, the Supports & Reinforcers and the Barriers themes relate to Organizational Behaviour Management theory. The themes were verified by getting feedback from the participants and other members of the Association in the form of questionnaires (Aronson, 1994).

Coding Process.

The thematic analysis was conducted in several stages according to the literature (Braun & Clarke, 2006). After the initial reading of the transcripts, open coding was used to organized broad themes from reoccurring concepts described by the participants (Esterberg, 2002): Organizational Change Mechanisms, Changes in Behaviours, Supports and Reinforcers that Assist in the Rights Initiative, Barriers Inhibiting the Rights Initiative, and Issues with Health and Safety.

The theme describing Issues of Health and Safely was based on the participants' responses rather than on the aforementioned literature since this theme reflects an inductive approach of analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006). This theme was developed based on recurring comments relating to issues of health and safety that must be considered when supporting the rights of individuals with intellectual/developmental disabilities.

Following open coding, subcategories of these themes were developed using focused coding (Esterberg, 2002). For each main theme, subthemes were developed and coded. Sub themes also emerged from the participants' responses and were consistent with previous theory and research questions. These themes and subcategories were compared across all interviews.

The next step of the analysis involved refining the themes (Braun & Clarke, 2006). This process consisted of reviewing the coded transcripts to ensure that the coded excerpts accurately represented each theme. Through this process, it was evident that the excerpts from the theme relating to Issues of Health and Safety were more accurately placed under different themes. As a result, the theme relating to Issues of Health and Safety no longer represented a full theme and it has been removed from the analysis.

During this step, it also became apparent that, due to the interrelated nature of the themes, some participants' responses could be categorized into two themes. For example, when participants made reference to systemic factors and advocating for individuals with severe disabilities and / or who were non-verbal, these references were coded under both the Organizational Change Mechanisms and Barriers themes. In these situations, participants' responses were coded under the most relevant theme (for example Barriers), but the significance of the comment was also referred to in the other theme.

It was anticipated that the reports from Section C of the interviews (Behavioural Change) could be organized into a similar format as Anecdotal Observations (Cooper, Heron & Heward, 2007). The initial analysis plan was for the transcripts from the behavioural changes section of the questionnaire to be organized into antecedents, behaviours and consequences. This format would have allowed for an analysis of the antecedents and consequences that influence behaviour supporting the rights of individuals with intellectual disabilities. However, after careful examination of the transcripts relating to this section, it became apparent that Anecdotal Observations coding would not lend to an accurate representation of the examples discussed. Participant examples varied greatly and thus patterns of antecedents and consequences would not be apparent. Furthermore, the examples discussed by the participants were very specific in nature. Participants used examples that related to a specific individual that they supported and thus were not anonymous. In addition, the examples related to specific situations in which their behaviour was greatly influenced by a specific situation and thus were not indicative of the general course of actions leading to indicators of regular reinforcements or punishments. Specifically, when participants discussed particular incidents in which the rights of individuals with intellectual/developmental disabilities were restricted, although some participants indicated that the consequences did influence how they would respond to future situations, these consequences were rarely indicative of a general change in behaviour. Many participants indicated that they would engage in the same behaviours in the future, whether to protect individual rights or to enforce a restriction on the basis of health and safety. Furthermore, many participants had a difficult time describing an example of a rights restriction that was not related to a health and safely concern. Therefore, a thematic analysis was not conducted for this part of the interviews and participants' responses to these questions will not be discussed further.

Organizational Change Mechanisms

Change Readiness

Understanding the purpose of the 3Rs Project.

All participants reported that they believed the 3Rs Human Rights Project was designed to increase awareness of the human rights of individuals with intellectual/developmental disabilities whom the Association serves. They reported that, in the past, the rights of these individuals have not been upheld. It is important for people who support individuals with disabilities to consider rights in order to provide the best possible care.

> It has various purposes I think. They are to heighten people's awareness of the rights of people who have intellectual disabilities, including the individuals themselves, the staff who are paid to work with them, their families, the general public. To ensure that their rights are upheld and having all of these groups of people that I mentioned become aware of the ways in which the rights of people with intellectual disabilities have not been respected in the past, and to change the ways in which this has been happening, and to have this uppermost in their minds and consider the rights when making decision[s] about how supports are provided. (1)

In addition, a crucial element of the purpose of the 3Rs Project, as was identified by the participants, is to educate the individuals with disabilities about their rights, "so that the people that we support recognize their rights" (6). A few participants also related this awareness around rights to a focus on more individualized and person centered planning.

Specifically, in order to ensure that everyone is supported individually, individual rights have to be considered.

Source of the 3Rs change.

As for participants' perspectives as to where the 3Rs initiative came from, all reported different sources of the change. All participants indicated that the change was initially driven by individual leaders within the agency, but that this orientation came from several different large systemic external changes such as changing regulations from the government, the closing of the institutions, union issues and internal changes such as a shift towards person centered planning.

Specifically, when asked the source of the 3Rs initiative several participants indicated that they believed the change came from the Executive Director; "I do know that it's something that was certainly greatly instigated by our Executive Director if not totally" (1). Others believed that the change also came from a Board Member of CLWP:

> I think one of our board members [deleted for anonymity] and I think [his/her] experience, you know, in people having their rights infringed upon, you know, plus when, when [he/she] came on the board here in Welland that--I think it was, [he/she] was a catalyst to making, making, making people's lives better because, you know, there were a lot of people complaining that, this wasn't happening and this wasn't happening and, in their lives and it's because we, we were acting in their best interests but, or so we thought, but we, we tried to fit them into a box which, I think, I think now looking back that it was the wrong thing to do but at the time that was, what was the accepted standard (3).

Participants indicated that it is likely that these two leaders worked together to get the initiative going; "I know that it's something they, they collaborated on and discussed" (1) and "I think those two [deleted for anonymity] together started this groundswell of, of ensuring people with disabilities have rights and have the, and have the ability to exercise their rights, not just have them, have people talk about rights" (3).

In addition, some participants identified external systemic changes that were linked to the initiation of the rights perspective of support of individuals with intellectual /developmental disabilities. One participant believed that this rights perspective had been underway since the late 1980s, which was "around when Westwood [a large community residence] closed and we started opening up a lot of homes and people were given options about where they would like to live and with who" (5). Another participant indicated that the change stemmed from governmental changes and "that when the legislation came down and the rights came out and us to start changing things for them, because they wanting more of their own rights, standing up for themselves" (6).

Other participants reported that several things were also changing around the time that the 3Rs initiative began. In addition to the rights initiative, other changes included the initiation of a Union for staff and Person-Centered Planning (with a focus on Outcomes) for individuals supported by the agency. This meant that there were changes in every respect, in that "You know, you had staff working right[s]. You had staff rights. You had people's rights. You had outcomes and it was all at once. It was actually quite, for somebody who came into it so early, you know, ten years beforehand it was like oh my God, this is all changing all quickly" (4).

Shift in job expectations.

Although participants' length of employment with CLWP ranged from approximately 15 to 35 years, all participants reported that "rights weren't a consideration when I started working at the Association" (3). The type of care for individuals with disabilities was different when the staff started working for the Association; "it was more about personal care" (5). This meant that rights restrictions were present. For example, one participant reported,

> This certainly was a long time ago. And I don't think there was specific discussion about rights. I think probably we talked about, you know, I was told about being fair and consistent treatment was important. I do remember that. But certainly when I started working there were a heck of a lot more restriction[s] in people's lives than there are now. Things like, you know, there were general rules, like everybody went to bed at the same time and everybody ate at the same time and it was just, we - when I started we just had one community residence with 30 people in it (1).

How were they informed of the change?

Participants had a difficult time remembering where they actually heard about the start of the 3Rs initiative. A few participants reported that they believed they were informed about the change from their supervisors. Other participants indicated they learned about the change through meetings or memos, and they were informed that they would be taking the rights training. There were also less informal ways that participants reported that they were informed of the 3Rs Project, for example they "heard through the grapevine this stuff was going on" (2). All participants, however, reported that they received the rights training.

3Rs Training.

All staff and managers reported participating in the 3Rs rights training. As one informant pointed out, the 3Rs Staff Training has become part of the orientation for new staff; "When we hire new staff they go through very extensive training and orientation and the rights is part of that" (1). Some participants reported that, when they took the training, they found it supportive of their beliefs about rights.

> So I think the rights training just was, just was more support for me and how I wanted to, to be a staff. Like that's, that's, that's how I wanted to support so I think getting the training just helped me saying no I am doing it right (5).

Participants indicated that the training was helpful in that it introduced the concepts of rights with respect and responsibility. The training focused on the importance of all three concepts when supporting individuals with intellectual/developmental disabilities.

> Interestingly, I mean it helped me learn about, you know, this rights, respect and responsibility. And it's an interesting approach to see that, you know, yeah, it's not, it's more than just rights. You have to realize, you know, respecting other people's rights and exercising your rights sometimes and the responsibility to go along with it, right? (2).

Participants said that the training gave them some insight into how to support the rights of individuals with intellectual disabilities. The training prompted more awareness of rights concerns, but the formal training was only the start of a "gradual learning process" (5).

> Well it gave us the tools to start to learn how to do it, to do the training and to support those guys. And once you start doing it you end up learning more with each rights infringement and you start considering things more. So you end up learning as you go along (5).

Although for many of the participants, the training provided support for what they already believed their role was in supporting individuals with disabilities, participants also reported that this may not have been the case for all staff at the Association. Staff participants reported feeling confused about what was expected of them as staff members.

> Yeah. I think that I believed in it prior to the training. I think a lot of staff had to, had to almost buy into it. But I think, the way I have always supported, I really believed in, in rights and I, and individuality and I really felt that my job was always to support people to get what they wanted (5).

When participants were asked if they felt that the rights training fully prepared them to support the rights of individuals, one participant indicated that it was not sufficient. Specifically, one participant noted that,

> I didn't think it did. I did find it lacking. At a time I felt I was out there on a limb and I didn't know which way they wanted us to go. I really didn't. I remember, I remember being at [deleted for anonymity] and everybody had to have their teeth brushed every night, whether you wanted it or not. Line up and have your teeth brushed. I remember that culture (4).

Another staff participant indicated that the training gave him or her “the tools to start to learn how to do it, to do the training and to support those guys. And once you start doing it you end up learning more with each rights infringement and you start considering things more" (5). The training was only the beginning of the change process. To make the training more beneficial, one participant suggested that

> I think if we were able to sit in with our guys while they took the training too. But then I don't want to override their personal time and questions and being, there are staff members in here, I can't talk freely, but I think if everybody gets to review that together some how, some way, it would be a good thing too (4).

Feelings regarding the change.

In response to the 3Rs Rights initiative, most participants reported feeling that the change was positive. Management participants indicated that this was

> a good change. I think it's a very positive thing. We're right on the right direction and, you know, it helps the Agency be a leader in lots of ways but it's about helping people living quality lives and I think we're doing that. So actually I can feel good about that (2).

Another participant said that this change

> seemed like a natural progression I think. Our, our agency has always been seen as, as fairly forward thinking and I think, you know, things have certainly changed as I've said a great deal since I started, but it's just been ongoing. So it didn't, it didn't seem a step in a different direction or anything (1)

Participants' indicated that this change was especially beneficial for the individuals supported by the agency who have the ability to speak up for themselves. Unfortunately, according to one participant, this means for individuals with severe disabilities, their rights may not be afforded as diligently as they are for individuals who are more able to speak for themselves. This point is further discussed in the section on Barriers. In addition, one participant reported that the change was beneficial for staff, specifically, "I think it really helped with staff who had a positive attitude. Kind of weed you out from the staff that were there for controlling" (5). Staff also reported that the change was beneficial for them, but that changing would require a lot of work, and additionally, "I think it's going to change a lot of things, because as they recognize more of their rights and they're going to be standing up for themselves more" (6). In fact, several participants reported that they believed that this change would last into the future. Participants indicated that they believed that this "shift will continue. It's like in evolution" (2). There are still some areas of the organization that need to adopt the rights perspective. For example, one participant said,

> So that evolution has started. Some places it's like magic, it's like wow, the stuff that people, the support staff are doing in some of the places is really fabulous. Then there's other places where they're not quite getting it yet. So this evolution is, I'm confident will continue. So do I think the shift is going to impact individual plans? Absolutely. Because more and more the planning process is grasping that whole thing. And like I say, it is in a lot of place got to, got to go further (2).

Participants reported that some staff members are really endorsing the rights initiative and some staff members are slower to embrace it. In addition, participants reported that the rights initiative could have an impact on the way in which the larger community perceives individuals with disabilities.

> I'm hoping it does. I think one of, one of the toughest things is to change the, the, how people in the community perceive people with mental disabilities or developmental disabilities or intellectual disabilities or whatever the catch word is today. Because there, there, there are people, lots of people in the community who see people with intellectual disabilities and, and are still afraid or shy away because they don't know anything about people with intellectual disabilities. What I'm, what I'm hoping to see is, is more like the senior centre, for example has, has embraced an individual who is now a very valued member of the senior centre and hopefully we can make more and more inroads like that. ...I'm hoping those kinds of shifts will, will continue for people because they are getting out into the community a lot more and, and staff are really working hard to get them into the community and try to make those connections and they're making, those connections are happening more and more (3).

Changes in the Organization

There have been several changes made to the organization in response to the 3Rs Human Rights initiative. Some of these changes include alteration in the overall mission for the Association, a change in the measurement of goals and changes to all the job descriptions to include a focus on rights. These changes should facilitate the sustainability of the rights initiative.

Changes in mission.

In response to the 3Rs imitative, participants reported that the overall mission of the Association is now more focused on rights. Although one participant indicated that the "actual official mission" has not changed, the Association's rights interest has "focused the way that we provide service, you know, towards the rights more" (1). Several other participants, however, reported that there was a change in the overall mission of the Association. Participants indicated that "the old outcome used to be just to support people, make sure people are safe. It's much more complex now" (5). There have been changes to the way that goals and outcomes for individuals supported by the agency are evaluated. For example, according to one participant, the mission has changed in response to the 3Rs imitative,

> Yes it has. It's, it's taken the organization in a completely different direction from where, where we were going. I don't even know how long this, we've been doing this research. I have no idea. But it's, it's taken it from a, you know, maintenance kind of, kind of--I can't think of the word--instead of just maintaining people in, you know, day to day. Making sure they have their teeth brushed and their hair combed and their, you know, and clean clothes on to having them actually go out into the community and make friends and, and have the, have the people in the community accept them as people. So I think the, the push is, is for us to ultimately work ourselves out of a job. That would be, that would be the ultimate, I guess (3).

Either way, participants agreed that the purpose of the Association now focuses on rights. The purpose of the Association now, in response to the 3Rs initiative, is

> to provide the best possible supports to create for individuals the, the best quality of life that they envision for themselves. So it's the best life as

> defined by them. So we're supporting them to achieve that on an individual basis (1).

Another participant added that in addition to respecting individual rights, the goal of the Association is to integrate individuals with disabilities into the community.

> I think the Community Living is, we're working, like I say, to, to support people in the best way possible. Affording them as many rights as possible. Well not as possible but affording, affording them all of their rights and integrating them into the community with, so they're, so that the community accepts them as, as equal members within the community, which is a tough thing to do (3).

In order to attain this purpose the measurement of goals has changed.

> The measurement has changed. People are not considered to have their rights in place unless they have gone through the process for any infringements in place. So when we're measuring outcomes, if they haven't had a review of all infringements in place in their life, like say mood altering medications or maybe control of their money. Those are the two things that we always make sure that that's been reviewed, before we can consider that that outcome is present. And they have to have gone through the due, due process of submitting a rights infringement and having it reviewed. So I think that's the main change in measuring the outcome (1).

Change in job descriptions.

In response to the 3Rs rights initiative, management in the Association has "redone all the job descriptions" (2). Now included in each of the job descriptions is an expectation that planning include individuals' choices. For example, "the very first one is, you know, how do you respect people you're working with, right?" (2). By changing the expectations of the job, participants indicate "that in itself might be a, a good way to get to some staff that aren't quite figuring it out yet" (2). Now there is a formal process for recognizing the importance of supporting rights. This change now reflects the way that the role of the support staff has "evolved" (2). What the staff are "doing on a day to day basis is much different now"; "their job changed, evolved" (2).

Organizational Structures

In general, it was reported by a participant that the Association maintains traditional organizational structures. Specifically, within the Association, the authority flows from the Executive Director, Directors, then Supervisors, to Managers, and Full-time to Part-time staff. This is the reporting structure in terms of hiring, assigning responsibility and providing disciplinary action. In addition to this traditional structure, participants were asked about less formal structures in the Association. In order to gain insight into this informal structure, participants were asked to report on who they would go to regarding different areas (asking questions, seeking advice and getting something done) with regards several different areas pertaining to rights, specifically. Participants' reports of who they would go to varied more in terms of the area or type of information they were seeking, than their position of the individual that they would approach.

Questions about supporting rights.

Participants where asked who would they go to if they had questions about supporting rights. The participants who were Directors reported that they would ask the Executive Director of the Association, their peers and staff members. One of the

Directors also added that he/she would seek information from family members and the individuals supported by the agency. It is important to go to everyone because, according to this participant, "Well if you've got a question about the person's rights you need to have all the information" (1). When the Supervisors were asked whom they would ask if they had questions about rights, they said they would seek out the Directors of the Association. One of these participants also said he/she would ask "my staff as well. We meet as groups. So a lot of times, like with the individuals that are harder to support" (5). Staff participants reported that first they would ask other full-time staff, then they "go to [their] immediate manager" (4; 6). For additional questions, staff participants reported that they would seek out individuals on the 3Rs research team.

Seeking help to get something done to support rights.

When participants were asked who they would go to if they wanted something done to help them to support rights, all participants reported that they would go up the organizational ladder. The participants who were Directors themselves reported that they would go to other Directors if they needed something done related to funding. Supervisors reported that they would go to their Director. One participant noted, "They give me quite a bit of freedom, which is nice. Like normally, like I have, I'm able to make a lot of decisions on my own but, but if I need anything more, you know. Very, very supportive" (5). Similarly, staff participants reported that they would go to their immediate supervisor.

Advice on supporting rights.

Finally, when participants were asked from whom they would seek advice about rights, all participants reported that they would go to their immediate Supervisor (including other Directors), peers and “the rights research team that work within our office” (3). Additionally, one participant reported, “Once in an odd while the, there are two professors here at Brock that are involved and I've asked them” (3). One of the participants added that seeking advice would depend “upon the individual and what the right is that I wanted supported” (4).

Management Style

Senior managers indicated that they have changed their management style in response to the 3Rs initiative. Supervisors commented on how their own management style has become more “relaxed” and less rigid in response to their increased awareness of rights. They reported using “much more of a team approach and flexible” (5) approach to planning that requires a lot more brainstorming. All participants reported using an “open door policy” (1) where any staff member can come and discuss concerns that they may have. Most participants indicated that, in giving staff directives, their presentation styles are “usually in the form of requesting rather than commanding” (1). Participants reported that it was rare for them to assert managerial authority; “I mean there might be occasions where somebody is doing something that's just absolutely unacceptable and totally against policy and then I would be telling them that” (1). Furthermore, some participants discussed that they “delegate” (2) responsibilities through notes, emails or memos. They will, however, “incorporate in something that [the staff] would like to do” (4). Participants reported that they view leading by example to be an important aspect of the role of manager. It was reported that a manager should have “more of an educational influence” (4) that will help to support rights.

Changes in Behaviours

Participants reported many behaviour changes in response to the 3Rs human rights initiative. Many of these changes related to internal factors that may be acting as motivating operations to increase their behaviour to support rights. These include an increased awareness of rights and an understanding of a shift in the role of how support is provided for individuals with disabilities. Staff members now are acknowledging that they no longer have control in their relationship with the individuals whom they support. Additional external behaviour changes that were reported by the staff included a shift towards individualized programming, providing people they support with more education about rights, a change in both their perspective and behaviour related to rights infringements, an increase in their advocacy for rights, and supporting individuals with disabilities when they are in the community. Many of these behaviour changes were reported at both the managerial and direct support staff levels.

Shift in the Role of Supporting Individuals with Disabilities

Staff members relinquishing control.

Participants made repeated comments about how the role of staff has changed in relation to who has control. Participants discussed how their role in supporting individuals with disabilities has changed. In the past, staff had control in the relationship as they told individuals with intellectual/developmental disabilities what to do.

> Oh, yeah, like you have to go brush your teeth. You have to go take a shower. You basically point them in the direction and that's exactly where they are. Yeah, you have to eat your dinner or you don't get a snack later. You know, that's all, that doesn't happen anymore (4).

As a result of the rights initiative, staff members, as a group, are in the process of shifting their role with regard to how they provide support for people with intellectual disabilities. They have become aware of the rights of people they support and the control that the individuals themselves possess over events in their own lives. Participants discussed that "As we all learned that, to become less of a caregiver to more of person that's - we're now supporting people to make decisions on their own" (2). Another participant commented that, as a staff member he/she has to be "More open mind[ed]. Thinking of them, that this is something that they want and no, you're not in control. They're in control. Let them have their own rights" (6). This relinquishing of control means that staff members are now supporting individuals in the choices that they themselves want to make. From a staff perspective, these choices may not always be in the individuals' best interests, but staff and managers are recognizing that they do not have the right to prevent an individual from making these choices. One participant discussed this process when he/she considers individual rights, specifically, "And the individuals I support, you know, in my head I'm thinking, okay, well you don't have, I, [name], don't have a right to, to say they can or can't do anything" (5). Another participant referred to his/her role in supporting individuals to make their own life choices about what risks they want to take and paralleled this to their own ability to make these types of choices.

> Well good and bad. Because that, because before in the past there would have been I had control over that person, not realizing I was controlling them by just saying that's it. And now he has more freedom and he's making his own choices. So it's nice to see him going after things that are important

> for him, that are his right to decide if I do this I'm going to get sick, and if I don't it'll stop, but that's his choice. And I take it as I'm a smoker and I know that's bad for my health, but I still continue to smoke. So it's nice (6).

Everyone has the right to make choices that may not be in his/her best interest. The rights initiative has caused a shift in the distribution of control within the relationship between support staff and individuals with disabilities. Now individuals with disabilities have the power to make their own decisions as to what they want out of life. The 3Rs initiative supports this shift in control and as staff and managers become more aware of the right of individuals with disabilities, the more these individuals will be empowered to assert their rights.

An Increased Awareness of Rights

Participants reported that the 3Rs initiative has changed their awareness of rights issues that has led to several changes in the behaviour of both staff and managers. Some of these changes include a questioning of current policies, procedures and rights concerns, open discussions about rights, seeking out information on how to better support rights, and changes in how decisions and plans are made.

Changes in Management.

Management participants spoke of having an increased awareness of rights issues as a result of the 3Rs initiative. This awareness seems to be biggest change that has prompted change in the behaviours of participants in a management position. Participants discussed that they are “Maybe just being a little more aware of things that are rights infringements that possibly in the past, it wouldn't have occurred to me that they were” (1). Similarly another participant said that he/she is “I'm a lot more cognisant of people's rights. I'm a lot more cognisant of what I do and how I do it and how I treat people and how I talk to them" (3). In addition, managers are encouraging staff "to question current practices and procedures and policies" (1). They are asking their staff to ask the individuals they support if there are any rights issues and to listen to them.

> So it's, and always check, like I try and get the staff to always check in with individuals. Is there anything right now that's kind of brewing. Is there anything that they're not happy with. So my role is, I think, to keep pushing that. To keep asking, to keep making sure that people are happy. That nothing's happening on the bus. Nothing is happening in the community that, you know, that rights are being infringed upon (5).

These participants reported an increased sensitivity to the rights and choices of the individuals supported by the agency. They reported that this awareness is important to make sure that all rights restrictions are considered. For example, one of the participants stated "Yes, we've become very sensitive of what, you know, what rights are important to people and, and when, whether due process is available for those people that, when, when rights cannot be exercised" (2).

In fact, the managers' reports of their changes in response to the 3Rs initiative were confirmed by the staff participants. Specifically, the staff participants referred to their managers as now having an open door and a willingness to listen to any rights concerns. They reported that the management personnel has to think about how to support people individually. One participant noted that he/she believes that management "have to think more" (6). Further, participants discussed that when addressing their managers, “The door is open. They'll listen to the issues and the door wasn't always open. They will listen to the issues. That's the big thing” (4).

Changes in Staff.

Staff members also reported that they have become more aware of rights issues. With this awareness, they think more about how they make decisions with human rights now at the forefront of their decision making process. Staff reported that they “think strategy first” (4), “because you have to think of their [people supported by the agency] rights first” (6). When referring to other staff, one participant noted that

> They're just more aware. They're more aware that they're not taking control, that those, the guys we support have the control, not us. That we're not to step in and say no, do this later if they don't want to do it now. That we have to be more flexible with the guys (6).

In addition to an increased awareness, staff participants reported an increased amount of discussion about rights amongst staff.

> I say we have a lot more discussions over that. Certain people, something happens will say well isn't that infringing upon their rights, which would shock me. You know, like, I'm like oh yeah, you're right. You know, it's there. It's something we discuss. We discuss, we discuss a lot. We never would have (4).

Staff members are asking other staff for information about rights issues. One participant reported that other staff members “come to me to ask for, for information onto it, because they're even more unsure. That, is this a rights infringement?” (6).

Overall, both groups of participants indicated that they have made many changes because of their increased awareness of rights issues. Managers prominently indicated that the 3Rs initiative has brought about awareness in rights, which has led to questioning of policies and procedures, seeking out information from their staff about rights concerns and open discussions about rights. Staff participants also indicated that this increased awareness of rights has led them to seek out more information about rights concerns and has impacted their programming to include individuals rights.

Shift towards Individualized Programming

Shifting towards individualized programming was a major change identified by all participants. Participants indicated that they have changed the way that they develop programs and overall planning by considering individuals' rights when making plans.

Changes in Management.

Managers have reported that they have changed their programming to be more individualized.

> Yeah, like let's figure out what they want because it's more the individualized perspective, self-directed stuff. So people were on programs, and they're not anymore. And we just help people do whatever. So our planning's changed. People aren't on programs, you know, in particular where I am anyway (2).

Managers are attempting to incorporate the individuals' choices in their programming. They are asking individuals supported by the agency what they want and what is important to them.

> So now we're addressing them by finding out our people, what do people want and what do they understand are their rights. A lot of people don't understand that they have rights and what, what are the ones that are important to them. ...You know, it's not just voting, right? You know, can I use the phone? Can I use the phone privately? Can I go visit my friends? Can I be with my girlfriend or my boyfriend? You know, can I have some privacy with them. You know, all those kinds of things (2).

They are also trying to listen to individuals who are not able to articulate their rights concerns. Managers reported that they are trying to observe individuals' behaviour to gain insight into choices of individuals who are non-verbal.

> And if you, if you really listen to people, even those guys that have those nasty labels, if you listen to what they're on about. I mean lots of times it's just a matter of communication. They're trying to tell you something they don't like (2)
>
> Now, now I look at the an...., you know the A, B, C, the antecedents, the, what the behaviour is, or the consequences. You know I, or the, but back then you, you were reacting to the reaction, basically. Well, you know, you weren't looking at what was, what was causing it to happen or or why a person wanted to make that, whatever the choice, you know, that they were making. Why they wanted to engage in whatever activity they wanted to engage in. If, you know, you just basically said yes or no but now you look, we look at it more holistically, I think (3).

In response to this individualized programming that focuses on choices and rights of people supported by the agency, participants reported that rules have had to change. There are no longer rule governed schedules. Programming must include brainstorming to maintain the balance between what the individuals want and what is feasible for the organization.

> Yeah, I think we problem solve now. …I think we, yeah, we, we, we sit, we brainstorm. We try and figure out what's going to be the best for the individual. What's, you know, what the staff feels most that, that they can live with 'cause a lot of times it's the balance and I'll say to them, okay, well you give a little bit and that individual will be happy. I'm not saying that you have to completely change the way you're doing things but a lot of times the staff think it's black and white and it can't be. It has to. It's just, it is problem solving. You're sitting with the person saying, you know, okay, what can we do? Okay, we can't do that but let's try this (5).

Changes in Staff.

Management has also seen a change in their staff in regards to how they are providing more individualized care. Management participants reported that some staff members are listening to the individuals they support to help them in issues that are important to them. For example, one participant discussed, “Well depends who the others are. Some people are, are learning to listen a lot better. I think for the most part then I'd have to say most people are getting better at listening to people” (2).

Staff participants also reported that they have changed the way they are planning to ensure a more individualized approach to the people they support by asking individuals what they want. Staff participant discussed the change as "before I wouldn't ask. I would just, you're doing it, you know, demand. It would just, it would just be part of go take your shower. Not like do you want to go take a shower today?" (4).

Staff members also reported that they have changed the way that they offer choices to individuals whom they support by providing all the options and consequences.

> People stop and think wait a minute, we shouldn't be making these decisions. They should. And how they offer those decisions. Sometimes I would say before if they did offer decisions it was slanted to get the outcome that that specific person wanted. Now it's, no it's, it's all there for their decision. These are, you know, they give them the consequences for each decision and then let them decide, which is so much better and so much different. It is different (4).

The staff also reported that the change towards respecting each individual's choices can be difficult and requires that staff utilize more strategy and brainstorming.

> Trying to shift and try and make sure you're not infringing on anybody's rights when someone else decides they don't want to come. You have to be brainstorming all the time so that everyone gets out there and gets to do things (6).

Thus, both the staff and management participants indicated that they have changed their programming in response to the rights initiative by taking a much more individualized approach to programming, including individuals they support in making choices and developing their own plans. This planning, however, requires a lot more effort and brainstorming in order to balance everyone's rights within the organizational context. Sometimes this balance is difficult and participants indicated that they would like more information on how to better support the rights of all the individuals they support.

Providing Education about Rights

Changes in Management.

In fact, the participants who were managers acknowledged that the staff members they supervise required more information and education about how to better support rights. Management participants referred to their role as educators in supporting individuals' rights. Aside from assisting in organizing the formal 3Rs training, as one participant discussed doing, all management participants referred to the importance of providing their staff with informal education about rights issues. For example, one participant stated that "I think the rights initiative has helped us, you know, educating people we support and educating the staff because I think there were a lot of problems there" (2). Managers reported that they also "encourage the staff on all levels to be rights trainers" (1). When rights are not being supported, managers have discussions with the staff and educate them about rights. One participant said that, with regard to staff not supporting rights, "if they're not being recognized it's us going in there and, and talking with the staff and educating them" (5).

Changes in Staff.

In addition to managers educating staff, managers reported that they have seen that staff members are taking on a rights education role with other staff and with the individuals supported by the Association. One staff participant discussed that there are differences in the way that staff have adopted the rights initiative. When staff understand the importance of rights, they are comfortable sharing this with other staff members.

> in some people they've changed completely. You know, it's funny because you've got some staff who just get it naturally and others that it took a long time but I think the majority now are understanding and if they're not they have peers that kind of push and say okay, no, you can't do that. You need to rethink. [deleted for anonymity] So I think a lot, it's almost peer pressure to be doing things on a consistent way and hopefully the right way (5).

The staff members are also acknowledging that their role now includes a focus on educating others about rights. One staff participant said that it is important to "lead by example" and that this has become a "really big role" (4) for him/her. In response to the 3Rs Project, staff have changed their role; "Yeah, I became more of an educational person than anything. Before, I don't think I really took on the, the role of educating until about that time" (4).

Change in Perspective on Rights Infringements

Education has been important to help shift staff perspectives on rights infringements. There has been some reported change in how the Rights Facilitation Forms are being perceived by the staff. Initially, it was reported by other staff, that staff thought the Rights Infringement Forms were a bad thing and the idea that someone reported a violation would be taken as a criticism of their work.

> I think with more and more the staff at first they thought it would be a bad thing to put in a rights infringement. But in my home I'm seeing more and more of the part-time staff hand in rights infringement and they're realizing

> that it's not a bad thing. It's a good thing and it's helping them to achieve more things in their life (6).

This change came as a result of a lot of education by the management team. Managers have had to educate their staff about the importance of submitting rights infringement forms. They had to inform their staff that recognizing a rights restriction does not reflect badly on the staff. Instead, acknowledging rights restrictions is important in order to rectify the concern. Participants reported that most staff are now viewing the Rights Facilitation Forms as a positive innovation.

> But once they see that they're going in and positive changes are happening towards that because of the rights infringement, instead of negative stuff, they open up and then they're more willing to watch for the stuff and not think of it as something bad (6).

Some staff members are really embracing the rights initiative. One participant reported that some staff members have submitted a lot of Rights Facilitation Forms on behalf of the individuals they support.

> And I think certainly staff have picked up on recognizing rights infringements and bringing them to our attention. We have one, one particular staff who is just super in terms of - again [name] complains about all the rights infringements [he/she] gets from this staff member, but [he's/she's] really on top of things in terms of making sure everything goes, goes through and gets approved (1).

Staff members are empowered by management as a result of the rights initiative to acknowledge and report rights infringements. When asked how their relationship with the staff they supervise has changed because of the rights initiative, one management participant indicated,

> I don't think it's changed. I've always had a good relationship with the, with the staff that I supervise. There are, there are a lot, well they'll, they'll tell me when I'm out of line a lot more now than, you know, in the past. They're, they're a lot more, they've been empowered a lot more to speak up, which is good and I, and I'm never offended by that because, just because I'm a supervisor doesn't make me right all the time so. It's, it's empowered, it's empowered the, it's empowered the staff (3).

Thus, managers accept it when staff point out that they have made a rights infringement and will try to change their behaviour.

> And sometimes rights infringements are easily fixed. When you realize that you just say well I'll stop doing that then. I mean I've done stuff when people have said hey listen, you know. When you do that the, the person interprets it this way, and this maybe - well I'll stop doing that then, won't I? (2).

However, it is important to note that this change in perspective on rights infringements may not be adopted fully throughout the whole Association, as participants reported,

> Every so often, you know, I find that staff, not, not all staff but every so often somebody falls back into, into the old ways of doing things and we can't do that. We can't do that. It just wasn't, it's, it's not positive for anybody (3).

> Or sometimes it's negative because I'll see that that's a rights infringement and I will say that's a rights infringement, you need to change that. Or I'll fill out of the form and sometimes it's, you know, it'll be like who does she think she is. Or then, sometimes it's positive. You're right, I did infringe on their right. So, and they change it. But sometimes it's negative. Sometimes it's good (6).

The reported change in the staff members' perspective of rights has required a lot of education from both staff and managers. The increased acceptance of rights has empowered the staff to raise their own rights concerns, even when they are related to the behaviour of managers. However, this change may not be fully accepted by all those who work with the agency. Participants reported that more education is required for some staff members who may still feel negatively about changing in response to rights infringements.

Advocating for Rights

Changes in Management.

Although management personnel are somewhat removed from the front line in supporting individuals with intellectual disabilities, they still view themselves as having an active role in supporting individuals' rights. Management participants reported that they "support people in exercising their rights. Help them submit rights infringements" (1).

> I see myself as, as somebody who's, who's there to guarantee that people are allowed to make choices and exercise their rights and, and--I'm, I'm just thinking. … Other people were, were just being put down and, and I see

> myself as, as a, as somebody who's there to guarantee that people, the people that are being supported are treated equally, fairly and are, have the opportunity to be independent. To be independent thinkers (3).

Managers are also changing rules (either formal or informal) in order to support individuals in making choices. Some of the reported rule changes include allowing staff to support individuals in "controlling their own money" (2), not enforcing a bed time rule, offering individuals food choices and choices in within the community activities even in risky behaviours (going to strip clubs, owning guns).

Changes in Staff.

Management reported that their staff who have adopted the rights perspective are advocating for individuals' rights by doing whatever they can to support their choices. According to this participant, however, there are other staff who have not fully adopted the new direction.

> A. I have some, I have some very strong staff who, who protect the rights of individuals. They're, there are a lot of staff who, who have taken, taken a grave interest in this and are affording people their rights. Letting them make choices, letting them, not letting them, that's horrible. That's horrible language but are, are, are supporting them in making those decisions and su..., and the, the way we support people has changed completely since this started.
>
> Q. Were they, were these people supporting them before?
>
> A. They were but not in this way. Now people, you know, they're, we have staff who, who will come in and take somebody, you know, if

> somebody wants to go play bingo, staff will come in on their own time and pick up that person and take them to bingo with them whereas in the past it was, whew, if you're not paying me I'm not taking them, you know but I think, I think there's a, there's a whole, a shift that's happening but it's happening slowly. I don't think—although they said the staff need, need to, they need to buy in. I don't think all the staff have bought in but this is, this is the direction that the agency has taken and that until all the staff buy in and I don't know how to make staff, like you can't beat them into.... (3).

Managers reported that it has been difficult for them to help their staff to overcome this resistance to the rights agenda, while other staff are fully adopting the rights agenda. The staff participants reported that they advocate for the rights and choices of individuals supported by the agency.

> I'm here to support them in what they want, and to help them speak the way, to get it down if they can't get it across, because some of mine are non-verbal. So I try and think of how they would like it by looking at their body language, to stand up for them (6).

They discussed that their role as rights advocates is especially important for people who are non-verbal and thus have difficulty asserting their rights independently. Both staff and managers reported that they have increased their role as advocates for the human rights of individuals with disabilities.

Supporting Individuals outside the Association

In addition to supporting individuals' rights within the Association, it is important to consider how rights are respected in the wider community. Participants reported that managers sometime need to assist their staff with external agencies, such as medical facilities, in order to ensure that the rights of the people they support are being protected.

A. Well personally what I do is if, if staff are having trouble, you know, getting people recognized that they do have rights, especially in the community and a medical facility and I can give a lot of examples in a medical facility. I, as a manager, will, will take the reigns and support those staff and, and, to ensure that people with intellectual disabilities get equal care. You know, they don't walk into a hospital, oh, okay, wait in that room over there for 12 hours, 14 hours and then we'll send you home again. I've, I've had many arguments with medical personnel in the last few years, especially since this research started because it also opened my eyes that people have rights. Everybody has, has rights and they have the right to medical care. They have the right to equal medical care and when they, when they don't get that then I get my back up. You know when they're, when they're treated like oh, well what, what value do they have to society and, and I've heard that far too often. It doesn't matter what their value is to society. They're, they're, that's a person and that, they should get the best medical care possible and we've, and that's, this is just one example of medical, the medical care.

Q. In those instances would you back up the staff or would you actually go and talk to the professional?

A. I'd back up the staff. We, we, with the staff we'd go and talk to the professional. You know, it's not, I wouldn't take over because you don't

> want to do that either. You want everybody to feel empowered but I, am there as a resource, and they're, you know, because I can, I can say things coming from, as a manager, you know, as far as what, what the agency can and cannot do. Can and cannot afford whereas, whereas a senior support worker or a part-time staff may not have that kind of information (3).

A few participants made reference to the fact that as an agency, "we support people in employment situations" (2). In doing this, there are times when a manager will have to advocate with employers for the rights of individuals with disabilities:

> So, so if an employer is being tough on somebody then you go, you go harder on somebody with an intellectual disability than they would be if they didn't have the intellectual disability then, then you know, we, we go and support people that live in our service so, within our service (3).

Participants also reported that sometimes they need to go outside the agency in order to get insight on how to best support individuals' rights.

> You know, a lot of times it's been, we've had one individual where, you know, we actually went and talked to, to the minister because they were very close to the minister so, you know, this individual was given support by the church rather than us because it was a better role. So I'm a firm believer in kind of brainstorming with a bunch of people (5).

Thus, participants are not just changing in response to how they support individuals' rights within the agency. They are also looking outside the Association, to the medical field, employers, spiritual groups, etc. to ensure that the rights of people with disabilities are being supported. Informants indicated that sometimes going outside the Association provides a different perspective on how to better support rights.

Behaviour Changes in Individuals Supported by the Agency

Participants reported that there seems to be a process of change for the individuals supported by the agency. Participants have reported that individuals supported by the agency are responding to the rights training in different ways. Participants indicate that learning about rights depends on the specific individual. The process is individual with some individuals benefitting greatly from learning about their rights and others having a difficult time accepting the change.

> A. Some I think it's too much for them, and some have grown from it.
>
> Q. For the ones that you think it's too much for, can you elaborate on that?
>
> A. More behaviour stuff comes out because they don't know what to do with all those choices. They're so used to being told to follow a strict routine, and then now if you leave it open and you're giving them more choice they come out with more behaviours. And other ones are loving it, that they're feeling very proud of themselves. Look what I've done.
>
> Q. Okay. Are the behaviours more in terms of respect and responsibility issues or just like physically acting out more?
>
> A. Physically acting out more. Some, that's a lot of change. That is some stuff they don't, they don't want. So you have to do smaller steps rather than doing it all, all at once with them. Because some of them, they could take

> the rights training but they aren't going to understand. So you have to help them through it (6).

Educating individuals about their rights can be difficult because they may not be able to understand and will require more assistance from staff members. However, individuals supported by the agency are changing their reliance on their staff. One participant indicated that he/she had the opportunity to observe an individual supported by the agency during a 3Rs rights test (used to assess the knowledge change from the 3Rs training for participants with intellectual disabilities). This participant indicated that listening to the individual's responses that suggested a heavy reliance on staff "really knocked me for a loop" (3). This participant reported that individuals supported by the agency have not been recognizing their autonomy and have tended to follow the direction of their staff members. Knowing this, however, will inform the agency's direction towards encouraging the development of self advocacy in the individuals they support. Specifically the participant reported that,

> just listening to some of the answers that came out of the people, I, I thought what have we done here? You know, we've created little robots and, you know, staff were always right and, and I think, I think that's, that's helping to guide the, the Community Living in, in the direction of making sure that people understand truly what, what rights are and what, what it is to be autonomous, almost, you know, so that they, they don't have to depend on staff and they don't have to do what the staff tell them to do and you're allowed to have a, have your own thoughts and express yourself (3).

Another participant reported observing a similar reliance on staff when participating in Outcomes Reviews.

> Because they'll go through a phase of not trusting us. They go through a phase of being told what to do for [number of years] and all of a sudden it's, this thing comes along, whether it be [name] or somebody in this outcomes thing, start talking about the kind of stuff they want to do. And it's like oh crap, what is, what's the right answer here? What does he want me to say. Or, and we still have it, you know, there will be four that's sitting here and here's a person that support, they're supporting. And I'll say okay, so what is it you want to do, and they're looking directly at their support staff. And it's like you know they're looking at the support staff to say is this what I'm supposed to do? You know, so there's a lot of that, and that still happens (2).

Most participants reported positive changes in the individuals supported by the agency as a result of the 3Rs Project. Before the initiation of the project, “They had a basis for their rights but they didn't know their full rights and they couldn't exercise their full rights. Now they can” (4). Participants reported “What I mean is it's amazing when people finally, people we support finally figure out that we're listening to them” (2). As individuals supported by the agency are learning about their rights, they are also advocating for themselves. One participant reported that now that individuals supported by the agency are “learning their rights they're learning to fight for their rights and they're going back to doctor's appointments and things to get things changed that they would like to see changed (6). Furthermore, another participant noted that individuals “are very good about if they feel that they, their rights have been infringed upon they'll call someone in the rights team directly or they'll talk to staff about it" (1). When people learn of their rights they become empowered, as one participant commented,

> People are, are, people aren't afraid now to say, you know, I need to go to the mall. People aren't afraid to say, you know, just--it's, it's, the doors have opened for them. They're not, they're not being held captive anymore (3).

A participant reported that individuals supported by the agency are even standing up for each others' rights. "I do know that [name] and [name] will stick up for each other whether they're, even if they're arguing at each other. He'll say so and so raised her voice at [name] yesterday and that wasn't right" (4). Individuals are now celebrating the choices they have made.

> I mean you go on holidays you take pictures, another good example. Where people we support didn't used to. Now they do and we want to make, and they put things on the walls and the whole point of that is to, so they can celebrate that they've done that kind of trip (2).

Staff reported observing changes in individuals they support. One participant reported that an individual that he/she supports has learned to assert her rights within the context of respect and responsibility.

> [name] is an interesting one because she knew all her rights. Didn't necessarily know the responsibilities and respect behind them. So her, she knew all her rights. Doesn't mean she actually exercised them but she knew them and she never did understand the respect and responsibility and she does. She's learning. And I have a right to go and yell at staff because

> they're staff so I can go up there and yell at them because I feel like it and that's life. She understands that that's not respectful and that's changed and she understands that. Like before it was just, it was her right. [example removed for anonymity] (4).

Participants are reporting that they predict individuals supported by the agency will continue to change as they learn more about their rights.

> Well each of them have their own individual goals and they're going to, as they learn more about their rights and the things that they can do, they're going to go out and go after more of the things that they would want in life, to learn about more, their medical issues, every aspect of their life? (6).

Supports and Reinforcers

Motivating Operations

Participants' perspectives on internal motivation did not differ according to participant category. All participants reported that they believe it is important to support the rights of individuals with intellectual/developmental disabilities because this is a part of their internal belief structure. They want to support the rights of individuals with disabilities because "it's just an intrinsic part of my belief system. That's really about it. … I believe it's the right thing to do" (1). Participants, however, reported different reasons for the origin of this internal belief. These reasons include: a personal belief that all people have rights; that people must be treated as individuals; a belief in the importance of advocacy; a personal history of disability; and a belief in the importance of supporting the rights of individuals in order to encourage them to strive for and reach their goals.

One participant reported that his/her motivation for supporting rights is that all people have rights, regardless of ability and that the only circumstance in which rights should be restricted is if a person breaks the law.

> A. Well my motivation because I, well I'm, I'm motivated because people, everybody has rights, you know, and, and they should be afforded those rights.
>
> Q. So personal belief structure.
>
> A. Yeah, it's just not, it's not something that--you can't just afford rights to people who don't have any, you know, who are deemed normal in society. Everybody is, should be afforded those rights unless you've done something to give up your rights and then you're in prison (3).

Another participant reported believing that all people are different, and as such, they should be treated as individuals. Listening to people's choices is an important way to support each person individually and is the only way to make a difference.

> No it's, I've always believed that people need to be supported individually. I don't believe that any two people in our, in our agency that we support should be looked at the same. And I, and I truly believe. [deleted to maintain anonymity] In the group homes, it was very difficult to treat people as individuals (5).

A participant referred to the importance of advocacy, where individuals with disabilities often need people to speak up for them. This participant emphasized that it is important that advocates not back down, even when the choices that individuals make are not easy to achieve. It is important to fight for the choices made by individuals. “I just think they, that they, speaking for those who can't speak for themselves, I guess that would be my motivation" (3).

Another motivation reported for supporting rights was a personal family history of disability. A participant reported that his/her personal experiences helped to promote an understanding of the importance of supporting people with their disability.

> My motivation would be I personally have people in my life that have disabilities, either intellectual or mental health issues and have seen through their life that they've needed somebody to champion those things so I think it's just part of the course and that's my motivation. You know it's, it's everybody. You've got to do it (4).

Furthermore, another participant reported that he/she can relate to individuals with disabilities and tries to support them as he/she would like to be supported personally.

> This is important to them. You've got to be there. You've got to be, you've got to help them. And a lot of them I try to think of it as if I was in their shoes would I want somebody standing there to help me to fight for what I want. So I try to put myself in their shoes, and is that the kind of support that I would want someone to give me (6).

Finally, participants reported that they believe that it is important for people to have positive life outcomes (as reflective of quality of life) and to achieve goals. Asserting individual rights is inherent in reaching these goals.

> Rights infringements is a big part of outcomes. So I do, really do believe strongly around the outcomes, that it's a really good direction to go. And so

> my motivation for that is all about supporting the outcomes for people. And rights is just an inherent part of all that (2).

Furthermore, when individuals reach these goals, participants reported feeling satisfied. "Because some of them with their rights ... So when you see them achieve those goals, it's like yup" (6).

Internal Reinforcers

Participants reported that they proved themselves with internal reinforcement after they supported the rights of individuals with intellectual/developmental disabilities. All participants reported feeling good about themselves after they support the rights of individuals with disabilities. "I guess I just would feel good about doing it. I really don't get any other kind of feed, give any other kind of feedback to myself I don't think" (1). Further, they also interpret the supporting of individual rights as being an important measure of their job performance. All participants reported feeling "pretty good about my work" (2) and that they have done "a good job" (4) after they engage in rights supporting behaviours. They believe that supporting rights is an important part of their job now and they acknowledged their own successes. "Well I feel I'm doing my job I guess" (2). Participants know the importance of supporting rights and they are rewarding themselves for their good work, even in the absence of external contingencies. "As long as I know people we support are being treated with all their stuffs, rights and ... you know, we're doing a good job - and I don't need someone else to tell me" (2). Another participant noted,

> And, and usually I, I, just by what I've been able to achieve I've been tel...., I've told myself you've done a good job, even if nobody else has done, had told you that, I know that I've done a good job so (3).

An additional internal reinforcer for participants to support the rights of individuals with disabilities is that through supporting rights, relationships become stronger. Managerial participants reported changes in their relationships as a result of being strong advocates for individuals' rights. They are experiencing stronger relationships not only with those they support, but also with peers and staff.

> Yeah. I don't know if I receive a lot in the way of formal recognition or anything. But I think, I think what I receive is positive relationships and respect hopefully from all the people that I talked about before, the individuals that we support, the staff who I supervise, my supervisors (1).

Extrinsic Reinforcers

Participants reported several different types of extrinsic reinforcers, or supports that assist them in supporting the rights of individuals with intellectual disabilities. The predominate types of supports reported included informal supports, formal supports, education and discussions. All participants reported either receiving or providing each of these types of supports.

Informal support.

In terms of providing informal reinforcers for supporting rights, both Directors and Supervisors reported providing praise and encouragement to those they supervise. They reported encouraging staff and individuals supported by the agency to submit rights infringement forms, question policies and procedures and to take part in the rights training.

> I encourage the staff on all levels to be rights trainers or to, I support people in exercising their rights. Help them submit rights infringements or encourage them to, and to question current practices and procedures and policies and give positive reinforcement for all of the above. Encourage people who are supported by us to take the rights training to exercise their rights (1).

Participants in managerial positions reported simply trying to acknowledge their staff for supporting rights “try to make a point of saying good job” (2). In addition, supervisors reported feeling reinforced by their staff and the individuals supported by the agency for enforcing rights.

> I probably get it daily. This, the program that I have has over [number] people that we support so that's a lot of individuals and a lot of varied settings so between staff and family and individuals I have a pretty well revolving door. So it, it has to be at least daily (5)
>
> I get a lot of kudos from, from the staff. They, they're, they're amazed at what I can pull off and, and how I do it and personally I've been amazed at myself, what I've been able to pull off because when you don't back down from somebody (3)

Consistent with the managerial perspective, staff reported feeling encouraged by their managers to support the rights of individuals with intellectual/developmental disabilities. Staff members are recognized for raising rights concerns, for example “it'll be that's a good catch, you caught that, that's good. Good thinking," (6) or "I've seen positive feedback saying thank you very much for bringing it for our attention and it was, you know, indeed a rights infringement that we needed to deal with" (4). Staff reported feeling encouraged to fill out rights infringement forms, for example, "if you have a rights infringement fine, here's the forms. Go get it done. Here, dah dah, no big deal" (4). The support staff members receive continues through the rights infringement process. "But usually when we get, when the rights infringements are answered the [identifies person in senior role] always answers back good recognizing the rights infringement, or she'll question it but continue, keep doing a good job" (6). This acknowledgement for provides feedback to the staff that they are doing a good job in following through on the organization's rights procedures.

> "That was a good job. You did it right 'cause that happens so, you know, you don't get to get a lot of positive feedback all the time that when it does happen it's a good thing. Because I, I just received one the other day from one that I put in. It's like I did right. I mean it was good. It was good. I really like to see that and it validated my concerns" (4).

Once they receive confirmation that there is, in fact, a rights restriction in place, then managers support staff in order to address the rights restriction.

> "They're realizing that is a rights infringement and then once it's been confirmed that that is a rights infringement or we could work around it another way it's brought up at a staff meeting. So then it's supporting everybody. The person the rights infringement went in for, they get to find

> out the answer. The staff get to find out the answer, and management. So everyone's getting affected by it" (6).

Formal support.

Managerial participants reported that they do a number of things to recognize the staff formally for supporting rights. They reported that there have been changes made to their job descriptions to include supporting rights, so staff members are being formally recognized during their evaluations. Other than this, managers reported acknowledging staff with 'letters of recognition' and in 'staff awards presentations' that are held regularly. These awards are given for years of service, but "if a recognition of rights and really working in that area is something that a staff has been really good at, then obviously that would be mentioned in the speech when they get their award" (1). On some occasions, managers will even hold small parties or go out for coffee when the rights of individuals supported by the organization are supported.

> "Well I think there's a lot more celebrations now so we, we celebrate together so if an individual has, you know, achieved something that they've been wanting or if, you know, the individual has spoken up and staff have supported them, you know, we celebrate that now, whether it be, it could be something minor like just all going out for a coffee or, or even having parties. A lot of times what I do as a manager is I'll write a letter saying, you know, way to go. ...To the staff, yeah. And that goes in their file. It's just kind of recognition and, you know, that you're doing, you're doing what we want you to be doing and" (5).

Staff members are not the only ones getting letters for supporting rights. One manager reported receiving thank you cards from the people he/she supports, "Yeah. For, for helping" (3).

Education.

Aside from the formal 3Rs training, participants reported that they educate others about rights. Managers reported that an important aspect of their job is to educate staff, For example, one participant reported that he/she will "go to staff meetings on occasion to talk about certain things for them. So I have a bit of a role of that type of influence I guess" (1). Managers reported that they have to provide a lot education to their staff about how to recognize rights restrictions.

> So it's managers supporting....
>
> Q. Okay.
>
> A. ....the staff in doing that or if, also if, if they're not being recognized it's us going in there and, and talking with the staff and educating them (5).

Managers had to educate their staff about the intent of the rights restrictions forms in an attempt to change staff members' perception of the forms from negative to positive.

> "And that was a lot of education that managers had to do. So ... That it was okay to be putting ... these in. If you, if you recognize any kinds of rights infringements, it's not that you're doing a bad job. It's that we need to recognize it as an agency ... and deal with it so people, I think, are viewing that as a positive now" (5).

Staff members reported that they are still learning about rights issues. In addition to the formal 3Rs Rights Training, staff are learning about rights issues at meetings. "They give us rights training and we, we're always learning at different meetings, different things that are around the rights issues" (6). One participant felt that he/she received extra insight into supporting rights by being a part of the research project.

> "That's, that's what I'm going ahead and trying to figure it out. We have our education that we're doing. I have a little, I get a little bit more so I don't know if everybody is getting that because I was helping with, one of my guys was doing, going through the course ... so I was helping with the probes. So I got the education first hand. I got to see what was working, what wasn't working and not everybody got that. I think that was helpful" (4).

This participant found it helpful to see first hand how the individuals supported by the agency are interpreting their rights.

Discussions.

Participants reported that another type of support they receive is in the form of discussions. They described how rights are talked about openly, and that "at the office it's high, it's just widely spoken" (4). All participants reported that rights are discussed openly and this helps them to get a better perspective on a rights issue. The managerial participants reported having many discussions with colleagues and supervisors. They reported sharing ideas and talking about different rights issues. According to a participant's reports "there's that kind of, feedback from discussions with colleagues" (1).

When managerial participants sought advice from their supervisors, they found their supervisors to be easy to contact and very supportive. Participants made repeated comments about how the directors of the Association are "very open door around here so" (5). For example,

> "Mainly it's just a sounding board so I go in there and we talk about it and, and they're very clear if I'm being out of line or if, if we're on the same page. You know, a lot of times it's just shooting off an email and then they'll come back or and other times it's a five hour meeting. So that's pretty well the supports" (5).

Sometimes the feedback comes in the form of advice or alternative strategies, for example,

> A. Yeah and, and it, it hasn't been negative and there's always, there's always well maybe we could try this too or, you know, there's alternative strategies in case the current line that I'm on is, is unsuccessful. You know, then, you know, they suggest a different approach maybe but.
>
> Q. Okay.
>
> A. But it's usually along the same lines so (3).

Other times the feedback comes in the form of "philosophical discussions about rights issues" (1). Either way, these participants reported that they are engaging in a lot of discussion about rights, and that these discussions assist them in supporting the rights of individuals with disabilities.

Staff members also reported having conversations about rights with their managers. They indicated that they can bring up rights issues and receive feedback on them.

> A. They talk about it a lot. They consider it. Like when you're discussing a situation with them they're like oh okay, let's see if that, that might be a rights thing. Maybe we should put in a rights infringement. You know, it's, again widely talked about.
>
> Q. Do you see it just talk or do you see it as them trying to actually....
>
> A. Oh now, they go through it. It's not just talk (4).
>
> They're there to bounce ideas off that we can sit there, is this a rights infringement. You can question and ask their opinion onto it and then you can put it, or you if you don't want their opinion can still put it in (6).

Staff members know that their managers are there for them when it comes to rights issues. They reported feeling confident asking and having conversations with their managers about their rights concerns.

> Well I know if I walk into any of my managers' offices and said I have a rights infringement I need to discuss with you or I have a rights thing that I want to kick back, every one of them will either make time for me or say right then and there say come back in five minutes and we'll discuss this. And if I, and I know, 'cause there was one time that I went to my one manager and I said, you know, I need to discuss this because I don't know what to do with this and [he/she] says, I can't talk to you now, you know, and we played hit and miss all day long but [he/she] finally did catch up to me, which was, I thought was pretty stick-with-to-it-ness (4)

Aside from their managers, staff also reported going to other individuals when they had rights issues. They reported seeking informal advice from the Rights Committee and the 3Rs research team on issues they had about supporting individual rights. For example,

> A. If I have, if there's an area that I'm un, I'm unsure about and if I want to bounce off of different people that are at the Rights Committee I can go to them and just ask about an area, how they would approach that.
>
> Q. So you mean the Rights Team or the like Rights Facilitation Committee?
>
> A. Well the Rights Team, but then I know some people that are on the rights facilitation thing too. So I've bounced things off of them too. So it's, I feel like you can go anywhere to ask the question and they'll give you some ideas or what their feedback would be on it (6)

According to all of the participants, rights are now being discussed at staff meeting. Managers are asking, "is there any rights infringement?" (5). One participant reported that, "Some of the discussions get very heated because, as I said before, part-time staff, they, they need a lot more information" (3). Participants discussed that it was important for rights to be discussed in this venue, as some of the staff need a lot more information about rights.

Barriers

Inhibiting Operations

Participants reported that there was a learning process for the staff with respect to the 3Rs initiative. Just as there was a learning process for the individuals supported by the Association, the staff also had to learn how to support the choices of individuals.

Participants reported that some staff may not have been endorsing the rights initiative for the intended purpose. Staff may have been supporting individuals' choices, but for their own gain. For example, one participant reported,

> A. Yes. Yeah. Yeah, that was, that was, and I'm not sure where that falls in here. We had a real learning curve on individuals when they learned about rights because everything was their right and that was, and we had staff who didn't understand it either so we had a lot of head butting because some people were saying it's my right to, you know, to go out every night and eat. Well you know what, you don't have enough money. So yeah, it might be your right, it's my right too but unless you have the money you can't do it. And then staff saying, well it's their right to sleep in all day. They don't have to work because they want to sleep in. Okay, but, you know what, it's your responsibility to educate the individual to understand that if they sleep in every day they lose their job and they don't get to do what they want. Like, you know, it's, it was a, it was, we had a lot of people that were using it, especially a lot of staff that were using it for their own purpose....
>
> Q. Oh.
>
> A. ....rights initiative saying, okay, that individual didn't want to get up today. Well no, you didn't want to work today so you let the individual sleep in all day. So, so those were the barriers and there's, there are still are. Not as much because I think people are understanding more. And the

> individuals that we support understanding that, yeah, it is your right but this is what's going to happen, you know (5).

It is a learning process for staff to understand how to respect individuals' choices, while maintaining the staff's responsibility to the individuals. This learning process still may not be fully realized within the group homes. In some group homes, participants reported that rights are "… very widely spoken like it is here [at the office] but not all" (4). This is reported as "a barrier that still needs to be broken down" (4). This participant went on to discuss that,

> Now necessarily in some of the group homes it's not that way. It's, it's still a little taboo. Oh God, we have a rights infringement, it's a bad thing. It's a good thing and it's a bad thing. You know, sometimes we have to have the rights infringed upon but at least we put it before somebody who can say yes, this needs to be done or no this doesn't need to be done or you need to this but, you know, we've got review it in six months. So I think it's the language, the culture here at the office is very open to putting in rights so therefore it makes it much easier to put in the rights. You, every group home I, I'm aware of, staff knows where the rights forms are but I still think there's a little bit of a, a block to enable the rights infringements to be not a taboo thing (4).

Although rights may be talked about at the office, the concept of rights is 'taboo' in some group homes. This blockage or barrier may be associated with a negative belief about the rights infringement process. Some staff believed that submitting a Rights Facilitation Form would reflect badly on the staff. Participants indicated that "some staff were afraid that if you wrote up a rights infringement that that was something bad" (6). Furthermore, participants reported that staff may find it especially difficult to submit a Rights Facilitation Form if the rights infringement is being imposed by a supervisor. One participant said that "the staff maybe find it really awkward to say well I'm going to put this in. It's almost like a complaint against that staff, and it's not meant to be" (2).

Another potential reason for the delay of some staff in accepting the rights initiative might be some resistance to the amount of work involved in supporting individuals' rights and choices. For example, one participant indicated, "staff members, on the other hand, were like why bother to go to the trouble. Some of them were like that" (4). When the participant was probed as to why he/she believed that some staff would not want to go to the trouble of reporting rights restrictions, the participant indicated that "some, I think, think it's a very negative having the rights infringement put in" (4). Another participant reported that staff might be resistant to submitting a Rights Facilitation Forms due to the work involved. Upon hearing about the whole 3Rs initiative, the participant reported feeling that "Well it's gonna be a lot of work. But it would be good for them" (6).

A third reported barrier that staff face when supporting rights relates to over analyzing every decision. That is, trying to maintain a balance between supporting everyone's choices and the daily requirements of the house. One participant reported that even though he/she supports the rights initiative, sometimes trying to balance everyone's rights gets in the way of life.

> Sometimes it's a barrier. Sometimes, sometimes you get so worried about rights and outcomes that you forget to just go and do it, you know. Just

> forget to, piss on it, I don't want to. You know, we're down doing groceries. We're doing this. We're going out. You know, we're going to go out and have a good time. Ah, well we didn't give so and so, you know, enough time to prepare for it. Well you know what, today he seemed to have a good day. Let's go. You know, sometimes that does become a barrier. Overthink it (4).

Therefore, although the rights initiative has been implemented across the whole organization, participants have reported that there was an initial learning curve that many staff had to overcome. Some of the internal factors that may have caused some initial resistance for the staff could be related to a negative perspective of the Rights Facilitation Forms, apprehension about the amount of work involved in attempting to preserve the rights of all the individuals whom they support and attempting to balance these rights with their daily responsibilities. If staff, however, did not overcome these internal barriers, and thus do not support the rights of individuals with intellectual/developmental disabilities, then according to participants there will likely be remedial action taken from within the Association.

Correction Methods for Rights Infringements

Participants reported several remediation strategies that are used within the Association when the rights of individuals with intellectual/developmental disabilities are not supported. These strategies included discussions, which ranged from informal discussions to gain more information about the reasons for the restriction, to formal discussions with individuals supported by the agency, other staff members and managers to correct the restriction. Other remediation strategies also range from staff submitting a Rights Facilitation Form to disciplinary action and termination.

Information Seeking Discussions.

Participants reported that often they would have a conversation with a staff member who is not supporting the rights of individuals within the agency. These conversations could be to gain more insight into the reasons for the restriction or to educate the staff as to the importance of supporting rights. All of the managerial participants reported that they would try to have an informal discussion with the staff. For example,

> It could just be further training for that staff person if they just didn't seem to be quite getting it in terms of rights. Maybe discussion at a staff meeting if it's, you know, maybe an issue in a particular group home, as a reason, where the staff has different opinions about it. There could be discussion about it. Response to a written rights infringement could be to change a procedure that's in place, or it could result, the rights infringement could result in getting more information from the staff and suggesting to them different approaches they could use. And there is the possibility, I guess if it's a really big issue, of it going to the board level, to be discussed at our board (1).

Some of these discussions may be difficult, as more information about rights is needed. This is reflected in one participants report, "They are and some of the, some of the discussions get very heated because, as I said before, part-time staff, they, they need a lot more information" (3). One participant reported that if it is an issue of the staff not understanding, then often these discussions are enough to rectify the situation.

> But if it's, if it's something where, where a staff member is just not aware of it, you know that, or doesn't see it as a rights restriction it's an, it's an easy fix without going to the Rights Facilitation Committee (3).

Within the discussion, managers inform their staff about the importance of supporting the individuals in what they want to do. "And I'll explain what their role is. Their role is not to personally influence an individual. They have to keep an open mind. A lot of it is, is just talking" (5). Staff participants also acknowledged that these discussions are taking place. Although, not immediately, one participant reported these conversations usually occur "after many issues, but I do see a lot of education and I do see some correction" (4). Participants indicated that typically it is the role of the direct supervisor to have a conversation with the staff about rights issues. These conversations, although sometimes informal in nature, usually follow the organizational structure of the agency.

> Well it would be me that talked to them if I, if I felt it was a rights restriction. If I didn't feel it was a rights restriction then, you know, then my supervisor would probably come and say that's a rights restriction and that, you know, you can't do that and then we would have a discussion about it before we went and talked to the staff member involved. ...you know, it's, it's not often that, that my supervisor would go directly to the staff member and say listen, that's a rights restriction. You can't do that (3).

Within the residential setting, it was reported that staff might have conversations with other staff members about supporting rights.

> If it's in residential... Yeah... Could be, could be corrected at the immediate level of - one staff observing another, and pointing out to them that they've infringed on somebody's rights and discussing it with them and...
>
> Q. So colleagues?
>
> A. Yeah. And possibly that could, a change could occur at that level (1).

In fact, a staff participant reported that he/she would correct another staff member who is infringing on the rights of the individuals. Specifically, one participant said "I'll see that that's a rights infringement and I will say that's a rights infringement, you need to change that" (6). However, not all staff feel that they should be responsible for correcting their peers. This is seen in the report from another staff participant.

> Sometimes. Sometimes. But I, I think the idea is if you haven't figured out that you screwed up and you restricted somebody's right, you're beyond talking to and you need to go to, the managers need to deal with you because you're just not catching it. ...And I've seen that happen a lot, actually. I've seen staff members just not want to deal with it because they don't want to deal with teaching somebody and educating somebody who is supposed to be your peer. They would prefer the managers do that (4).

It is important to note again that individuals supported by the agency will also inform staff when they feel that their rights have been infringed upon. When participants were asked who would provide feedback to someone who is not supporting rights, several made reference to the fact that individuals whose rights were restricted would assert themselves. For example, "Okay. It could be the individuals themselves, if they are saying that they've had their rights infringed upon" (1). "Oh my gentleman can speak up. He, he's on the phone all the time. He would, he would call. He calls everybody" (6). "And anytime, there's different times he's thought we've infringed on his rights and stuff has already been sent in, and he calls the rights infringement, the Rights Team all the time to get clarification. He would tell" (6). Thus, according to the participants, the first form of remediation for staff who may be restricting an individual's rights is for managers to have discussions with these staff. In addition, some staff members are also correcting other staff by discussing rights issues. Furthermore, individuals supported by the agency are asserting themselves by having discussions with others about how their rights are being infringed upon.

Submitting Rights Facilitation Forms.

If staff do not respond to a discussion about a rights infringement, then the issues will go on to the Rights Facilitation Committee through a Rights Facilitation Form.

> If they continue not to support an individual because of their own values or their own feelings, without any really justification I do suggest that they, they do the rights infringement prior to disciplinary because then I say, okay, you know what, this is a party outside of us. You know, maybe the two of us are wrong. So we do that (5).

Participants view this next step as beneficial as it allows the issue to be reviewed by an objective third party.

> If there's any rights violations then we do the rights, it goes to the Rights Committee. We fill out the rights infringement forms and have the Rights Committee or Facilitation Committee, whatever they're called, review what,

> what's going on. Why we do, why we're doing what we're doing and it is binding on everybody and that's, that's really all I'm aware of as far as working out rights, rights infringements if… (3).

Disciplinary Action.

If rights infringements persist after discussions with the staff, then management take disciplinary action. Disciplinary action is not taken lightly. According to participants' reports, serious rights infringements are discussed with senior management and are viewed as a type of abuse.

> If they continue, though, then it's disciplinary because it's going against our agency's values. A lot of times I will go to my Director and say okay am I being out of line here? Like, you know, maybe I have it wrong. I'm pretty quick to, to say okay I may not have the answers. You know, I am just a regular person too and I, and this may, I may be looking at this wrong so I usually go talk to my director and, and then a lot of times I'll go to the ED as well. You know, they're, they're very open door around here so. And then if, if everyone's kind of on the same page and the person is not being supported by the staff how we feel then, then we'll call them in saying, no. You know at that point it's disciplinary because we do view it as very serious and it is almost a form of abuse if, if you're not allowing the individual to have what they want in life so (5).

As for the severe rights restriction cases, participants reported that this usually leads to some form of disciplinary action or even termination. Termination is usually carried out by a Supervisor or Director (According to Participant #1). The types of severe rights infringements that could result in dismissal involve verbal abuse, neglect and physical abuse, although the latter are not typically occurring within the agency.

> A. Yeah. Like I said, if a person has, has been, there's been more than one case that staff have had to be disciplined for being abusive to individuals. Sometime - I'm trying to think if there's an actual physical abuse. It's, it's been more, like a lot of verbal abuse cases, not a lot, but verbal abuse cases and disrespect, neglect. So not providing them with the basic care that they should be getting.
>
> Q. And then you get involved when it becomes that severe?
>
> A. Yeah, Involved in the disciplining (1).

The staff participants reported that they are aware of the severity of restricting individuals' rights. In response to a rights restriction, staff have "seen disciplinary action" and in other cases, staff have "seen education and I have seen dismissal" (4). Staff members know what could happen to them for violating individuals' rights. A staff discussed that he/she thinks that for not supporting rights, staff "could be reprimanded or fired because that's important to them" (6) as "That's my job to do that" (6). Thus, participants know that if staff do not follow the new requirements of their job to support rights then they will not last long within the agency. If they do not support the rights initiative, "They'll leave or they'll be fired or they'll, something will happen" (4).

Barriers That Inhibit Rights Support

Participants reported several barriers that make it difficult to support the rights of individuals with intellectual disabilities. These barriers include lack of support and feedback around rights issues from superiors, lack of information and education to actually put rights support into practice and overcoming the grey systemic and individual issues including the structure of care for individuals, lack of financial resources, lack of support from outside the agency and individual barriers of people with disabilities. These barriers inhibit the way that staff are able to truly support individual rights and choices. Each of these barriers will be discussed further.

Not receiving support from within the agency.

Management participants acknowledged that they believe that they are not giving enough recognition and praise to their staff for supporting rights. “I don't think we, we support the staff. I don't we recognize them enough. I, I, at this point, at this moment I agonized over this question because I was thinking we don't recognize them not nearly enough” (3). Most participants reported that they do not receive enough encouragement from their superiors. In fact, participants reported that unfortunately they will often not receive feedback from their superiors until they are having difficulty supporting rights. As one participant noted, “That's most of, when you hear, when you hear from, from your supervisor most of the time when things aren't going well. When things are going really well it's, I don't think they give enough positive strokes so” (3). Furthermore, participants indicate that the encouragement does not happen until after attempt at supporting rights have been made. This can be even perceived as resistance.

> Well there might be, you know, there, there might be a little bit of resistance, you know. Well go ahead if think you can do that, you know, or achieve that goal but it's almost like if you achieve it, great, we'll support you. If you don't, then, well, we, we, we told you so, you know, that kind of thing (4).

Participants reported that they would like more support and encouragement from all levels in the agency. Middle managers (Supervisors) reported that they would like "more direct involvement from a, from a senior manager. You know, rather than always staying at an arms length" (3). This participant would like to see "managers supporting managers a little bit, like senior managers supporting middle managers a little more. A lot more, not just a little more" (3). Although this support was perceived to be lacking, it was reported that members of management understand the importance of providing this type of praise.

> And whether it be a formal goal or not, when somebody feels good about something we have to make a point of saying well done, good job, I'm really pleased. And how do we celebrate that? And that's something we have to almost formally put in place and it's still not good enough (2).

Even though participants recognized the importance of providing support and praise to their staff, one participant reported that a barrier that makes this difficult is the agency's financial limitations that make it difficult o recognize staff formally for supporting rights.

> And how in the hell do you do that? You know, it's not like we're a big corporation with millions of dollars, right? You know, we're just an agency making it year to year with what dollars we have, and how do you recognize staff? And so, we have little tricks up our sleeves now and then that help, you know. But I can't, you know, I don't have the big award stuff (2).

Most participants reported that they are not provided with enough praise from their managers to encourage them to support rights. This is an area of concern for the participants who would like to provide more feedback, but recognize that they are limited financially.

Not getting feedback about rights concerns.

In addition to receiving more praise, participants indicated they would also like to receive more feedback on the outcome of submission of the Rights Facilitation Forms. Participants reported that they would like to receive more consistent information from the Rights Facilitation process because "sometimes you get feedback, sometimes you don't" (6). Several participants reported that this feedback would be beneficial since they submit the forms because they are struggling with rights issues.

> So I mean there is an issue there. I mean right now a lot of staff - there has been some thoughts around feedback from staff, but they don't even find out. They put in a rights submission to say listen, I'm really questioning something that's happening here, whether it be a restriction or not. And then they were saying they weren't getting feedback (2).

In addition to receiving feedback, another participant indicated that he/she would like to have "a little more access to that whole commission [former name of the Rights Facilitation Committee]" (5). This participant reported that it would be helpful to be able to ask the Rights Facilitation Committee about rights issues that they are struggling with,

> Yeah, or even just, yeah, rather than throwing, like just saying this is what we're thinking of doing. Are we totally out of line here? [deleted for anonymity] Like it's, it's a very small group and a lot of times it would be nice to get people outside of the agency to more, to, to give more of an informal because we kind of live in our little bubble and, you know,

> sometimes we, we're just appalled at how the communities reaction to something. But that's because we've been doing this for 20 some years, right, 30 years and 40 years I mean. So we just, you know, we forget sometimes what the community at large sees as right and wrong, you know what I mean? (5).

Thus, participants would like more feedback on rights issues. They would like feedback from their managers, on the Rights Facilitation Forms and from the Rights Facilitation Committee. Participants indicated that this feedback would provide them with objective insight into rights issues with which they are struggling. Participants reported dealing with many grey areas and would like help with dealing with them.

Staff and managers talk about grey areas.

In fact, the most predominate barrier to supporting rights, as reported by the participants, was attempting to overcome the 'grey areas'. Participants reported that, in some situations, they do not know what situations are rights infringements; "I'm not sure, is this a rights infringement or isn't it that we're dealing with because it's a grey area. And then I, that's when I'd seek out for feedback onto it" (6). These grey areas refer to the fact that sometimes it is unclear if supporting an individual's rights will go against their responsibilities as a staff member. For example, "If somebody is going to, say I'm doing this no matter what, it's my right to do it, but they're not safe, then it's my responsibility to say no" (5). When the participants were asked if they thought they were able to support the rights of all the individuals supported by the agency, most participants responded that they were not because some choices would put individuals at too much risk. For example,

> No. Because some people's choices would put them at too much risk, maybe health-wise or safety-wise. Or they might even possibly end up in jail. Or they might put others at risk, you know, in terms of causing physical harm to others or possible sexual abuse. We can't support choices that infringe upon other people's rights (1).

Furthermore, even when rights have been restricted for the purposes of safety, this is not done without consideration and future reevaluation.

> And many times we do in fact restrict people's rights when, usually in the name of health or safety. Okay? So we will find ourselves doing that in certain situations. But through the due process that we've put in place we want to make sure that we're constantly reviewing that too. We don't want to just say okay, that right's been restricted, now good luck, see you in ten years. Now we want to make sure we review it on a regular basis to say is there not a way, is there some way we can make this less restrictive for the person. And many times we can. You know, just, even, and we want to make sure there's no blanket statements (2).

When staff members encounter situations that seem to be falling into grey areas of rights judgment, they will often seek out more information. One participant reported that he/she would like "Just general information because right now I feel like we have a lot of them down, but if there's always that tricky question that you can still go to someone and learn more" (6). In general, participants would like to receive more information on how they should be supporting individuals' rights.

Not enough training or education about rights issues.

Not having enough training or information about rights issues was another barrier raised by the participants. A few participants indicated that they would like both more training for themselves or for the staff. In fact, staff participants reported that they "would like more training" (6). Participants expressly indicated that they would like to see more training for the part-time staff because "a lot of part-time staff that really don't have all the information they need to make sure the people's rights are, are guaranteed" (3). Participants had some suggestions as to how to gain more information about supporting rights. A few participants indicated that they thought that the information should come from the 3Rs research team. Participants reported that they think the 3Rs research team "need to be a lot more visible so that all, all the staff, not just the full-time staff, not just the supervisor because it seems that it just stops at senior support workers and, and up" (3). Similarly, another participant reported,

> A. I, well I'm trying to think. It's not, like I said before, staff are, are slowly, they're slowly buying in but as I, as I just said, they need a lot more information. They just haven't been given enough information I don't think. And, and the team itself needs to go out and, and talk to the staff and answer questions. There are only so many questions that I can answer. I don't, there's only so much information that I have. I don't have, I don't know all the information that's been, been acquired by the team over the last, how long's it been, five years? Something like that?
>
> Q. More, I think, to cover the first thing published, so.

> A. But I, I, I don't have, I haven't seen all of the, the results of what they've done and if I haven't seen it, I know the part-time staff haven't seen it but people are supporting, are supporting people with, you know, in terms of exercising rights and choices and, as much as they can so (3).

There needs to be more training to make everyone in the Association aware of what is going on with respect to rights issues, how to handle them and what research is going on. In terms of training, another participant suggested that it would be beneficial to watch more "hands on videos, as a group in a group home setting where we can all discuss it in that specific group home, like as a group" (4). Specifically, this participant reported that he/she would like to watch these scenarios more often,

> not just once every two years. See them being part of our, our meetings. We're going to discuss these rights or just a refresher but in a group setting with the rest of my peers to discuss what comes up in the group homes and how we dealt with it so we all know how we're dealing with it or how we should be dealing with it or what possible issues are going to come up with it. That's what I would like to see (4).

All participants reported that they would like to have more information on how to better support rights. Participants indicated that this information should come from the 3Rs research team by providing the staff and managers with more training. This training would help the staff to be able to deal appropriately with rights issues that they encounter.

Systemic issues.

Other barriers that participants reported that inhibit the ability to support rights are related to the organizational system. Participants reported that it is difficult to support individual rights due to the "silos" inherent in the organizational structure. Participants reported that these silos are divisions in the provision of care. For example, "Group congregated sessions, living arrangements and day programs, the prior programs are barriers because there's certain things that have to happen in a group living situation and, and group working situations. There's barriers inherent in the system" (2). Another participant supported the notion that the silos inhibit their ability to support rights,

> Another is, is the group living situation. You can't, you can't guarantee everybody's right. You can't guarantee everybody's choices in a group living situation because then if you did you're infringing on somebody else's rights within the, within that living situation. Just the, the entire group living situation is wrong. It's, it's, the whole thing is a rights infringement and one of the other barriers, one of the big barriers is that people don't have the choice to say where they want, where they want to, they don't get the choice to live where they want to live or who they want to live with. Too much of that is, is dictated by, by Contact Niagara or, you know, Ministry. By, by money, I guess, because if you, if you truly, if you're truly supporting people in rights and freedoms and choices, then, then group living situations would never happen. Well not, never. I wouldn't, they would probably happen by, more by choice, you know. The current system, I think we warehouse people and just group living, group living itself is, is the biggest barrier, I think (3).

The group home setting is difficult because if you support one individual's rights then you may be infringing on the rights of another person. In fact, one participant said that as a result of the group living situation, “rights are still being violated in, in group homes and the only way to stop that is to get rid of the group homes” (3). Aside from the fact that it is difficult to address all the individual needs of people living in group homes, there are also ministry requirements that create systemic barriers to supporting individual rights. As one participant discussed,

> Especially the supervisors in the group living ones. They're, it's a struggle. You know, they're so bound by, you know, so many miniature requirements and something called compliance where they have, there's certain fundamental rules they have to follow. You know, making sure meds are locked up and making sure this and making sure - and some of those aren't very, they're somewhat intrusive when it comes to outcomes kind of stuff (2).

In an attempt to align with all of the ministry requirements, individual rights may be restricted. Specifically, one participant discussed the ministry requirement to have all medication locked, which may restricted an individuals rights to control ones on medication. Additionally, there is insufficient staffing to provide individual support for everyone and it can be difficult to respect rights when people live together. One participant reported that it would be helpful to have more financial support to support individual choices.

> I think what I'd like to see is some more financial support, you know, in some areas and I, I know that finances don't solve everything but they're, they're a big part of it. You can't really attain anything, depending on the

> situation, unless you have the money to, to buy the equipment you need or to pay the staff, you know (3).

Negative feedback from outside the Agency.

In addition to the internal barriers that the participants reported, a few participants referred to the fact that it is sometimes difficult to support rights because of the negative feedback from family members and the larger community. Specifically, participants reported that some family members are resistant to the concept of individuals making choices because they are nervous about allowing their family member to take risks. That is participants reported that "There's the possibility of getting negative feedback from families who feel a person may be at risk if not protected or restricted in some way sometimes" (1). One participant gave a clear example of the concerns that are raised by family members and this participant discussed how he/she responds to these concerns.

> But a lot of times the family is, no they, they can't be taking the bus because it's not safe. You know, there's no way. They need to be driven everywhere and then I have to sit and weigh and say, you know what, this individual is capable. Yes, there's risks to it but, you know, it's their right and, and I'll support them. So yes, it's a pick and choose. It's, you know, and it's a lot of, a lot of discussion with the individual. A lot of discussion with the staff to make sure that people are ready for, for whatever responsibility they want. So yeah, no it's, it's the feedback is really mixed (5).

In addition to concerns raised by the families, participants also reported that they receive negative feedback from the community when they support individuals' choices to be more active in the community.

> And sometimes from the community. This hasn't happened to me personally. I, but I know there have been instances of when people have been out in the community with a staff supporting them, the community - like it was at the mall. Somebody made the comment that the person had no business being out in public in the mall. So, that doesn't happen very often anymore I don't think, but there, there is some negative feedback (1).

Concerns from the family and the community may be an additional barrier to supporting the rights of individuals with disabilities. However, participants attempt to work past this barrier. As one participant said "So that's, I think, and a lot of times we're limited by community as well, right. The community may not be open to something and we have to fight for it but a lot of times we're not successful yet" (5).

Individuals' own disabilities.

A further barrier to supporting human rights that was raised by participants related to the nature of the disabilities of people supported by the Association. A few participants referred to the fact that it is important to consider "our own client's barriers" (4) when trying to support individuals' choices. Factors that makes it difficult to support individuals choices are "their own physical barriers or mental barriers or intellectual barriers" (4). Another participant said that the intellectual barrier makes it difficult for individuals to understand and make informed decisions and in turn, this makes it difficult to support some individual choices.

> Yes, yes I, you, again it depends on the request and it depends on what the outcomes are. You know, what the outcomes are. You know, you're not-- while a lot of people say, you know, they deserve, people deserve the

> dignity of risk, if you can't give somebody all the information or have them understand all the information or what the consequences of this action will be then you can't just let them do it, you know. That if you, if they truly don't understand, if it's a ne...., especially if it's a negative consequence because it's, while it's a learning situation I, I just think, as a staff member, I, maybe it's the parent coming out in me, I don't want anything bad to happen but--I don't know (3).

Unfortunately, this also can mean that some rights are not being supported for individuals who are not able to speak for themselves. One participant said that although he/she feels that everyone should be entitled to the same respect for individual rights, individuals with multiple and severe disabilities might not be getting the same support for their rights as individuals who can assert themselves.

> I thought, for most people, for people with, with, who had abilities and I, and I don't know how to explain this any different and any better. People who were, are able to talk and, and, and express themselves and, and move about, it was very positive for them. For people who have high needs, I don't, I don't know how beneficial it was, it is for them because even, even now I don't think people with, with, who have high needs or who have a lot of needs and can't talk and aren't, and have no mobility of their own, I don't think they're, they're afforded the same rights and choices as people who do have, who can walk and talk and, you know, cook for themselves and change their clothes and do all that for themselves. I don't, I don't think people who can't do that, people who are lacking those abilities, I don't think

> they're giving, having the same rights afforded to them. We say we're doing it but I don't think we're doing as well as we could be so (3).

Thus, in order to support individual rights, several barriers need to be overcome. These barriers raised by the participants include, the lack of praise and encouragement from management, lack of feedback and training on rights issues, systemic barriers and resistance from outside the Association. In addition, when attempting to support rights, it is important for staff and managers to consider the individuals personal barriers and attempt to balance their limitations with the rights they should be afforded.

Results for the Questionnaires

Analysis of the Questionnaires

As was previously discussed, the questionnaires were developed to determine whether the themes from the interviews would be consistent for the rest of the full-time staff members at CLWP. The specific themes that were used in the questionnaires relate to changes in jobs and behaviours as a result of the 3Rs Project, motivation for supporting rights, the way management support those they supervise to support the rights of individuals with disabilities, barriers and supports to advocating for rights, what happens when the rights of individuals with intellectual/developmental disabilities are not supported, and participants' perceptions on this process.

Of the individuals eligible to participate, 11 participants returned their signed consents and questionnaires. There were 6 participants, who returned the questionnaire, from a Management Position and 5 participants from a Staff Position. This is a return rate of 31 percent. Due to this small sample size, no statistical analyses could be conducted on the questionnaire data. Therefore, the analysis consisted of a visual inspection of the frequency tables developed for each question. All of the frequency tables can be found in Appendix 7. In general, the participants' responses on the questionnaires supported the themes and subthemes from the interviews. In addition, there are several interesting findings relating to the questionnaire data.

Results of the Questionnaires

Table 1 presents participants' reported changes in job/work in response to the 3Rs Project. Across both groups, participants varied in their perception of how their job had changed in response to the 3Rs Project, with three participants indicating that they did not believe that there was a change. However, when asked about whether their behaviour at work had changed, more participants agreed with this statement, with only one participant dissenting. This indicates that it is likely that although their specific jobs have not changed, the way that they are doing their job may have changed. This is apparent in the additional comment made by one participant "My job hasn't changed; but how I do it has improved" (10). This change can be explored further by examining the participants' perceptions of changes in their role in relation to supporting individuals with intellectual/developmental disabilities (Table 2). Most participants were either unsure or only somewhat agreed with the statement that they believed they were in control of, supervise or manage the lives of individuals supported by the agency. Instead, participants tended to agree more with the statements regarding supporting the choices of individuals with intellectual/developmental disabilities, even when the individuals' choices went against the personal beliefs of the participants. In addition, participants also reported that they were responsible for the protection of the individuals they support.

This indicates that while participants must support rights and choices, they are also balancing these rights with their responsibility to protect these individuals.

Participants were asked to report on why it is important for them to support the rights of individuals with intellectual/developmental disabilities. Similar to the participants' reports from the interviews, the participants indicated agreement with the reasons that the interview participants noted as to why they support rights (see Table 3). All participants agreed that all people have rights, that everyone deserves to be treated as a unique individual and that it is important to speak for individuals who cannot speak for themselves. Approximately half of the participants reported that, in their personal life, they had experience with disabilities and needed someone to advocate for their rights and that it is important for people to have and achieve outcomes. Most participants disagreed with the statement that supporting rights is only important because it is now part of their job.

To verify the subtheme relating to internal reinforcers, participants were asked what they tell themselves when they support the rights of individuals with intellectual /developmental disabilities (see Table 4). Similar to the reports from the interviews, most participants indicated that they tell themselves that they have done a good job. In addition, most participants disagreed with the statement that supporting rights was a lot of work and not that important, and most agreed with the statement that, in spite of the work, supporting rights is important. It is important to note that this question may have been difficult to interpret, as it was a compound question. Specifically, of the participants whose responses diverged from these trends, it could be possible that their reports may be due to the combined nature of the question rather than their lack of support for rights.

For example, one participant added that "It is always worth it, but not always a lot of work – sometimes it's relatively easy" (7).

Participants were also asked to report on behaviour changes in individuals supported by the agency as a result of the 3Rs Project. Participants indicated that individuals supported by the agency are asserting themselves more (see Table 5). Interestingly, most participants indicated that individuals are asserting themselves more within the context of respect and responsibility. However, all participants indicated that individuals were asserting themselves more, but not within the context of respect and responsibility. Again, this was a compound question, which may have influenced the participant responses, however, it may also be possible that this could be due to an increased understanding of rights throughout the Association, but a lack of exposure to the concepts of respect and responsibility as not all individuals supported by the Association have had the 3Rs training. In addition, all participants noted that individuals with intellectual /developmental disabilities are speaking up for the rights of their peers more often, and are having more discussions with peers and staff about rights.

In addition, participants were asked to identify the degree to which their behaviour as staff members and that of their managers had changed in the following areas that were identified in the interviews: awareness of rights, discussion with peers and supervisors, questioning policies and procedures, advocating for rights, educating others and individualized programming (see Table 6). Consistent with the interview results, both staff and managers identified behaviours that had increased surrounding rights since the initiation of the 3Rs Project. As for the reported changes in staff, all participants reported that they had observed increases in staff behaviour in all areas concerning rights (see Table 7). An interesting difference can be observed by comparing the reports between participant positions (Managerial vs. Staff positions). Although most staff reported that they had observed somewhat more changes in other staff, managers reported an increase in staff behaviour in these areas from somewhat more to a lot more. As for reported changes in the participants' manager/supervisor since the start of the 3Rs Project, all but one participant indicated changes in the aforementioned areas (see Table 8). These findings support the identified Changes in Behaviours theme from the interviews and indicate that the same behaviours are changing within the whole Association.

Tables 9 and 10 reflect the reports of both staff and managers, respectively, concerning what their manager/supervisor does from them to support the rights of individuals with intellectual /developmental disabilities. These tables were separated, as there is a significant distinction between the reports of the participants from the two positions. The reports from the participants in the management position indicate that their managers are not generally providing them with the types of supports that were identified from the analysis of the interviews. For the staff participants, the reports indicate that they are generally receiving similar types of support to those identified in the interviews. The types of supports identified as being used most often were the informal types of supports including praise and encouragement, providing education, welcoming discussion, providing advice, offering feedback on submitted Rights Facilitation Forms and providing support in advocating for the rights of individuals outside the agency. This result is similar to the reports of the participants in the management positions when they were asked to indicate what they do to provide their staff with support for advocating for the rights of individuals with intellectual/developmental disabilities (see Table 11). Participants indicated more agreement with providing the informal types of support than those referring to formal types.

Participants were also asked to identify areas that make it difficult for them to support the rights of individuals with intellectual/developmental disabilities (see Table 12). In most areas, managers tended to agree with more barriers (with fifteen agreements), than the staff (with 8 agreements). Specifically, more managers identified the group home living situation itself as a barrier to supporting rights. An important distinction from this trend, however, relates to the participants' concerns about safety for individual they support. Although several staff identified individual safety as a barrier to supporting rights, none of the management participants agreed with this statement. In general, the responses from this question diverged most from the interview results. It is important to note, however, that participants may have had difficulty interpreting this question as it included a double negative. The question asked "what makes it difficult to support rights" and some of the statements indicated a lack in different areas.

Participants were also asked to indicate what types of supports they would like to receive (see Table 13). This question was asked in an attempt to gain insight into ways to improve the support that employees are receiving, thereby aiding in their ability to advocate for the rights of individuals with intellectual/developmental disabilities. Less than half of the participants indicated that they would like more training and formal recognition for supporting the rights of individuals with disabilities. Most participants would like to receive more feedback about concerns expressed on Rights Facilitation Forms, financial and/or support and praise, and more recognition and encouragement for supporting the rights of individuals with disabilities. This is a similar trend to previous findings that participants indicated that they would like to receive more of the informal types of supports rather than the formal ones. This could speak to the desire for more ongoing development rather than a need for formal recognition for supporting rights.

In an attempt to identify the process by which rights restrictions are remediated, participants were asked what happens to staff when they do not support the rights of individuals with intellectual/developmental disabilities (see Table 14) and what is their perspective on the process of handling rights concerns (see Table 15). Participants indicated agreement with most of the statements regarding what would happen to staff if they do not support rights. There was considerable variation in participant responses to questions regarding the degree to which individuals supported by the agency will assert themselves with staff who have restricted their rights, and whether disciplinary action and/or termination is taken in relation to the staff who do not support individuals' rights. For these statements, less than half of the participants indicated that these consequences would happen. Here again, it appears that there are more informal modes of correcting staff behaviours than formal ones (i.e. termination). There was general confirmation of the themes relating to the participants' perspective on the Rights Facilitation Forms and the process of handling rights concerns. Both groups of participants indicated that formal complaints were not negative reflections of the staff. Most participants disagreed with the question that asked whether they did not want to submit Rights Facilitation Forms because they are not worth the work. Most participants agreed that submitting a form provides a positive influence on change. Both participant groups found it useful to receive feedback from the Rights Facilitation Committee. There were some differences between groups in their reports on statements relating to: feeling comfortable raising concerns about a manager/supervisor, feeling that the overall process is effective and feeling that the process for handling human rights complaints at CLWP has caused more problems than it has solved. For these reports, although there is some variance in their responding, managers seemed to report more feelings that are negative about the process.

Although there was some variance in the participants' responses, the results from the questionnaires support the themes found in the interviews. These findings lend credibility to the thematic analysis of the interview data. Furthermore, these findings support the notion that the 3Rs Project is being embedded into the organizational culture, as is evident by the reported behaviour changes.

Discussion

The 3Rs Project has attempted to incorporate an emergent participatory action research approach within all of its research projects (Tarulli et al., 2004). The present research was no different, as it also attempted to incorporate some elements of the participatory action research approach. Although the research did not employ all elements of participatory action research, this research stemmed from the desire of the leaders of the Association to gain an understanding of how the 3Rs Project is being implemented within CLWP. The extensive insights and comments raised by the participants in this study reflect their intimate understanding of the initiation of the 3Rs Project. Through this investigation, a larger picture of the systemic implications of the 3Rs Project was revealed. The results outline how the employees of CLWP are supporting the rights of individuals with intellectual disabilities. The investigation has also identified the presence of both supports and barriers that affect the implementation of a rights initiative. Although this information is valuable to the general public and other Associations for Community Living, it is also pertinent for CLWP. Through careful consideration of these findings, the Association can make necessary adjustments to ensure the effective facilitation of the 3Rs Project. It is anticipated that the findings and recommendations will be fed back to the organization in an attempt to improve the support for the rights based perspective. In addition, these findings could lead to valuable insights when attempting to increase employee support for the preservation and promotion of the rights of individuals with intellectual disabilities within other organizations.

Organizational Change Mechanisms

Readiness for change is an important precursor to an effective change initiative (Armenakis, Harris & Mossholder, 1993). As was previously discussed, Armenakis, Harris and Mossholder described readiness as a type of cognitive antecedent that influences employees' behaviours that either supports or resists a change initiative. Being continually ready for change is an important characteristic of a learning organization. Although the Association's level of readiness was not assessed prior to the initiation of the 3Rs Human Rights Project, this study provided a retroactive perspective into this level of readiness and leads to insights into how this change initiative was interpreted within the organization.

To assess whether the concept of rights was a novel notion within the Association, brought on by the 3Rs Project, participants were asked questions relating to the Association's focus on rights prior to and following the 3Rs initiative. When the staff and managers started working for the Association, the type of care for individuals with disabilities was different; “rights weren't a consideration when I started working at the Association” (3). Participants reported a shift towards rights promotion in their job expectations as a result of the 3Rs initiative.

According to Armenakis, Harris and Mossholder’s (1993) readiness model, one of the most important influences for readiness is the message for change. Thus, participants were asked what they believed was the purpose of the 3Rs Project, where the rights focus came from and how they were informed of the change. Participants accurately interpreted one of the purposes of the 3Rs Human Rights Project was to increase awareness of the human rights of individuals with intellectual/developmental disabilities. They reported that the 3Rs initiative attempts to increase awareness of rights through education and to ensure the protection of these rights. This was a top-down organizational change, as it was reported that the change was driven by individual leaders within the agency. Participants reported that the rights initiative stemmed from several external systemic changes such as changing regulations as specified by the government, the closing of the institutions, union issues and inter-organizational changes such as a shift towards person centered-planning. Furthermore, although most participants reported hearing about the project through informal means, they did report that they were informed of the rights initiative by their supervisors, through meetings or memos.

Armenakis, Harris and Mossholder (1993) also discuss addressing the employees’ sense of self-efficacy to implement the change within the change message. Armenakis and his colleagues suggest that supporting employees to develop this self-efficacy will help them to build confidence to enact the desired change. A key feature of the 3Rs Project was to provide rights education to all staff and managers within the Association.

This training was designed to inform the staff about the 3Rs Project, the role of the Rights Facilitation Committee, how to use the Rights Facilitation Forms and their role in supporting the rights and choices of individuals supported by the agency. In other words, the training was designed to increase their ability and to build their sense of self-efficacy to implement the change. To determine whether the training attained this goal, participants were asked whether the 3Rs training equipped them to support the rights of the individuals that they support. Participants were also asked questions relating to their current feelings, attitudes and opinions about the 3Rs human rights project.

All participants had received the 3Rs rights training. Participants had different perspectives on the training it. They indicated that overall they found the training to be beneficial; that the training focused on considering rights within the context of respect and responsibility. Participants found that it "just was more support for me and how I wanted to, to be a staff" (5). The formal training increased their awareness of rights concerns, but it was only the start of a "gradual learning process" (5).

Participants reported that they felt positively towards the 3Rs rights initiative. The rights perspective provides a positive shift in the way individuals with disabilities are supported. Although it was reported that considering rights requires a lot more effort for the staff and managers, participants "think it's going to change a lot of things, because as they recognize more of their rights and they're going to be standing up for themselves more" (6). "So this evolution is, I'm confident will continue" (2).

Based on the participants' discussion about the initiation of the 3Rs Project and the rights training for the staff and managers at CLWP, it appears that the Association was ready to embrace the new initiative. Many participants indicated that they were accepting of the change and that they were informed of the message for change (the purpose of the 3Rs Project and their role in supporting this purpose). The training, however, may not have met all the participants' needs in terms of increasing their belief in their own ability to implement this change. It seems as if the training led more to a better understanding of the change initiative than fully preparing the staff and managers to effect the change. The training seemed to spark in the participants a new awareness of rights and may have led to this 'evolution' that participants feel will continue into the future.

Implications of the Leadership on Rights Promotion

The supervisors and directors were also interviewed to determine how they have been supporting the 3Rs Project and how it has influenced their work. Managers are the link between the goals of the organization and its employees (Lloyd, 2008). Support staff depend on management not only for direction, but also for sustained employment and the allocation of rewards (Mansell & Elliott, 2001). Therefore, it is critical for management to be "ready and supportive of any new system" (Burns, 2008, p. 14).

As was discussed earlier in the introduction regarding Schmid's (2006) descriptions of leadership styles, Associations for Community Living could be characterized as incorporating two types of organizational structures requiring different leadership approaches. The larger organization should be led by a transformational leader and the residential settings leaders should maintain authority and assign tasks. Reports from participants reveal that some of the managers are utilizing both approaches in their leadership styles. Participants reported that they employ several of the characteristics of a transformational leader as discussed by Schmid (2006) and by

Podsakoff et al. (1996). It was reported that managers predominantly use an “open door policy” (1), where staff members can come and discuss concerns that they may have. They also provide intellectual stimulation through discussions. Managers reported the need to be flexible in their management style. They utilize a team approach, incorporating different sources of feedback, and brainstorming in order to make plans and decisions that support individual rights. Participants reported that managers delegate tasks. Most participants prefer to make requests rather than issue commands, and that they will usually only assert managerial authority for disciplinary means, when other attempts to change behaviour have failed. It appears that managers model appropriate supportive behaviours concerning rights preservation for their staff. It was reported that managers should have “more of an educational influence” (4) in order to help to support rights. In addition, in order to balance the two types of organizational leadership styles, leaders within CLWP incorporate staff feedback, options and suggestions into the decision-making process while maintaining clear authority in their position. Staff members understand and respect the traditional organizational structure in regards to authority; however, they are also empowered by their managers to inform decisions. Managers incorporate staff insights when attempting to make decisions regarding the promotion of the rights of individuals supported by the Agency.

The type of leadership required for supporting individuals with intellectual disabilities has changed. Previously, individuals with intellectual disabilities were supported within institutional settings and, as was discussed previously, the leadership style thought to be required to manage the staff within this type of organizational setting was characterized as a transactional leader. This leader maintains full authority and provides clear guidelines for the distribution of rewards and punishments. As the type of support for individuals with disabilities has become more incorporated within the community, the management style required for these staff members has also changed. Now a transformational leader is required. There are several benefits to the transformational leadership style, which was reported by the participants in the study. Beyond those already mentioned, additional benefits include the implications that this leadership style has on the sustainability of the change initiative and the ability to overcome some of the systemic factors that influence the risk of abuse among individuals with disabilities.

As was previously discussed, Reid et al. (2007) indicate that transformational leaders are important precursors to change initiatives that are sustained across time. As individuals with intellectual disabilities are supported by several different aspects of the Association, i.e. residential, supported employment, etc., the distribution of authority is also dispersed across the Association. There must be consideration of the complete organizational system. Leaders now incorporate the insight from their staff members, as they are providing the direct care for individuals without continual oversight from their managers (as managers' offices are located within the main office and the provision of care by staff members is provided within the residential setting). It is important for managers to inspire their staff to transform their beliefs and visions regarding the protection and promotion of rights, as managers are not always present to provide contingencies for reinforcement and punishment. Fortunately, as was discussed in the subthemes relating to motivating operations, staff members indicated that supporting rights is a part of their belief system. All participants reported that they believe it is important to support the rights because “it's just an intrinsic part of my belief system” (1). Furthermore, participants reported providing themselves with internal reinforcement after they supported the rights of individuals with intellectual /developmental disabilities. Caregivers interpret the supporting of individual rights as being an important measure of their job performance and they acknowledged their own successes. In addition, participants feel “pretty good about my work” (2) even in the absence of external reinforcement. Participants also reported having stronger relationships with those they support as well as peers and fellow staff. It is important to note that there still needs to be some work done to initiate these internal beliefs in some of the staff. Participants reported that there was an initial learning curve that many staff had to overcome. Participants discussed that some staff may have been supporting individuals’ rights for reasons other than the intended purpose of the rights initiative, such as personal gain. This may be because the concept of rights is taboo in some group homes as it is associated with a negative belief about the rights infringement process. Participants indicated that “some staff were afraid that if you wrote up a rights infringement that that was something bad” (6). In addition, participants reported that some staff might be concerned about the amount of work involved in supporting individuals' rights and choices, including submitting a Rights Facilitation Form. One participant stated that, “staff members, on the other hand, were like why bother to go to the trouble. Some of them were like that” (4). Finally, staff might be resistant to supporting rights as balancing individuals’ rights might interfere with their ability to fulfill the daily requirements of the house. Participants, however, reported that there would be remediation for staff if they did not overcome these internal barriers.

Another benefit to utilizing a transformational leadership style is that organizations can overcome some of the systemic factors that put individuals with disabilities at greater risk of abuse from their caregivers. Specifically, as discussed previously, in some settings caregivers are given "responsibility without authority" (Wendell, 1996, p. 142). Frontline support staff are responsible for providing the most intimate care for individuals with intellectual disabilities, but often these staff are not given the authority to implement change. By adopting the transformational leadership style that incorporates the insight from all employees, support staff are provided with some authority. By incorporating staff in the decision-making process, staff members may begin to have some authority to influence organizational change, which in turn could mean that they may feel less need to assert their authority over the individuals that they support. This was discussed previously as a possible explanation as to why a minority of caregivers unintentionally abuse those that they support, which is related to the increased risk of abuse experienced by individuals with disabilities. According to participants, now direct support staff are empowered by their managers as they are included in the decision-making process. Staff members are the direct vehicles who advocate for the rights of individuals with intellectual/developmental disabilities.

Organizational Culture in Response to Rights Initiative

According to Schein (1990), organizational culture is the learned beliefs and values that guide behaviours to solve problems within an external environment. He explained that organizational culture could be illustrated by a common understanding of the external and internal factors influencing the whole organization. Through careful examination of the participants' reports, it is apparent that the organizational culture within CLWP now includes the rights-based philosophy for the group of full-time staff who shared their experiences in this study. In the absence of data from a larger group of staff, including those employed part-time, it is not possible to determine the extent of this change. According to Schein, some of the external factors that may have led to a change in the organizational culture of CLWP include: the articulation and reinforcement of developing and following a formal statement of organizational philosophy (the Human Rights Statement), changes to organizational systems (including the Rights Facilitation Committee and policy and procedural changes), and other changes to the organization itself. The Participants discussed their perception that the 3Rs initiative has influenced the overall mission of the Association, a change in the measurement of goals and changes to all the job descriptions to include a focus on rights. These changes should help to facilitate the sustainability of the rights initiative. Participants indicated that the overall mission of the Association is now more focused on rights. Now, the purpose of the Association is to provide the best support possible for individuals in order that they may maintain the best quality of life as defined by each individual. In order to attain this purpose, the goals and the measurement of these goals have changed. This now includes a consideration of each individual's choices and a review of all possible rights infringements in place. In an attempt to ensure that the organization's goals are achieved, the job descriptions now include an expectation that planning include individuals' choices. This change reflects how the role of the support staff has "evolved" (2) in response to the rights initiative. Participants indicated that these changes should assist in ensuring that all staff understand the focus on rights and act as a remediation strategy for those who may not be promoting rights.

Schein (1990) also discussed internal factors that influence the organizational culture including criteria for group inclusion; the allocation of status, power and authority; roles and boundaries among and between staff and those they support; and the contingencies that lead to rewards and punishment. These factors have also changed within the Association in response to the 3Rs Human Rights Project. The functional organizational structure, both informal and formal, reflects and delineates the internal factors relating to group membership, the allocation of status, power and authority. In general, the Association has a traditional organizational structure. Specifically, in terms of hiring, assigning responsibility and providing disciplinary action, the chain of authority flows down the organizational ladder. The informal structure of the Association was also assessed by asking participants who they would go to regarding several different areas pertaining to rights (including asking questions, seeking advice and getting something done). Participants varied on whom they would go to depending on the type of information they were seeking. This indicates that when asking questions and seeking advice on rights issues, participants may not always follow the formal organizational structure. This suggests that although the Association must maintain a traditional functional organizational structure in regards to authority, individuals within the Association are more flexible when it comes to rights issues. Insights from all members of the Association are welcomed and considered.

Shift in the role of supporting individuals with disabilities.

Another internal factor relates to the roles of staff members and managers; both of whose roles have changed in response the rights initiative. This has led to changes in the boundaries among and between staff and those whom they support. Participants reported that due to the rights initiative, they are shifting their role with regard to how they provide support for people with intellectual disabilities. "As we all learned that, to become less of a caregiver to more of person that's - we're now supporting people to make decisions on their own" (2). Participants acknowledged that to support rights they must relinquish their control; caregivers must always be "thinking of them, that this is something that they want and no, you're not in control. They're in control. Let them have their own rights" (6). This shift in role has important implications for both the individuals with disabilities and their support staff.

It was noted earlier that individuals with disabilities may have been at a greater risk due in part to issues of authority and power. Within the support care relationship, historically, the caregiver had the authority and power to control individuals with disabilities, as the individuals supported by organizations were reliant on their caregivers to provide assistance in all aspects of their lives. Individuals with disabilities relinquished their control over their lives in return for this support, thereby increasing the risk of abuse (Wendell, 1996). According to participant reports, however, the balance of control has shifted as a result of the rights initiative. By acknowledging the rights of individuals with disabilities, these individuals are regaining control over their own lives. In turn, as individuals acknowledge their rights, they may also be decreasing their risk of abuse.

As for the support staff, although their role has changed and staff may be more aware that they must support the rights of individuals with intellectual disabilities, they may still be expected to fulfill several relationship roles. While considering rights, support staff may be expected to act as a "friend, confidante, counsellor, parent, teacher"

(Owen et al., 2000, p. 47). The balance of these roles might still lead to "confusion and ambiguity regarding intimacy boundaries" (ibid, p. 47). Therefore, in addition to providing rights education for staff and managers, it would be beneficial if they also received some education about when it is appropriate for them to engage in multiple relationships. As was discussed earlier, members of various helping professionals are expected to evaluate carefully whether a dual relationship poses harm or exploitation to the individual (Barnett, 2007). It would likely be beneficial for staff to receive some training on how to make these careful evaluations within the context of their caregiving environment. As was discussed by Owen et al., (2001) developing a code of ethics to guide this kind of decision making is crucial due to the complex nature of the support environment. Providing the 3Rs rights education cannot be seen as a substitute for this type of code of ethics, as it was reported by many participants that they require more information about handling rights issues when they are in the grey areas of social determination.

Behaviour Change and Organizational Culture Changes

In addition to changes in the organization, participants reported several changes in their own behaviour and that of others, in response to the 3Rs initiative. These behaviour changes, observed in both staff and managers, appear to reflect participants' increased awareness of and ability to support rights. This suggests that the initiation of the 3Rs Project has had an impact on the culture of the organization although the full extent of that impact cannot be fully assessed since the participants were full-time staff only. A large number of part-time staff work at CLWP however, for pragmatic reasons, they were not included in the present study.

An increased awareness of rights.

Increased awareness of rights issues was reported as one of the greatest changes in the attitudes of the participants. Participants reported that they are “a lot more cognisant of what I do and how I do it and how I treat people and how I talk to them” (3). This awareness has influenced many aspects of the care-giving relationship. For example, for both staff and managers, this increased awareness has led to several behaviour changes with regard to rights, including; an increased questioning of current policies, procedures and issues that influence human rights; more open discussions with staff and managers; seeking out more information about rights issues; and changes to the participants decision and planning processes.

Shift towards individualized programming.

Another change in behaviour reported by the participants was a shift towards individualized programming. Both staff and managers reported that they have changed the way that they develop programs and overall planning with individuals who have intellectual disabilities. Now they are “Trying to shift and try and make sure you're not infringing on anybody's rights when someone else decides they don't want to come. You have to be brainstorming all the time so that everyone gets out there and gets to do things” (6). Staff also reported that they have shifted the way they offer choices that now include all the options and consequences.

Providing education about rights.

Both staff and managers reported that they have taken on an educational role because of the 3Rs initiative. Management participants reported that their staff required more information and education about how to better support rights. When rights are not being supported, managers and staff reported having discussions in an attempt to educate the staff about the rights of the people they support.

Change in perspective on rights infringements.

Rights education has also led staff to change their perspective on rights infringements. Managers and staff reported a change in staff members' behaviour in that more Rights Facilitation Forms are being submitted. It was reported that initially staff viewed the recognition of rights infringements as a negative reflection on their own performance. Through education and experience, staff have begun to see the positive benefits of submitting a Rights Facilitation Form. "But once they see that they're going in and positive changes are happening towards that because of the rights infringement, instead of negative stuff, they open up and then they're more willing to watch for the stuff and not think of it as something bad" (6). Participants reported they are "seeing more and more of the part-time staff hand in rights infringement" (6).

Advocating for rights.

As a result of the 3Rs Human Rights Project, both staff and managers reported that they are now advocating for the rights of individuals supported by the Association. Participants have taken an active role in the rights initiative, i.e., they "support people in exercising their rights. [They] help them submit rights infringements" (1). Rules are being changed because of the Association's commitment to individual rights. Management participants reported that the way they "support people has changed completely since this started" (3). Most staff are doing whatever they can to advocate for individuals' rights while other staff may be slow to adopt this new rights perspective.

Supporting individuals outside the Association.

Participants have also reported that they have changed with respect to supporting individual rights outside of the Association. To ensure that rights are being protected, managers reported, that they need to support their staff and individuals with intellectual disabilities within the medical community and in employment settings. Additionally, participants reported that they would sometimes seek advice from people outside the Agency (for example religious leaders and professors) about how to better support the rights of individuals with intellectual/developmental disabilities.

Behaviour changes in individuals supported by the Association.

According to participants, there seems to be a process of change for the individuals with intellectual/developmental disabilities when they learn about their rights. Participants reported that individuals supported by the Agency are changing their reliance on their staff. How they respond to learning about rights, however, varies depending on the specific individual. Some individuals have begun to advocate for themselves. "They had a basis for their rights but they didn't know their full rights and they couldn't exercise their full rights. Now they can" (4). Thus, participants indicated that this change is especially beneficial for the individuals supported by the Agency who have the ability to speak up for themselves (i.e. individuals were are verbal as opposed to those who are non-verbal). On the other hand, others are having a difficult time accepting the change because they may not be able to understand the complex concepts of rights within the context of respect and responsibility because of their disability. One participant said that, although everyone should be entitled to the same amount of respect for individual rights, within the Association individuals with severe disabilities might not be getting the same support for their rights as individuals who can assert themselves. This participant noted that for individuals who are lacking the verbal abilities to assert themselves, "I don't think they're giving, having the same rights afforded to them. We say we're doing it, but I don't think we're doing as well as we could be" (3). This participant's report seems very similar to a participant report in Forbat's (2006) study which was discussed in the introduction. In Forbat's review, a participant discussed that for people with severe disabilities, it is not likely that individual choices are going to be considered. It is apparent from both of these reports that more work needs to be done in order to ensure that the rights of all the individuals with intellectual/developmental disabilities are supported, not just the ones who have the ability to assert themselves.

Sustainability of the Rights-Based Organizational Culture.

As Schein (1990) discussed, culture is perpetuated throughout an organization by the systematic change of contingencies under which rewards and punishments are allocated. In the present study, participants reported receiving several extrinsic reinforcers, including praise and encouragement, for supporting individual rights. It was also discussed that the job descriptions and performance evaluations of the employees have changed and now include a focus on supporting the rights and choices of individuals with intellectual/developmental disabilities. In addition, participants reported a clear process for correcting, which could lead to disciplinary action or even termination for an employee who does not follow this rights-based service approach. Several more of the specific supports and barriers reported by the participants will be discussed in the next section.

Extrinsic Supports and Barriers

As was noted by Caton et al., (2007), staff members within an organization facilitate effective practice; they are responsible for actually implementing changes into practice. The reports from direct support staff provided insight into how the rights of the individuals they support are being protected and preserved. It is predominantly staff who mediate access to home and community involvement for the individuals they support (Mansell & Elliott, 2001). As Mansell and Elliott discussed, support staff will follow new initiatives if they are provided with sufficient contingencies. Furthermore, if these extrinsic contingences are removed, staff behaviour associated with the new initiatives is often abandoned. Thus, in the present study participants were asked what extrinsic contingences were provided to them for following the 3Rs program and whether these contingences were maintained.

Extrinsic Reinforcement

Several different types of extrinsic reinforcers were reported by participants, which assist them in supporting the rights of individuals with intellectual disabilities. These reinforcers include: informal supports, formal supports during performance evaluations and with letters, education and discussions. As to the informal support, Directors and Supervisors reported that they provide praise and encouragement to staff and individuals supported by the Agency for submitting rights infringement forms, questioning policies and procedures and for taking part in the rights training. There have been changes to all the job descriptions in the organization. During performance evaluations, managers recognize their staff for supporting rights. Managers also reported that they acknowledge staff with letters of recognition, staff award presentations and by holding small parties or by going out for coffee, when staff members recognize individuals' rights. Staff members also reported that they feel encouraged by their managers to support the rights of individuals with intellectual/developmental disabilities. They did not report, however, receiving any formal recognition, as was discussed by their managers for supporting rights. Thus, although managers have reported that they are providing these formal supports, not all staff reported receiving them.

Education is another extrinsic reinforcer discussed by the participants. Managers reported that an important aspect of their job is to provide education for their staff about how to recognize rights restrictions. They educate staff about the intent of the rights restriction forms in an attempt to change staff members' perception, so that if they "recognize any kinds of rights infringements, it's not that [they are] doing a bad job. It's that we need to recognize it as an agency … and deal with it so people, I think, are viewing that as a positive now" (5). Staff members reported that they are still learning about rights issues, through the formal 3Rs Rights Training, and at meetings. One participant felt that it was helpful being a part of the research project's data collection, as she saw firsthand how the individuals supported by the Agency are interpreting their rights.

Another type of support participants receive is in the form of discussions. They described how rights are talked about openly, and stated that it is "very open door around here" (5); they can bring up rights issues and receive feedback on them. In addition, staff reported having discussions with the Rights Committee and the 3Rs research team in an attempt to seek informal advice when they have rights issues. Managers also reported having many discussions with colleagues and supervisors about different rights issues.

They found their supervisors to be easily accessible and very supportive when they sought advice. All participants reported either receiving or providing each of these types of support.

Correction Methods for Rights Infringements

There appears to be a process by which staff members are corrected for not supporting the rights of individuals afforded by the agency. This process includes: discussions with the staff, the submission of a Rights Facilitation Form regarding the rights issue in question, disciplinary action, and possible termination. Discussions are the first form of remediation that managers take for staff who may be restricting an individual's rights. These discussions include evaluation of the reason for the restriction and review of the importance of supporting individuals' rights. One staff member noted, however, that these conversations usually occur "after many issues, but I do see a lot of education and I do see some correction" (4). In addition, some staff members correct other staff by discussing rights issues. Furthermore, individuals supported by the Agency are asserting themselves by having discussions with others about how their rights are being infringed upon. If staff members do not respond to a discussion, it was reported that staff and managers would submit a Rights Facilitation Form. Having an objective third party was seen as beneficial by the participants. If rights infringements persist, then management takes disciplinary action that can lead to termination. Serious rights infringements are viewed as a form of abuse. Participants indicated that staff members are aware of the consequences for violating individuals' rights.

Barriers That Inhibit Rights Protection and Promotion

Participants reported several barriers that make it difficult to support the rights of individuals with intellectual disabilities. These barriers include: lack of support and feedback around rights issues from their superiors, lack of information and education to put supporting rights into practice, and overcoming the grey areas. In addition, organizational limitations such as the structure of care for individuals, lack of financial resources, lack of support from outside the agency and individual barriers of people with disabilities were also reported as factors that inhibit the rights initiative. Each of these barriers inhibits the way that staff members are able to support individual rights and choices.

Staff report that they do not receive enough encouragement from their superiors for supporting rights. Unfortunately, it was reported that participants would often only hear feedback, but not act on it “when things aren't going well. When things are going really well it's, I don't think they give enough positive strokes so” (3). For their part, management participants recognize the importance of providing feedback, but feel that they are limited financially to initiate monetary incentives for their staff.

In addition, participants would also like to receive more feedback on submitting Rights Facilitation Forms as well as from the Rights Facilitation Committee. Participants indicated that they do not consistently receive feedback from the Committee. Participants feel that this feedback would be helpful in handling the many grey areas that arise when dealing with rights.

The attempt to overcome ‘grey areas’ was the predominate barrier reported in their study to supporting rights of individuals with intellectual disabilities. Participants were unsure as to what constitutes a rights infringement. In addition, some participants felt that it was unclear whether supporting an individual's rights will go against their responsibilities as a staff member as it may put the individual at too much risk. However, the staff are careful that when rights have to be restricted, for example, for health and safety reasons, such a restriction decision will be reviewed regularly.

Management participants were concerned about the lack of training and education provided about rights issues and felt that they needed more training for themselves and for the staff. This is especially true for part-time staff, as there are “a lot of part-time staff that really don't have all the information they need to make sure the people's rights are, are guaranteed” (3). This differentiation in the acceptance between staff and managers may be a characteristic of their positions within the organizations. According to Devos, Buelens and Bouckenooghe (2007), individuals in higher positions within an organization are more open to change initiatives. Thus, it is typical for part-time staff who are removed from the administration to be delayed in fully accepting a change initiative. In addition, participants discussed that the 3Rs research team needs to be more accessible. Participants also felt that it would be helpful to watch “hands on videos, as a group in a group home setting where we can all discuss it in that specific group home” (4). Thus, more training is needed in order to help staff fully embrace the rights initiative and to give them insight into how to handle rights issues.

Participants reported other systemic barriers that inhibit their ability to support rights. These barriers relate to the organizational structure including: silos, ministry requirements and a lack of staffing and financial aid. Silos refer to a division in the provision of care, for example, in the group home living setting. The group home creates an environment in which it is difficult to support each individual's rights because to do so may infringe on the rights of another individual. This is an important issue as “rights are still being violated in, in group homes and the only way to stop that is to get rid of the group homes” (3). Another systemic barrier related to factors concerning ministry requirements which, if followed rigidly, may result in violations of the rights of individuals, for example, an individual’s right to access medication might be restricted if all mediations within a group home must be locked up. Additionally, a lack of staffing and financial aid also limits participants' ability to support each individual's choices.

Receiving negative feedback from outside the Association is another barrier reported by the participants. A few participants reported that negative feedback from family members and the larger community makes it difficult to support rights. The risks that follow from an individual having rights may make families resistant. Participants also reported that they experience some opposition from the community when they support individuals' choices to be more active outside the Association.

A final barrier raised by participants was related to the individuals’ own disability. Participants discussed the importance of considering “our own client's barriers” (4) when supporting rights. Individuals' barriers may make it difficult for some to fully understand their rights and make informed decisions. This is especially the case for individuals who are not able to speak for themselves. One participant discussed that it was easier for individuals who can assert themselves to have their rights supported. It is important to consider the individuals’ personal barriers and attempt to balance their limitations with the rights they should be afforded.

Implications from the Questionnaires

In general, the themes from the interviews were confirmed by the results from the questionnaires. These results also suggest a shift in organizational culture towards rights protection and promotion across the whole Association. However, as indicated earlier, this shift is based on the perceptions of full-time staff only with no reflection of the experience of the large number of part-time staff. Beyond this, there are two specific findings from the questionnaires that lend critical insights into the impact of the initiation of the 3Rs Project. First, participants' reports indicated that they are more often receiving informal supports rather than formal recognition for supporting rights. On the surface, this trend appears to go against the literature with regards to providing sufficient contingencies for supporting changes in behaviour; however, it actually lends support for transformational learning occurring within the Association (Kofman & Senge, 1993). Specifically, these findings could be seen as support for the transformation that has occurred within the organization's members. It appears as if the rights initiative has become internalized, (as was reported by participants' motivation for supporting rights) as these members are more interested in receiving supports that will allow them to develop their skills to support rights rather than in receiving supports in the form of formal recognition. The second noteworthy finding from the questionnaires is the fact that managers reported that they are not receiving the same types of support from their own supervisors as staff reported from their managers with regard to rights promotion. These results support the need for more specific management training for managers in how to support rights promotion behaviours in the people that they supervise. Both of these areas are worthy of further examination.

Implications of the Systemic influence of Organizational Culture

Overall, the findings from this research have demonstrated that the 3Rs Project has impinged on the organizational culture and that the reported behaviour changes will likely facilitate the sustainability of the rights initiative. Based on the participants' reports, it seems pertinent to examine where the Association is located concerning the full initiation of the rights perspective. It is possible to gain some insight into this by considering Ertmer's (1999) model of the two types of barriers that must be overcome (Parsons, et al., 2008). First-order barriers relate to access to tangible means of implementing the change (for example physical resources and supports). Second-order barriers relate to individuals' understanding and beliefs about the purpose, usefulness and importance of the imitative, organizational culture, and the individuals' enthusiasm, motivation and confidence in supporting the change. According to participants' reports, the 3Rs Project has influenced and overcome many of the second-order barriers. Participants reported that most of the employees within the organization are considering rights as a means to provide support for individuals with intellectual/developmental disabilities. There is a need for more work to be done, however, to influence some staff members' beliefs about rights, including those of part-time employees. Thus, some staff are still limited by this second order barrier. As for the first-order barriers, participants reported that although they are receiving many resources for supporting the rights of individuals with disabilities, many pragmatic barriers remain.

Strengths and Limitations of the Study

When interpreting the results of this study it is important to consider both its limitations and strengths. Several limitations should be taken into accounts that influence the application of the findings of this research. These limitations include issues relating to the small sample size and the nature of the interview questions.

There was a relatively small sample size for both the interviews and the questionnaires. The sample size for the interviews was limited intentionally due to the in-depth nature of the questions. Having only six participants, however, does limit the ability of the participants' reports to be considered as fully representative of the CLWP population, especially in the absence of part-time staff. The questionnaires were designed and developed to triangulate the themes that emerged through the analysis completed on the transcripts of the interviews. Here again, although the findings from the questionnaires tended to support the themes found in the interviews, the sample size for the questionnaires was small. It is important to note that the population size available for the questionnaires was relatively small. There were only 35 full-time employees who met the criteria for inclusion. The decision to include only participants who were eligible to participate in the interviews, i.e., full-time employees from the three employment positions who were likely to have been employed prior to the initiation of the 3Rs Project, was made to ensure that the themes triangulated through the questionnaires were examined within a consistent context. The return rate from those eligible to participate was reasonable at 31%. Future research could involve offering all employees of CLWP, including part-time support staff, the opportunity to participate. This would provide the opportunity for a comprehensive examination of the perspectives of all staff groups and could provide insight into the experience of the institution of a rights agenda within a community living setting.

The limitations relating to the interview questions include the degree to which the questions could be considered leading, the lack of direct questions that probed for the presence of behavioural contingencies maintaining the promotion and protection of human rights for individuals supported by the agency, and the fact that staff were not asked questions relating to specific areas of change in their managers' behaviour. Some of the questions the participants were asked might have implied that there was a change in response to the 3Rs initiative. This was recognized during the interviews, and so in an attempt to accommodate for this, participants were asked 'if any changes had occurred'.

In addition, as previously discussed, in their examination of the reported contingencies of direct staff supporting individuals with intellectual disabilities in residential settings, Mansell and Elliott (2001) proposed that the knowledge of these contingencies would mediate action in a form of 'rule-governed behaviour'. Through their analysis, however, they were only able to code for behaviours that reflected their topography of the consequences. Without examination of subsequent behaviour, this analysis provided little insight as to whether the consequences were, in fact, reinforcing or punishing. It was anticipated that the current research project would be able to overcome this limitation through the third section of the interviews relating to the presence of behavioural contingencies maintaining the protection of human rights for individuals supported by the agency. Unfortunately, this section yielded little insight into the presence or absence of reinforcers and punishers maintaining participants' behaviours. Fortunately, analysis of the two preceding sections of the interviews suggested the presence of supports and barriers that influence the participants' ability to support rights.

It is important to note that although staff did report observing several changes in their managers' behaviour, they did not identify some of the specific changes that the management participants had identified in themselves. Specifically, the staff did not report any change in their managers regarding the way they advocated for the rights of individuals supported by the agency, the increased focus on individualized programming, the provision of formal support for staff who adopted a rights approach to their work, and the increased provision of education about rights by management. This does not mean that staff members have not observed their managers making these changes. This merely indicates that staff did not report these particular changes. It is important to note that no questions were asked about how staff perceived their management changing in these specific areas. Another explanation is that the few participants interviewed in the staff positions may not have observed these changes. At any given time, a manager oversees several different staff members. Since managers identified these changes in themselves, it is likely that the managers are increasing in the aforementioned areas with several staff members, but that they are not able to do so for every staff member under their supervision. The fact that staff did not report witnessing these changes in their managers may be a limitation of this study. Future research of this kind should include specific probes to draw out this information.

On the other hand, there are several strengths of the present research that must be considered. One was that sampling from different participant groups, for both the interviews and the questionnaires, allowed for the triangulation of perspectives of change within and between full-time staff groups. Another strength of the study was the use of the questionnaires to confirm themes derived from behavioural interviews. Finally, focusing on one Association allows for a comprehensive examination of shared experience across groups within the organization. This examination led to the type of systematic evaluation proposed by Olson (2003). Olson discussed that this type of evaluation could lead to the decrease in the risk of abuse. This analysis has identified the behavioural mechanisms that support organizational and individual changes, which were identified by Sobsey (1994) as essential predictors to the support of rights.

A suggestion for future research would be to complete a similar type of analysis on several different community care organizations for individuals with intellectual disabilities, at varying points in time across the initiation of the 3Rs Project. It was revealed through the analysis of reports from the full-time staff and managers who participated in this study that this Association is run by relatively forward thinkers and that the Association itself has been fairly accepting of this organizational change. In addition, this Association has been involved in the 3Rs Human Rights Project since its inception and has been an active agent in its ongoing development. This reflects organizational culture and readiness for change. Since these factors may be organizationally specific, careful consideration must be made when attempting to generalize these findings to other organizations. For example, Community Living Welland Pelham's long history of service innovation may have facilitated its ability to adopt and foster the shift to a rights based approach while more effort may be required from the change agent in other organizations undertaking this type of major philosophical shift.

On the other hand, although participants were asked to report their knowledge and feelings regarding the change when they initially learned about the project, it is likely that participants' retroactive reports are biased due to the longevity of the Project and its apparent relative acceptance by most full-time employees of the Association. If the Association had been examined at different points, for example prior to, immediately following and several years following the Project's initiation, it is likely that the participants would have revealed more of their gradual learning and acceptance process. This suggests the importance of completing future research with other organizations and at different points in time, in order to gain a more complete perspective of the whole process of initiating the change to a rights based service philosophy.

These results lend critical insight into the systemic impact of the 3Rs Project at CLWP. As Olson (2003) discussed, without consideration for the whole organization, the overall benefits and adaptability of the change might be limited. Although this has been a retrospective account of the initiation of the project, and thus the precise degree to which the Association considered the systemic influences cannot be determined, it is clear from the participants' reports that the rights initiative has influenced the whole organization in countless ways. Even with the reported barriers operating, the systemic impact of the 3Rs Project has been considerable.

What is also clear from the results is that Community Living Welland Pelham has demonstrated strong organizational learning mechanisms and incorporates some of the elements of a learning organization. As discussed in the introduction, learning organizations are characterized by a focus on the human component technology (Senge, 1994), they must engage in transformational learning (Kofman & Senge, 1993), They are continually and systemically ready for change (Armenakis, Harris & Mossholder, 1993) and they are led by transformational leaders (Reid, Kneafsey, Long, Hulme & Wrights,

2007) who espouse the concept of servant leadership (Owen et al, 2009) and are systems thinkers (Owen et al, 2009; Reid, Kneafsey, Long, Hulme & Wrights, 2007). Through this analysis, there is evidence of the emergence of these characteristics in the association and its leaders. This speaks to the credibility of the whole organization and the sustainability of the 3Rs human rights project.

References

Armenakis, A., Harris & Mossholder (1993). Creating readiness for organizational change, *Human Relations, 46*(6), 681-703.

Aronson, J. (1994). A pragmatic view of thematic analysis. *The Qualitative Report*, 2, 1 – 3. Retrieved from http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/BackIssues/QR2-1/aronson.html

Bailey, J.S. & Burch, M. R. (2005). *Ethics for Behavior Analysts.* Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Bannerman, D. J., Sheldon, J.B., Sherman, I. A., & Harchik, A. E. (1990). Balancing the rights to habilitation with the right to personal liberties: The rights of people with developmental disabilities to eat too many doughnuts and take a nap. *Journal of Applied Behaviour Analysis, 23*, 79-89.

Barnett, J., Lazarus, A., Vasquez, M., Moorehead-Slaughter, O. & Johnson, W. B. (2007). Boundary issues and multiple relationships: Fantasy and reality. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 38*(4), 401-410.

Berg, B. L. (2004). *Qualitative Research Methods, 5th Edition*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Bogomolny, L. (2004) Do the rights thing. *Canadian Business, 77*, 96-97.

Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*, 77-101.

Burns, M., (2008) Using Technology to Improve the way you do business: Managing change the right way. *CAmagazine*, 14.

Canadian Association for Community Living (2009). All about CACL. Retrieved from: http://www.cacl.ca/english/aboutus/index.asp

Caton, Starling, Burton, Azmi & Chapman (2007). Responsive services for people with learning disabilities from minority ethnic communities. *British Journal of Learning Disabilities, 35*, 229-235.

Cooper, J. O., Heron, T. E., & Heward, W. L. (2007). *Applied Behaviour Analysis*. 2nd Edition. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson

Devos, G., Buelens, M. & Bouckenooghe, D. (2007). Contribution of Content, Context, and Process to Understanding Openness to Organizational Change: Two Experimental Simulation Studies. *Journal of Social Psychology. 147*(6), 607-629.

Ertmer, P. A. (1999). Addressing First- and Second-Order Barriers to Change: Strategies for Technology Integration. *Educational Technology Research and Development. 47*(4), 47-61.

Esterberg, K. G. (2002). *Qualitative Methods in Social Research*. Boston, MA: The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.

Feldman, M. A. (1990). Balancing freedom from harm and the right to treatment in persons with developmental disabilities. In A. Repp and N. Singh (Eds.), *Current perspectives in the use of nonaversive and aversive interventions with developmentally disabled persons* (pp. 261-271). Sycamore, IL: Sycamore Publishing.

Feldman, M. A., Atkinson, L., Foti-Gervais, L., & Condillac, R. (2004). Formal versus informal interventions for challenging behaviour in persons with intellectual disabilities. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research,* 48, 60-68.

Forbat, L., (2006). An analysis of key principles in Valuing People: Implications for supporting people with dementia. *Journal of Intellectual Disabilities,* 10(3), 249-260.

Gosse, L., Stoner, K., Tweedy, K., Owen, F., Vryostko, B., Griffiths, D., Sales, C., & Watson, S. (2002). *Rights, respect, responsibility-The 3R project: System wide human rights survey.* Welland, ON: Community Living Welland Pelham.

Griffiths, D., Baxter, J., Haslam, T, Richards, D., Stranges, S., & Vyrostko, B. (1996). *Building healthy boundaries: Considerations for reducing sexual abuse.* NADD 13th Annual Conference Proceedings, 114-118.

Griffiths, D. M., Owen, F. A., Gosse, L., Stoner, K., Tardif, K. Y., Watson, S., Sales, C., & Vyrostko, B. (2003). Human Rights and Persons with Intellectual Disabilities: An Action-Research Approach for Community-Based Organizational Self-Evaluation. *Journal on Developmental Disabilities, 10*(2), 25-42.

Haseltine, B. & Miltenberger, R. G. (1990). Teaching Self-Protection Skills to Persons with Mental Retardation. *American Journal on Mental Retardation. 95*(2), 188-197.

Hewitt, A. S., Larson, S. A., Lakin, K. C., Sauer, J., O'Nell, S & Sedlezky, L. (2004). Role and Essential Competencies of the Frontline Supervisors of Direct Support Professionals in Community Services. *Mental Retardation, 42*(2), 122-135.

Kofman, F & Senge, P. (1993) Communities of commitment: The heart of learning organizations. *Organizational Dynamics. Special Issue: The learning organization, 22*(2), 5-23.

Kurpius, D., (1993). Book Review: The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization by Peter M. Senge. *Consulting Psychology Journal, 45*(4), 1061-4087.

Mansell, J. (2006). Deinstitutionalisation and community living: Progress, problems and priorities. *Journal of Intellectual & Developmental Disability, 31*(2), 65-76.

Mansell, J., & Elliott, T. (2001). Staff members' prediction of consequences for their work in residential settings. *American Journal on Mental Retardation, 106,* 424-447.

Mazzucchelli, T. G. (2001). Feel Safe: A Pilot Study of a Protective Behaviours Programme for People with Intellectual Disabilities. *Journal on Intellectual & Developmental Disabilities, 46*(2), 115-126.

McCabe, M. P., Cummins, R. A. & Reid, S. B. (1994). An empirical study of the sexual abuse of people with intellectual disabilities. *Journal of Sexuality and Disability, 12*, 297-306.

Mitchell, G., & Hastings, R. P. (2001). Coping, burnout, and emotion in staff working in community services for people with challenging behaviours. *American Journal on Mental Retardation, 106,* 448-459.

National Alliance for Direct Support Professionals. (2001). *Code of Ethics.* Retrieved September 22, 2008, from http://www.nadsp.org/library/codetext.asp.

Olson, R (2003). Organizational Culture Putting the Organizational Culture Concept to Work. *The Behaviour Analyst Today, 3*(4), 471-481.

Owen, F. A., Griffiths, D., Feldman, M. A., Sales, C., & Richards, D. A. (2000). Perceptions of acceptable boundaries by persons with developmental disabilities and their care providers. *Journal on Developmental Disabilities, 7*(1), 34-49.

Owen, F. A., Sales, C., Griffiths, D. & Richards, D. A. (2001). Prelude to a code of ethics for caregivers in services for persons with developmental disabilities: A systemic approach to preventing abuse. *Developmental Disabilities Bulletin, 29*(2), 152-169.

Owen, F. A., Griffiths, D., Stoner, K. Gosse, L., Watson, S., Tardif, C. Y., Sales, C., & Vyrostko, B. (2003). Multi-Level Human Rights Training in an Association for Community Living: First Steps Toward Systemic Change. Journal on *Developmental Disabilities, 10*(2), 43-64.

Owen, F., Julien, M., Sales, C., Tardif-Williams, C. Y., Vyrostko, B. & Stoner, K. (2009). Ensuring rights: Systematic and educational approaches. In F. Owen & D. Griffiths (Eds.) (2009). *Challenges to the human rights of people with intellectual Disabilities* (pp. 263-279). London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Parsons, S., Daniels, H., Porter, J. & Robertson, C. (2008). Resources, Staff Beliefs and Organizational Culture: Factors in the Use of Information and Communication Technology for Adults with Intellectual Disabilities. *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities, 21*, 19-33.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B. & Bommer, W. H. (1996). Transformational leader behaviors and substitutes for leadership as determinants of employee satisfaction, commitment, trust, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Management, 22*(2), 259-298.

Reid, G., Kneafsey, R., Long, A., Hulme, C. & Wright, H. (2007). Change and transformation: the impact of an action-research evaluation on the development of a new service. *Learning in Health and Social Care, 6*(2), 61-71.

Schein, E. H. (1990) Organizational culture. *American Psychologist, 45*(2), 109-119.

Schmid, H. (2006). Leadership Styles and Leadership Change in Human and Community Service Organizations. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership, 17*(2), 179-194.

Senge, P. (1994). *The fifth discipline fieldbook: Strategies and tools for building a learning organization*. New York: Currency Doubleday.

Sievert, A. L., Cuvo, A. J. & Davis, P. K. (1988). Training Self-Advocacy Skills to Adults with Mild Handicaps. *Journal of Applied Behaviour Analysis, 21,* 299-309.

Skinner, B.F. (1953). *Science and Human Behavior*. New York: Macmillan.

Skinner, B. F. (1981). Selection by consequences. *Science, 213*, 501-504.

Smith, D. & Fitzpatrick, M. (1995). Patient-therapist boundary issues: An Integrative review of theory and research. *Professional Psychology, 26*, 499-506.

Sobsey, D., & Varnhagen, C.K. (1989). *Sexual abuse and exploitation of people with disabilities: Toward prevention and treatment.* In M. Csapo and L. Gougen (Eds.), Special education across Canada: Challenges for the 90s (pp. 199-218). Vancouver, B.C.: Centre for Human Development and Research.

Sobsey, D. (1994). *Violence and abuse in the lives of people with disabilities: The end of silent acceptance?* Toronto: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

Tardif-Williams, C. Y., Owen, F. A., Feldman, M. A., Tarulli, D., Griffiths, D., Sales, C., McQueen-Fuentes, G., & Stoner, K. (2007). Comparison of Interactive Computer-based and Classroom Training on Human Rights Awareness in Persons with

Intellectual Disabilities. *Education and Training in Developmental Disabilities, 42*(1), 48-58.

Tarulli, D., Tardif, C. Y., Griffiths, D., Owen, F. A., McQueen-Fuentes, G., Feldman, M. A., Sales, C., & Stoner, K. (2004). Human Rights and Persons with Intellectual Disabilities: Historical, Pedagogical, and Philosophical Considerations. *Encounters on Education, 5,* 161-181.

Todnem, R. (2007) Ready or Not ... *Journal of Change Management*, 7(1), 3-11.

Wadsworth, Y. (2008). Is it Safe to Talk About Systems Again Yet? Self Organ-ising Processes for Complex Living Systems and the Dynamics of Human Inquiry. *Systemic Practice and Action Research. 21*(2), 153-170.

Wendell, S. (1996). *The Rejected Body*. New York: Routledge.

Appendix 1

BROCK UNIVERSITY & COMMUNITY LIVING WELLAND PELHAM

Invitation to Participate in Interviews

Investigation of a Systemic Approach to Human Rights Education: Exploring Organizational Processes

Researchers: Laura Mullins, Centre for Applied Disability Studies & Frances Owen, Child & Youth Studies and Centre for Applied Disability Studies

The primary focus of this 3Rs research to date has been on evaluating the impact of the training program on people who have intellectual disabilities. This research will focus on the broader systemic aspects to investigate the extent to which the training has an impact on the organizations that support people with disabilities. The purpose of this research will be to examine the cultural and behavioural change across the Association in response to the implementation of the 3Rs Human Rights project.

Participating in this study includes an interview. The interviews will focus on items describing changes in you and across the Association in response to the institution of the 3Rs initiative. A written copy of the interview questions will be provided prior to the interview itself.

Your participation will be voluntary, can occur during work time and you may withdraw from the study at any time with out penalty. All personal data will be kept strictly confidential. Only the researchers named above, and certified court reporters responsible for transcribing the interviews, will have access to the information you give throughout your participation in the study. Your name will not be associated with any comments provided when the results of the study are reported, used for educational purposes and published. Your involvement in the study involves only minimal risk (e.g., feeling uncomfortable disclosing some information). However, all information disclosed will remain completely anonymous.

Your participation in this project is extremely important. It will help to improve the implementation of the 3Rs Human Rights Project in your Association. If you would like to participate in this 3Rs research, please contact Laura Mullins, at laura.mullins@brocku.ca .

Thank you for your consideration.

Appendix 2

BROCK UNIVERSITY & COMMUNITY LIVING WELLAND
PELHAM

Consent for Interview Participants

Investigation of a Systemic Approach to Human Rights Education: Exploring Organizational Processes

Researchers: Laura Mullins, CADS Frances Owen, CHYS

Name of Participant: (Please print) ____________________________________

I understand that the purpose of the research project in which I have agreed to participate is to help evaluate the 3Rs: Human Rights Project in the Community Living Welland. I understand that Brock University and Community Living Welland Pelham are conducting this study together. I understand that my participation includes being interviewed about the promotion of rights of individuals with intellectual disabilities.

I understand that my participation in this study is voluntary and there will be no additional payment for my participation in this study. I understand that I may withdraw from the study at any time and for any reason without penalty.

I understand that my participation in this study may benefit other persons, since any information that is gathered will be used in improving the implementation of the 3Rs Human Rights Project. I also may benefit by learning more about human rights of persons with intellectual disabilities. I understand that, for myself, the risks involved in participating in this study are only minimal (e.g., feeling uncomfortable disclosing some information). However, I am aware that all information disclosed will remain completely anonymous.

I understand that all my personal data will be kept strictly confidential. I understand that only the researchers named above, their research assistants and a certified transcriber will have access to the information I give throughout my participation in the study. My name will not be associated with my comments in this information. I understand that the researchers will publish articles, and make professional and public presentations using the information that all the people who helped in the study have provided. However, if during the course of my participation in the study I tell you that I, or any person I support in my work with the Association, has been abused or will be abused, or is a threat to him/herself or others, the Executive Director will be informed so that this can be reported to the appropriate authorities. I also understand that my personal information will have to be given to the courts if the law requires it.

[ ] Yes, I understand the general nature of this study and my involvement in it. I agree to participate in this study and I understand that I may withdraw from this study at any time without penalty. I also give you permission to use my results in other studies that are similar to this one (this is called "secondary analyses"). I give permission for you to contact me after the study is over to ask me if I would be willing to answer some more questions or be in a new study.

Participant Signature_____________________________ Date: ____________________

This study has been reviewed and approved by the Brock Research Ethics Board. (File # 02-327) If I have any questions or concerns about my participation in the study, I may contact Laura Mullins, (laura.mullins@brocku.ca) or Fran Owen (fowen@brocku.ca) or the Brock University Research Ethics Officer (905) 688-5550, 3035.

Thank you for your help! Please take one copy of this form with you for further reference

Researcher Signature_____________________________ Date: ____________________

Appendix 3

Participant Interviews

Participant Number:

Employee Position:

Length of employment:

A: Organizational Culture

Structure and Process of CLWP in response to the 3Rs Project:

1. What do you think is the purpose of your organization taking on the rights initiative?
    a. Do you think the rights initiative has influenced the organization's mission? If so, how?
2. What are the goals or the desired outcomes of CLWP?
    a. How do you think your organization has changed in relation to measurement of outcomes for individuals with regard to rights?
    b. How do you think this cultural shift is going to impact individual plans and outcomes of people supported by the organization over the next few years?
3. How are staff recognized by the organization in making the shift to support rights?
4. What do managers/supervisors do to support the rights movement?
5. What is your motivation for supporting the rights of individuals with intellectual/developmental disabilities?
    a. What sort of feedback do you receive from others for supporting the rights of individuals with disabilities?

    b. Who provides this feedback (Peers, supervisor, manager, rights team, ED, the individuals you support)?
    c. How often do you receive this feedback (every time, once a month, etc)?
    d. What sort of feedback do you give yourself for supporting the rights of individuals with intellectual/developmental disabilities?

6. What remedial strategies are used when the rights of the individuals the agency serves are not supported?
    a. Who provides this feedback (Peers, supervisor, manager, rights team, ED, the individuals you support)?
7. Are you provided with support from the Association (management etc) to ensure the protection of the rights of those you support?
    a. If yes, please describe two examples of support you have received to help you to support human rights.
    b. In order to assist you in supporting the rights of individuals with intellectual disabilities, what are some examples of supports you would like to receive?
8. If you have questions about supporting the rights of individuals with intellectual disabilities who do you go to? (Include their position and relationship to you (for example: peers, supervisor, manager, rights team, ED, the individuals you support).
9. If you want something done, (for example money for things your program needs) who do you go to?
10. If you need advice about supporting the rights of individuals with intellectual disabilities, who do you go to?

B: Readiness for 3Rs Change Initiative

1. What were you told about rights when you started working at the Association?
2. Where did the shift towards supporting rights come from? Why do you think the organization got involved with the rights initiative?
    a. How did you find out about this change?
    b. Do you feel that the rights training prepared you to support the choices the individuals the Association serves?
    c. What were your feelings regarding this change?
    d. What do you do to support this initiative (what is your role)?
    e. Do you think that you are able to support the choices of all the individuals the Association serves?
    f. Is there anything that makes it difficult to support the choices of all the individuals the Association serves? Please discuss.
3. What has changed in your behaviour since the start of the rights initiative?
4. What has changed in the people that you work with since the start of the project?
    a. Please give me an example of how the staff have changed in response to the rights initiative?
    b. Please give me an example of how individuals supported by the agency have changed in response to the rights initiative?
    c. Please give me an example of how supervisor has changed in response to the rights initiative?
    d. Please give me an example of how a rule that you thought was unchangeable was changed in response to the rights initiative?
5. Can you give me an example of when someone's rights were violated in the past that would not be violated now since the rights training?
6. Are rights discussed during staff meetings?

Managers/Supervisors:

7. As a manager/supervisor how has your relationship with the staff you supervise changed as a result of the rights initiative?
8. Has the rights initiative changed your management style? If so how?
9. How has the rights initiative impacted problem solving to address the needs of the people supported by the organization?

C: Behavioural Change (Please do not disclose any identifiable characteristics)

1. Please describe a time when the rights of an individual you support were violated by someone else. (Probe to ensure that this was not a justifiable restriction)
    a. What was their relationship?
    b. What were your actions in response to this violation?
    c. What were the consequences of these actions?
    d. Who provided these consequences?
    e. Did these consequences influence how you will respond in future similar situations?
    f. Will you engage in the same behaviours again in the future?
2. Is there a time when you had to restrict the rights of an individual you support? Describe the situation.
    a. What were your actions in response to this restriction?
    b. Why did you feel you needed to restrict these rights?
    c. What were the consequences?
    d. Who provided these consequences?
    e. Did these consequences influence how you will respond in future similar situations?
    f. Will you engage in the same behaviours again in the future?

3. Please describe a time when the rights of an individual you support could have been restricted but you (or another staff member) prevented this violation.
    a. What were your actions in response to this potential restriction?
    b. Why were their rights not restricted?
    c. What were the consequences?
    d. Who provided these consequences?
    e. Did these consequences influence how you will respond in future similar situations?
    f. Will you engage in the same behaviours again in the future

Appendix 4

BROCK UNIVERSITY & COMMUNITY LIVING WELLAND PELHAM

Research Questionnaire for Staff and Management

Investigation of a Systemic Approach to Human Rights Education: Exploring Organizational Processes

Researchers:

Laura Mullins, Centre for Applied Disability Studies

Frances Owen, Child & Youth Studies and Centre for Applied Disability Studies

The primary focus of this 3Rs research to date has been on evaluating the impact of the training program on people who have intellectual disabilities. This research will focus on the broader systemic aspects to investigate the extent to which the training has an impact on the organizations that support people with disabilities. The purpose of this research will be to examine the cultural and behavioural change across the Association in response to the implementation of the 3Rs Human Rights project.

This study consists of two parts: interviews that have already been conducted and questionnaires. Participating in this part of the study involves answering a questionnaire that focus on identifying changes in you and across the Association in response to the institution of the 3Rs initiative.

Your participation is voluntary, you can complete the questionnaire on work time and you may withdraw from the study at any time with out penalty. All personal data will be kept strictly confidential. Only the researchers named above will have access to the information you give throughout your participation in the study. Your name will not be associated with any comments provided when the results of the study are reported, used for educational purposes and published. Your involvement in the study involves only minimal risk (e.g., feeling uncomfortable disclosing some information). However, all information disclosed will remain completely anonymous.

Your participation in this project is extremely important. It will help to improve the implementation of the 3Rs Human Rights Project in your Association. If you would like to participate, please review, sign the attached consent form, and fill out the questionnaire. Once the competed, please return the signed consent form and questionnaire in the envelope provided and mail them back to the researchers in care of the Dr. Frances Owen at the Child & Youth Studies department.

Please kindly return the completed questionnaires within the next ten days (however, late questionnaires will still be accepted). If you have any questions please contact Laura Mullins, at laura.mullins@brocku.ca or Dr. Frances Owen, at fowen@brocku.ca.

Thank you for your consideration.

Appendix 5

BROCK UNIVERSITY & COMMUNITY LIVING WELLAND PELHAM

Consent for Participants with Questionnaires

Investigation of a Systemic Approach to Human Rights Education: Exploring Organizational Processes

Researchers: Laura Mullins, CADS Frances Owen, CHYS

Name of Participant: (Please print) ______________________________________

I understand that the purpose of the research project in which I have agreed to participate is to help evaluate the 3Rs: Human Rights Project in the Community Living Welland. I understand that Brock University and Community Living Welland Pelham are conducting this study together. I understand that my participation includes filling out a questionnaire related to the promotion of rights of individuals with intellectual disabilities.

I understand that my participation in this study is voluntary and there will be no additional payment for my participation in this study. I understand that I may withdraw from the study at any time and for any reason without penalty.

I understand that my participation in this study may benefit other persons, since any information that is gathered will be used in improving the implementation of the 3Rs Human Rights Project. I also may benefit by learning more about human rights of persons with intellectual disabilities. I understand that, for myself, the risks involved in participating in this study are only minimal (e.g., feeling uncomfortable disclosing some information). However, I am aware that all information disclosed will remain completely anonymous.

I understand that all my personal data will be kept strictly confidential. I understand that only the researchers named above, their research assistants and a certified transcriber will have access to the information I give throughout my participation in the study. My name will not be associated with my comments in this information. I understand that the researchers will publish articles, and make professional and public presentations using the information that all the people who helped in the study have provided. However, if during the course of my participation in the study I tell you that I, or any person I support in my work with the Association, has been abused or will be abused, or is a threat to him/herself or others, the Executive Director will be informed so that this can be reported to the appropriate authorities. I also understand that my personal information will have to be given to the courts if the law requires it.

[ ] Yes, I understand the general nature of this study and my involvement in it. I agree to participate in this study and I understand that I may withdraw from this study at any time without penalty. I also give you permission to use my results in other studies that are similar to this one (this is called "secondary analyses"). I give permission for you to contact me after the study is over to ask me if I would be willing to answer some more questions or be in a new study.

Participant Signature_____________________________ Date: ____________________

This study has been reviewed and approved by the Brock Research Ethics Board. (File # 02-327) If I have any questions or concerns about my participation in the study, I may contact Laura Mullins, (laura.mullins@brocku.ca) or Fran Owen (fowen@brocku.ca) or the Brock University Research Ethics Officer (905) 688-5550, 3035.

Thank you for your help! Please take one copy of this form with you for further reference.

Researcher Signature_____________________________ Date: ____________________

Appendix 6

BROCK UNIVERSITY & COMMUNITY LIVING WELLAND PELHAM
Research Questionnaire for Staff and Management

Investigation of a Systemic Approach to Human Rights Education: Exploring Organizational Processes

Please write the information in the grey area to the right of each of the following:					
Participant Number					
Length of Employment with CLWP					
Number of years in current position					
Job Title: (Please put an X through the box with your job title)	Director	Manager	Supervisor	Co-ordinator	Senor Support Worker

Instructions For Completing the Remainder of the Questionnaire: For each question, please indicate your choice of answer for each and every statement presented (e.g. in Question #2) how strongly do you agree or disagree with each of the statements, by putting an X through the appropriate box (in grey) to the right of each statement.	X

1. Do you believe that your job has changed in response to the 3Rs Project?

Not At All	No	Not Much	Unsure	Some What	Yes	Yes a Lot

Comments:

2. How do you perceive your role in relation to supporting individuals with intellectual/developmental disabilities?
(Please respond to each of the following statements)

2a. I believe I am in control of, supervise, manage the life of individuals supported by the agency	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
2b. I believe I need to support the choices of individuals with intellectual/developmental disabilities	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
2c. I believe I need to support the choices of individuals with intellectual/developmental disabilities, even when their choice go against my personal beliefs	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
2d. I believe I am responsible for the protection of individuals supported by the agency	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree

Comments:

3. Do you believe that your behaviour at work has changed in response to the 3Rs Project?

Not At All	No	Not Much	Unsure	Some What	Yes	Yes a Lot

4. What, if any, change have you seen in yourself since the start of the 3Rs Project?
(Please respond to each of the following statements)

4a. Awareness of rights issues for individuals supported by the agency	A Lot Less	Somewhat Less	Somewhat More	A Lot More
4b. Discussion with peers about rights issues for individuals supported by the agency	A Lot Less	Somewhat Less	Somewhat More	A Lot More
4c. Discussion with supervisors about rights issues for individuals supported by the agency	A Lot Less	Somewhat Less	Somewhat More	A Lot More
4d. Questioning of policies and procedures in regards to rights concerns	A Lot Less	Somewhat Less	Somewhat More	A Lot More
4e. Advocating for the rights of individuals supported by the agency	A Lot Less	Somewhat Less	Somewhat More	A Lot More
4f. Educating others about the rights of intellectual/developmental disabilities	A Lot Less	Somewhat Less	Somewhat More	A Lot More
4g. Focusing on individualized programming (such as offering choices, listening to individuals)	A Lot Less	Somewhat Less	Somewhat More	A Lot More

Comments:

5. What, if any, change have you seen in your manager/supervisor since the start of the 3Rs Project?
(Please respond to each of the following statements)

5a. Discussion about rights issues for individuals supported by the agency	A Lot Less	Somewhat Less	Somewhat More	A Lot More
5b. Focus on individualized programming such as offering choices, listening to individuals)	A Lot Less	Somewhat Less	Somewhat More	A Lot More
5c. Provide assistance to support the rights of individuals supported by the agency	A Lot Less	Somewhat Less	Somewhat More	A Lot More
5d. Educate me about different rights issues and how to address them	A Lot Less	Somewhat Less	Somewhat More	A Lot More
5e. Advocate for the rights of individuals supported by the agency	A Lot Less	Somewhat Less	Somewhat More	A Lot More

6. What, if any, change have you seen in staff since the start of the 3Rs Project?
(Please respond to each of the following statements)

Awareness of rights issues for individuals supported by the agency	A Lot Less	Somewhat Less	Somewhat More	A Lot More
Discussion about rights issues for individuals supported by the agency	A Lot Less	Somewhat Less	Somewhat More	A Lot More
Questioning of policies and procedures in regards to rights concerns	A Lot Less	Somewhat Less	Somewhat More	A Lot More
Advocating for the rights of individuals supported by the agency	A Lot Less	Somewhat Less	Somewhat More	A Lot More
Educating others about the rights of intellectual/developmental disabilities	A Lot Less	Somewhat Less	Somewhat More	A Lot More
Focusing on individualized programming (such as offering choices, listening to individuals)	A Lot Less	Somewhat Less	Somewhat More	A Lot More

7. What does your manager/supervisor do to help you to support the rights of individuals with intellectual/developmental disabilities? (Please respond to each of the following statements)

7a. Provides me with praise and encouragement when I support the rights of individuals supported by the agency	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
7b. Recognizes me formally at staff meetings when I support the rights of individuals supported by the agency	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
7c. Recognizes me formally with letters when I support the rights of individuals supported by the agency	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
7d. Recognizes me formally in performance evaluations when I support the rights of individuals supported by the agency	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
7e. Recognizes me formally with a special celebration such as a going for coffee when I support the rights of individuals supported by the agency	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
7f. Provides me with training / education about rights issues	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
7g. Welcomes discussions about rights concerns	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
7h. Provides me with advice	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
7i. Provides me with feedback about Rights Facilitation Forms	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
7j. Supports me in my advocating for the rights of individuals with outside agencies (medical, employment, etc)	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
7k. Provides me with extra resources i.e., staffing and/or financial support that allow me to support an individuals' rights	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Comments:				

7/8. What, if any, change have you seen in individuals supported by the agency since the start of the 3Rs Project?
(Please respond to each of the following statements)

7a. Assert their rights within the context of respect and responsibility	A Lot Less	Somewhat Less	Somewhat More	A Lot More
7b. Assert their rights but not within the context of respect and responsibility	A Lot Less	Somewhat Less	Somewhat More	A Lot More
7c. Speak up for the rights of their peers	A Lot Less	Somewhat Less	Somewhat More	A Lot More
7d. Discussions with peers about rights	A Lot Less	Somewhat Less	Somewhat More	A Lot More
7e. Discussions with staff about rights	A Lot Less	Somewhat Less	Somewhat More	A Lot More
Comments:				

8. What is your perspective on the Rights Facilitation Forms and the process of handling rights concerns? (Please respond to each of the following statements)				
8a.The formal complaints made on the forms reflect negatively on the staff	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
8b. I don't want to put them in because they are not worth the work	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
8c. Submitting forms is positive because that will influence change in a positive direction	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
8d. I feel uncomfortable raising a concern about a manager/supervisors	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
8e. It is very useful to have feedback from the Rights Facilitation Committee	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
8f. Overall, the process for handling human rights complaints at CLWP is very effective	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
8g. Overall, the process for handling human rights complaints at CLWP has caused more problems that it has solved	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Comments:				

9. What happens to staff when they do not support the rights of individuals with intellectual/developmental disabilities? (Please respond to each of the following statements)				
9a. Manager/supervisor will have a discussion with staff about the importance of supporting rights	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
9b. Manager/supervisor will have a discussion with staff to find out more information about the rights restriction	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
9c. Other staff/peers will have a discussion or correct the rights restriction	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
9d. Individuals supported by the agency will assert themselves with staff who have restricted their rights	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
9e. Disciplinary action and/or termination is taken in relation to the staff who do not support individuals' rights	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
9f. A Rights Facilitation Forms will be submitted against the staff member	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree

10. What makes it difficult for you to support the rights of individuals with intellectual/developmental disabilities? (Please respond to each of the following statements)				
10a. Not enough praise and encouragement for supporting the rights of individuals with intellectual/developmental disabilities	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
10b. Not enough formal recognition for supporting the rights of individuals with intellectual/developmental disabilities	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
10c. I do not have enough training in how to support rights	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
10d. I need access to information about rights (for example from the 3Rs Research Team)	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
10e. I receive negative feedback from outside the agency (for example family members or community)	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
10f. Individuals' own disabilities (consider individual limitations, individuals with severe disabilities)	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
10g. My concern about the safely of individuals with intellectual/developmental disabilities	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
10h. Not enough financial support and/or staffing	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
10i. The group home living situation e.g., balancing the needs of all individuals	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Comments:				

11. What would help you to support the rights of individuals with intellectual/developmental disabilities even more than you do now? (Please respond to each of the following statements)				
More training / education about rights issues (e.g. The 3Rs Team)	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Feedback about concerns expressed on Rights Facilitation Forms	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
More financial support and/or staffing	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Praise, recognition and encouragement for supporting the rights of individuals with intellectual/developmental disabilities	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Formal recognition for supporting the rights of individuals with intellectual/developmental disabilities	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree

12. Why is it important to you to support the rights of individuals with intellectual/developmental disabilities? (Please respond to each of the following statements)				
12a. I believe all people have rights	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
12b. Every person deserves to be treated as a unique individual	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
12c. It is important to speak for individuals who can't speak for themselves	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
12d. People in my personal life have had disabilities and needed someone to advocate for their rights	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
12e. It is important for people to have outcomes and achieve goals (rights are part of outcomes)	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
12f. Just because it is now part of my job (and job description)	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Comments:				

13. When you support the rights of individuals with intellectual/developmental disabilities, what do you tell yourself? (Please respond to each of the following statements)				
13a. That was a lot of work, but definitely worth it	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
13b. That was a lot of work, really and not that important	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
13c. I did a good job	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Comments:				

14. As a person in a managerial role, how do you provide your staff with support to allow them to advocate for the rights of individuals with intellectual/developmental disabilities? (Please respond to each of the following statements)					
I provide praise and encouragement to my staff when they support rights	N/A	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I recognize the staff formally at staff meetings when they support rights	N/A	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I recognize the staff formally with letters when they support rights	N/A	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I recognize the staff formally in performance evaluations when they support rights	N/A	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I recognize the staff formally with a celebration such as going for coffee when they support rights	N/A	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I provide my staff with training / education about rights issues	N/A	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I welcome discussions about rights concerns	N/A	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I provide staff with advice	N/A	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I provide my staff with feedback about Rights Facilitation Forms	N/A	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I support my staff in their advocating for rights of individuals with outside agencies (medical, employment, etc)	N/A	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I provide (or seek out) my staff with extra resources i.e., staffing and/or financial support that allow me to support an individuals' rights	N/A	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Comments:					

Any additional comments you wish to make about the 3Rs initiative within CLWP:

Tables

Table 1

Reported changes in job/work in response to the 3Rs Project

	Participant Responses						
Combined Positions	Not At All	No	Not Much	Unsure	Some What	Yes	Yes a Lot
Do you believe that your job has changed in response to the 3Rs Project?	0	1	2	0	3	3	2
Do you believe that your behaviour at work has changed in response to the 3Rs Project?	0	0	1	0	6	2	2

Table 2

How do you perceive your role in relation to supporting individuals with intellectual/developmental disabilities?

	Participant Responses			
Combined Positions	Unsure	Some What	Yes	Yes a Lot
I believe I am in control of, supervise, manage the life of individuals with ID	5	4	1	0
I believe I need to support the choices of individuals with ID	0	1	3	7
I believe I need to support the choices of individuals with ID, even when their choices go against my personal beliefs	0	0	3	8
I believe I am responsible for the protection of individuals with ID	0	1	5	4

* 1 Missing value

Table 3

Why is it important to you to support the rights of individuals with intellectual /developmental disabilities?

	Participant Responses			
Combined Positions	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I believe all people have rights	0	0	1	10
Every person deserves to be treated as a unique individual	0	0	1	10
It is important to speak for individuals who can't speak for themselves	0	0	1	10
People in my personal life have had disabilities and needed someone to advocate for their rights *	1	3	2	3
It is important for people to have outcomes and achieve goals (rights are part of outcomes)	0	1	2	8
Just because it is now part of my job (and job description)	3	6	0	2

* 2 Missing Values

Table 4

When you support the rights of individuals with intellectual/developmental disabilities, what do you tell yourself?

Combined Positions	Participant Responses			
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I did a good job	2	1	6	2
That was a lot of work, but definitely worth it	1	1	8	1
That was a lot of work and not that important	5	6	0	0

Table 5

What, if any, changes have you seen in individuals supported by the agency since the start of the 3Rs Project?

	Participant Responses			
Combined Positions	A Lot Less	Some What Less	Some What More	A Lot More
Assert their rights within the context of respect and responsibility	0	2	8	1
Assert their rights but not within the context of respect and responsibility	0	0	5	6
Speak up for the rights of their peers	0	0	10	1
Discussions with peers about rights	0	0	9	2
Discussions with staff about rights	0	0	9	2

Table 6

What, if any, changes have you seen in yourself since the start of the 3Rs Project?

Combined Positions	Participant Responses A Lot Less	Some What Less	Some What More	A Lot More
Awareness of rights issues of individuals with ID	0	0	7	4
Discussion with peers about rights issues	0	0	5	6
Discussion with supervisors about right issues	0	1	6	4
Questioning of policies and procedures in regards to rights concerns	0	1	6	4
Advocating for the rights of individuals with ID	0	0	7	4
Educating others about rights	0	0	3	7
Focusing on individualized programming	0	0	5	6

Table 7

What, if any, changes have you seen in staff since the start of the 3Rs Project?

	Participant Responses			
	A Lot Less	Some What Less	Some What More	A Lot More
Management Position				
Awareness of rights issues	0	0	0	6
Discussion about rights issues	0	0	2	4
Questioning of policies and procedures in regards to rights concerns	0	0	5	1
Advocating for the rights of individuals with ID	0	0	5	1
Educating others about the rights	0	0	4	2
Focusing on individualized programming	0	0	2	4
Staff Position				
Awareness of rights issues	0	0	5	0
Discussion about rights issues	0	0	5	0
Questioning of policies and procedures in regards to rights concerns	0	0	5	0
Advocating for the rights of individuals with ID	0	0	5	0
Educating others about the rights	0	0	5	0
Focusing on individualized programming	0	0	4	1
Awareness of rights issues	0	0	1	4

Table 8

What, if any, changes have you seen in your manager/supervisor since the start of the 3Rs Project?

	Participant Responses			
Combined Positions	A Lot Less	Some What Less	Some What More	A Lot More
Discussion about rights issues	0	0	7	4
Focus on individualized programming such as offering choices, listening to individuals	0	0	8	3
Provide assistance to support the rights of individuals with ID	0	1	7	3
Educate me about different rights issues and how to address them	0	1	8	2
Advocate for the rights of individuals with ID	0	1	6	3

* 1 Missing Value

Table 9

What does your manager/supervisor do to help you to support the rights of individuals with intellectual/developmental disabilities?

	Participant Responses			
Management Position	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Provides me with praise and encouragement when I support rights	0	2	3	0
Recognizes me formally at staff meetings when I support the rights of individuals with ID	1	1	3	0
Recognizes me formally with letters when I support the rights of individuals with ID	1	4	0	0
Recognizes me formally in performance evaluations when I support rights	1	3	1	0
Recognizes me formally with a special celebration (i.e. coffee) for supporting rights	1	4	0	0
Provides me with training / education about rights issues	0	2	2	1
Welcomes discussions about rights concerns	0	0	3	3
Provides me with advice	0	2	1	3
Provides me with feedback about Rights Facilitation Forms	0	2	2	2
Supports me in my advocating for the rights of individuals with outside agencies	0	1	3	1
Provides me with extra resources (i.e. financial, staffing support) to support rights	0	2	2	1

* 8 Missing Values

Table 10

What does your manager/supervisor do to help you to support the rights of individuals with intellectual/developmental disabilities?

	Participant Responses			
Staff Position	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongl y Agree
Provides me with praise and encouragement when I support rights	0	1	3	1
Recognizes me formally at staff meetings when I support the rights of individuals with ID	0	2	3	0
Recognizes me formally with letters when I support the rights of individuals with ID	0	3	2	0
Recognizes me formally in performance evaluations when I support rights	0	2	2	1
Recognizes me formally with a special celebration (i.e. coffee) for supporting rights	1	3	1	0
Provides me with training / education about rights issues	0	0	5	0
Welcomes discussions about rights concerns	0	0	4	1
Provides me with advice	0	0	4	1
Provides me with feedback about Rights Facilitation Forms	0	0	4	1
Supports me in my advocating for the rights of individuals with outside agencies	0	0	4	1
Provides me with extra resources (i.e. financial, staffing support) to support rights	1	1	2	1

Table 11

As a person in a managerial role, how do you provide your staff with support to allow them to advocate for the rights of individuals with intellectual/developmental disabilities?

	Participant Responses				
Management Position	N/A	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I provide praise and encouragement to my staff when they support rights	3	0	0	6	0
I recognize the staff formally at staff meetings when they support rights	4	0	1	4	0
I recognize the staff formally with letters when they support rights	4	0	3	2	0
I recognize the staff formally in performance evaluations when they support rights	4	0	0	4	1
I recognize the staff formally with a special celebration (i.e. coffee) for supporting rights	4	0	4	1	0
I provide my staff with training / education about rights issues	4	0	0	5	0
I welcome discussions about rights concerns	2	0	0	3	4
I provide staff with advice	2	0	1	3	3
I provide my staff with feedback about Rights Facilitation Forms	4	0	0	4	1
I support my staff in their advocating for rights of individuals with outside agencies	2	0	0	3	4
I provide (or seek out) extra resources (i.e. financial, staffing support) to support rights	3	0	0	4	2

* 2 Missing Values per Statement

Table 12

What makes it difficult for you to support the rights of individuals with intellectual/developmental disabilities?

	Participant Responses			
Management Position	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Not enough praise and encouragement for supporting rights	2	3	1	0
Not enough formal recognition for supporting rights	1	2	2	1
I do not have enough training in how to support rights	2	4	0	0
I need access to information about rights	3	2	1	0
I receive negative feedback from outside the agency	1	4	1	0
Individuals' own disabilities (consider individual limitations)	1	3	2	0
My concern about the safely of individuals with ID	2	4	0	0
Not enough financial support and/or staffing	1	2	2	1
The group home living situation e.g., balancing all individual needs	1	1	4	0
Staff Position				
Not enough praise and encouragement for supporting rights	2	3	0	0
Not enough formal recognition for supporting rights	2	3	0	0
I do not have enough training in how to support rights	2	3	0	0
I need access to information about rights	2	3	0	0
I receive negative feedback from outside the agency	2	2	1	0
Individuals' own disabilities (consider individual limitations)	1	3	1	0
My concern about the safely of individuals with ID	1	1	2	1
Not enough financial support and/or staffing *	1	1	1	0
The group home living situation e.g., balancing all individual needs	1	2	2	0

* 2 Missing Values

Table 13

What would help you to support the rights of individuals with intellectual /developmental disabilities even more than you do now?

Combined Positions	Participant Responses			
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
More training / education about rights issues	1	5	5	0
Feedback about concerns expressed on Rights Facilitation Forms	1	1	8	1
More financial support and/or staffing	1	2	7	1
Praise, recognition and encouragement for supporting the rights of individuals with ID	0	3	6	2
Formal recognition for supporting the rights of individuals with ID	0	6	3	2

Table 14

What happens to staff when they do not support the rights of individuals with intellectual/developmental disabilities?

Combined Positions	Participant Responses			
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Manager/supervisor will have a discussion with staff about the importance of supporting rights	0	1	7	3
Manager/supervisor will have a discussion with staff to find out more information about the rights restriction	0	0	8	3
Other staff/peers will have a discussion or correct the rights restriction	0	1	10	0
Individuals supported by the agency will assert themselves with staff who have restricted their rights	1	5	5	0
A Rights Facilitation Form will be submitted against the staff member	1	3	7	0
Disciplinary action and/or termination is taken in relation to the staff who do not support individuals' rights	2	5	4	0

Table 15

What is your perspective on the Rights Facilitation Forms and the process of handling rights concerns?

	Participant Responses			
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Management Position				
The formal complaints made on the forms reflect negatively on the staff	0	5	1	0
I don't want to put them in because they are not worth the work	2	3	1	0
Submitting forms is positive because that will influence change in a positive direction	0	1	3	2
I feel uncomfortable raising a concern about a manager/supervisors	1	2	2	1
It is very useful to have feedback from the Rights Facilitation Committee	0	0	3	3
Overall, the process for handling human rights complaints at CLWP is very effective	0	3	2	1
Overall, the process for handling human rights complaints at CLWP has caused more problems than it has solved	0	3	2	1
Staff Position				
The formal complaints made on the forms reflect negatively on the staff	0	4	1	0
I don't want to put them in because they are not worth the work	1	4	0	0
Submitting forms is positive because that will influence change in a positive direction	0	1	3	1
I feel uncomfortable raising a concern about a manager/supervisors	0	4	1	0
It is very useful to have feedback from the Rights Facilitation Committee	0	0	4	1
Overall, the process for handling human rights complaints at CLWP is very effective	0	1	4	0
Overall, the process for handling human rights complaints at CLWP has caused more problems that it has solved	1	4	0	0