

REFERENCES

- Agree, E. M. 1999. The influence of personal care and assistive devices on the measurement of disability. *Social Science & Medicine*, 48:427 – 443.
- Alam, I. 2005. Fieldwork and data collection in qualitative marketing research. *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, 8(1):97 – 112.
- Albert, B., Dube, A. K., Hossain, M. & Hurst, R. 2005. *Research gap analysis report: Disability knowledge and research programme*. Norwich: University of East Anglia.
- Albrecht, G. L. & Devlieger, P. J. 1999. The disability paradox: High quality of life against all odds. *Social Science & Medicine*, 48(8):977 – 988.
- Ali, A. M. 2005. Using the Delphi technique to search for empirical measures of local planning agency power. *The Qualitative Report*, 10(4):718 – 744. <http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR10-4/ali.pdf>. Accessed on 26 March 2008.
- Altink, W. M. M., Visser, C. F. & Castelijns, M. 1997. Criterion development: The unknown power of criteria as communication tools. In Anderson, N. & Herriot, P. (eds). *International handbook of selection and assessment* (pp. 287 – 301). Chichester: John Wiley.
- Anderson, J. C., Milkovich, G. T. & Tsui, A. 1981. A model of intra-organizational mobility. *Academy of Management Review*, 6(4):529 – 538.
- Andrade, A. D. 2009. Interpretive research aiming at theory building: Adopting and adapting the case study design. *The Qualitative Report*, 14(1):42 – 60. <http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR14-1/diaz-andrade.pdf>. Accessed on 10 September 2009.
- Anspach, R. 1979. From stigma to identity politics. *Social Science & Medicine*, 13(A):765 – 773.

- Archer, L. 2008. *Introduction to Atlas.ti: A training manual*. (2nd edition).
Pretoria: University of Pretoria.
- Arthur, S. & Nazroo, J. 2005. Designing fieldwork strategies and materials. In
Ritchie, J. & Lewis, J. (eds.) *Qualitative Research Practice: A Guide for
Social Science Students and Researchers* (pp.109 – 137). London:
Sage.
- Backenroth, G. A. M. 2001. People with disabilities and the changing labor
market: Some challenges for counseling practice and research on
workplace counseling. *International Journal for the Advancement of
Counselling*, 23:21 – 30.
- Bahrs, O., Heim, S., Kalitzkus, V., Matthiessen, P., Meister, P. & Müller, H.
2003. Salutogenesis in general practice: How to use potential of doctor-
patient communication to promote health. Paper presented at the 2nd
Conference on Making Sense of Health, Illness and Disease, 14 – 17
July. St Hilda's College, Oxford.
- Baldwin, M. L. & Johnson, W. G. 2001. Dispelling the myths about work
disability. Prepared for the 1998 IRRA Research Volume, 1 February.
- Balser, D. B. 2000. Perceptions of on-the-job discrimination and employees
with disabilities. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*,
12(4):179 – 197.
- Bambra, C., Whitehead, M. & Hamilton, V. 2005. Does 'welfare-to-work' work?
A systematic review of the effectiveness of the UK's Welfare-to-Work
Programmes for people with disability or chronic illness. *Social Science
and Medicine*, 60:1905 – 1918.
- Baptiste, I. 2001. Qualitative data analysis: Common phases, strategic
differences. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 2(3).
<http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs>. Accessed on 13 April 2010.
- Barbezat, D. A & Hughes, J. W. 2001. The effect of job mobility on academic

- salaries. *Contemporary Economic Policy*, 19(4):409 – 423.
- Barnes, C. 1990. *Cabbage syndrome: The social construction of dependence*. Lewes: Falmer.
- Barnes, C. 2001. 'Emancipatory' disability research: Project or process? Public Lecture presented at City Chambers, Glasgow, University of Leeds, 24 October 2001.
- Barnes, C. & Mercer, G. 1997. Breaking the mould? An introduction to doing disability research. In Barnes, C. & Mercer, G. (eds). *Doing disability research* (pp. 1 –14). Leeds: Disability Press.
- Barron, K. E., Evans, S. W., Baranik, L. E., Serpell, Z. N. & Buvinger, E. 2006. Achievement goals of students with ADHD. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 29(3):137 – 158.
- Baum, T. 1995. *Managing Human Resources in the European Tourism and Hospitality industry – a strategic approach*. London: Chapman & Hall.
- Beatty, P. W., Gordon, W. R., Tepper, S. & DeJong, G. 1998. Personal assistance for people with physical disabilities: Consumer-direction and satisfaction with services. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, 79, June:674 – 677.
- Beecham, S., Hall, T., Britton, C., Cottee, M. & Rainer, A. 2005. Using an expert panel to validate a requirements process improvement model. *Journal of Systems and Software*, 76(3):251 – 275.
- Benedict, R. H. B., Wahlig, E., Bakshi, R., Fishman, I., Munschauer, F., Zivadinov, R. & Weinstock-Guttman, B. 2005. Predicting quality of life in multiple sclerosis: Accounting for physical disability, fatigue, cognition, mood disorder, personality and behavior change. *Journal of Neurological Sciences*, 231(1-2):29 – 34.
- Bing, F. 2007. Understanding research process. *US-China Education Review*, 4(7), July:15 – 22.

<http://www.teacher.org.cn/doc/ucedu200707/ucedu20070702.pdf>.

Accessed on 10 September 2009.

- Bitsch, V. 2005. Qualitative research: A Grounded Theory example and evaluation criteria. *Journal of Agribusiness*, 23(1):75 – 91.
- Blair, I.V. & Jost, J.T. 2003. Exit, loyalty, and collective action among workers in a simulated business environment: Interactive effects of group identification and boundary permeability. *Social Justice Research*, 16(2):95 – 108.
- Bless, C., Higson-Smith, C. & Kagee, A. 2006. *Fundamentals of social research methods: An African perspective*. (4th edition). Cape Town: Juta.
- Bogdan, R. C. & Biklen, S.K. (2003). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Boni-Saenz, A. A., Heinemann, A. W., Crown, D. S. & Emanuel, L. L. 2004. *The business of employing people with disabilities: Four case studies: Multi-case study report*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Bouret, E. M., Bernick, L. G., Cott, C. A. & Kontos, P. C. 2002. The meaning of mobility for residents and staff in long-term care facilities. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 37(4):338 – 345.
- Bowen, G. A. 2008. Naturalistic inquiry and the saturation concept: A research note. *Qualitative Research*, 8:137 – 152.
<http://grj.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/8/1/137>. Accessed on 26 March 2008.
- Brandt, H. M. 2004. Use of cognitive interviewing to develop a Human Papillomavirus (HPV) telephone questionnaire for women living in rural South Carolina (SC). Public Health and the Environment. Recorded presentation: Washington, DC, November 6 – 10.
- Brown, B., Bonello, R. & Pollard, H. 2005. The biopsychosocial model and

- hypothyroidism. *Chiropractic & Osteopathy*, 13(5):1 – 9.
<http://www.chiroandosteo.com/content/13/1/5>. Accessed on 28 February 2010.
- Brown, S. C., Stevens, R. A., Troiano, P. F. & Schneider, A. K. 2002. Exploring complex phenomena: Grounded Theory in student affairs research. *Journal of College Student Development*, 43(2):1 – 11.
- Burton, K. 2006. Designing criterion-referenced assessment. *Journal of Learning Design*, 1(2):73 – 82. <http://www.jld.qut.edu.au/>. Accessed on 13 September 2009.
- Caine, K. J., Davidson, C. M. & Stewart, E. J. 2009. Preliminary fieldwork: Methodological reflections from northern Canadian research. *Qualitative research*, 9(4):489 – 513.
- Cape Gateway. 2004. *Retirement age: What are your rights?* Cape Town: Cape Gateway.
http://www.capegateway.gov.za/eng/pubs/public_info/R/66371. Accessed on 5 July 2011.
- Cascio, W. F. 1995. *Applied Psychology in Human Resources Management*. (5th edition). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Cegielski, C. G., Reithel, B. J. & Rebman, C. M. 2004. Issues affecting the integration of emerging information technologies into corporate Information Technology strategy: A Delphi study. *Academy of Information and Management Sciences Journal*, 7(1):27 – 42.
- Chapple, K. 2006. Overcoming mismatch: beyond dispersal, mobility, and development strategies. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 72(3):322 – 336.
- Charmaz, K. 2005. Grounded Theory in the 21st century: Applications for advancing social justice studies. In Denzin, N. K. & Lincoln, Y. S. (eds). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (pp.507 – 535) (3rd edition).

Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Chatterton, J. 2005. How will I get there? Mobility training for employment. *International Congress Series*, 1282:1130 – 1133.

Chiovitti, R. F. & Piran, N. 2003. Rigour and Grounded Theory research: Methodology issues in nursing research. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 44(4):427 – 435.

Cho, J. & Trent, A. 2006. Validity in qualitative research revisited. *Qualitative Research*, 6(3):319 – 340.
<http://qrj.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/6/3/319>. Accessed on 25 March 2008.

Chung, T. & Martin, C. S. 2005. What were they thinking? Adolescents' interpretations of DSM-IV Alcohol Dependence symptom queries and implications for diagnostic validity. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, 80(2):191 – 200.

Clark, D. O, Stump, T. E. & Wollinsky, F. D. 1998. Predictors of onset of and recovery from mobility difficulty among adults aged 51 – 61 years. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 148(1):63 – 71.

Claassen, G. 2004. *Male menopause and decision-making: A qualitative study*. Unpublished dissertation. Johannesburg: Rand Afrikaans University.

Cogneau, D. 2005. *Equality of opportunity and other equity principles in the context of developing countries*. Paris: Institut de Rechercher pour le Développement.

Commission for Employment Equity. 2007. *Annual Report – Commission for Employment Equity 2005 – 2006*. Pretoria: Commission for Employment Equity.

Commission for Employment Equity. 2009. *Annual Report – Commission for Employment Equity 2008 – 2009*. Pretoria: Commission for Employment

Equity.

Commission for Employment Equity. 2010. *10th Commission for Employment Equity Annual Report: 2009 – 2010*. Pretoria: Commission for Employment Equity.

Community Constituency. 2003. *Address to the Growth and Development Summit*. 7 June. Johannesburg: National Economic Development and Labour Council.

Corbin, J. & Strauss, A. 2008. *Basics of qualitative research*. (3rd edition). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J. W. 2003. *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches*. (2nd edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J. W. 2007. *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J. W. 2009. *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. (3rd edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J. W., Fetters, M. D. & Ivankova, N. V. 2004. Designing a mixed methods study in primary care. *Annals of Family Medicine*, 2(1):7 – 12.

Daengbuppha, J., Hemmington, N. & Wilkes, K. 2006. Using Grounded Theory to model visitor experiences at heritage sites. *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, 9(4):367 – 388.

Daniels, R. C. 2007. *Skills shortages in South Africa: A literature review*. Cape Town: Development Policy Research Unit, University of Cape Town.

Davia, M. A. 2005. *Job mobility and wage mobility at the beginning of the working career: A comparative view across Europe*. Working Papers of the Institute for Social and Economic Research, Paper 2005-03. Colchester: University of Essex.

Day, J. & Bobeva, M. 2005. A generic toolkit for the successful management of

- Delphi studies. *Electronic Journal of Business Research Methods*, 3(2):103 – 116.
- Daymon, C. & Holloway, I. 2002. *Qualitative research and marketing communications*. London: Routledge.
- Delbecq, A. L., Van de Ven, A. H. & Gustafson, D. 1975. *Group techniques for planning: A guide to nominal group and Delphi processes*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman & Company.
- Devers, K. J. & Frankel, R. M. 2000. Study design in qualitative research – 2: sampling and data collection strategies. *Education for Health*, 13(2): 263 – 271.
- Dossa, P. 2005. Racialized bodies, disabling worlds ‘they [service providers] always saw me as a client, not as a worker’. *Social Science & Medicine*, 60:2527 – 2536.
- Douglas, D. 2003. Inductive theory generation: A Grounded approach to business inquiry. <http://www.ejbrm.com>. Accessed on 29 September 2009.
- Drennan, J. 2003. Cognitive interviewing: Verbal data in the design and pretesting of questionnaires. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 42(1):57 – 63.
- Drum, C. E., Krahn, G., Culley, C. & Hammond, L. 2005. Recognizing and responding to the health disparities of people living with disabilities. *Californian Journal of Health Promotion*, 3(3):29 – 42.
- Dube, A. K. & Charowa, G. 2005. Are disabled people’s voices from both South and North being heard in the development process? A comprehensive analysis between the situation in South Africa, Zimbabwe, United Kingdom and Northern Europe. *Disability Knowledge and Research*, May – June:1 – 64.
- Duckett, P. S. & Pratt, R. 2001. The researched opinions on research: Visually

impaired people and visual impairment research. *Disability & Society*, 16(6):815 – 835.

Durant-Law, G. 2005. *The philosophical trinity, soft systems methodology and Grounded Theory*. A paper presented to the Schools of Education and Community Studies, Information Management and Tourism, Division of Communication and Education, Canberra, Australia: University of Canberra, 12 May.

Eide, A. H. & Loeb, M. E. 2005. Data and statistics on disability in developing countries. *Disability Knowledge and Research*, July: 1 – 28.

Elliot, N. & Lazenbatt, A. 2005. How to recognise a 'quality' Grounded Theory research study. *Australian Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 22 (3):48 – 52.

Ellis, T. J. & Levy, Y. 2009. Towards a guide for novice researchers on research methodology: Review and proposed methods. *Issues in Informing Science and Information Technology*, 6:323 – 337.

Elwyn, G., O'Connor, A., Stacey, D., Volk, R., Edwards, A., Coulter, A., Thomson, R., Barratt, A., Barry, M., Bernstein, S., Butow, P., Clarke, A., Entwistle, V., Feldman-Stewart, S., Holmes-Rovner, M., Llewellyn-Thomas, H., Mounjid, N., Mulley, A., Ruland, C., Sepucha, K., Sykes, A. & Whelan, T. 2006. Developing a quality criteria framework for patient decision aids: Online International Delphi Consensus Process. *British Medical Journal Online First* bmj.com. <http://bmj.com/cgi/content/full/333/7565/417>. Accessed on 16 August 2007.

Emmett, T. 2006. Disability, poverty, gender and race. In Watermeyer, B., Swartz, L., Lorenzo, T., Schneider, M. & Priestly, M. (eds.). *Disability and social change: A South African agenda* (pp. 207 – 233). Cape Town: Human Sciences Research Council.

Emmett, T. & Alant, E. 2006. Women and disability: Exploring the interface of

- multiple disadvantage. *Development Southern Africa*, 23(4):445 – 460.
- Endacott, R. 2004. Clinical research 1: Research questions and design. *Intensive and Critical Care Nursing*, 20(4):232 – 235.
- Endacott, R. & Botti, M. 2005. Clinical research 3: Sample selection. *Intensive and Critical Care Nursing*, 21(1):51 – 55.
- Fawcett, B. & Hearn, J. 2001. Research and 'disability': Accounts, biographies and policies. *Research Policy and Planning*, 19(2):27 – 36.
- Feldman, D. C. 1981. The multiple socialization of organization members. *Academy of Management Review*, 6(2):309 – 318.
- Feldman, D. C. 2004. The role of physical disabilities in early career: Vocational choice, the school-to-work transition, and becoming established. *Human Resources Management Review*, 14(3):247 – 274.
- Ferguson, P. M., Ferguson, D. L. & Taylor, S. J. 1992. Interpretivism and disability studies. In Ferguson, P. M., Ferguson, D. L. & Taylor, S. J. (eds). *Interpreting disability: A qualitative reader* (pp.1 – 17). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Finch, H. & Lewis, J. 2005. Focus groups. In Ritchie, J. & Lewis, J. (eds). *Qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers* (pp.170 – 198). London: Sage.
- Finkelstein, V. 2001. *A personal journey into disability politics*. <http://www.independentliving.org/docs3/finkelstein01a.pdf>. Accessed on 28 May 2007.
- Florian, V. & Dangoor, N. 1994. Personal and familial adaptation of women with severe physical disabilities: A further validation of the Double ABCX Model. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 56(3):735 – 746.
- Gates, L. B. 2000. Workplace accommodation as a social process. *Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation*, 10(1):85 – 97.

- Gesthuizen, M. & Dagevos, J. 2005. *Mobility into favourable jobs: Causes of external and internal labour mobility and its impact on changes in job characteristics*. The Hague: Social and Cultural Planning Office.
<http://www.scp.nl/english/publications/summaries/9037702031.shtml>.
Accessed on 1 May 2006.
- Gibbs, G. 2007. *Analyzing qualitative data*. London: Sage.
- Gignac, A. M. & Cott, C. 1998. A conceptual model of independence and dependence for adults with chronic physical illness and disability. *Social Science & Medicine*, 47(6):739 – 753.
- Ginzberg, E. & Hiestand, D. L. 1968. *Mobility in the Negro community: Guidelines for research on social and economic progress*. Washington, DC: United States Commission on Civil Rights.
- Giske, T. & Artinian, B. 2007. A personal experience of working with classical Grounded Theory: From beginner to experienced Grounded Theorist. *International Journal of Qualitative Methodology*, 6(4):67 – 80.
- Glaser, B. 1992. *Basics of Grounded Theory analysis*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.
- Glaser, B. G. & Strauss, A. L. 1967. *The discovery of Grounded Theory*. Chicago, IL: Aldine.
- Gofalshani, N. 2003. Understanding reliability and validity in qualitative research. *The Qualitative Report*, 8(4):597 – 607.
- Goodley, D. 2001. 'Learning difficulties', the social model of disability and impairment: Challenging epistemologies. *Disability and Society*, 16(2):207 – 231.
- Gordon, T. J. 1994. The Delphi method. AC/UNU Millennium Project: Futures Research Methodology. www.futurovenezuela.org_curso/5-....
Accessed on 29 February 2008.

- Goss, J. D. 1996. Focus groups as alternative research practice: Experience with transmigrants in Indonesia. *Area*, 28(2):115 – 123.
- Goulding, C. 1999. *Grounded Theory: Some reflections on paradigm, procedure and misconceptions*. Working Paper Series. June. Telford, Shropshire: University of Wolverhampton.
- Graham, B., Regehr, G. & Wright, J. G. 2003. Delphi as a method to establish consensus for diagnostic criteria. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, 56(12): 1150 – 1156.
- Greacen Associates. 2007. *Self-represented litigation network: Guideline for the use of focus groups*. Reston, VA: State Justice Institute.
- Groce, N. E. 1999. *An overview of young people living with disabilities: Their needs and their rights*. New York, NY: United Nations Children's Fund Programme Publications.
- Grudens-Schuck, N., Allen, B. L. & Larson, L. 2004. *Focus group fundamentals. Methodology brief*. Ames, IA: Iowa State University.
- Guba, E. G. & Lincoln, Y. S. 1994. Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In Denzin, N. K. & Lincoln, Y. S. (eds). *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 105 – 117). London: Sage.
- Guba, E. G. 1990. *The paradigm dialogue*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage
- Guion, R. M. 1961. Criterion measurement and personnel judgments. *Personnel Psychology*, 14:141 – 149.
- Hahn, H. 1993. The potential impact of disability studies on political science (as well as vice versa). *Policy Studies Journal*, 21(4):740 – 751.
- Hall, E. 2005. The entangled geographies of social exclusion / inclusion for people with learning disabilities. *Health and Place*, 11:107 – 115.
- Hanafin, S. & Brooks, A. 2005. *The Delphi technique: A methodology to support the development of a national set of child well-being indicators*.

Dublin: Stationery Office.

Hanafin, S. 2004. Review of literature on the Delphi technique.

http://www.omc.gov.ie/documents/Delphi_Technique_A-Literature-Review.pdf. Accessed on 21 September 2009.

Hardesty, D. M. & Bearden, W. O. 2004. The use of expert judges in scale development: Implications for improving face validity of measures of unobservable constructs. *Journal of Business Research*, 57(2):98 – 107.

Harris, J. & Roberts, K. 2003. Challenging barriers to participation in qualitative research: Involving disabled refugees. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 2(2):1 – 16.

Harrison, O. 1998. Employing people with disabilities: Small business concerns and recommendations. *Research to Practice*, 4(5):n.p..

Hartley, S. & Muhit, M. 2003. Using qualitative research methods for disability research in majority world countries. *Asia Pacific Disability Rehabilitation Journal*, 14(2):103 – 114.

Hatcher, T. & Colton, S. 2002. Using the internet to improve HRD research: The case of the web-based Delphi research technique to achieve content validity of an HRD-oriented measurement. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 31(7):570 – 587.

Hawkridge, D.G., Vincent, T. & Hales, G. 1985. *New information technology in the education of disabled children and adults*. Sydney: Croom Helm.

Hays, R. D., Hahn, H. & Marshall, G. 2002. Use of the SF-36 and other health-related quality of life measures to assess persons with disabilities. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, 83(2):4 – 9.

Hennessy, D. & Hicks, C. 2001. *The ideal attributes of chief nurses in Europe: A Delphi Study for WHO: Europe*. Oslo: WHO.

- Hertz, T. 2006. *Understanding mobility in America*. Washington, DC: Centre for American Progress.
- Hofmeister, H. 2006. Literature on job mobility in the United States: State-of-the-art of mobility research. Job mobilities Working Paper No. 2006-01, pp.173 – 194. http://www.jobmob-and-famlives.eu/papers/JFW_06-01_09_Hofmeister.pdf. Accessed on 4 July 2011.
- Hofnie-//Hoëbes, K. 2005. *Empowerment of nurse managers to facilitate change management during Namibian health sector reforms*. Unpublished DSc dissertation, Windhoek, University of Namibia.
- Holliday, A. 2002. *Doing and writing qualitative research*. London: Sage.
- Hsu, C. & Sandford, B. A. 2007. The Delphi technique: Making sense of consensus. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 12(10). <http://pareonline.net/getvn.asp?v=12&n=10>. Accessed on 31 March 2007.
- Huysamen, G.K. 1994. *Methodology for the social and behavioural sciences*. Johannesburg: Southern.
- Hyde, K. F. 2000. Recognising deductive processes in qualitative research. *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, 3(2):82 – 89.
- Ingledeew, D. K., Markland, D. & Sheppard, K. E. 2004. Personality and self-determination of exercise behaviour. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 36(8):1921 – 1932.
- Jayasooria, D. 1999. Disabled people: Active or passive citizens – reflections from the Malaysian experience. *Disability & Society*, 14(3):341 – 352.
- Jette, A. M. 2003. Assessing disability in studies on physical activity. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 25(3):122 – 128.
- Jette, A. M. 2006. Toward a common language for function, disability, and health. *Physical Therapy*, 86(5):726 – 734.

- Johnson, R. B. & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. 2009. Mixed methods research: A paradigm whose time has come. *Educational Researcher*, 33(7):14 – 26. <http://edr.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/33/7/14>. Accessed on 21 December 2009.
- Johnston, M. 1997. Integrating models of disability: A reply to Shakespeare and Watson. In Barton, L. & Oliver, M. (eds). *Disability studies: Past present and future* (pp. 281 – 287). Leeds: Disability Press.
- Jones, M. L., Kriflik, G. & Zanko, M. 2005. Grounded Theory: A theoretical and practical application in the Australian film industry. <http://ro.uow.edu.au/commpapers/46>. Accessed on 10 September 2009.
- Kakihara, M. & Sørensen, C. 2002. *Mobility: An extended perspective*. csdl.computer.org/comp/proceedings/hiccs/2002/1435/05/14350131.pdf Accessed on 22 June 2007.
- Kaye, J. & Raghavan, S. K. 2002. Spirituality in disability and illness. *Journal of Religion and Health*, 41(3):231 – 242.
- Keeney, S., Hasson, F. & McKenna, H. P. 2001. A critical review of the Delphi technique as a research methodology for nursing. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 38(2):195 – 200.
- Kellett, M. & Nind, M. 2001. Ethics in quasi-experimental research on people with severe learning disabilities: dilemmas and compromises. *British Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 29(2): 51–55.
- Kempen, G. I. J. M., Van Heuvelen, M. J. G, Van Sonderen, E., Van der Brink, R. H. S., Kooijman, A. C. & Ormel, J. 1999. The relationship of functional limitation to disability and the moderating effects of psychological attributes in community-dwelling older persons. *Social Science & Medicine*, 48:1161 – 1172.
- Kempen, G. I. J. M., Miedema, I., Ormel, J. & Molenaar, W. 1996. The assessment of disability with the Groningen Activity Restriction Scale:

- Conceptual framework and psychometric properties. *Social Science & Medicine*, 43(11):1601 – 1610.
- Kennedy, J. & Olney, M. 2001. Job discrimination in the post-ADA era: Estimates from the 1994 and 1995 National Health Interview Surveys. *Rehabilitation Counselling Bulletin*, 45(1):24 – 30.
- Kenyon, S., Lyons, G. & Rafferty, J. 2002. Transport and social exclusion: Investigating the possibility of promoting inclusion through virtual mobility. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 10(3):207 – 219.
- Kitthananan, A. n.d. *Choosing and using qualitative research: The focus group method*. Bristol: School of Policy Studies, University of Bristol.
- Klimoski, R. & Donahue, L. 1997. HR strategies for integrating individuals with disabilities into the work place. *Human Resources Management Review*, 7(1):109 – 138.
- Knight, A., Almeroth, K., Mayer, R. & Chun, D. 2006. Observations and recommendations for using technology to extend interaction. <http://nms/cs.ucsb.edu/papers/EDMEDIA-KNIGHT-06.pdf>. Accessed on 20 January 2011.
- Koch, T. 1994. Establishing rigour in qualitative research: The decision trail. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 19:976 – 986.
- Koch, T. 2000. The illusion of paradox: Commentary on Albrecht, G. L. and Devlieger, P. J. (1998). The Disability paradox: high quality of life against all odds. *Social Science & Medicine*, 48:977 – 988.
- Kopec, J. A. 1995. Concepts of disability: The Activity Space Model. *Social Science and Medicine*, 40(5):649 – 656.
- Koster, A., Bosma, H., Van Lenthe, F. J., Kempen, G. I. J. M., Mackenbach, J. P. & Van Eijk, J. T. M. 2005. The role of psychosocial factors in explaining socio-economic differences in mobility decline in a chronically ill population: Results from the GLOBE study. *Social Science and*

Medicine, 61: 123 – 132.

- Kramer, M. A. M. 2007. *Re-examining the theoretical foundations of mobility and mobile learning*. www.mamk.net/wp-content/uploads/2007/04/imcl2007_mkramer_final-sent.pdf. Accessed on 22 June 2007.
- Krauss, S. E. 2005. Research paradigms and meaning making: A primer. *The Qualitative Report*, 10(4):758 – 770.
<http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR10-4/krauss.pdf>. Accessed on 26 March 2008.
- Krautt, R., Olson, J., Banaji, M., Bruckman, A., Cohen, J. & Couper, M. 2004. Psychological research online: Report of Board of Scientific Affairs' Advisory Group on the conduct of research on the internet. *American Psychologist*, 59(2):105 – 117.
- Kreismann, R. & Palmer, R. 2001. Reasonable accommodation under the ADA: What's an employer to do? *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, October-November:24 – 33.
- Kritzinger, J. 1995. Qualitative research: Introducing focus groups. *British Medical Journal*, 311:299 – 302.
<http://bmj.bmjournals.com/cgi/content/full/311/7000/299>. Accessed 10 September 2009.
- Lahtinen, E., Koskinen-Ollonqvist, P., Rouvinen-Wilenius, P., Tuominen, P. & Mittelmark, M. B. 2005. The development of quality criteria for research: A Finnish approach. *Health Promotion International*, 20(3):306 –315.
- Leedy, P. D. & Ormrod, J. E. 2005. *Practical research. International edition*. (8th edition). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson, Merrill, Prentice Hall.
- Levy, D. 2003. Qualitative methodology and Grounded Theory in property research. *Pacific Rim Property Research Journal*, 12(4):369 – 388.
- Lewis, R. B. 2004. Nvivo 2.0 and Atlas.ti 5.0; A comparative review of two

- popular qualitative data-analysis programs. *Field Methods*, 16(4):439 – 469.
- Li, E. J. Q., Li-Tsang, C. W. P, Lam, C. S., Hui, K. Y. L. & Chan, C. C. H. 2006. The effect of a ‘training on work readiness’ program for workers with musculoskeletal injuries: A randomized control trial (RCT) study. *Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation*, 16: 529 – 541.
- Lupton, D. & Seymour, W. 2000. Technology, selfhood and physical disability. *Social Science and Medicine*, 50:1851 – 1862.
- Lutabingwa, J. & Nethonzhe, T. 2006. Ethical issues in Social Research. *Journal of Public Administration*, 41(3.1): 694 – 702.
- Lynch, K. 1999. Equality studies, the academy and the role of research in emancipatory social change. *Economic and Social Review*, 20(1):41 – 69.
- Maclaran, P. & Catterall, M. 2002. Analysing qualitative data: Computer software and the market research practitioner. *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, 5(1):28 -39.
- Makwetu, S. 2007. *The impact of legislation dealing with unlawful discrimination against people with disabilities: People’s Assembly Report 2006*. Cape Town: Parliament of the Republic of South Africa.
- Malterud, K. 2001. Qualitative research: Standards, challenges and guidelines. *Lancet*, 358(9280):483 – 488.
- Manns, P. J. & Chad, K. E. 1999. Determining the relation between quality of life, handicap, fitness and physical activity for persons with spinal cord injury. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*. 80, 1566 – 1571.
- Marshall, C. & Rossman, G. B. 2006. *Designing Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Mauro, R. 1999. If you're newly disabled. *Accent on Living*, Spring:101 – 106.
- Mays, N. & Pope, C. 1995. Qualitative research: Rigour and qualitative research. *British Medical Journal*, 311:109 – 112.
- Mbara, T. & Paradza, G. n.d. *Overview of mobility in Zimbabwe*. www.bremen-initiative.de/lib/papers/zimbabwe.pdf. Accessed on 22 June 2007.
- McGhee, G., Marland, G. R. & Atkinson, J. 2007. Grounded Theory research: Literature reviewing and reflexivity. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 60(3):334-342.
- McLafferty, I. 2004. Focus group interviews as data collection strategy. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 48(2):187 – 194.
- McMillan, J. H. & Schumacher, S. 2001. *Research in education: A conceptual introduction*. New York, NY: Longman.
- McQueen, K. M. 2008. Ethics and team-based qualitative research. In Guest, G. & Macqueen, K. (eds). *Handbook for team based qualitative research* (pp.21 – 38). Lanham, MD: AltaMira.
- Mead, G. H. 1925. The genesis of the self and social control. *International Journal of Ethics*, 35(3):251 – 277.
- Meerman, J. 2001. Poverty and mobility in low-status minorities: The Cuban case in international perspective. *World Development*, 29(9):1457 – 1481.
- Meerman, J. 2005. Oppressed people: Economic mobility of the socially excluded. *Journal of Socio-Economics*, 34(4):542 – 567.
- Meho, L. I. 2006. E-mail interviewing in qualitative research: A methodological discussion. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 57(10):1284 – 1295.
- Merriam, S. B. 1998. *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. Revised and expanded from *Case Study Research in*

- Education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Meyerson, L. 1988. The social psychology of physical disability: 1948 – 1988. *Journal of Social Issues*, 44(1):173 – 188.
- Miaskiewicz, T. & Kozar, K. 2006. *The use of Delphi method to determine the benefits of the personas method – an approach to systems design*. Proceedings of the Fifth Annual Workshop on HCI Research in MIS, Milwaukee. Personas Delphi Study, December 9, 2006.
- Mickhail, G. & Graaf, A. n.d. *The Kabuki of accounting philosophy*. Wollongong, NSW, Australia: University of Wollongong.
- Mihalko, S. L. & Wickley, K. L. 2003. Active living for assisted living: Promoting partnerships within a systems framework. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 25(3Sii):193 – 203.
- Miles, M. B. & Huberman, M. 1994. *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. (2nd edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Miles, M. B. & Weitzman, E. A. 1994. Choosing computer programs for qualitative data analysis. In Miles, M. B. & Huberman, A. M. (eds). *An expanded sourcebook: Qualitative data analysis* (pp. 311 – 317) (2nd edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Montreal Process Working Group. 2007. *Criteria and indicators for the conservation and sustainable management of temperate and boreal forests*. Buenos Aires: Montreal Process Working Group. <http://www.rinya.maff.go.jp/mpci/>. Accessed on 28 June 2008.
- Moodle. 2010. About Moodle. <http://docs/moodle.org/en/AboutMoodle>. Accessed on 20 January 2011.
- Morgan, A., Brown, C. & Ziglio, E. n.d. *Investing in health: Valuing assets of individuals, communities and organizations – introducing the Assets for Health and Development Programme*. <http://www.hzjz.hr/skolska/EUSUMHInvesting.pdf>. Accessed on 30

September 2007.

- Moscarini, G. & Thomsson, K. 2007. Occupational and job mobility in the US. *Scandinavian Journal of Economics*, 109(4):807 – 836.
- Mouton, J. 1996. *Understanding social research*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.
- Mouton, J. & Marais, H. C. 1990. *Basic concepts in the methodology of the social sciences*. Pretoria: Human Sciences Research Council.
- Mrug, S. & Wallander, J. L. 2002. Self-concept of young people with physical disabilities: Does integration play a role? *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, 49(3):267 – 280.
- Muffels, R. J. A. & Luijkx, R. 2004. *Job mobility and employment patterns across European welfare states. Is there a 'trade-off' or a 'double bind' between flexibility and security?* Paper for the TLM.Net Conference 'Quality in Labour Market Transitions: A European Challenge'. Amsterdam: Royal Dutch Academy of Arts and Sciences.
- Mutasa, G. 2010. *The disincentive effects of disability grants on labour supply in South Africa: A cohort analysis*. Cape Town: University of Cape Town.
- Nair, K. M., Dolovich, L. R., Ciliska, D. K. & Lee, H. N. 2005. The perception of continuity of care from the perspective of patients with disabilities. *Family Medicine*, 37(2):118 – 124.
- Nas, S.O., Ekeland, A., Iversen, E.J., Åkerblom, M., Virtaharju, M., Svanfeldt, C. & Ullström. 1998. *Formal competencies in the innovation systems of the Nordic countries: An analysis based on register data*. Oslo: Stiftelsen STEP.
- Neal, D. 1999. The complexity of job mobility among young men. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 17(2):237 – 261.
- Neath, J. & Schriener, K. 1998. Power to people with disabilities: Empowerment

issues in employment programming. *Disability & Society*, 13(2):217 – 228.

Ngwena, C. 2004. Equality for people with disabilities in the workplace: An overview of the emergence of disability as a human rights issue. *Journal for Juridical Science*, 29(2):167 – 197.

Ngwena, C. 2007. Deconstructing the definition of disability under the Employment Equity Act: Legal deconstruction. *South African Journal on Human Rights*, 23:116 – 156.

Nicholson, N., West, M. & Cawsey, T. F. 1985. Future uncertain: Expected vs. attained job mobility among managers. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 58:313 – 320.

Northway, R. 2000. Disability, nursing research and the importance of reflexivity. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 32(2):391 – 397.

Oliver, M. 1986. Social policy and disability: Some theoretical issues. *Disability, Handicap and Society*, 1(1):5 – 18.

Oliver, M. 1996. Defining impairment and disability: Issues at stake. In Barnes, C. & Mercer, G. (eds) *Exploring the divide* (pp. 29 – 54). Leeds: Disability Press.

Oliver, M. 1997. Emancipatory research: Realistic goal or impossible dream? In Barnes, C. & Mercer, G. (eds). *Doing disability research* (pp. 15 – 31). Leeds: Disability Press.

Oliver, M. 2002. *Using emancipatory methodologies in disability research*. 1st Annual disability research seminar hosted by Great Southern Hotel. Dublin: National Disability Authority and the Centre for Disability Studies. Dublin University College.

Oliver, M. & Barnes, CO. 1997. All we are saying is give disabled researchers a chance. *Disability and Society*, 12(5):811 – 813.

- Oliver, M. & Barton, L. 2000. *The emerging field of disability studies: A view from Britain*. Paper presented at Disability Studies: A Global Perspective. Washington DC, October 2000.
- Olsen, W. K. 2004. Triangulation in social research: qualitative and quantitative methods can really be mixed. *Developments in Sociology*, 20: 103 – 121.
- Pandit, N. R. 1996. The creation of theory: A recent application of the Grounded Theory method. *The Qualitative Report*, 2(4):1 – 20. <http://www.nopa.edu/ssss/QR/QR2-4/pandit.html>. Accessed on 30 September 2009.
- Patel, K. V., Coppin, A. K., Manini, T. M., Lauretani, F., Bandinelli, S., Ferruci, L. & Guralnik, J. M. 2006. Midlife physical activity and mobility in older age. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 31(3):217 – 224.
- Patla, A. E. & Shumway-Cook, A. 1999. Dimensions of mobility: Defining the complexity and difficulty associated with community mobility. *Journal of Aging and Physical Activity*, 7:7 – 19.
- Patton, M. 2002. *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. (3rd edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Philo, C. & Metzger, D. S. 2005. Introduction to theme section on geographies of intellectual disability: Outside the participatory mainstream. *Health and Place*, 11: 77 – 85.
- Pinder, R. 1996. Sick-but-fit or fit-but-sick? Ambiguity and identity at the workplace. In Barnes, C. & Mercer, G. (eds). *Exploring the divide* (pp. 135 – 156). Leeds: Disability Press.
- Plack, M. M. 2005. Human nature and research paradigms: Theory meets physical therapy practice. *The Qualitative Report*, 10(2):223 – 245.
- Potter, W. J. 1996. *An analysis of thinking and research about qualitative*

methods. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Pretorius, W. L. 1996. *Die benutting van die Delphitegniek vir die ontwikkeling van 'n strategiese profile vir die bestuur van 'n akademiese departement*. Ongepubliseerde MCom verhandeling. Universiteit van Pretoria, Pretoria.

Pretorius, E. M. 2006. *The role of leadership in enhancing service delivery in local government*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Johannesburg: University of Johannesburg.

Puhl, R. & Brownell, K. D. 2001. Bias, discrimination and obesity. *Obesity Research*, 9(12):788 – 805.

Quintana, J. M., Aróstegui, I., Azkarate, J., Goenaga, J. I., Elexpe, X., Letona, J & Arcelay, A. 2000. Evaluation of explicit criteria for total hip joint replacement. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, 53(12):1200 – 1208.

Rab, M. A., Afzal, M., Abou-Zeid, A. & Silverman, H. 2008. Ethical practices for health research in the Eastern Mediterranean Region of the World Health Organization: A retrospective data analysis. *Public Library of Science ONE*, 3(5): e2094. www.plosone.org. Accessed on 10 September 2009.

Rabiee, F. 2004. Focus-group interview and data analysis. *Proceedings of the Nutrition Society*, 63:655 – 660.

Raina, P., Wong, M., Chambers, L. W., Denton, M. & Gafni, A. 2000. *Describing disability among high and low income status older adults in Canada*. Hamilton, ON: McMaster University.

Rambaree, K. 2008. Internet-mediated dating/romance of Mauritian early adolescents: A Grounded Theory analysis. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies and Society*, 6(1):34 – 59. <http://www.swin.edu.au/ijets>. Accessed on 10 September 2009.

Reiser, R. & Mason, M. 1990. *Disability in the classroom: A human rights*

issue. London: Inner London Education Authority.

Republic of South Africa. 1996. *Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, Act 108 of 1996*. Pretoria: Government Printer.

Republic of South Africa. 1997. *Integrated National Disability Strategy: White Paper*. Pretoria: Government Printer.

Republic of South Africa. 1998. *The Employment Equity Act, Act No 55 of 1998*. Pretoria: Government Printer.

Republic of South Africa. 2001. *Employment Equity Act No 55 of 1998: Code of Good Practice on Key Aspects of Disability in the Workplace – Draft for Public Comments*. Pretoria: Government Printer

Republic of South Africa. 2007. *National Skills Development Strategy: Implementation Report 1 April 2006 – 31 March 2007*. Pretoria: Government Printer.

Richards, J. S., Bombardier, C. H., Tate, D., Dijkers, M., Gordon, W., Shewchuk, R., DeVivo, M. J. 1999. Access to the environment and life satisfaction after spinal cord injury. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, 80:1501 – 1506.

Rigby, S. A., Domenech, C., Thornton, E. W., Tedman, S. & Young, C. A. 2003. Development and validation of a self-efficacy measure for people with multiple sclerosis: The Multiple Sclerosis Self-Efficacy Scale. *Multiple Sclerosis*, 9:73 – 81.

Risjord, M., Moloney, M. & Dunbar, S. 2001. Methodological triangulation in nursing research. *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, 31: 40 – 59.

Ritchie, J. & Lewis, J. 2005. Carrying out qualitative analysis. In Ritchie, J. & Lewis, J. (eds). *Qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers* (pp.219 – 262). London: Sage.

Ritchie, J., Lewis, J. & Elam, G. 2005. Designing and selecting samples. In

- Ritchie, J. & Lewis, J. (eds). *Qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers* (pp. 77 – 108). London: Sage.
- Roberts, L. W., Geppert, M. A. & Brody, J. L. 2001. A framework for considering the ethical aspects of psychiatric research protocols. *Comprehensive Psychiatry*, 42(5):351 – 363.
- Roberts, P., Priest, H. & Traynor, M. 2006. Reliability and validity in research. *Nursing Standard*, 20(44):41 – 45.
- Rocco, T. S., Bliss, L. A., Gallagher, S. & Pérez-Prado, A. 2003. Taking the next step: Mixed methods research in organizational systems. *Information Technology, Learning and Performance Journal*, 21(1):19 – 29.
- Rolfe, G. 2006. Validity, trustworthiness and rigour: Quality and the idea of qualitative research. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 53(3):304 – 310.
- Rosal, M. C., Carbone, E. T. & Goins, K. V. 2003. Use of cognitive interviewing to adapt measurement instruments for low-literate Hispanics. *Disability Educator*, 29(6):1006 – 1017
- Ross, G. F. 2004. Ethics, trust and expectations regarding the treatment of disabled staff within a tourism/hospitality industry context. *Hospitality Management*, 23:523 – 544.
- Rossier, P. & Wade, D. T. 2001. Validity and reliability of 4 mobility measures in patients presenting with neurologic impairment. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, 82:9 – 13.
- Rubin, H.J. & Rubin, I. S. 1995. *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data*. London: Sage
- Sadleowski, M. 1986. The problem of rigor in qualitative research. *Advances in Nursing Science*, 8(3), 27 – 37.
- Sale, J. E. M., Lohfeld, L. H. & Brazil, K. 2002. Revisiting the quantitative-

- qualitative debate: Implications for mixed-methods research. *Quality and Quantity*, 36:43 – 53.
- Schaeffer, P. 1985. Human capital accumulation and job mobility. *Journal of Regional Science*, 25(1):103 – 114.
- Scheid, T. L. 2005. Stigma as a barrier to employment: Mental disability and the Americans with Disabilities Act. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, 28:670 – 690.
- Schur, L., Kruse, D. & Blanck, P. 2005. Corporate culture and the employment of persons with disabilities. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 23:3 – 20.
- Schurink, W. J. 2004. Operationalisation of research proposals. *Notes to M and D Students*. Johannesburg: Rand Afrikaans University.
- Scotch, R. K. & Schriener, K. 1997. Disability as human variation: Implications for policy. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 549, 148 – 159. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1048092>. Accessed on 19 January 2010.
- Seale, C. & Silverman, D. 1997. Ensuring rigour in qualitative research. *European Journal of Public Health*, 7:379 – 384.
- Seelman, K. 2004. *Trends in rehabilitation and disability: Transition from a medical model to an integrative model (Part 1)*.
http://www.disabilityworld.org/01-03_04/access/rehabtrends1.shtml. Accessed on 19 January 2010.
- Seymour, W. 2001. In the flesh or online? Exploring qualitative research methodologies. *Qualitative Research*, 1(2):147 – 168.
<http://qrj.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/1/2/147>. Accessed on 17 August 2007.
- Shah, S. 2006. Sharing the world: The researcher and the researched. *Qualitative Research*, 6(), 207 – 220.
<http://qrj.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/6/2/207>. Accessed on 17

August 2007.

- Shakespeare, T. 1996. Disability, identity and difference. In Barnes, C. & Mercer, G. (eds.) *Exploring the divide* (pp. 94 – 113). Leeds: Disability Press.
- Shannak, R. O. & Aldhmour, F. M. 2009. Grounded Theory as a methodology for theory generation in information systems research. *European Journal of Economics, Finance and Administrative Sciences*, 15: <http://www.eurojournals.com/EJEFAS.htm>. Accessed on 23 September 2009.
- Shar, S.K. & Corley, K.G. 2006. Building better theory by bridging the quantitative-qualitative divide. *Journal of Management Studies*, 43(8):1821 – 1835.
- Sheldon, A. 2003. Changing technology. In Swain, J., French, S., Barnes, C. & Thomas, C. (eds). *Disabling barriers – enabling environments* (pp. 1 – 9). London: Sage.
- Sideridis, G. D. 2006. Achievement goal orientations, 'oughts,' and self-regulation in students with and without learning disabilities. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 29(1):3 – 18.
- Simon, G. E., Unützer, J., Young, B. E. & Pincus, H. A. 2000. Large medical databases, population-based research, and patient confidentiality. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 157: 1731 – 1737.
- Simpson, W. 1990. Starting even? Job mobility and the wage gap between young single males and females. *Applied Economics*, 22:723 – 737.
- Skulmoski, G. J., Hartman, F. T. & Krahn, J. 2007. The Delphi method for graduate research. *Journal of Information Technology Education*, 6:1 – 21.
- Smit, b. & Cilliers, F. 2006. Understanding implicit texts in focus groups from a systems psychodynamic perspective. *The Qualitative Report*, 11(2):302

– 316. <http://www.nova.edu/sss/QR/QR11-2/smit.pdf>. Accessed on 10 September 2009.

- Snape, D. & Spencer, L. 2005. The foundations of qualitative research. In Ritchie, J. & Lewis, J. (eds). *qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers* (pp. 1 – 23). London: Sage.
- Sofaer, S. 2002. Qualitative research methods. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care*, 14(4):329 – 336.
- Sousa-Poza, A. & Henneberger, F. 2004. Analyzing job mobility with job turnover intentions: An international comparative study. *Journal of Economic Issues*, 38(1):113 – 137.
- South African Human Rights Commission. 2002. *A report on accessibility and built environments for people with disabilities*.
http://www.sahrc.org.za/sahrc/cms/publish/printer_86.shtml. Accessed on 25 June 2008.
- Statistics South Africa. 2005. *Census 2001. Prevalence of disability in South Africa: Report No. 03-02-44 (2001)*. Pretoria: Statistics South Africa.
- Steinfeld, E. 2003. Modelling spatial interaction through full-scale modelling. *International Journal of Industrial Ergonomics*, 33:265 – 278.
- Stephens, D. L., Collins, M. D. & Dodder, R. A. 2003. A longitudinal study of employment and skill acquisition among individuals with developmental disabilities. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, 26:469 – 486.
- Stiffman, A. R., Freedenthal, S., Brown, E., Ostmann, E. & Hibbeler, P. 2005. Field research with underserved minorities: The ideal and the real. *Journal of Urban Health: Bulletin of the New York Academy Of Medicine*, 82(2): iii56 – iii 66.
- Stiles, W. B. 1993. Quality control in qualitative research. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 13: 593 – 618.

- Stineman, M. G., Weschler, B., Ross, R. & Maislin, G. 2003. A method for measuring quality of life through subjective weighting of functional status. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, 84 (2):15 – 22.
- Stockdale, A. 2003. An approach to recording, transcribing, and preparing audio data for qualitative analysis.
<http://www2.edc.org/CAEPP/audio.html>. Accessed on 30 November 2007.
- Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. 1998. *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing Grounded Theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Sullivan, S. E. & Arthur, M. B. 2006. The evolution of the boundaryless career concept: Examining physical and psychological mobility. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 69:19 – 29.
- Swartz, L. & Schneider, M. 2007. Tough choices: Disability and social security in South Africa. In Watermeyer, B., Swartz, L., Lorenzo, T., Schneider, M. & Priestly, M. (eds). *Disability and social change: A South African agenda* (pp. 234 – 244). Cape Town: Human Sciences Research Council.
- Swartz, L. & Watermeyer, B. 2006. Introduction and overview. In Watermeyer, B., Swartz, L., Lorenzo, T., Schneider, M. & Priestly, M. (eds.). *Disability and social change: A South African agenda* (pp.1-6). Cape Town: Human Sciences Research Council.
- Swift, A. 2002. *Would perfect mobility be perfect?* Sociology Working Papers, Paper Number 2002- 05. St. Ebbes, Oxford: University of Oxford.
- Tafforeau, J., Cobo, M. L., Tolonen, H., Scheidt-Nave, C. & Tinto, A. n.d. *Guidelines for the development and criteria for the adoption of Health Survey instruments*. Brussels: European Commission.

- Taylor, C. L. 1993. Foundation concepts essential for evaluation: Criteria / evidence / judgment. *Bulletin PE-24*, March 1 – 4. Gainesville, FL: University of Florida.
- Thurmond, V. A. 2001. The point of triangulation. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, Third Quarter:253 – 258.
- Townsend, A., Pande, M. & Gorbis, M. 2007. *The mobility explosion: Shaping innovation and technology needs*. Palo Alto, CA: Institute for the Future.
- Valjus, S. 2002. Virtual mobility in reality: A study of the use of ICT in Finnish Leonardo da Vinci Mobility Projects.
<http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/leonardo/new/leonardo2/studies/mobility.pdf>. Accessed on 29 April 2008.
- Van Ham, M. 2002. *Job access, workplace mobility, and occupational achievement*. PhD Thesis: Faculty of Geographical Sciences. Utrecht: Utrecht University.
- Van Vianen, A. E. M., Feij, J. A., Krausz, M. & Taris, R. 2003. Personality factors and adult attachment affecting job mobility. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 11(4):253 – 264.
- Venter, C. J., Rickert, T. E. & Maunder, D. A. C. 2003. *From basic rights to full access: Elements of current accessibility practice in developing countries*. Washington, DC: Transport Research Board.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.3141/1848-11>. Accessed on 26 June 2008.
- Venter, C., Savill, T., Riekert, T., Bogopane, H., Venkatesh, A., Camba, J., Mulikita, N., Khaula, C., Stone, J. & Maunder, D. 2002. Enhanced accessibility for people with disabilities living in urban areas. Unpublished Project Report (PR/INT/248/02. Engineering Knowledge and Research: Department for International Development, UK.
- Verbrugge, L. M. & Jette, A. M. 1994. The disablement process. *Social Science & Medicine*, 38(1):1 – 14.

- Verma, S. 2003. *Research design chapter of 'Product Innovativeness and Performance in Software Firms'*. Paper presented at the EkL Seminar. Eskilstuna: Märdalens University.
- Walter, F. M. & Emery, J. 2005. Coming down the line – patients' understanding of their family history of common chronic disease. *Annals of Family Medicine*, 3(5):405 – 414.
- Wang, P. P., Badley, E. M. & Gignac, M. 2004. Activity limitation, coping efficacy and self-perceived physical independence in people with disability. *Disability and Rehabilitation*, 26(13):785 – 793.
- Watts, J. H. 2008. Emotion, empathy and exit: reflections on doing ethnographic qualitative research on sensitive topics. *Medical Sociology Online*, 3(2): 3 – 14.
- Weiss, J., Diamond, T., Demark, J. & Lovald, B. 2003. Involvement in Special Olympics and its relations to self concept and actual competency in participants with developmental disabilities. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, 24:281 – 305.
- Welsh, E. 2002. Dealing with data: Using Nvivo in the qualitative data analysis process. *Forum – Qualitative Social Research*, 3(2), 26 May. <http://www.qualitative-research.net/fgs/>. Accessed on 30 September 2009.
- Whittemore, R. & Knafl, K. 2005. The integrative review: updated methodology. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 52(5):546 – 553.
- Williams, C. 2006. Disability in the workplace. *Perspectives*, February:16 – 24.
- Williams, E. 1998. *Research and paradigms*. Unpublished MCom Dissertation, Wellington, New Zealand, Victoria University.
- Willis, S. P., Fabian, E. S. & Hendershot, G. E. 2005. Help-seeking behavior among people with disabilities: Results from a national survey. *Journal*

of Rehabilitation, 71(1), 42 – 48.

- Winning, E. A. 2002. *What is reasonable accommodation?*
<http://www.ewin.com/articles.rsnabl.htm>. Accessed on 1 August 2007.
- Wolff, A. C. & Ratner, P. A. 1999. Stress, social support, and sense of coherence. *Western Journal of Nursing Research*, 21 (2):182 – 197.
- Woodhams, C. & Danieli, A. 2000. Disability and diversity – a difference too far? *Personnel Review*, 29(3):402 – 416.
- Wooten, L. P. & James, E. H. 2005. Challenges of organizational learning: Perpetuation of discrimination against employees with disabilities. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 23:123 – 141.
- World Bank. 2008. *Economic implications of chronic illness and disability in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union*. Washington DC: World Bank.
- Wright, E. R., Gronfein, W. P. & Owens, T. J. 2000. Deinstitutionalization, social rejection and the self. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 41(1): 68 – 90.
- Yelin, E. H. & Katz, P. P. 1994. Making work more central to work disability policy. *Milbank Quarterly*, 72(4): 593 – 619.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/3350357>. Accessed on 1 April 2010.
- Zarb, G. 1997. Researching disabling barriers. In Barnes, C. & Mercer, G. (eds). *Doing disability research* (pp. 49 – 66). Leeds: Disability Press.
- Ziegler, J. R. 2001. *A critical analysis of the literature surrounding attitudes toward people with disabilities*. Unpublished MSc dissertation. Menomonie, WI: University of Wisconsin, Stout Graduate College.

ANNEXURE A

INFORMED CONSENT AGREEMENT

I voluntarily participate in this study, which is intended to identify workplace-effective mobility criteria for people with disabilities for use by employers.

I therefore confirm that

- the researcher was fully introduced to me, and I am aware of his academic credentials and experience;
- I have been fully briefed on the nature of the methods, the uses of the data collected and the participation risks involved in the study;
- I am aware that I have the right to withdraw my participation in the study at any time if I feel uncomfortable;
- I have been informed that the study is conducted in partial fulfilment of the PhD requirements of the researcher at the University of Pretoria, and that the information collected will be used solely for this purpose;
- I am aware that the information may need to be disclosed to the research promoter(s) for purposes of verifying the process and results, which disclosure I have been informed will require my written consent. By signing this agreement, I am granting such consent;
- I am aware that participation in this study is a sacrifice I am making to the academic process and that any answers will be provided anonymously;
- in exchange for my participation, I am informed that a copy of the results will be made available via the disability organisation of which I am a member;
- I am aware that in the event of any queries pertaining to this study or information on my participation rights, I may contact the researcher at his e-mail address, kgomotso@vut.ac.za or his promoter, Professor Hannes de Beer, at jjdebeer@hakuna.up.ac.za.

Signed:.....**Date:**.....

ANNEXURE B

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

Adapted from www.theta.org.za/etqa/index.asp?thepage=mou.htm – 44k

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

between

**KGOMOTSO WILLIAM KASONKOLA
PHD CANDIDATE AT THE UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA
STUDENT NUMBER 9930007**

and

Disability Organisation

1. PARTIES TO THE MEMORANDUM

- 1.1 The parties to this Memorandum of Understanding are Kgomotso William Kasonkola (hereinafter referred to as the student) and (hereinafter referred to as a Disability Organisation)
- 1.2 This document is an agreement in respect of data to be collected by the student in partial fulfilment of a PhD qualification at the University of Pretoria;
- 1.3 The data will be collected on members of the organisation outlined herein.

2. DURATION

This agreement shall commence on signature by both parties, for an initial period of four (4) consecutive weeks.

3. PURPOSE OF MEMORANDUM

- 3.1 The purpose of this Memorandum is to:
 - 3.1.1 establish a relationship to enable the conduct of a PhD research with the members of disability organisations;
 - 3.1.2 clarify the conditions under which such research will be conducted; and
 - 3.1.3 mutually identify and agree on mechanisms to protect the human rights of members in the course of this research.
- 3.2 This memorandum provides exclusive mutual partnership status in the conduct of the afore-mentioned research.

4. PRINCIPLES OF CO-OPERATION

In order to achieve the purpose of this Memorandum, the parties have adopted and will comply with the principles of co-operation set out below:

4.1. The parties agree that, for the duration of the research project, the researcher will:

4.1.1. promote the rights of members to privacy, anonymity, voluntary participation and to voluntarily withdraw at any stage of the research process should they feel uncomfortable;

4.1.2. provide detailed information regarding the objectives of the research project, uses and disposal of data collected;

4.1.3. obtain written and informed consent to any disclosure of information that may be required by a competent person, i.e. the research promoter, research auditor or the University of Pretoria's Ethics Committee, for the purposes of verifying the results;

4.1.4. carry the costs of transporting participants to and from the venue, and of supplying refreshments during breaks, where applicable;

4.1.5. provide a copy of the findings upon completion and approval of the research report; and

4.1.6. the disability organisation will encourage members to participate and assist in the process of identifying accessible and noise-free venues for the conduct of intended focus group interview sessions.

5. DATA COLLECTION, RECORD KEEPING, DOCUMENTS AND REPORTING

The parties undertake:

5.1. to ensure the confidentiality of the records, that all records generated during data collection, interpretation and reporting shall be destroyed upon acceptance of the final research report by the University of Pretoria; and

- 5.2. that the information shall be used solely for purposes of the intended qualification by the student.

6. CONFIDENTIALITY

- 6.1. The parties acknowledge that any information supplied in accordance with this agreement, transferred to or come into the possession or knowledge of the research promoter, research auditor or the university ('the receiving party'), may consist of confidential or proprietary data, which is not available in the public domain;
- 6.2. The receiving party therefore agrees to hold such material and information in the strictest confidence and not to make use thereof other than for the purposes of this agreement and to release it only to such properly authorized persons requiring it for the purposes explained in this agreement and agree not to release or disclose it to any other party who has not signed an agreement expressly binding himself not to use or disclose it other than for the purposes of this agreement. The undertaking and obligations contained in this clause do not apply to information that is publicly available at the date of disclosure or thereafter becomes publicly available from sources other than the parties;
- 6.3. The parties shall take such precautions as may be necessary to maintain the secrecy and confidentiality of such material and will maintain the confidentiality of all personal information lodged by the organisations' members and any other person to whom any such confidential or proprietary data may have been or will be disclosed;
- 6.4. Should this agreement be cancelled for whatsoever reason, each party shall return to the other forthwith and upon demand all documents, written instructions, notes, memoranda, disks or records and other documentation of whatsoever nature or description relating to the confidential information which it acquired or may acquire or came into its possession and any such confidential information stored by electronic means shall forthwith be destroyed.

7. ADDITIONAL / OTHER CO-OPERATION AGREEMENTS BETWEEN PARTIES

The parties may conclude additional agreements as required in order to clarify their responsibilities and to establish further mechanisms and procedures for partnership to pursue the objectives of this agreement.

8. AMENDMENTS TO THIS MEMORANDUM

This agreement and the annexures hereto constitute the sole record of the agreement between the parties in relation to the subject matter hereof. Neither party shall be bound by any express, tacit or implied term, representation, warranty, promise or the like not recorded herein. This agreement supersedes and replaces all prior commitments, undertakings or representations, whether oral or written, between the parties in respect of the subject matter hereof.

No addition to, variation, notation or agreed cancellation of any provision of this agreement shall be binding upon the parties unless reduced to writing and signed by or on behalf of the parties.

9. NEW PARTIES TO THE MEMORANDUM

The parties may agree to introduce a new party to this Memorandum. Following agreement in writing to this effect, the Memorandum shall become binding on the new party on signature.

10. DISPUTE RESOLUTION

Should any dispute or difference arise between the parties with regard to interpretation and/or implementation of any one or more of the provisions of this agreement, either party shall be entitled to submit such dispute or difference to the attention of Professor J. J. de Beer (jjdebeer@hakuna.up.ac.za), Human

Resources Department of the University of Pretoria, for resolution.

11. TERMINATION OR SUSPENSION OF AGREEMENT

The agreement is terminable by either party giving the other fourteen days notice. Neither party shall have any claim against the other for cancellation of the Agreement in terms of this clause.

12. ADDRESSES OF PARTIES FOR CORRESPONDENCE

Kgomotso William Kasonkola

Telephone: 083 626 8997

Facsimile: ((016) 950 9782

E-Mail: kgomotso@vut.ac.za

Postal: Private Bag X 021

Vanderbijlpark

1911

Disability Organisation

SIGNATORIES OF THIS AGREEMENT

Signed on this.....day of2008
at.....

Kgomotso William Kasonkola

Student

Signed as witness to this agreement

Signed as witness to this agreement

Name:.....Name:.....

Address:.....Address:.....

ANNEXURE C

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEWS

Topic: Identification of criteria for workplace-effective mobility among employees with disabilities

INTRODUCTION

Greeting	Greet the participants, introduce the researcher and research assistants
Thanks	Thank the participants for their time
Confidentiality	Explain that the interviews are anonymous and assure participants of confidentiality. Introduce the Informed Consent Agreement.
Purpose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explain that the purpose of this interview is to identify indicators of workplace-effective mobility of employees with disabilities. • Explain that the research is in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the researcher's doctoral programme at the University of Pretoria. • Explain the procedure to be followed, the rules of participation and the intended uses of the results
Value of the interview	Explain that the participant's information will be used to compile a checklist to be used by employers to select suitably qualified employees with disabilities in the workplace.

THE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE	
A. Nature of workplace-effective mobility	
1.	In your opinion, and based on your experience, how do you define the workplace-effective mobility of employees with disabilities?
B. Enablers of workplace-effective mobility	
2.	What factors are attributable to the attainment of workplace-effective mobility by employees with disabilities?
C: Inhibitors of workplace-effective mobility	
3.	What factors are attributable to the lack of workplace-effective mobility among employees with disabilities?
D. Differential treatment of disabilities	
4.	What are your views regarding the role of employers treating the different types of disabilities when making employment decisions?
E. General opinions and experiences	
5.	What are your impressions of this focus group interview session?
CLOSURE	
Thank the interviewees for their valuable time and their contributions. Ask if you can speak to them again in the event that you need more clarity on any one of the above questions. Indicate that you will transcribe the tapes and compile a report, which you will present to them for additions, corrections of comments at a later stage.	

DELPHI ROUND ONE
VERIFICATION AND CONFIRMATION OF INDICATORS

1. BACKGROUND

The pilot rounds focused on the expansion and refinement of the indicators of workplace-effective mobility as identified from the focus group interviews with participants with disabilities. This round presents a consolidated version of indicators identified based on your comments and inputs received in the previous rounds.

The goal of this round is therefore to verify and confirm the identified indicators and categorise them into workplace-effective criteria that employers may use to select suitably qualified Employees with Disabilities to their workplaces.

2. THE TASK

You are requested to read through the identified indicators per criterion and perform the following actions:

- 2.1. Indicate the extent to which you regard the definition of workplace-effective mobility proved to be clear, relevant and representative of the phenomenon and use the **1 – 5 point Likert Scale** to indicate your response. In the scale **1 = Low and 5 = High**;
- 2.2. Indicate your agreement or otherwise with the dimensionalisation of the definition on a **1 – 5 point Likert Scale**. In the scale **1 = Strongly Disagree and 5 = Strongly Agree**.
- 2.3. Indicate your agreement or otherwise with the dimensionalisation of the definition on a **1 – 5 point Likert Scale**. In the scale **1 = Strongly Disagree**

and 5 = Strongly Agree. In the event of you having a different view, you are most welcome to reflect it in the **comment**_space provided;

2.4. Please make sure that you complete **ALL** questions on the questionnaire; and

2.5. Please note that the return date for this round is close of business on **Friday, 11 September 2009.** In the interest of maintaining the anonymity of your responses, you are to submit your inputs to keshald@vut.ac.za

THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Section A: Definition

A1. Workplace-effective mobility is defined as the willingness and ability of employees with disabilities to find work in the open labour market; make an effective contribution; and maintain an economically active lifestyle. Please rate this definition for clarity, relevance and representativeness using a **5-point ordinal scale (1 = low and 5 = high).**

Clarity: the extent to which the definition is understandable	1	2	3	4	5
Relevance: the extent to which the definition is appropriate to the understanding of the concept of workplace-effective mobility	1	2	3	4	5
Representativeness: the extent to which the definition represents the concept of workplace-effective mobility	1	2	3	4	5

Suggested amendments to the definition:

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

Section B: Dimensions

- B1.** Aspects of the definition are dimensionalised in the following table. Please look at the dimensions and on a **5-point ordinal scale** indicate the extent to which you are in agreement with these dimensions (**1 = strongly disagree** and **5 = strongly agree**).

Segment	Dimension	Rating					Comment
		1	2	3	4	5	
Willingness and ability to find work in an open labour market	It requires a <u>positive self-concept</u> , which is a perceived competence to achieve general self-worth.						
Willingness and ability to make an effective contribution	It requires <u>self-efficacy</u> , which is the perceived ability to perform in order to meet socially acceptable levels.						
	It also requires <u>physical mobility</u> , which is a physical dimension.						
	It also requires a <u>sense of coherence</u> , which is a personal feeling of confidence that the required personal resources are available to cope with challenges.						

Segment	Dimension	Rating					Comment
Willingness and ability to enjoy the benefits of an economically active lifestyle	It is associated with <u>a positive sense of independence</u> , which is an economic dimension.	1	2	3	4	5	

- B2.** The following are the categorisation of the definition of workplace-effective mobility indicated in B above into indicators and dimensions, which are listed below. Please choose by placing a tick in the space provided your proposed categorisation of indicators and the reason for your choice in the comments column.

Indicators	Category	Rating					Comments
<u>Willingness and ability to</u>							
Work in a team environment	Positive self-concept	1	2	3	4	5	
Assert one's human rights	Positive self-concept	1	2	3	4	5	
Acquire job-related knowledge and experience	Positive self-concept	1	2	3	4	5	
Communicate	Positive self-concept	1	2	3	4	5	
Determine own career path	Positive self-concept	1	2	3	4	5	
Maintain a positive self-concept	Positive self-concept	1	2	3	4	5	
maintain self-confidence	Positive self-concept	1	2	3	4	5	
Find work in the open labour market	Self-efficacy	1	2	3	4	5	

Indicators <u>Willingness and ability to</u>	Category	Rating					Comments
		1	2	3	4	5	
Adjust to changing working environment	Self-efficacy	1	2	3	4	5	
Change cultural responses to disability in order to achieve success	Self-efficacy	1	2	3	4	5	
Achieve upward mobility in the workplace	Self-efficacy	1	2	3	4	5	
Assume a productive role	Self-efficacy	1	2	3	4	5	
Work hard	Self-efficacy	1	2	3	4	5	
Make an effective contribution	Self-efficacy	1	2	3	4	5	
Maintain a positive sense of purpose in the community	Self-efficacy	1	2	3	4	5	
Positive work etiquette	Self-efficacy	1	2	3	4	5	
Transcend constraints and gain membership of an occupational class	Self-efficacy	1	2	3	4	5	
Cope with work demands	Sense of coherence	1	2	3	4	5	
Maintain a positive attitude towards life	Sense of coherence	1	2	3	4	5	
Maintain a productive job fit	Sense of coherence	1	2	3	4	5	
Move freely and safely in built areas	Workplace accessibility	1	2	3	4	5	
Change places of residence to achieve success	Workplace accessibility	1	2	3	4	5	
Operate and care for assistive devices	Workplace accessibility	1	2	3	4	5	
Travel from home to work	Workplace accessibility	1	2	3	4	5	



Indicators <u>Willingness and ability to</u>	Category	Rating					Comments
		1	2	3	4	5	
Observe workplace safety and health procedures	Workplace accessibility	1	2	3	4	5	
Maintain an economically active lifestyle	Positive sense of independence	1	2	3	4	5	
Exercise life choices	Positive sense of independence	1	2	3	4	5	

C. General comments.....

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION