

Evaluating the Community Based Rehabilitation (CBR) Program

(Integrating the Disabled in
Local Community Centers)

Dr. Majed Abu Jaber,
Heyam Katanani, Mustafa Al-Kumash,
Ra'ed Al-Zghoul, Math-her Ateyat

Al-Balqa' Applied University
Princess Rahma University College

Introduction

Community Based Rehabilitation (CBR) is considered a new social, political and economical idea in Jordan, but it is considered relatively old in some other developed countries such as Sweden.

CBR is a definite result of the industrial and technological development, where humans depend heavily on machines. This has increased work and transport accidents which caused many disabilities and problems that affected the social life of the whole community.

As a result, the international community tended to offer rehabilitation services through the participation of the community members in rehabilitation and development where the benefits will be generalized with less costs.

Considering the importance of this idea, it was implemented in Jordan through the help and support of the Swedish Organization for Individual Relief (SOIR) which is an experienced organization in offering services for persons with special needs for more than 30 years.

Purpose of the study:

This study is aimed at evaluating the CBR project and its integration in Jordan from the point of view and attitudes of the workers in the local community centers, as well as the views and attitudes of the families of the disabled and the members of the community.

Research Questions:

The study tried to answer the following questions:

1. What are the views and attitudes of the workers towards the CBR project?
2. What are the views and attitudes of the children's families towards the CBR project?
3. What are the views and attitudes of the local community towards the CBR project?
4. Are there differences between the views and attitudes of the workers, the families and the community members towards the CBR project?
5. Are there differences between the views and attitudes of the workers, the families and the community members towards the CBR project in regard to the location of the center in the local community?

Terminology:

Rehabilitation: World Health Organization (WHO) defined rehabilitation as the use of various facilities (services) in the medical, social, educational and vocational domains in order to train or retrain the individual to reach the highest level of function ability (Karvoti, 1995).

Yehya (1984) defined rehabilitation as the process of readaptations, or re-preparations or re-teaching to life, in order help the individual identifies his own capabilities and provide him with various means to get the maximum use of them.

Community Based Rehabilitation (CBR):

The idea of (CBR) is built on the principle of integrating the disabled in the community through establishing special environments and services that adapt to the needs of the disabled on the condition that these services will disappear gradually. The main objective of CBR is to integrate the disabled in the community by using all human and material resources and through the participation of the disabled, their families and community members in the rehabilitation process. The disabled shall not be separated and isolated from their community (Al-Zomut, 1992).

According to this, CBR can be defined as a process of integrating the disabled children who were residing in the Swedish Organization / Sweileh into the local community centers in order to rehabilitate them educationally, medically, socially, and vocationally to reach the highest level of functional ability.

Workers: Persons working in the local community rehabilitation centers as administrators, specialists and supervisors.

Families: Parents of the disabled children who were moved from the Swedish Organization in Sweileh to centers in the local community.

Members of the local community: Donors, supporters, neighbors, and businessmen who are working voluntarily in the disabled centers.

Limitation / Delimitation of the Study:

The study did not include the disabled persons who were individually integrated in the local community due to the difficulty of following them up. Moreover, the study was delimited due to the fact of

the difficulty of getting back the questionnaires that were distributed to the centers especially the questionnaires that were sent to the parents in Baqa'a CBR center.

Theoretical Framework:

CBR services started to appear and develop in general with the growing need for the equalization of opportunities in the industrial society and the development in medicine as well as the promulgation of the vocational legislation for the disabled in many countries. Many international and national organizations have worked in order to develop the social and economical levels of the disabled. Examples of such organizations are: International Labor Organization (ILO) and the Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia (ESCWA) organization (Zo'mot, 1992).

The Context of this Idea:

CBR concentrates on the principle that the disabled are normal citizens who have the right to have a normal human life. As for the economical side, the process of building institutions to include all the disabled is impossible. The only solution to meet their needs is to offer public services for both the normal and the disabled persons. When the disabled are integrated in the public life and feel that they are part of the community, they become active and independent members. In summary, there is a need to provide opportunities for the disabled children to be raised in their homes and communities.

A new Idea:

The idea of implementing CBR is a new social and economical idea in Jordan. It was introduced by the Swedish organization who suggested the use of the public services in the community. It means that persons with special needs shall use the same services offered to the community members. This facilitates the conditions for the disabled to live a normal life among the family members and other members in the community. Socially, it is a democratic right for the disabled to use the same services and facilities of the normal persons. It is their right for normal life.

Institutional and Community Services:

Institutional services and community services as a concept of support differs between communities and their structures. Some communities provide special services for persons with mental retardation, while others use the same services as other members in the community. They both have different objectives. One of them seeks institutional life, while the other seeks a normal life in the local community. There are important differences between the two approaches regarding their connection with people. The institutional approach sees them as pupils or patients who need to develop their abilities in order to leave the institution and have their normal role in the community. The community approach considers them as regular citizens and have the right to participate in the normal life in the community regardless of their disability.

The integration project is looked at as a contrary approach to the institutional one. It aims at achieving better life for the individuals and their families. Its main activity is to provide the disabled who leave their institutions and centers to the local community a better life. This study is a serious attempt to prove this approach.

Procedures of the Study:

Population of the study:

The population of the study consisted of all (53) persons with disabilities who were moved from the Swedish Organization in Sweileh to the following centers:

The Peace Club for the Handicapped at Deheyat Al-Rasheed. It received seven (7) persons with disabilities.

The Training and Rehabilitation Charitable Society for girls with Disability at Jabal Alqosour. It received six (6) girls.

The local committee for the CBR at El-Wehdat Camp. It received four (4) children.

The Hay Nazal Zakat Committee Special Education Center. It received twelve (12) children.

Al-Hussein Camp Special Education Center. It received seventeen (17) children.

Al-Balqa'a Center. It received seven (7) children.

Instrumentation:

A questionnaire was constructed for this study. It included the following three domains:

First domain: Families Questionnaires

It consisted of (21) items that were divided into three areas:

- 1- Families' attitudes towards the CBR project in general. It consisted of (13) items (1,2,3,6,7,12,13,16,17,18,19,20,21).
- 2- Families' attitudes towards the quality of services offered. It consisted of (5) items (4,8,10,14,15).
- 3- Families participation in offered services. it consisted of (3) (5,9,11).

Second domain: Workers' Questionnaires

- 1- Workers attitudes towards the CBR project. It consisted of (12) items (1,4,10,14,15,16,17,21,24,25,26,27).
- 2- Workers' Career Satisfaction. It consisted of (4) items (18,19,20,23).
- 3- Families' attitudes towards the project from the workers point of view. It consisted of (5) items (5,6,7,8,9).
- 4- Satisfaction on the quality of services offered from the workers point of view. It consisted of (6) items (2,3,11,12,13,22).

Third domain: Local Community Members' Questionnaires

It consisted of (16) items to know their attitudes toward the CBR project.

To find the validity of the questionnaires, they were sent to a three faculty members in the Faculty of Education / Jordan University in order to disclose any inaccuracies or ambiguities and to enable the necessary refinements. Data received were reviewed and required changes were made.

To find the reliability coefficient, the split half method was computed. They were found to be (0.90), (0.88) and (0.72) for families, workers and local community members questionnaires respectively.

A four point scale was used and was given a grade between (1-4) for the positive items as follows:

"Applicable to a high extent" as (4), "Applicable to a moderate extent" as (3), "Applicable to a weak extent" as (3), and "Not applicable" as (1).

After having the questionnaires back, they were corrected and the data was computerized and analyzed using the statistical package (SPSS). The questionnaires of the three domains (families, workers and local community members) have been distributed to the above mentioned centers. Table (1) shows the numbers of questionnaires received according to the domains and the centers.

Table (1)

Questionnaires Received According to Domains and the Centers

Domain/ Center	Al-Qosour	Al-Rasheed	Al-Hussein	Wehdat	Baq'a	Nazal	Total
Families	11	6	13	1	0	18	49
Workers	10	6	8	11	0	8	43
Local Community	9	3	4	6	2	5	29

Statistical Analysis:

To answer the first three questions, the domains were arranged according to their means. As the number of the items is different in each domain, it was impossible to compare the numbers according to the mean of the raw grades. Thus, they were compared according to their weighted means. Frequencies and percentages for each item of the three questionnaires were calculated. The items were arranged in a descending order within each domain to reflect the relative importance within each domain as shown Tables (2,3,4).

To answer the fourth question, the weighted means were calculated for each domain. And to facilitate the comparison process, the weighted means were calculated for each domain and each area within it as shown in Table (5).

Table (2)
Frequencies, Percentages and Means of the Families' Attitude
Responses Toward the CBR project.

Items	Applicable to a high extent		Applicable to a moderate extent		Applicable to a weak extent		Not Applicable		Response Mean
	Frequ- ency	Perc- entage	Frequ- ency	Perc- entage	Frequ- ency	Perc- entage	Frequ- ency	Perc- entage	
	45	91.80	3	6.10	1	2	46	93.90	3.9
8 I feel more comfortable because my son is near my residence									
12 I feel ashamed when visiting my child in the center	1	2	1	2	1	2	46	93.90	3.88
20 I prefer establishing more centers for the children in the local community	41	83.70	3	6.10	3	6.10	2	4.10	3.69
16 Understanding the needs of our child has increased	36	73.50	8	16.30	4	8.20	1	2	3.61
2 We feel satisfied for moving our child from the main center to the local community	34	69.40	9	18.40	5	10.20	1	2	3.55
5 Our responsibility became bigger towards our child	32	65.30	11	22.40	4	8.20	2	4.10	3.49
10 I feel the current situation is better for us and for our children	31	36.30	10	20.40	7	14.30	1	2	2.45
14 I think the staff in the center are qualified and sufficient	29	59.20	13	26.50	6	12.20	1	2	3.43
11 Current situation developed interaction among the families and led to better understanding	32	65.30	11	22.40	1	2	5	10.20	3.43
21 Being in the local community the center led to more family participation activities	34	69.40	7	14.30	1	2	7	14.30	3.29
17 We became able to meet the needs of our children in a better way	30	61.20	11	22.40	5	10.20	3	6.10	3.39
19 I think that our participation in the center's activities led to more acceptance of the disability	31	63.30	9	18.40	4	8.20	5	10.20	3.35
1 I understand the true meaning of rehabilitation in the local community	27	55.10	12	24.50	7	14.30	3	6.10	3.29
4 I consider the transference of the children from the main center to the local community center a way of giving up or stopping services *	7	14.30	4	8.20	7	14.30	31	63.30	3.27
15 The kind of services provided by the center in the local community is good	22	44.90	18	36.70	8	16.30	1	2	3.24
13 I think it is possible to develop the integration project in a better way	28	57.10	11	22.40	2	4.10	8	16.30	3.20
3 We feel satisfied for moving our children from the main center	22	44.9	18	36.70	4	8.20	5	10.20	3.16
7 I feel that the current situation causes anxiety and frustration *	9	18.40	8	16.30	7	14.30	25	51	2.98
8 I think keeping the child in the main center (Sweileh) is better for the child and the family	24	49	8	16.30	5	10.30	12	24.50	2.90
6 I expect negative reactions from the local community	13	26.50	9	18.40	10	20.40	17	34.70	2.36
9 I offer services for the local community center	15	30.60	10	20.40	12	24.50	12	24.50	2.57

* Indicates that the item measures a negative attitude towards the CBR project

Table (3)
Frequencies, Percentages and Means of the Workers' Attitudes
Toward the CBR Project

Items	Applicable to a high extent		Applicable to a moderate extent		Applicable to a weak extent		Not Applicable		Response Mean
	Frequ- ency	Perc- entage	Frequ- ency	Perc- entage	Frequ- ency	Perc- entage	Frequ- ency	Perc- entage	
13 The Swedish Organization makes a continuous follows up to the centers and shows attention for the children with disabilities	38	88.40	4	9.30	1	2.30	0,0	0,0	3.86
10 The center practices activities in both the center and the local community	35	81.40	7	16.30	0,0	0,0	1	2.30	3.77
18 I feel contented and satisfied working in the integration project	38	88.40	2	4.70	1	2.30	2	4.70	3.77
16 People around the center feel ashamed because of the children with disabilities in the area *	1	2.30	1	2.30	5	11.60	36	83.70	3.77
3 The number of children registered on the waiting list decrease after the integration project implementation	33	76.70	9	20.90	1	2.30	0,0	0,0	3.74
12 The Swedish Organization provides qualified staff to deal with the children	35	81.40	6	14	1	2.30	1	2.30	3.74
1 Being in the local community children with disabilities can integrate and adapt with the environment centers	31	72.10	12	27.90	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	3.72
4 I think the children adaptation in society is better after the implementation of the integration project	32	74.40	10	23.30	1	2.30	0,0	0,0	3.74
20 The integration method made positive changes in dealing with my colleagues	34	79.10	5	11.60	3	7	1	2.30	3.67
7 Parents have a feeling of satisfaction and tranquility after integrating their children in the local community centers.	30	69.80	11	25.60	1	2.30	1	2.30	3.63
11 The Swedish Organization provides enough financial support to meet the needs of the center.	29	67.40	11	25.60	3	7	0,0	0,0	3.60
24 Integration increased social relationship between the staff and families of the children in the local community	31	72.10	8	18.90	3	7	1	2.30	3.60
17 People in the local community object because the center is in their area *	3	7	3	7	4	9.30	33	76.70	3.56

Items	Applicable to a high extent		Applicable to a moderate extent		Applicable to a weak extent		Not Applicable		Response Mean
	Frequ- ency	Perc- entage	Frequ- ency	Perc- entage	Frequ- ency	Perc- entage	Frequ- ency	Perc- entage	
25 The local community became aware of the needs and situation of the children and supports them	25	58.10	13	30.20	5	11.60	0,0	0,0	3.47
2 I think the problem of the children transport is less after moving to the local community centers	31	72.10	4	1	2.30	7	16.30	xxx	3.37
21 I think the participation of the local community in rehabilitating persons with disabilities increased their adaptation in the community	24	55.80	12	6	14	1	2.30	xxx	3.37
26 I prefer keeping the children in the main center (Sweileh) *	5	11.60	5	11.60	3	7	30	69.80	3.35
5 I think the families of the children cooperate and try to help especially after integration	20	46.50	19	44.20	3	7	1	2.30	3.35
27 The local community became aware of the needs and situation of the children and supports them	18	41.90	21	48.70	4	9.30	0,0	0,0	3.33
22 The kind of services offered to persons with disabilities improved in the local community centers more than the main center	21	48.80	15	34.90	4	9.30	3	7	3.26
23 I feel contented and satisfied on my future	28	65.10	5	11.60	2	4.70	8	18.60	3.23
19 The integration project added more burden on my job *	9	20.90	3	7	2	4.70	29	67.40	3.19
6 Some families feel ashamed when visiting their children in the center*	3	7	10	23.30	10	32.30	20	46.50	3.09
9 I think the local community understands and supports the needs of the center	14	32.60	16	37.20	9	20.90	4	9.30	2.93
14 I think the local community understands and supports the needs of the center	10	23.30	20	46.50	10	23.30	3	7	3.86
15 Volunteers from the local community cooperate with the center to offer services for the children	13	30.20	13	30.20	9	20.30	8	18.60	2.72
8 Families offer services to the center to meet the children needs	7	16.30	16	37.20	14	32.60	6	14	2.52

* Indicates that the item measures a negative attitude towards the CBR project.

Table (4)
Frequencies, Percentages and Means of the Local Community
Members on the Attitudes Questionnaires Towards the CBR project.

Items	Applicable to a high extent		Applicable to a moderate extent		Applicable to a weak extent		Not Applicable		Response Mean
	Frequ- ency	Perc- entage	Frequ- ency	Perc- entage	Frequ- ency	Perc- entage	Frequ- ency	Perc- entage	
4 I prefer to participate in the activities both in the center and in the local community	26	89.7	2.00	6.9	1	3.40	0.0	0.0	3.86
1 I prefer the children to be in centers within their local community	25	86.2	3.00	10.30	0.0	0.0	1.00	3.4	3.79
2 I welcome the idea of moving the children from the Swedish Organization (Sweileh) into centers near their homes	22	75.90	6	20.70	0.0	0.0	1.00	3.4	3.69
6 I feel ashamed because the center for the disabled is in our area *	5	17.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	24	82.80	3.48
5 I avoid children with disabilities when I see them *	5	17.2	1	3.4	0.0	0.0	23	79.30	3.41
3 I prefer the children to stay in main center (The Swedish Organization) *	2.97	48.3	14	24.1	7.00	3.4	1.00	24.1	7

* Indicates that the item measures a negative attitude towards the

Table (5)
Means, Weighted Means of Participants' Responses for Each Domain
(Families, workers, local community members)

Domain	Area	Area Mean	# of Items	Weighted Means
Families	Families attitudes towards CBR in general	43.49	13	3.35
	Families attitudes towards the kind of services offered in the centers	17.29	5	3.46
	Families participation in giving services the center	9.49	3	3.4
Total		70.27	21	3.35
Workers	Workers attitudes towards CBR in general	41.23	12	3.44
	Workers career satisfaction	13.86	4	3.45
	Know the families attitudes towards the project from the view point of the workers	15.56	5	3.11
	Satisfaction on the kind of services from view point of the workers	21.58	6	3.6
Total		92.23	27.00	3.42
Local	Local Community members attitudes towards the project in general	21.21	6.00	3.54

Table (6) below shows the items response mean for each domain (families, workers, local community members) according to the community rehabilitation centers.

Table (6) Means, Weighted Means of Participants' Responses for Each of The Three Domains: (Families, workers, local community members) according to the CBR Centers

Center	Item Response Mean			Weighted Means		
	Families	Worker	Local community members	Families Workers		Local community members
Nazal	68.61	93.25	22	3.26	3.45	3.67
Al-Qosour	74.64	98.5	18.56	3.55	3.64	3.09
Al-Wehdat	75	89.82	32.67	3.57	3.32	3.95
Al-Hussein	66.62	95.13	23.25	3.17	3.53	3.88
Al-Rasheed	70.5	81	18.33	3.36	3	3.06
Al-Baq'a'a	-	-	24	-	-	4

Finding and Discussions:

First Question:

What are the attitudes of the workers towards the CBR project?

The workers questionnaire contained (27) items. It measured four areas.

First area: Career satisfaction of the workers.

Second area: Families attitudes towards the integration

project from the workers point of view.

Third area: Satisfaction on the kind of services from the workers point of view.

Fourth area: Workers' attitudes towards the integration project.

Table (7) shows the weighted means of the responses of the workers attitude separately and together

Table (7)
Weighted Mean of The Responses of The Workers Attitudes
Separately and Together

Area	Number of items	Weighted Mean of Responses
Career satisfaction of the workers	4	3.45
Attitudes of the families from the workers point view	5	3.11
Satisfaction on the quality of services from the workers point of view	6	3.60
Attitudes of the workers towards the integration project	12	3.44
Total Mean		3.42

Table (7) indicates that the workers' attitudes towards the project are positive and high. The weighted mean responses was (3.44) whereas, the weighted mean responses of the workers' career satisfaction was (3.45). this means that career satisfaction is higher than working in the CBR centers. On the other hand, weighted mean of the families' responses from the workers point of view was (3.11). This number indicates that the attitudes are positive and high. In addition' it was found that the weighted mean of the responses on the kind of services area from the workers point of view was (3.60). The mean of the four areas together was (3.42) which means that the attitudes towards the project are positive and high. The career satisfaction and the kind of services in the centers are also high. The above indicates that the workers adopted the integration project and showed their interest in it.

Second question:

What are the views and attitudes of the families towards the CBR project?

The families questionnaire included (21) paragraphs and measures three areas:

Attitudes of the families towards CBR.

Attitudes of the families towards (21) services offered in the

centers.

The families' participation in offering service from their point of view.

Table (8) shows the weighted mean of the responses of the families attitude separately and together.

Table (8)

Weighted Mean of the Responses of the Families Attitudes Separately and Together

Area	Number of items	Weighted Means
Families attitudes towards CBR	13	3.35
Families attitudes toward services in the center	5	3.46
Families participation in offering services from their point of view	3	3.16
Total mean		3.35
Total number of the items		21

Table (8) shows that total weighted mean in the attitudes area was (3.35). This indicates that the attitudes and items of the families are positive and high. Also it can be noticed that the families attitudes towards the quality of services offered was positive and high. The response mean for this area was (3.46). The response mean on the items of families participation in offering services was (3.16). This reflects families and parents enthusiasm and participation in offering services to the Center.

Third question:

What are the views and attitudes of the local community towards the CBR project?

The questionnaire included (6) items. It measured the attitudes of the local community members towards the project in general. The responses mean was 3.54. This indicates that the local community attitudes are positive and high. This indicates the enthusiasm of the community members in offering volunteer services to the centers.

Fourth question:

Are there any differences between the attitudes of the workers, families and the local community members towards the CBR projects?

To answer this question, the response mean for the participants in the three domains was calculated (Table 9).

Table (9) The Response Mean for the Workers, Families and Local Community Questionnaires.

The questionnaire	Number of items	Weighted response mean
Workers	27	3.42
Families	21	3.35
Local Community Members	6	3.54

Looking at table (9) one can notice that the means of the three domains are approximately the same. The three means are positive and high especially that the maximum grade is (4) and the least grade is (1). This indicates that the attitudes of the participants of the community, either workers or parents or members of the local community are similar. This also means that the community is interested in general in persons with disabilities, thus the negative attitude towards them has been changed. In addition, they can be integrated and rehabilitated within the local community.

Fifth question:

Are there differences between the attitudes of families and the members in the local community towards the CBR project according to the center location in the community?

The findings indicates that there is no big difference among the means. All the values of the weighted means indicate positive and high attitudes in all the centers and in different locations. (Table 10).

Table (10) Means of the Three Domains According to the Rehabilitation Centers in the local community

Center	Workers questionnaire	Families questionnaire	Local community questionnaire	Total mean
Ha Nazal	3.45	3.26	3.67	3.46
Qosour	3.64	3.55	3.09	3.42
Wehdat	3.32	3.57	3.95	3.61
Al-Hussein Cam	3.52	3.17	3.88	3.52
Al-Salam Club	3.00	3.36	3.60	3.14

Table (10) shows that the responses mean for the centers ranged between (3.14-3.61). This indicates that there are big differences in the attitudes' means of the workers, the families and members of the local community in different areas. This can be justified due to the great interest of the workers, families and the local community members regarding accepting the idea of integration. There is no rejection or disagreement towards the idea of integration.

Regarding the open questions in the three questionnaires, two questions were mentioned in the workers questionnaire. The first one was about the difficulties and problems that they met in implementing the integration project. From the quality analysis for the workers' responses one could identify the most important problems in each center as follows:

Al-Hussein Camp Center: The neighbors were annoyed as the center is newly established in the area. People could not understand the children with disabilities, and made many jokes of them.

Wehdat Camp Center: Parents did not accept the idea of sending their children to the center because they were afraid that necessary services might not be offered. And there is a kindergarten near the center. In addition, there were some difficulties in coordinating with the main center.

Hay Nazal Center: Lack of volunteers and small salaries for the staff.

Regarding the second question in the workers' questionnaire related to the important services that the center in need of and not provided. The following notes were mentioned:

Al-Salam Club Center: Daily meals are needed for persons with disabilities as well as training and recreational aids. Jabal

Al-Qusour Center: It suffers from financial support and a lack of transportation mean. The center needs a wider building.

Al-Hussein Camp Center: Lacks a courtyard or a garden in addition to training and playing instruments inside the center.
Wehdat Camp Center: Needs technical instruments and a bus for the children.

Hay Nazal Center: The children need medical insurance and a wider place.

In the local community questionnaire, the following question have been mentioned:

Do you have any ideas or opinions to activate the role of the families and the members of the local community to provide better services for the children in the center?

The responses emphasized the following ideas:

Al-Salam Club Center: Establishing working places for the disabled to work under the supervision of their families.

Increase the number of centers. Encourage the parents to visit the center and participate in its activities.

Wehdat Center: Participating in developing the level of services and increasing the financial support.

Hay Nazal Center: Inviting the families to visit the center and make them aware that the disabled people are a part of the society. Establishing new centers to follow-up the children after leaving the centers.

Recommendations:

In the light of the findings, the following recommendations were presented:

1. Prepare pamphlets about the CBR project to spread awareness among the families of the disabled children and the local community members as to know the importance and the benefits of the CBR project.
2. Arrange meetings and lectures for the workers in the center as well as to the parents of the disabled in order to activate their role in offering services for the children in and out the centers.
3. Conduct other studies to follow-up on the disabled who were integrated on individual basis in the society in order to know the difficulties they face in their new places.

المراجع:

1. Mansell, J. and Ericsson, K, (1996). Deinstitutionalization and community Living Intellectual disability services in Britain. Scandinavia, and the U.S.A. London: Chapman Hall. P 81-83.
2. Ericsson, K, (1993). Development of social policy and forms of support to persons with an intellectual disability in Sweden. Upsala: Department of Education Upsala University.
٣. القربيوني، إبراهيم، و"يسلامي، أمين، وجاسم، غانم(١٩٩٥) مقدمة في تأهيل ذوي احتياجات الخاصة. عمان، الأردن.
٤. النزصطي، يوسف ثبني، التأهيل المهني للمعوقين (١٩٩٢)، ط٢، دار المطبوعات لنشر عمان، الأردن.
٥. صندوق الملكة عليا للعمل "الاجتماعي لتطوير المعوقين الأردني، واقع ومستقبل مؤسسات المعوقين في الأردن(١٩٨٤)، عمان، الأردن.