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INTRODUCTION

The Normalisation Training Project was funded by the Commonwealth Department of Community Services and Health for a period of twelve months during 1987. Under the auspices of the Centre for the Development of Human Resources of the Western Australian College of Advanced Education the Project provided eight training workshops for human service workers on the principles of Normalisation.

There were two types of workshops. A two-day programme was offered on "An Introduction to Normalisation (Social Role Valorisation)". These workshops were introductory and designed for people who had only limited exposure to the principles of Normalisation. Participants examined many of the key value questions that play a role in the quality of life of persons who are socially devalued. This involved exposure to Normalisation principles (or Social Role Valorisation Theory) and their potential contribution to improving the quality of personal and community life.

The PASSING workshops (Program Assessment of Service Systems' Implementation of Normalisation Goals) were designed for people who may have had previous experience with, or exposure to Normalisation and who wished to extend their understanding and skills. PASSING is an evaluation and training instrument based on Normalisation theory. These live-in workshops were conducted over a period of five days.

The focus of the workshops was on the needs of people who are elderly and people with disabilities. However, the principles of Normalisation are relevant to other groups of people who are marginalised such as poor people, people from different ethnic backgrounds and people with mental illness.

Nearly two hundred people attended the workshops. Participants were workers in various human service areas including disability and aged services and mental health, consumers of services, students, parents and advocates. A number of people who attended an introductory workshop later participated in a PASSING workshop.

At the conclusion of each workshop participants were required to complete an evaluation questionnaire. Staff from the Department of Community Services and Health who had participated in the workshops were involved in a review conducted by the Staff Training and Development Branch of that Department. The focus of the current study was to evaluate the impact of the workshops on the work practices of human service personnel. The study is funded by the Commonwealth Department of Community Services and Health.
2.0 AIMS OF THE STUDY

At the completion of each workshop participants completed an evaluation questionnaire designed to assess the quality of the workshop. The purpose of this study is primarily to obtain a measure of the impact of the workshop on subsequent work-related behaviours and attitudes. Participants, however, were given the opportunity to comment on the workshops in the current study for several reasons. First, the inclusion of a number of items on the workshop served to focus the remainder of the questionnaire for the respondents. Second, it was thought to be useful to obtain evaluative data on the workshops after participants had had time to reflect upon the experience. Third, the latter data could be used to cross-validate the responses given to the questionnaire completed at the conclusion of the workshop.

2.1 Evaluation of the Workshop

The evaluation questionnaire was designed to examine five aspects of the workshops.

(a) Participant Satisfaction

Many factors contribute to the level of satisfaction of participants including the quality of the lecturers, the quality of the venue, opportunity for participants to contribute and the issues addressed by the workshop. The index of satisfaction used in this study was the relationship between expectations participants brought to the workshops and outcomes.

(b) Achieved Level of Understanding

It was not appropriate to objectively assess the level of understanding of the principles of Normalisation achieved by participants. A subjective report by participants on how well they believed they understand these principles can be taken as a measure of the effectiveness of the workshop.

(c) Issues Raised in the Workshop

Identifying those issues perceived to be of greatest importance to the participants can be taken as an index of the extent to which the workshops achieved the stated objectives. This information might also be used in the planning of future workshops.

(d) Consideration of Issues

Data obtained from earlier evaluations indicated that participants found the workshops to be rigorous and demanding. This raises the question of whether there is simply sufficient time allocated to give full consideration of all the issues, or did the workshops attempt to achieve too much in the time available?
3.

(e) Teaching/Learning Processes

A variety of teaching strategies were used in the workshops, including lectures, small group discussions and practical learning activities. Information was sought on the overall effectiveness of these teaching strategies.

2.2 Impact of the Workshops

The study examines the impact of the workshops on the work-related attitudes and practices of participants. It is this aspect of the Project that has not been evaluated to date. Obviously, if the workshops are to serve a useful purpose it must be in the application of knowledge to the work place.

(a) Work Attitudes

Central to the principles of Normalisation is the attitude of caregivers to their clients. The protagonists of Normalisation firmly believe that the quality of life of clients is substantially diminished by the attitudes of the service providers. Thus, it would be expected that the workshops would have a significant impact upon the work attitudes of the participants.

(b) Work Satisfaction

It is not assumed that an unidimensional relationship exists between work satisfaction and the workshops. For those participants who derive substantial satisfaction from improving the quality of the clients well-being, at least two outcomes are possible. First, the participants may achieve a greater level of work satisfaction through the application of the principles of Normalisation to the work place with positive outcomes. Second, those participants who subscribe to the principles in full may become more dissatisfied if it is not possible for them to apply these principles in the workplace. Other participants will derive satisfaction from other aspects of their work such as staff relations, public relations, cost-efficient management, etc. and will not see the Normalisation workshops as relevant to work satisfaction. The study will bear some light on these issues.
(c) Application of Normalisation principles.

A fundamental question is whether the participants believe that the principles of Normalisation have application in human service agencies in Western Australia. Staff from some agencies have expressed the belief that there may be a conflict between applying Normalisation principles and discharging their legal or moral responsibilities. Other agencies have made a strong commitment to the philosophy of Least Restrictive Alternatives in the provision of care for their clients in recent years. Normalisation is built on a values base that does not have universal support among human service providers.

(d) Implementation of Normalisation Principles

Given that there is support for the principles of Normalisation among workshop participants the associated question is the extent to which it is possible to implement these principles in the workplace. A number of factors may mitigate against the implementation including lack of training, resistance by management, entrenched attitudes of staff, or associated costs.

(e) Work Practices

A direct measure of the impact of the Normalisation workshops is an indication of any changes to work practices that have occurred, or that participants may wish to introduce as a result of attending the workshop. Not only the frequency of the changes but also the types of changes will provide an insight into the effectiveness of the workshops.

(f) Professional Development

The study investigated the perception of the workshops by the participants in terms of professional development of human service workers. The issues addressed include the place of Normalisation in terms of the participants' own development and the importance of Normalisation in terms of training priorities in their agency.

(g) Networking

The sustained application of the principles of Normalisation in human service agencies is dependent upon the extent to which the field is prepared to support it. This issue is not independent of the professional development question. However, the effectiveness of the workshops can be assessed in terms of expressed willingness of participants to develop Normalisation in the industry.
3.0 PROCEDURES

The investigator did not participate in any of the workshops. To develop the questionnaire the investigator reviewed the evaluation reports that had been completed by participants at the conclusion of their workshop. A number of consultations were held with the project co-ordinator, Mr Errol Cocks, to identify those issues that should be addressed in the questionnaire.

The investigator had the opportunity to attend the Normalisation Review Workshop conducted by Staff Training and Development of the Department of Community Services and Health in December, 1987. This workshop provided a valuable opportunity to learn from Departmental participants. The workshop briefly reviewed the objectives of the Normalisation Training Project and what had been accomplished to date. After a recapitulation of the basic principles of Normalisation an evaluation questionnaire was completed by participants. This was followed by small group discussions leading to recommendations for the application of Normalisation principles in the work of programme areas.

The investigator decided not to approach other workshop participants for background information in the development of the questionnaire. This deliberate decision was taken in light of the fact that participants had signed a confidentiality pledge and may have felt compromised if asked to discuss the workshop experience.

As mentioned above, the investigator did have discussions with the Project Co-ordinator, Mr Errol Cocks and other persons regarding the construction of the questionnaire. However, it must be stated that the investigator accepts full responsibility for the final form of the questionnaire.

The questionnaire (see Appendix 2) was mailed out to all participants on February 10, 1988. Participants were requested to return the questionnaire to the investigator in the stamped-addressed envelope provided by March 1, 1988.

The questionnaires were individually numbered and the investigator is able to identify the respondents for the purposes of data analysis. Participants were informed of this procedure but were assured that all information would be treated in strict confidence. The prime purpose in numbering the questionnaires was to enable the investigator to follow up participants with a reminder should it turn out that the response rate was unsatisfactory.
4.0 PARTICIPANTS

The Normalisation Training Project conducted eight workshops during 1987. The Department of Community Services and Health previously funded two PASSING workshops which were conducted in 1986. A number of people who attended the 1986 workshops also participated in later workshops. Therefore, it was decided to distribute questionnaires to all those who had participated in the 1986 programme.

One hundred and eighty-nine people participated in one or more of the ten workshops conducted between July, 1986 and November, 1987. The number of participants who attended the workshops ranged from 23 for the initial workshop to 43 who attended a workshop on 'An Introduction to Normalisation' under the direction of Michael Kendrick, Director of the Normalisation Safeguards Project in Western Massachusetts. The usual size of the remaining workshops was about 33 participants.

Information on the agencies represented by participants at the workshops has been detailed in previous reports by the Project Co-ordinator. Suffice to say here that the major government and voluntary agencies in the fields of aged care and habilitation have sent staff to the workshops. Other organizations involved in the workshops include parent action groups and tertiary institutions.

The participants were employed at various levels within the different agencies ranging from Board members and administrators through to direct-care providers, parents and students. Thus, the experience of the participants in the human services field was widespread. Similarly, their prior knowledge of the principles of Normalisation ranged from minimal to substantial.

It is not clear how participants were selected by their agencies for the workshops. At least in some cases, attendance was on a straightforward voluntary basis. There is evidence to suggest that, in a few instances, the participants may have been directed to attend the workshop by their agency. It may be expected that these participants would not necessarily have strong positive feelings towards the workshop experience.
5.0 METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES

It is important for the interpretation of the data obtained from the survey that this study is not viewed as a summative evaluation of the Normalisation Training Project. A central component of the project was the implementation of a programme of formative evaluations. At the completion of each workshop, feedback was received from participants. This information was used to improve the subsequent workshops.

The formative evaluation strategy has meant that, in a number of ways, the workshops were quite different from one another. For example, if a venue selected for one workshop was found to be unsatisfactory then a better one was used for the following workshops. If the organizers felt that too many participants attended a workshop then the numbers were deliberately reduced.

Over time the skills of the team leaders involved in the workshops became more practiced. After eighteen months of conducting the workshops a small team of people have become highly competent in managing the workshop processes. The backgrounds of participants varied from one workshop to another in terms of their professional experience, the type of work in which they were engaged and their previous knowledge of the principles of Normalisation. For example, one workshop was conducted in Bunbury rather than in Perth. Hence, the participants in this workshop differed in the types of agencies they represented, as did their role in the agencies. The common characteristic across all workshops was the heterogeneous nature of each group.

It was necessary to take into account the heterogeneity of the groups in constructing the questionnaire. Obviously the degree of specificity of the questions was limited by this factor. It was necessary to frame the questions to ensure general applicability to as many participants as possible.

The time interval that occurred between participation in a workshop and responding to the evaluation questionnaire ranged from three to eighteen months. Thus, there were significant differences in terms of the demands made on participants to recollect the events of the workshop they attended. As would be predicted, the response rate was considerably lower for the workshops conducted in 1986 than in 1987.

It was not possible to construct a questionnaire that permitted respondents who had participated in more than one workshop to comment on each workshop separately. To have done so would have meant the questionnaire would have become unwieldy. To have asked respondents to complete separate questionnaires for each workshop they attended would have been excessive. Thus the analysis of the data yielded by the survey is constrained by the fact that some respondents attended several workshops.

The critical question in any survey of this nature is to determine the usefulness of the information obtained. Bearing in mind, the methodological limitations of the study it is possible to identify a number of clear-cut findings.
6.0 RESPONSE RATE

Questionnaires were distributed to 189 participants of the ten workshops conducted over a period of eighteen months under the auspices of the project. 71 questionnaires were returned, representing a response rate of 37%. The response rate for individual workshops ranged from 15% to 48%.

In terms of surveys of this nature the response rate is at a predictable level, particularly as nearly 18 months had passed since the first workshop had been conducted. In that time a number of participants had changed their occupations or had left the workforce and were unable to be contacted.

Table 1 indicates the number of respondents according to the workshop attended.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1: WORKSHOP ATTENDED BY RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introduction to Normalisation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 - 23 April 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - 9 July 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 7 August 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - 10 September 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 - 18 October 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No of Participants</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No of Respondents</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response Rate (%)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **PASSING Workshop**                      |
| **Date**                                  |
| 14 - 18 July 1986                         |
| 1 - 5 December 1986                       |
| 18 - 22 May 1987                          |
| 10 - 13 August 1987                       |
| 23 - 27 November 1987                     |
| **No of Participants**                    |
| 23                                        |
| 34                                        |
| 32                                        |
| 24                                        |
| 33                                        |
| **No of Respondents**                     |
| 6                                         |
| 5                                         |
| 14                                        |
| 8                                         |
| 16                                        |
| **Response Rate (%)**                     |
| 26%                                       |
| 15%                                       |
| 44%                                       |
| 33%                                       |
| 48%                                       |

Note: Fifteen respondents participated in more than one workshop.
7.0 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Given the methodological limitations of the study it is nevertheless possible to interpret the obtained data with a degree of confidence on those dimensions identified at the outset.

1. Participant Satisfaction.

More than ninety per cent of respondents were satisfied, or very satisfied, with the workshop(s) they attended in terms of effectiveness. Taking into account that satisfied participants are more likely to return the questionnaire than those who are dissatisfied it appears safe to conclude that the project was successful on this dimension. Confidence in this conclusion is sustained by the fact that similar findings were consistently reported in the evaluative studies conducted at the conclusion of each workshop.

2. Achieved Level of Understanding

Again, more than ninety per cent of respondents stated that they had acquired a sound understanding of the principles of Normalisation. It is necessary to be circumspect in interpreting this item. Clearly, from some respondents further comments there was only limited understanding of the concepts presented in the workshops. Nevertheless, the fact that a large majority of participants believe they have understanding of the principles may be taken as testimony to the workshop effectiveness. The fact that a majority of respondents indicated that they would like to attend further workshops on Normalisation suggests a realistic evaluation by participants.

3. Issues Raised in the Workshop

An analysis of the respondents' comments indicates that three main issues arose out of the workshop. First, there was widespread agreement on the realization of how easy it is to devalue clients of the agency. Clearly, the workshop experience had a powerful effect on many participants in terms of raising their awareness of the issue of devaluation. Second, the importance of implementing the principles of Normalisation in the workplace was seen as a critical issue. Third, the concept of analysing human services in terms of model coherency was recalled as a significant issue by a number of participants.

4. Further Consideration of Issues

There was a general consensus of opinion expressed by respondents that the workshop programme was tightly packed and to have spent more time on any one issue would have been at the expense of other equally important issues. To overcome this problem a number of people suggested a follow-up workshop would provide an opportunity for discussion of issues after a period of reflection.
Several respondents expressed a need to consider the application of Normalisation principles in specific situations, or exploration of strategies that might be employed to implement these principles.

5. Teaching/Learning Processes

The data suggests that the teaching/learning processes employed in the workshops were generally well organized and effectively presented. The most outstanding experience was clearly the on-site visit which was conducted during the PASSING workshops.

6. Work Attitudes

80 per cent of respondents indicated that the workshop experience challenged their attitudes towards work. An analysis of the questionnaires shows that those respondents who were unchallenged by the workshop generally had some previous experience with the principles of Normalisation.

7. Work Satisfaction

A little more than 50% of respondents indicated that work satisfaction had been enhanced by attendance at the workshop. Those respondents who did not experience any improved work satisfaction tended to fall into one of two categories. Those in the first category did not see any relationship between the workshop experience and job satisfaction. In the second category respondents were ambivalent. Their work was less satisfying because they were unable to implement the principles of Normalisation.

8. Application of Normalisation Principles

There was almost unanimous agreement (94%) among respondents that the principles of Normalisation should be implemented in their agency. Normalisation is clearly perceived to be an effective way of improving the quality of life of the clients served by the agency.

Many respondents realised that Normalisation could be applied to a wide range of human service organizations. Among the services that were suggested as needing exposure to the principles of Normalisation were the Education Department, Department of Corrective Services, the Police Department and the Department of Aboriginal Affairs. The important point here is, that whether or not these agencies would benefit from training in Normalisation, the participants appreciated that the process of Normalisation has broad application.

9. Implementation of Normalisation Principles

Responses to Item 10 of the questionnaire, which deals with the degree of difficulty associated with the implementation of Normalisation, were evenly distributed. Some agencies have a very positive attitude towards implementing Normalisation and have undertaken to do so. Other agencies apparently have not embraced the concept wholeheartedly.
The major difficulty in introducing the principles of Normalisation into human service agencies, as perceived by the respondents, is to change the attitudes of staff. This can only be achieved through an educational programme which would draw heavily upon limited resources.

Half of the respondents were reasonably confident that they would be able to introduce Normalisation in their agency.

10. Work Practices

A significant proportion of respondents were able to mention changes that had occurred in work practices as a result of attending a workshop. These changes ranged from environmental improvements, such as the abolition of staff uniforms, to in-service courses to staff. Behavioural changes such as heightened empathy for the needs of clients was frequently reported.

A similar number of comments were made regarding changes to work practices that respondents would like to make. The nature of the suggested change indicates that the participants had an appreciation of the principles of Normalisation.

11. Professional Development

Ninety per cent of respondents indicated that they would recommend attendance at a similar workshop to their work colleagues. This level of recommendation is probably the clearest endorsement of the programme.

Fifty seven per cent of respondents would be willing to attend another workshop to further their understanding of Normalisation principles. Among the respondents not interested in attending further workshops were a preponderance who were not engaged in the direct delivery of services to clients such as members of organizational boards or staff of DCS and H.

Sixty three per cent of respondents identified Normalisation as a training priority for staff in their agency.

12. Networking

Twenty five people expressed an interest in becoming part of a network to extend the application of Normalisation principles. The most frequently cited reason for not participating in such a network was lack of time.

Most respondents had not established closer contacts with other agencies since attending the workshop. Fourteen people indicated that they had done so.
8.0 CONCLUSION

This study set out to evaluate two types of workshops conducted under the auspices of the Normalisation Training Project. One type of workshop provided a two-day programme on "Introduction to Normalisation". The other type of workshop took the form of a five-day live-in programme on "PASSING". For methodological reasons and because of the response rate the analysis of the data did not discriminate between the two types of workshops.

The evaluation study was designed to assess the perceived quality of the workshops and the impact of the workshops on work-related behaviours and attitudes.

While a small number of respondents were critical of different aspects of the workshops, such as the intensity of the programme or the quality of lectures in some workshops, it is clear that the overwhelming majority of respondents rated the workshops very highly. These results confirm the findings of the evaluation studies conducted at the conclusion of each of the workshops. This may be taken as an endorsement of the professional approach of the Project Co-ordinator, Mr Errol Cocks, to the management of the workshops.

There is a strong acceptance by respondents for the place of Normalisation principles in the field of human services, though a number of difficulties associated with implementation were identified. Training in the principles of Normalisation was recognized as an important priority for human service workers. The number of changes to work practices that were reported by respondents supports the relevance of the Normalisation approach.

In conclusion, it appears that a strong demand exists within the human services field for further training in the principles of Normalisation. The application of these principles is seen to have the potential to significantly improve the quality of life of clients.
APPENDIX 1

ITEM ANALYSIS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE
ITEM ANALYSIS

The following analysis of the returned questionnaires includes:

1. A percentage breakdown of responses to category-type items.

2. A selection of comments made by respondents where appropriate. The comments have been deliberately selected to reflect the percentage of responses in each of the categories and to provide as much information as possible on the reasons respondents made their judgments.

3. In some category-response items the respondents were not given the opportunity to comment further. In these cases the investigator has added comment based on an interpretation of the information obtained from the questionnaires.
1. MY EXPECTATIONS OF THE WORKSHOP(S) WERE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOT SATISFIED</th>
<th>SATISFIED</th>
<th>VERY SATISFIED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents' Comments:

"Very professional, well organized presentations."

"I was bombarded with far too much information."

"It is difficult to remember my expectations nearly 12 months on. However, I remember feeling after the event that it was interesting."

"I have never before attended a course which was so meaningful and relevant."

"I expected to gain a basic understanding. The two courses provided a greater level of analysis than I expected."

"I have been more than satisfied with the professionalism of the whole project."

"I was not looking forward to a week of an apparently very intensive and taxing learning experience. I was satisfied though with the extent to which my knowledge was increased."

"A great deal of theory was presented over the two days but time was allowed for discussion and practical exercises."

"Attendance at a single workshop is not enough to acquire full understanding of SRV."

"Only introductory theoretical session valuable."

"I expected a full two days of theory, theory, theory. But was relieved to find it was not just that."

"Unbalanced emphasis on the negative."

"I had previously been informed of the demanding nature of the workshops, but found that they weren't as bad as I expected."

"Very thought-provoking and challenging."

"The course really heightened my awareness of the issues surrounding normalisation and their relevance to the individual service user."
2. THE WORKSHOP HAS GIVEN ME A SOUND UNDERSTANDING OF THE NORMALISATION PRINCIPLES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents' comments:

"The workshop has given me an understanding of normalisation principles but two days is not enough for a complete and total understanding."

"I have realised the true meaning of Normalisation but still find it difficult to put it fully into practise."

"I thought I knew what normalisation was. How wrong I was. I now have a better understanding."

"I am working in an area where this understanding is invaluable. The workshop(s) have clarified a number of issues."

"Obviously five days is not enough to fully appreciate and assess the value of normalisation principles."

"I could have been far better grounded in these principles if the principles were more simply and briefly stated."

"The presentation of the theory component of the workshop was logical, clear and easy to understand."

"It is still very easy to make mistakes."

"I had previously thought I was fully conversant with the principles of Normalisation, but I realised after the course that I have gained a much more heightened awareness of the issues involved."

"The principles now sit very comfortably with me. A recent transfer to DCS & H, Disability Services section helped reinforce the issues of SRV."

"I feel I understand much more of the devalued persons problems in everyday life."

"It was useful having the participants coming from a diverse background of human service occupations. Thus, I was taught to look broadly at the principles and apply them to a variety of settings."

"Still need further study to fully comprehend more of the principles."

"Although I had studied the principles of Normalisation in the past two years, I felt the workshop was very valuable revision and yet still contained many new concepts on Normalisation that were new to me."
3. CAN YOU RECALL ANY ISSUES IN THE WORKSHOP THAT WERE PRESENTED IN A PARTICULARLY MEANINGFULLY WAY?

Respondents' Comments:

"Group discussion on the pros and cons of providing as 'normal' an environment as possible, as opposed to the need to protect and support the individual."

"How easy it is to devalue a person, particularly taking away independence in small areas."

"The issues on devaluation of the elderly and handicapped."

"The boredom, feeling of uselessness and lack of control over their life inflicted on many people, e.g. the elderly, by the general community."

"I though the film was very powerful and that when concrete examples of the principles were given, it was very clear and meaningful. When the jargon and principles were presented without such reference, it was difficult to follow."

"That these people have been very hurt - and how easy it is to hurt them. Also that they have human needs."

"I particularly enjoyed the group work. Breaking into the small groups helped me to pick up on many other ideas."

"Significance of the symbols of devaluation through location/external features of buildings/access to public."

"The model coherency analysis was a most useful tool to clarify and resolve issues and facilitated a more meaningful conciliation."

"At the beginning of the conciliation we were asked to describe/explain the individual from the service being assessed, who we had been associated with."

"The importance of positive imagery; the exercises of looking at a person who does not have a disability v's the same person with a disability and what consequences this has on their perceived future (e.g. dreams, visions, aspirations, etc.)"

"The team leader summary of the facilities that each team had visited, was to me very thought provoking - and I became very emotional as I became deeply aware of the issues."

"The fact that we concentrated on WHAT was happening rather than WHY it was happening. This makes PASSING a useful tool but means it is not a stand along measurement technique."

"The on-site experience at the particular institution was most meaningful and a graphic experience."

"Model coherency - this provided a framework for service design and analysis to ensure that the appropriate service was provided by the appropriate people in an appropriate manner."
4. **ON REFLECTION WERE THERE ISSUES RAISED IN THE WORKSHOP THAT YOU WOULD HAVE LIKED TO HAVE SPENT MORE TIME ON?**

Respondents' Comments:

"How society measures itself by establishing its boundaries of 'deviance' would have been interesting to explore further."

"Yes, Application of the principles of Normalisation to a particular staff-client or general facility situation. The difficulty seems to me that 'how' and 'with whose help' does an individual care worker change the rules, the environment, senior staff, etc."

"Resolving feelings after the workshop, e.g. I felt terrible not being able to do something for the individuals we met."

"I suppose the least satisfying aspect is the final sessions when we determine action for change. The 'commonsense' approaches suggested make one realise that the lives people are living are often needlessly made bad."

"Not during the workshop, but a reconvening after 1 - 2 weeks would be helpful."

"Yes, more time discussing on documenting OH projection data - all too quick."

"The Conservation Corollary - there was just so much to take in, in such a little time, that I know it left many confused."

"Most issues cannot be adequately explored in one workshop."

"Without extending the length of the workshop, there is nothing I would have liked to spend more time on. It served as useful introduction."

"More discussion of the rating used. On occasions I felt uncomfortable about having to accept the choices and rankings within a rating."

"The whole course was rather hectic especially the 'after' discussions and findings of the experiences within the institution."

"Integration. Personal responsibility. Issues related to the information gathered by teams when visiting a site."

"I would like to have more discussion on implementation strategies."

"Yes, how to practically modify the existing service delivery system."

"Validity of scoring procedures."

"How can we bring people out of institutions without inflicting more wounds."
5. WHAT DID YOU FIND MOST USEFUL IN THE NORMALISATION AND/OR PASSING WORKSHOP(S) YOU ATTENDED?

Respondents' Comments:

"Sensitization to the needs/feelings of devalued people in the community."

"The way of viewing things generally - to give each individual their own feelings of self worth."

"How staff can bring about normalisation."

"The visits to a facility and learning what to look for in an evaluation."

"The complete openness and honesty in looking at devalued people."

"It increased my knowledge of the Normalisation Principles and reminded me of the direction we should always be working in."

"It made me more aware of my attitudes and others I work with."

"The smaller group discussions which allowed for a deeper discussion of the particular case studies."

"The people finding out there are other people who battle on in the same way and keep on caring."

"The film and group work that came from watching the film. We have talked a lot about normalisation, but after seeing the film it made me realize how much we do wrong without realizing it."

"On site investigations."

"A clarification of SRV principles through the practical use of PASSING as an assessment tool of service providers."

"Processes of Devaluation and the ability to understand the mechanics of the passing manual."

"Being able to meet and talk with other people in this industry on Normalisation."

"It gave my drive and determination a boost."

"Examining the quality of life of people with multiple disabilities in relation to my own quality of life."

"The discussions leading to the allocation of scores."

"The practical exercises for use in staff training."

"The understanding that there is many devalued people in society that the general public takes for granted and generally have no comparison."

"The knowledge that obviously many government departments are accepting the need to change to more dignified environments."
6. HOW DO YOU RATE THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE WORKSHOP YOU ATTENDED?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

The rating scores provided by the respondents indicate that generally the workshops were perceived to be very effective. A modal score of 8 on the 10 point scale, with 67% of responses scoring 7 or higher, can be taken as strong supporting evidence. Unfortunately, it is not possible to account for the 12% of respondents who ascribed a low rating scale. Comments made by respondents to other items on the questionnaire to point to possible reasons.

With such a heterogeneous group of participants attending the workshops it is not surprising that a small percentage of respondents did not rate the workshop very highly on this scale.

1. Some respondents have noted that the workshops were very demanding. That is, a good deal was packed in to the workshops in a very limited time.

2. Several respondents felt that a 'debriefing' could have been included. It is clear that these respondents concluded the workshop in a highly emotional state which they did not have the opportunity to work through.

3. Some criticism was made of the team leaders. It appears that the leaders may have lacked appropriate skills in the earlier workshops.
7. PLEASE COMMENT ON THE TEACHING/LEARNING PROCESSES USED IN THE WORKSHOP YOU ATTENDED.

Respondents' Comments:

"Very good considering the large theory and practical curriculum covered."

"Very powerful and a well planned learning process."

"Some of the lectures were a little too long to retain interest - found mind wandering when they lasted for an hour."

"I found the combination of lectures and group workshops effective."

"The material was well presented but because of the time factor I felt too much was crammed into two days."

"I particularly found the group sessions of great benefit."

"Practical applications excellent having a group leader who really knew the application to the manual of information."

"The whole group delivery was clear, informative and interesting. The small groups were well structured, but extremely repetitive and slow in terms of fully covering the material and fully engaging the participants."

"I found I was more inclined to ask questions when we were in smaller groups."

"Very good at bringing points home."

"Accent on participation - group leader very open to questioning and different reactions - very good facilitator led my group."

"Direct observation and minute structured analysis of observations were very powerful."

"The teaching/learning process was of a high standard, all lectures were of a high standard and well presented, at a level from which I felt I could learn. I realize that this level may not have suited all who attended as there was such a varied group attending."

"Live-in allows for more intensive study of issues."

"Practical use of PASSING tool/good team leadership discussion/recording of group ideas etc. - made for a high degree of individual involvement and participation in the learning process."
8. I FEEL MY ATTITUDES TOWARDS MY WORK HAVE BEEN CHALLENGED BY WHAT I HAVE LEARNT ABOUT NORMALISATION PRINCIPLES.

   | Attitude Description          | Percentage |
---|-------------------------------|------------|
     | Substantially challenged      | 41.2%      |
     | Slightly challenged           | 38.2%      |
     | Basically unchallenged        | 20.6%      |

Comment:

Nearly 80 per cent of respondents indicated that the workshop experience challenged their attitudes towards work. It appears that the workshops made considerable impact upon the work attitudes of the participants. This question may be regarded as one of the key items in the survey.

An analysis of the questionnaires shows that those respondents (or the large majority) who were not challenged by the workshop had already had some experience with the implementation of the principles of Normalisation.
9. I BELIEVE THE NORMALISATION PRINCIPLES SHOULD BE APPLIED IN MY AGENCY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRONGLY</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents' comments:

"Representing a very conservative agency and although mouthing the values of Normalisation they have little idea of what it really means."

"Normalisation principles are/and have been from our agencies conception a high priority for our focus of service provision."

"The principles of Normalisation work in most situations, however in some areas they are not totally appropriate and perhaps should be undertaken in conjunction with other models, e.g. least restrictive alternative."

"Normalisation principles already in operation - but obviously governed by restraints in implementing the more difficult aspects."

"Hopefully we have greater acceptance and increasing acceptance of normalisation principles."

"Most important to improve the quality of life for those with whom we work."

"Normalisation principles should be taught in all courses where students are preparing for vocations in human services."

"The principles would be hard to apply. However, personally I feel more equipped to tackle problems from my experiences."

"I think a lot of the philosophy behind 'normalisation', i.e. people are individuals with rights to choose and have opportunities and be treated with respect, should start to be applied in society generally."

"Since attending the workshop, several model coherency days have been carried out with all staff to evaluate service provision and to focus more clearly on client needs."

"The elderly are too easily dehumanised and devalued in the name of efficiency, cleanliness, etc."

"Before positive changes can be made, the residents I work with need to live in a normal environment. Normalisation cannot exist in an institution."
10. HOW DIFFICULT DO YOU BELIEVE IT IS TO INTRODUCE NORMALISATION PRINCIPLES INTO YOUR WORK PLACE?

<p>| | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No difficulties: 8%  2%  13  14  15  5%  16%  15%  6%  6%
Extremely difficult

Comment:
The question of introducing the principles of Normalisation into the work place and the difficulties associated with the process requires further elucidation. Useful information is provided from the responses to the following item on the questionnaire. The major difficulty, as perceived by respondents is to change the attitudes of staff through a process of education. This, in turn, requires the allocation of limited resources for staff training.
11. WHAT DIFFICULTIES DO YOU SEE IN IMPLEMENTING NORMALISATION PRINCIPLES IN YOUR WORKPLACE?

Respondents' Comments:

"The biggest difficulties are educating all the staff and clients."

"Getting people to see that normalisation is not just doing things normally. Lack of community understanding. Tendency to rationalise."

"It is very difficult to change the attitudes of some staff for various reasons. e.g. they already feel they are doing the best for their residents/clients or they can't see the importance or need for small changes that would increase a person's dignity in the eyes of others."

"The practicalities of so few resources that you have to settle for what you can get - for example, residents don't have much choice in terms of the work situation they go out to."

"Our major difficulty is inter-agency and professional co-operation with some areas of service provision."

"Aged ideas of institutionalisation with staff. Physical setting of main administration and where bulk of services are offered very institutionalised, but has been built only a few years. Senior management refused to accept concepts of social role valorisation."

"As a reasonable, small organization there is little difficulty in such areas as appearance, behaviour, experience, status and reputation, attitudes etc."

"Simply ignorance of what its about, and that the system doesn't offer. Also the differing priorities of people within the system."

"Staff acceptance to the meaning of social role valorisation."

"Insufficient staff completing workshops. Insufficient ongoing evaluation. No stated goals."

"While the Government does subsidise agencies to provide a service to people in need, and their agencies encouraged to adopt normalisation principles, I believe there is a limit to the extent to which the Government should interfere/impose such principles."

"Financial resources make it difficult to create utopia. Resistance to change by the bulk of people."

"Families of disabled people opposed to some of the principles."

"Time, money and effort required to education staff, families and communities and clients themselves."
12. **How confident are you about implementing Normalisation principles in your agency.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
<th>7.</th>
<th>8.</th>
<th>9.</th>
<th>10.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all confident: 3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident: Extremely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment:

A median score of 7 on a 10 point scale suggests that half the respondents felt sufficiently confident to implement Normalisation principles.

It would have been useful to have obtained some information as to why respondents replied in the way they did, i.e. what were the factors that determined their level of confidence. One possible factor appears to be the degree of acceptance of the principles of Normalisation by the agency employing the respondent. Other respondents were not directly involved in the delivery of direct care services. This remoteness from the work place seems to explain a lack of confidence in some cases. Several respondents indicated that they needed further training before they would feel confident enough to implement Normalisation in their work place.
13. CAN YOU THINK OF ANY CHANGES THAT YOU HAVE MADE TO WORK PRACTICES AS A RESULT OF ATTENDING THE WORKSHOP?

Respondents' Comments:

"I am making a conscious effort to discuss the principles with colleagues."

"It has altered the way that I view services we fund, and has altered the way that I look at applications for funding, placing much more emphasis on the life of the client."

"Much more able to empathise with consumers of human services, therefore I understand better the problems faced by institutional residents."

"Yes - many. I started by questioning just about everything that was presented as client 'needs' and by attempting to get as close to individuals in organizations as I could - not to have administrators 'screen' the issues."

"Staff no longer wear uniforms. Redecorating and furnishings have changed style totally from hospital orientation. Many staff are aware of the process of devaluation and trying hard to treat people individually. Staff arrange individual outings and facilitate same."

"Questioning everything that the service does. Highlighting to my volunteers any behaviours that I witness which do not fit with Normalisation principles."

"Clients continually encouraged to practice their right of self-determination after they have been given facts and information."

"No direct changes - more a matter of sensitivity."

"Social coherency day - focussing on employment needs of clients. Prepared a needs questionnaire. Approach clients difficulties from a broader spectrum - focussing on all areas of a person's life. Removed devaluing and wounding posters/decorations from a workshop."

"No. Although I have seen changes in my area brought about by those in higher positions, who have the opportunity to implement such changes."

"I have changed the way in which I approach the topics I teach so that students are able to consolidate their knowledge of Normalisation principles and apply it in practical units."

"Smaller groups. More outings. Greater awareness of what community can offer. Taking meals and tea breaks with clients."

"Conducted a workshop for twenty staff, Registered Nurses and Nursing Assistants (one day) on Social Role Valorisation. Currently drawing up plans for four people to implement procedures for Social Role Valorisation."
"Conducted an in-service to Options staff on the processes of devaluation. This made the staff more aware of what the service users have had to put up with over the years, therefore increasing staff determination to implement change."

"I keep SRV principles as a focus point when planning future program strategies with parents and clients."

"Clients participate in cooking activities, gardening experiences in a more home-like atmosphere."

"As board member I expect that changes will be longer term as I do not actually work within the organization on a day-to-day basis. However, name has been removed from bus as a result of proposal."
14. ARE THERE ANY CHANGES TO WORK PRACTICES THAT YOU WOULD LIKE TO MAKE SINCE ATTENDING THE WORKSHOP.

Respondents' Comments:

"New bathroom to give the clients more privacy."

"We try and spend as much time with our residents on a one-to-one basis but it is always a problem of too little staff and too little time."

"Yes - more stimulating leisure programs."

"Future community and parent education on the principles of SRV."

"More hours to attempt more changes. Individuals participating in community groups - U3A, evening classes, bowling clubs, free lunch-time concerts, etc."

"There are some areas I have views on but would not be able to implement due to management."

"Yes. Encouragement of agencies to attend Normalisation workshops."

"Promote more community integration. Assist clients to develop valued social roles."

"Aim to make service delivery more client centred."

"More staff to 'think' and 'work' normalisation. Try to forget what was done and look to what 'should' be done."

"Lots, but many don't fit with HACC guidelines and therefore are unattainable... FRUSTRATION!!"

"Yes, I would like to bulldoze the buildings and start again with staff who had already been to normalisation training."

"Yes, but most changes are impossible to implement with people who have not participated in a workshop, or who for some reason, are unable to understand the need to adopt the practices/principles of PASSING."

"I would like the ability to have a stronger influence on funding organisations. Also I believe consumers of services should be consulted more."
15. **AS A RESULT OF ATTENDING THE WORKSHOP I NOW GET GREATER SATISFACTION FROM MY WORK**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRONGLY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents' comments:

"This is rather difficult - as often the knowledge I now have grave worries - however it also keeps me aware of the issues."

"In some ways I get less satisfaction because the workshop made me more sensitive to the problems - however the workshop has provided me with ideals to achieve and has given me more momentum to my work."

"In some ways I get more satisfaction as I have a better understanding of what we are about. In other ways it is more frustrating when service organizations cannot be convinced."

"I have always gained great job satisfaction but even with small changes in the area of normalisation for our residents I feel a sense of achievement."

"Until Normalisation can be completely introduced it is difficult to have much satisfaction."

"It is frustrating knowing what should be done but being unable to do it for various reasons, e.g. other people's views, costs, etc."

"I understand our goals more than I did, but am less optimistic (occasionally) about the likelihood of us achieving those goals."

"It's nice not to be out on a limb! And know others may be advocating for Normalisation principles also."

"Confirms all the past efforts used in setting up options were worthwhile."

It's made me realize why our department has taken the direction it has.

"I do now get greater satisfaction from my work as I have in a small way been able to apply some of the principles in a more effective way than before. I have also been able to increase the awareness of staff to the needs of the people in their care and unite them in a common goal. On the other hand I feel more frustrated than before, as my expectations for them (clients) are higher - and there are so many constraints."

"It has contributed."

"Normalisation principles reinforce values which I have about people and what students should have about those who have disabilities or are devalued in some way, i.e. I have more direction than previously."
16. I RECOMMEND THAT MY WORK COLLEAGUES ATTEND A SIMILAR WORKSHOP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>AGRE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRONGLY</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents' Comments:

"I feel it is an excellent training medium for people working in this field."

"Everybody should attend! Most have already; of course some people cannot accept the challenges of PASSING and are unable to embrace the principles."

"I learnt a lot, and would be happy to send other people along."

"Other training courses would be a priority but there would be some value in their attendance."

"I think it is imperative that all persons involved in Human Service attend at least one PASSING workshop."

"I definitely can think of a few who I would pay to attend. Many staff are going or have gone through 'Burn Out', so definitely need to see the light again."

"Insufficient benefits."

"I see it as important that as many people within the department as possible are familiar with the theory of normalisation."

"It is difficult to think of any staff in human service organizations who would not benefit."

"Several people from my workplace have attended. If several of the 'unconverted' could attend then a more uniform approach could be adopted in all service areas."

"Those who are responsible for developing courses and teaching subjects of relevance to human services should attend."

"It is good to have your own ideas and perceptions challenged. Whether this leads to increased productivity is doubtful."

"Yes, particularly people in higher management with influence to affect more meaningful changes. It is also important for middle managers such as hostel supervisors - parents - community and professionals."

"Yes, I think the principles are important and worthwhile for all colleagues to be familiar with and I'm please to have a clearer understanding of the principles involved."

"Other Board members need to attend, especially some older parents who are resisting change."
17. WHAT WOULD BE THE MOST EFFECTIVE WAY TO INTRODUCE NORMALISATION PRINCIPLES INTO AGENCIES?

Respondents' Comments:

"Send all senior staff to PASSING workshop and a selection of others to a one day seminar."

"Staff education within the Agency."

"Practice workshops, doing what they normally do then show where they went wrong. I think that would have a greater impact on old established staff."

"Build the principles into the funding guidelines."

"By having a two-day workshop on Social Role Valorisation."

"Through your workshops and follow-up sessions."

"Short in-house sessions for staff over a period of time.
1. Regular workshops/training sessions for staff.
2. Facilities that encourage use of the principles, e.g. small units, homes, etc, no communal dining rooms, bathrooms, etc.
3. Education of the public in general to put pressure on the governments and agencies."

"By introducing it directly to service providers rather than through management exclusively."

"Consultants from your workshop visit the place of work of the particular programme and 'tailor-make' a presentation on Normalisation in line with the target population it is aimed for."

"Principles of Normalisation should be available to all staff that work in an institution not just nursing staff."

"I would think by exposing staff to literature, talks, training sessions in that order, in such a way that staff do not feel threatened by possible changes in their work environment."

"The most effective way to introduce Normalisation is education at all levels, i.e. all staff employed, parents, public and government bodies."

"Encourage disabled people on to management committees."

"The example needs to be set from the top – attitudes and practice. Plus letting staff know what is expected of them, behaviour and attitude wise by way of workshops and regular in-service meetings."

"Government encouragement and funding to support changes and pilot projects."
APART FROM WHERE YOU ARE WORKING NOW CAN YOU THINK OF OTHER AGENCIES THAT MIGHT APPLY NORMALISATION PRINCIPLES?

Respondents' Comments:

"Any people-caring agency."

"There are a number of service providing organizations who should apply them."

"Schools, Banks and Public Service Staff. The principles are adaptable to general attitudes which often prejudice a loser, or deviant person who might not fit the narrow parameters of the 'so-called-norm' in our society, i.e. unemployed, homosexual, poor, women, black, Asian."

"Just about all human service agencies would find some exposure useful."

"Gaols, Mental Health Centres, Schools."

"I feel that some doctors, pathologists, need to be more aware."

"Other agencies that work with any devalued groups, e.g. Alcoholics Anonymous, Aboriginals, Aged, Youth."

"All service providing organisations funded by this department."

"Every human service agency in Western Australia would benefit. Especially- Prisons
Police Force
Psychiatric Services
Residential Services for the Aged, etc. etc."

"Education Department, GSI, FCB, ParaQuad, Nursing Homes, Department of Aboriginal Affairs, Mental Health Services, Spastic Welfare."

"Yes, 'C' Class Hospitals, Teaching institutions - from primary up."

"The fact Normalisation is dealing with humans. I feel many aspects could be applied or understood in all walks of life, i.e. from nurseries, schools - right through to the aged in Nursing Homes."

"Corrective Services.
Child Care - residential and day care settings.
Schools.
Health Department - Psychiatric Services, Services for the Elderly."

"Any specialist/generic services dealing with people who are disadvantaged by the community attitudes, e.g. physiotherapy courses/services, occupational therapy etc."

"Any that deal with devalued people, i.e. Aborigines, Women's Services, Legal Aid."
"Telethon, Appealathon".

"All those agencies representing the many different disabilities. All institutions and hospitals, youth detention centres and prisons, all schools."

"Community and hospital day centres."

"All areas that work with people and have a controlling situation over their lives."

"Yes all those agencies dealing with human services should have built into their funding sources a 'passing evaluation' before funding is given for a further period of time."

"The areas attending to children and handicapped children and adults."
19. I WOULD LIKE TO ATTEND ANOTHER WORKSHOP TO FURTHER MY UNDERSTANDING OF NORMALISATION PRINCIPLES.

Yes 57%
No 23%
Uncertain 20%

This item was further analysed in terms of whether the respondents had attended only the Introductory Workshop, only the PASSING Workshop, or had attended at least one workshop of each type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introductory Workshop</th>
<th>PASSING Workshop</th>
<th>Both Workshops</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment:

It is difficult to interpret this more fine-grained analysis of the data. For example, the high number of positive responses (74%) obtained from the respondents who had attended both workshops may be attributed, at least in part, to the fact that several of the respondents in this category had been involved in running the workshops. It is not known what other biases may exist in the different groups.
20. WHAT DO YOU BELIEVE ARE THE TRAINING PRIORITIES FOR STAFF IN YOUR AGENCY?

63% of respondents included training in the principles of normalisation in the training priorities for staff.

Respondents' Comments:

"Further normalisation training. Negotiation skills. Working with organizations."

"Stress/Group Work/Corporate Planning/Marketing/General Managerial Skills/Industrial Relations/Negotiating Skills/etc."

"Follow-up training in principles of Normalisation."

"Not Normalisation. "I work in a short term detox unit for drug addicts and I don't think it's a real issue here."

"Attend both theory and Passing Workshops."


"More awareness of community issues. A better, more constructive understanding of what peoples' needs are - how those needs can be met using the kind of principles of Normalisation."

"Normalisation theory is our priority at the moment, as it is difficult to obtain and it is vital to our policy to create and maintain staff awareness in this area."

"Knowledge and understanding of normalisation principles. How Normalisation Principles can be positively implemented in the workplace."

"Team building. Group dynamics."

"Principles of service delivery. Programme development."

"Negotiation skills. Disability awareness. Normalisation."

"SRV. Technology of the Service."

"To understand the clients from the residential homes they are involved with. Many staff in my area really have no idea of Normalisation pertaining to the real people they are working for."

"Computer systems. Compensation packages. Induction into units."

"Normalisation - least restrictive alternative options."


"All direct care staff whether its in accommodation, supported employment, therapy support and education/independent living are not expected to have any specific training. I believe PASSING workshops are essential for this category of staff."
21. **WOULD YOU BE INTERESTED IN BECOMING PART OF A NETWORK OF PEOPLE TO EXTEND THE APPLICATION OF NORMALISATION PRINCIPLES?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment:**

This item was included in the questionnaire to determine the extent of interest among workshop participants in forming a network to promote the principles of Normalisation in human service agencies. The Project co-ordinator believes that the establishment of such a network would be an effective means of consolidating the level of training accomplished by the Project over the past eighteen months. The network would also provide directions that future workshops might take in terms of meeting the needs of human service workers.

It appears that there is sufficient interest in the formation of a network with a nucleus of about twenty people. The most frequent reason given by respondents who were not interested in becoming part of a network was their work commitments would not permit them the time to do so.
22. HAVE YOU ESTABLISHED CLOSER CONTACT WITH STAFF IN OTHER AGENCIES SINCE ATTENDING THE WORKSHOP?

Twenty two per cent of respondents indicated that they had established closer contact with staff in other agencies since attending the workshop.

Respondents' Comments:

"Yes, this has proved invaluable as now when contact is made we share a common ground for communication."

"To some extent."

"Too busy."

"Yes, we've established some co-operative inter-agency planning for mutual clients."

"Yes - I am already a member of a team of people who have run the workshops and therefore meet regularly with people from other agencies."

"Not in depth, but I have had discussions from various people within the industry and institutions."

"No - although I am aware of the need to use generic agencies wherever possible. There has not been the need to refer people at present."

"Yes. Those who were in my team."

"No. Being in a small country town and working part-time makes this difficult."

"Yes, most definitely."
APPENDIX 2

THE EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE
NORMALISATION TRAINING PROJECT

Since July, 1986 more than two hundred people employed in a range of human services have participated in a variety of workshops sponsored by the Normalisation Training Project.

At the conclusion of each workshop participants were given the opportunity to evaluate it. The information obtained from your responses to the evaluation questionnaire has been extremely important in ensuring that subsequent workshops meet the needs of participants.

The purposes of this questionnaire are twofold. First, we are seeking feedback on the workshops after participants have had time to reflect upon the experience. Since it is nearly 18 months since the first workshop was conducted the items in this section will be of a general nature.

Second, the project co-ordinators would like to gain some understanding of the impact of these workshops on work practices. That is, have you implemented any changes at work as a result of the workshop experience.

Again, the feedback that you are able to provide will be vital to the continued development of the workshops for training in normalisation principles in Western Australia.

Please return the questionnaire in the stamped, addressed envelope provided by Tuesday 1 March 1988.

Thank you for your co-operation.

Rod Underwood

Rod Underwood PhD
I attended a two day "Introduction to Normalisation" workshop:

- Introduction to Normalisation
  22 - 23 April 1987

- An Introduction to Normalisation
  (Social Role Valorisation)
  8 - 9 July 1987

- An Intensive Introduction to Normalisation
  (Social Role Valorisation)
  6 - 7 August 1987

- Introduction to Normalisation
  September 1987

- An Introduction to Normalisation
  (Social Role Valorisation)
  17 - 18 October, 1987 - Bunbury.

I attended a passing workshop:

- PASSING Workshop
  14 - 18 July, 1986

- PASSING Workshop
  1 - 5 December, 1986

- PASSING Workshop
  18 - 22 May 1987

- An Intensive PASSING Practicum
  10 - 13 August 1987

- PASSING Workshop
  November 1987

Please tick the appropriate box(es).
1. My expectations of the workshop(s) were:

Not Satisfied  Satisfied  Very Satisfied

PLEASE CIRCLE YOUR RESPONSE

COMMENT: ____________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________

2. The workshop has given me a sound understanding of the Normalisation principles.

Agree  Agree  Disagree  Disagree
Strongly

COMMENT: ____________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________

3. Can you recall any issues in the workshop that were presented in a particularly meaningful way?

_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
4. On reflection were there issues raised in the workshop that you would have liked to have spent more time on?

5. What did you find most useful in the Normalisation and/or PASSING Workshop(s) you attended?

6. How do you rate the effectiveness of the workshop you attended?

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10

   Low                                           High

7. Please comment on the teaching/learning processes used in the workshop you attended.

   ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________
8. I feel my attitudes towards my work have been challenged by what I have learnt about Normalisation principles.
   1. Substantially challenged
   2. Slightly challenged
   3. Basically unchallenged

9. I believe the Normalisation principles should be applied in my agency.
   Agree    Agree    Disagree    Disagree
   Strongly

   COMMENT:


10. How difficult do you believe it is to introduce Normalisation principles into your work place?
    1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
    No difficulties     Extremely difficult

11. What difficulties do you see in implementing Normalisation principles in your work place?
12. How confident are you about implementing Normalisation principles in your agency?

Not at all confident 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Extremely confident

13. Can you think of any changes that you have made to work practices as a result of attending the workshop?

______________________________
______________________________
______________________________
______________________________
______________________________

14. Are there any changes to work practices that you would like to make since attending the workshop?

______________________________
______________________________
______________________________
______________________________
______________________________

15. As a result of attending the workshop I now get greater satisfaction from my work.

Agree  Agree  Disagree  Disagree
Strongly   Strongly

COMMENT : ________________________________
______________________________
______________________________
______________________________
______________________________
16. I recommend that my work colleagues attend a similar workshop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMENT:


17. What would be the most effective way to introduce Normalisation principles into agencies?


18. Apart from where you are working now can you think of other agencies that might apply Normalisation principles?


19. I would like to attend another workshop to further my understanding of Normalisation principles?

   YES [ ]

   NO [ ]

   UNCERTAIN [ ]
20. What do you believe are the training priorities for staff in your agency?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

21. Would you be interested in becoming part of a network of people to extend the application of Normalisation principles?

YES

NO

22. Have you established closer contact with staff in other agencies since attending the workshop?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

23. Any further comments?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________