

American Journal on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities

Diffusion of the Shared Citizenship Paradigm: Strategies and Next Steps

--Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:	AJIDD-D-23-00062R1
Article Type:	Perspectives
Keywords:	intellectual disability; developmental disability; shared citizenship; rights; diffusion of change
Corresponding Author:	Ruth Luckasson, JD University of New Mexico - Albuquerque: The University of New Mexico Albuquerque, New Mexico UNITED STATES
First Author:	Ruth Luckasson, JD
Order of Authors:	Ruth Luckasson, JD Robert L. Schalock, PhD Valerie J. Bradley, MS
Manuscript Region of Origin:	UNITED STATES
Abstract:	The field of disabilities is being challenged to adopt a paradigm that can be used to guide the transformation of services, supports, and research practices to ensure and enhance the personal autonomy, rights, and community inclusion of people with disabilities. This article describes strategies associated with the systematic diffusion and sustainability of an innovation such as the emerging Shared Citizenship Paradigm (SCP), which has the potential to guide the transformation. The systematic diffusion process incorporates five components: knowledge, persuasion, decision, implementation, and confirmation. The systematic process also addresses the risks of dissonance, backlash, unintended consequences, and backsliding that can emerge when the sustainability of a paradigm is not supported. Throughout the article, we stress that meaningful change in organizations and systems requires use of a paradigm such as the SCP and its principles and foundation pillars to guide the change, and a systematic process such as that described in this article to bring about and sustain the change.

Diffusion of the Shared Citizenship Paradigm: Strategies and Next Steps

Abstract

The field of disabilities is being challenged to adopt a paradigm that can be used to guide the transformation of services, supports, and research practices to ensure and enhance the personal autonomy, rights, and community inclusion of people with disabilities. This article describes strategies associated with the systematic diffusion and sustainability of an innovation such as the emerging Shared Citizenship Paradigm (SCP), which has the potential to guide the transformation. The systematic diffusion process incorporates five components: knowledge, persuasion, decision, implementation, and confirmation. The systematic process also addresses the risks of dissonance, backlash, unintended consequences, and backsliding that can emerge when the sustainability of a paradigm is not supported. Throughout the article, we stress that meaningful change in organizations and systems requires use of a paradigm such as the SCP and its principles and foundation pillars to guide the change, and a systematic process such as that described in this article to bring about and sustain the change.

Keywords: intellectual disability, developmental disability, shared citizenship, rights, diffusion of change

The field of disability, including intellectual and developmental disabilities (IDD), has recently been challenged to transform and bring about meaningful change in services, supports, and research practices to ensure and enhance peoples' personal autonomy, rights, and community inclusion. Extended discussions and recommendations regarding this challenge can be found in the work of Bonney and Elison (2023), Bradley (2021), Bradley et al. (2021), Burke and Taylor (2023), European Association of Service Providers for Persons with Disabilities (2021), European Commission (2021), Friedman (2023), Kakoullis and Johnson (2022), Kover and Abbeduto (2023 a and b), Mittler (2015), National Center on Advancing Person-Centered Practices and Systems (2020), Quinn (2022), Schalock, Luckasson et al. (2021); Symons (2023 b), and Verdugo, Schalock et al. (2023).

Although positive change sometimes can be achieved for certain individuals with disabilities on a case-by-case basis, especially when the individual has access to significant private resources, meaningful systemic change that benefits all will require transformation at the societal, systems, and organizational levels. Based on considerable literature regarding organization and systems transformation and change, bringing about and sustaining meaningful change requires a paradigm to guide changes in policies and practices, and a systematic transformational process to bring about the change.

A paradigm is the collective and unifying set of values, assumptions, perceptions, and concepts that guide the development of policies and practices, and provide a framework for application, inquiry, and evaluation. A paradigm shift occurs when there is a change in the unifying perceptions that govern how things should be thought about, done, or made. According to Kuhn (1974), factors that facilitate the acceptance of a new paradigm involve the perception that the new paradigm reflects the current zeitgeist, promises to resolve issues that previous

paradigms have not, is flexible and testable, and is sufficiently open-ended to provide reinforcement and benefit to multiple stakeholders. The emerging Shared Citizenship Paradigm (SCP) described in the following section meets these criteria, and thus can be used to guide the needed transformation in services and supports to people with disabilities. Previous publications regarding the SCP have defined it operationally, demonstrated the paradigm's wide-ranging application, and described the parameters of a measureable application framework (Luckasson, Schalock et al., 2022; Verdugo, Schalock et al., 2023). To date, we have not described a systematic transformation process regarding the paradigm's infusion into disability-related policies and practices; nor have we described the components of a shared citizenship measurement model that can be used both to confirm the model's utilization and impact and provide research opportunities. Such are the two purposes of this article.

The systematic transformation process described in this article is based on the extensive work by Rogers (1995, 2003), and encompasses critical stages involved in the diffusion of innovations that bring about meaningful change in organizations and systems. Based on that extensive work, five stages have been identified: knowledge, persuasion, decision, implementation, and confirmation. Rogers' transformation/infusion process was selected based on its extensive application and empirical verification across multiple areas. The most recent edition (the 5th) of his seminal book includes contributions of various diffusion traditions; recent changes in marketing, public health, and communication; results from numerous studies regarding communication techniques; expanded understanding of diffusion networks; and results of the multiple application areas in which the diffusion of innovation stages have been successfully applied.

The Shared Citizenship Paradigm to Guide Change

Dramatic changes in societal approaches to people with disabilities and the services and supports they receive are reflected in a significant paradigm shift and the emergence of a new paradigm, which we (Luckasson, Schalock et al., 2022; Schalock, Luckasson et al., 2022) have named the shared citizenship paradigm. In this section of the article we describe the paradigm's definition, the catalysts that have brought about a paradigm shift from previous paradigms, and the SCP's principles, foundation pillars, appeal and potential impact, and current wide-spread application.

Definition

The shared citizenship paradigm is “the collective and unifying set of values, assumptions, and perceptions that envisions, supports, and requires the engagement and full participation of people with disabilities as equal, respected, valued, participating, and contributing members of all aspects of society” (Schalock, Luckasson et al., 2022, p. 427).

Catalysts

Over the last three to four decades a number of factors have contributed to a paradigm shift in the field of disabilities and the emergence of the SCP. Chief among these are the International Classification of Functioning, Disability, and Health (ICF, 2001) model of disability; national and international civil and human rights conventions; individual and family advocacy; adoption of changes in public policies and system practices that incorporate disability rights principles; incorporation of the supports model; the exponential growth of knowledge regarding causative risk factors and amelioration techniques; and activities by professionals and professional organizations (Schalock, Luckasson et al., 2021).

Principles

The SCP encompasses values related to autonomy, equity, inclusion, and empowerment.

These values are incorporated into the paradigm's three essential principles:

1. Align the moral vision of shared citizenship with societal, system, and organization policies by promoting the engagement and full participation of people with disabilities as equal, respected, valued, and contributing members in all aspects of society.
2. Create and support opportunities for achieving personal goals by assuring education, meaningful productivity, and well-being for all through systems of individualized supports.
3. Include all people in, and respect their contribution to, collaborative and shared citizenship through the provision of opportunities and supports for participation in all aspects of society.

Foundation Pillars

The SCP is supported by four foundation pillars that include a holistic approach to disability, a contextual model of human functioning, disability rights, and person-centered thinking (Luckasson, Schalock et al., 2022; Schalock, Luckasson et al., 2022).

1. *An integrated perspective on disability* incorporates four current perspectives on disability: biomedical, psychoeducational, sociocultural, and justice. Each perspective includes a presumed locus of disability, identified risk factors, and perspective-related interventions and supports. A holistic approach to disability incorporates these perspectives and supports the SCP because it emphasizes an integration of the multiple risk factors associated with disabilities and their amelioration and needed supports, and reinforces a whole person approach to services and supports.

2. *Contextual influences on human functioning* include: (a) the multifactorial, multilevel, and interactive properties of context; (b) the social-ecological model of disability that explains disability as resulting from the interaction between the person and their natural, built, cultural, and social environment/context; and (c) a functional approach to disability that involves a systematic and multidimensional understanding of human functioning, including human functioning dimensions, interactive systems of supports, and human functioning outcomes. These contextual influences support the SCP because they emphasize the key role that personal and contextual factors play in the manifestation and amelioration of a disability, focus on reducing the discrepancy between personal competency and contextual demands through systems of supports, and provide a framework for a supports-based service delivery and evaluation system.
3. *Disability rights principles* include belonging, equity, inclusion, empowerment, participation, and personal autonomy. Disability rights principles support the SCP because of their consciousness raising, sensitizing, and universal nature; their impact on policy development and organization and systems-level practices across ecological systems; and their essential role in encouraging the ability of people to have agency in their own lives and direct their services and supports.
4. *Person-centered thinking involves person-centered planning and evaluation.* *Person-centered planning* is built on disability rights principles, the individual's interests, goals, and potential for growth; supports the person to self-direct and self-determine their lives; provides or procures systems of supports that are an interconnected network of resources and strategies that are person-centered, comprehensive, and outcome oriented; and aligns the person's assessed support needs, individualized systems of supports, and valued

personal outcomes. *Person-centered evaluation* focuses both on the assessment of the individual's pattern and intensity of support needs, and the assessment of valued outcomes resulting from the systems of supports provided. Person-centered planning and evaluation activities support the SCP because they represent best practices, drive evidence-based inquiry, and center on the person, who is the fulcrum of the SCP.

Appeal and Impact

The appeal and potential impact of the SCP paradigm are due to a number of factors. Chief among these are that it: (a) incorporates an updated and contemporary set of values and beliefs about people with disability and their right to participate fully in all aspects of life and society; (b) moves the field from a general reference to environmental factors to specific contextual factors that influence the manifestation of disability, generate new perspectives on amelioration, and identify barriers to the realization of shared citizenship; and (c) is reflected in human and legal rights international covenants such as the UNCRPD (UN, 2006, 2015), and in policy goals and associated valued outcomes (Gomez, Moran et al., 2023; Schalock, Luckasson et al., 2021).

Wide-Ranging Application

There are currently wide-ranging applications of the SCP such as the provision of individualized services and supports, organization transformation and systems change, and evidence-based practices and inquiry (Luckasson, Schalock et al., 2022; Verdugo, Schalock et al. 2023 a). Despite these wide-spread applications, there is still work to be done to ensure that the promise of the SCP -- meaningful and person-centered services, supports, and involvement -- is realized across activities, organizations, and systems (Luckasson, Schalock et al., 2022; Quinn, 2022). To this end, the following section describes a systematic process for the successful

diffusion of an innovation, such as the SCP. This diffusion process not only brings about meaningful change and transformation but also enhances valued outcomes.

The Systematic Diffusion Process Applied to the SCP

Based on the extensive work of Rogers (1995; 2003), there are five stages involved in the diffusion of an innovation, such as a new paradigm, and bringing about meaningful change. These stages involve knowledge, persuasion, decision, implementation, and confirmation. The effectiveness and sustainability of each of these five stages depends on: (a) a clear understanding of each of the innovation diffusion stages; (b) the validation of the specific implementation, evaluation, and sustainability strategies employed (see Table 2); and (c) the collaboration and co-production among all stakeholders, including people with disabilities and their families and advocates. Each of these diffusion stages is discussed next in reference to the SCP.

Knowledge

Knowledge of the process of change (or the diffusion of innovation) involves three types of knowledge: awareness knowledge, how-to knowledge, and principled knowledge. As applied to the SCP, we interpret these three types of knowledge as follows:

- Awareness knowledge is reflected in the awareness of human rights, the definition of the SCP and its principles and foundation pillars, the advantages of the SCP, the current transformation occurring in the field of disability, and current best practices.
- How-to knowledge is reflected in knowledge of how change occurs, and how to evaluate the impact of change. The five stages involved in the diffusion of an innovation discussed in this article, plus the components of the shared citizenship measurement model described under “confirmation”, incorporate how-to knowledge. Such knowledge

is essential in providing information that increases understanding among change agents and facilitates the transferring of information into knowledge-based action.

- Principled-knowledge is reflected in understanding whether paradigm-related principles and values are stated clearly and incorporated into policies, rules, regulations, and practices. The confirmation/evaluation shared citizenship measurement model discussed later in the article incorporates principled knowledge.

Persuasion

The second stage of diffusion of innovation involves persuading potential change agents to become more involved with the innovation process. Persuasion strategies can focus on: (a) clarifying goals (e.g., UNCRPD Articles, and the four foundation pillars of the SCP); (b) communicating the relative advantage of the SCP and how it is compatible with human rights; (c) stressing that the paradigm's implementation is not an onerous undertaking, since some supports providers are already implementing the SCP foundation pillars using the quality of life supports model (Moran, Gomez, et al., 2023; Verdugo, Schalock et al., 2021; Verdugo, Schalock et al., 2023 b); and (d) demonstrating through data-based pilot studies or demonstration projects that an organization or system can implement SCP-related changes and easily evaluate the results (Luckasson, Schalock et al., 2022).

Decision

The third stage is making the decision. Deciding to adopt a new paradigm needs to occur at both the theoretical and application levels. For example, in many countries, the decision to adopt the UNCRPD was made at the theoretical level, but once adopted (and often ratified), there was no subsequent substantial application and change in services and supports to people with disability (see Quinn, 2022). The decision to not only adopt a paradigm but also to actually

create the infrastructure necessary to transform services, supports, and research opportunities for people with disabilities frequently involves addressing the apprehension that many stakeholders have regarding change. Overcoming this resistance to change and applying a new paradigm can generally be enhanced through seeing the potential of the new paradigm through self-trials and trials by others (Rogers, 2003; Schalock, Verdugo et al., 2018). *Self-trials*, which involve pilot studies and demonstration projects, can be coordinated by an organization, system, or consortium. *Trials by others* involve knowledge obtained from literature-based experiences of other comparable organizations or systems.

The development and evaluation of data-based pilot projects/studies might focus initially on implementing small changes in practices based on operationalizing and applying one or more of the SCP's foundation pillars. Scalable results can be used to evaluate the pilot in order to determine what worked and what did not work, and use "what worked" to support the decision to adopt the new paradigm. In addition, and depending on one's context or society, the decision to adopt a new paradigm can be facilitated through: (a) the development of public policies, agency practices, advocacy, interagency collaboration, engagement of the licensing power of the state, public media campaigns, knowledge transfer, and public investment (Quinn, 2022); and (b) supporting people with disabilities, their families, and others to advocate for meaningful changes in services and supports at the family, organization/system, community, national, and international level (Mittler, 2015).

Implementation

Implementation, which is the fourth stage in the systematic diffusion process, involves putting the SCP into use. Specifically, the strategies used in implementing the SCP incorporate and align the other key aspects of the systematic diffusion process (knowledge, persuasion,

decision, and confirmation) with the SCP's principles and four foundation pillars. This incorporation and alignment is reflected in the exemplary implementation strategies presented later in Table 2. As an overview, these implementation strategies involve, among others, developing specific indicators of shared citizenship; conducting a contextual analysis to identify change-related facilitators and inhibitors of change; informing change agents; building organization and system capacity to bring about and sustain meaningful change; implementing best practices; and evaluating the impact of the paradigm's implementation. The relevance and successful use of a specific implementation strategy depends on the stage of the organization's or system's development; contextual factors identified through a contextual analysis; the level of available resources (defined as time, expertise, and assets); and the level of commitment by the initiating entity.

Successful implementation also requires understanding the role that context plays in potential organization transformation and systems change. Context is a concept that integrates the totality of circumstances that comprise the milieu of human life and human functioning. As discussed by Shogren, Luckasson et al. (2021) and Shogren, Schalock et al. (2018), context can be viewed as: (a) an independent variable that includes personal and environmental characteristics that are typically not manipulated (e.g., age, language, culture and ethnicity, and family); (b) an intervening variable that includes organizations, systems, political structures, and societal policies, practices, and resources that can be manipulated to enhance human functioning and personal outcomes; and (c) an integrative construct that provides a framework for describing and analyzing aspects of human functioning and delineating the factors that affect, both positively and negatively, human functioning.

Understanding the role that context plays as an intervening variable or its use as an integrative construct facilitates the implementation of an innovation such as the SCP in multiple ways. For example, conducting a contextual analysis will identify both the facilitators and inhibitors of change. Once identified and understood, facilitators can be maximized through new or modified policies and practices, and inhibitors can be reduced through knowledge, policies, partnerships, and best practices. Similarly, implementing individualized and context-sensitive supports based on one's assessed support needs can reduce the discrepancy between one's personal competency and environmental demands.

Confirmation Requires a Measurement Model

To confirm the utilization and impact of the SCP, we propose a measurement model composed of five components: (1) defining shared citizenship operationally; (2) creating shared citizenship measurement domains; (3) developing shared citizenship measurement indicators; (4) specifying best practice shared citizenship measurement guideline; and (5) describing potential uses of information obtained from the model. The importance of the proposed measurement model is that it shows how the paradigm can be applied; generates information that can be used to both confirm the paradigm's utilization and impact on people and organizations and systems; and furthers the paradigm's implementation through initiating systemic change strategies that can be employed at the individual or organization/system level to enhance human dignity and autonomy, human endeavor, and human engagement.

Component 1. Define shared citizenship operationally. Shared citizenship can be defined operationally on the basis of the descriptors contained in its definition, principles, and foundation pillars. In reference to its definition, descriptors include equal, respected, valued, contributing member of society, and participation in all aspects of society. In reference to the

paradigm's principles, descriptors include engagement and full participation, education, meaningful productivity, well-being, contributions, and opportunities for participation. In reference to the paradigm's foundation pillars, descriptors include holism, context, rights, and person-centered planning and evaluation.

Component 2. Create shared citizenship measurement domains. Shared citizenship domains organize the descriptors listed above into a meaningful taxonomy that facilitates communication, understanding, action, and measurement. The three domains that provide these functions were developed by synthesizing the international disability literature regarding disability-related policy goals (Shogren, Luckasson, et al., 2017). These three domains are human dignity and autonomy, human endeavor, and human engagement. Each is defined below and aligned with its associated SCP principle.

- Human dignity and autonomy encompasses the quality or state of being worthy and self-directing and focuses on aligning the moral of shared citizenship with societal, system, and organization policies, and promoting the engagement and full participation of people with disabilities as equal, respected, valued, and contributing members of all aspects of society.
- Human endeavor encompasses serious, determined, effort towards the goals of personal development and optimum human functioning and focuses on creating and supporting opportunities or achievement of personal goals, and assuring education, meaningful productivity, and well-being for all through systems of individualized supports.
- Human engagement encompasses co-engagement and co-production in inclusive environments and focuses on including all people in, and respecting their contributions

to, collaborative and shared citizenship, and providing opportunities for participation in all aspects of society.

Component 3. Develop shared citizenship measurement indicators. Shared citizenship indicators should incorporate the paradigmatic descriptors discussed previously and be based on relevant literature. The exemplary indicators described in this section are based on two major sources: research over the last 30+ years on the concepts of quality of life and subjective well-being, and relevant articles of the UNCRPD. The rationale for using these two sources is as follows.

The concepts of shared citizenship, quality of life, and subjective well-being are closely related. This close relationship is reflected in each concept's emphasis on inclusion, equality, self-determination, empowerment, and belonging. Over the last three decades, research (see, e.g., Cummins, 2004; Gomez, Morin, et al., 2022; Schalock & Keith, 2016) on the latter two concepts has identified a number of domains and indicators associated with personal development, personal autonomy, interpersonal relations, social inclusion, human and civil rights, subjective well-being, and general well-being related to one's physical, emotional, and material status or condition. These indicators have generally been developed jointly with self-advocates, who have frequently been involved in their assessment (Baker et al., 2016; Bonham et al., 2004; Mostert, 2016).

The UNCRPD (United Nations, 2006) contains a number of articles that strive for social-political conditions that facilitate the implementation of human and civil rights related to equality, autonomy, non-discrimination, participation, and inclusion in one's society. Many of the Convention Articles (especially # 5 through # 30) have been shown to align closely with quality of life domains (see., e.g., Claes, Vandenbusshe et al., 2016; Gomez, Morin et al., 2022;

Lombardi et al., 2019). Thus, combining these UNCRPD-based indicators with those obtained from the quality of life and subjective well-being research literature results in a robust set of indicators that allows measurement across personal and environmental/contextual factors.

Exemplary shared citizenship indicators associated with the three shared citizenship domains are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1

Exemplary Shared Citizenship Indicators Aligned with Shared Citizenship Domains

<i>Shared Citizenship Domain</i>	<i>Exemplary Shared Citizenship Indicator</i>
Human Dignity and Autonomy	Shown respect; self-determination; equality and non-discrimination; equal recognition before the law; liberty and security; freedom from cruel or unusual punishment; freedom of expression and opinion; respect for privacy; respect for home and family
Human Endeavor	Personal goals; opportunities to pursue interests; life-long learning; predictable environments; spirituality (i.e. purpose and meaning); engagement in meaningful work/employment; personal mobility; health; habilitation and rehabilitation
Human Engagement	Belonging; social relations; interpersonal relations; participation in community activities and organizations; accessibility;

	freedom from exploitation, violence, and abuse; liberty of movement; participation in political and public life
--	---

Component 4. Specify best practice shared citizenship measurement guidelines.

Assessing or measuring indicators such as those listed in Table 1 should be done using best practices. The list of best practice guidelines presented next incorporate assessment standards associated with reliability, validity, and test development and administration (*The Standards of Education and Psychological Testing*, 2014); research on assessment strategies for people with IDD (e.g. Hartley & MacLean, 2006); and guidelines developed on the basis of the significant work on the assessment of personal outcomes published by the authors (Bradley et al., 2016; Schalock & Luckasson, 2021; Verdugo, Schalock et al., 2005). These best practices indicate that shared citizenship measurement: (a) involves the degree to which people have life experiences they value; (b) reflects the domains that contribute to a full and interconnected life; (c) considers physical, social, and cultural environments/contexts; (d) focuses on experiential outcomes, with the person as the primary and preferred respondent; (e) results in information that can be used for multiple purposes; and (f) should be culturally sensitive, use reliable and valid instruments, and use qualitative and quantitative data gathering strategies.

Component 5. Describe potential uses of the model. On subsequent pages we describe how components of the model can be used to confirm the paradigm's utilization and impact, and be employed in conjunction with the paradigm's foundation pillars to frame potential research opportunities. It is important to point out that information obtained from both uses can further the paradigm's implementation and sustainability.

Confirmation Involves Evaluation

As discussed by Fetterman et al. (2015), Gomez, Schalock et al. (2021), Patton (2008; 2018), and Schalock, Luckasson et al. (2022), three evaluation techniques can be used to confirm the SCP's utilization and impact. These techniques involve principle-focused evaluation, utilization-focused evaluation, and outcome-focused evaluation.

- Conducting *principle-focused evaluation* can employ Component 1 of the shared citizenship measurement model to assess whether paradigm-related principles and foundation pillars are stated clearly and incorporated into policies, rules, regulations, and practices.
- Conducting *utilization-focused evaluation* can use Component 3 of the model to assess whether the paradigm's foundation pillars are used for person-centered planning, supports provision and evaluation, organization transformation or systems change, and/or societal change.
- Conducting *outcome-focused evaluation* can use Components 3 and 4 of the model to assess the changes and benefits regarding rights and personal outcomes of value to individuals and families resulting from the paradigm's implementation.

Strategies for Bringing About Meaningful Change

In the preceding sections of this article we have emphasized that the field of disability is challenged nationally and internationally to adopt a paradigm that can be used to guide the transformation in services, supports, and research approaches involving people with disabilities so as to bring about meaningful changes in people's lives. To address this challenge, we discussed how meaningful change in organizations and systems requires both a paradigm to guide the change and a systematic diffusion process to bring about and sustain the change. To

that end, we described the SCP and its potential to guide innovative change, a five stage (knowledge, persuasion, decision, implementation, and confirmation) diffusion process to bring about and sustain the change, and a shared citizenship measurement model that can be used for multiple purposes.

In this section of the article, we present specific strategies associated with each of the five diffusion stages that can bring about and sustain meaningful change in policies, services, and supports for people with disabilities. These strategies not only facilitate the paradigm and its implementation, but also support the paradigm's sustainability. The exemplary strategies summarized in Table 2 are based on current literature and incorporate the actions encompassing a systematic approach to bringing about change. The exemplary strategies listed in column two of Table 2 are based on the published work of Claes et al. (2016), Fulani (2005), Kapucu et al. (2011), Luckasson, Tassé et al. (2022), MacDonald and Raymaker (2013), Nussbaum (2011), Rogers (1995, 2003), Schalock and Luckasson (2021), Schalock, Luckasson et al. (2022), Schalock and Keith (2016), Shogren, Luckasson et al (2021), Shogren, Schalock et al.(2018), Sobeck and Aguis (2007), and Thompson, Schalock et al. (2014).

In reference to the exemplary change strategies summarized in Table 2, and based on the references just cited, we emphasize a number of significant factors influencing the degree of successful change and transformation. Chief among these are that: (a) change is complex and frequently resisted; (b) change takes time and frequently involves resources, resource allocation, and/or resource re-distribution; (c) organizations and systems are at different levels of development, including their flexibility and history of change; (d) change is fluid and interactive; (e) the readiness to change and an organization or system's ability to change is influenced by multiple meso- and macro- system contextual factors; and (f) the effectiveness and sustainability

of innovation and desired change depends on the understanding of the change process, and the collaboration and co-production among all stakeholders involved in the change/transformation process.

Table 2

Alignment of Diffusion Stages to Implementation, Evaluation and Sustainability Strategies

<i>Diffusion Stage</i>	<i>Exemplary Implementation, Evaluation, and Sustainability Strategies</i>
Knowledge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Assure that multiple constituents have easy access to information about the SCP’s definition, foundation pillars, uses, attractiveness, and potential impact -Show the alignment between the SCP’s foundation pillars and human and legal rights principles expressed in international covenants such as the UNCRPD and comparable regional or national covenants such as the European Union’s Rights Document and the Americans with Disabilities Act
Persuasion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Show the alignment of the SCP with human and legal rights covenants, the current transformation in the field of disability, and current explanation/implementation models (such as the Quality of Life Supports Model) -Involve potential change agents through policy/mission statement changes, advocacy, short and long-term strategic planning, and sharing results of demonstration projects
Decision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Engage in grass roots campaigns to inform decision makers of the (a) relevance and importance of the four SCP foundation pillars (a holistic approach to disability, a contextual model of human functioning, disability rights principles, and person-centered thinking), (b) the appeal and potential of the SCP to resolve and overcome weaknesses of previous paradigms that emphasized personal ‘defects’ and segregation, and (c) the ‘do-ability’ of implementing the SCP -Conduct and evaluate demonstration projects that involve using the SCP’s four SCP principles and foundation pillars and using the results to guide organization, system, or society transformation
Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Develop measurable and specific indicators of shared citizenship (see Table 1) -Conduct a contextual analysis to identify (and then target) facilitators and inhibitors of change -Build organization capacity through workforce development and training around the SCP’s principles and foundation pillars, using technology, employing best practices and the power of licensure, harnessing the power of multiple types of resources (e.g., experience, expertise, social and financial capital, and good time management), developing partnerships, engaging in continuous quality improvement, and investing in the capacity of the community

	-Employ a ‘sustainability support system’ through which the SCP’s principles and foundation pillars are maintained and sustained through strong advocacy, policies, practices, and consumer involvement
Confirmation	-Monitor the status of measurable shared citizenship indicators -Evaluate the impact of the SCP through principle, utilization, and outcome focused evaluation

Next Steps in Advancing the Shared Citizenship Paradigm

For many professionals, organizations, systems, and societies, successfully implementing the SCP can be facilitated through four activities. These involve: (a) ensuring that the organization or systems’ policies and practices are compatible with the SCP’s principles and foundation pillars and are embraced by people with disabilities and their families; (b) sustaining the SCP and its principles and foundation pillars through a ‘sustainability supports system’; (c) providing research co-engagement and co-production opportunities; and (d) conducting thoughtful planning and evaluation.

Compatible Policies and Practices

Successfully putting in place the strategies presented in Table 2 requires changes in disability-related policies and practices at the macro system and mesosystem levels. We have listed in Table 3 some of the more relevant and important of these policies and practices (many of which are already in place in multiple jurisdictions) that are compatible with the SCP’s principles and foundation pillars.

Table 3

Policies and Practices That Facilitate Advancing the SCP

<i>Recommended Policies</i>	<i>Recommended Practices</i>
Inclusive education	Co-production of policies and practices with
Integrated employment	people with disabilities and family
Community living arrangements	members
Personal autonomy and self-determination	Person-centered planning based on assessed
Comprehensive physical and mental health	support needs
service	Individual Support Plans based on assessed
Expertise and capital to build organization	support needs and systems of supports
and system capacity	Allocation of resources based on needs to
Development and enforcement of human	ensure equity
rights and anti-discrimination laws	Targeted workforce recruitment,
Valid diagnoses based on current best	development, licensing, and compensation
assessment practices	base on SCP values and best practices
	Demonstration projects that employ the four
	SCP foundation pillars
	Measurable and specific indicators of
	shared citizenship (see Table 1)
	Contextual analyses to identify
	facilitators and inhibitors of organization
	and systems change/transformation

Sustainability Supports System

Positive and innovative paradigmatic changes can occur, but unless a paradigm's principles and foundation pillars are specifically and deliberately supported, a paradigm shift will not be sustained. As defined by Fullan (2005), sustainability involves "the capacity of a system to engage in the complexities of continuous improvement consistent with deep values of human purpose" (p. ix). The following principles of sustainability are consistent with this definition: interdependence and information; non-declining use of materials; inclusion of others; and increased capacity of the organization within systems (Benn et al., 2018).

Within the framework of the above definition and principles, it is important to consider what makes an innovation sustainable. Rogers (1995), for example, observed that "Unless an innovation is highly compatible with clients' needs and resources, and unless clients feel so involved with the innovation that they regard it as "theirs," it will not continue over the long term" (p. 341). Later, Rogers (2003) clarified that a sustainable innovation may not continue in its exact initial form. A re-invention stage may take place in which certain changes are made to fit the adopter's circumstances, such as simplifying the innovation, omitting parts of the innovation, adapting the innovation to a particular structure or system, or accommodating it to a perceived lack of resources. Furthermore, as discussed by Hargreaves and Fink (2000), sustainability does not simply mean whether something will last; it also allows for making changes to the original paradigm to accommodate contextual influences, such as cultural, language, social, political, and financial factors or conditions. These contextual influences can speed up adoption and improve sustainability, or they can distort or even destroy the innovation. It is therefore important to also monitor the paradigm's status and impact as a part of the sustainability support system.

Potential Research Opportunities

According to Kuhn (1974), one of the most important factors influencing a paradigm's acceptance and implementation is the paradigm's potential to provide opportunities to be tested and provide opportunities for research endeavors. The SCP is emerging at an opportune time in the field of IDD, since the paradigm can help guide the reimagining and transformation that is occurring. In regard to research endeavors, for example, recent attention has been given to changing perceptions and distinguishing between the context of discovery (i.e. the what and how) and the context of justification (i.e., the who and why; Symons, 2023 a); increasing allyship and anti-abelism in IDD research (MacDonald et al., 2023); implementing equity in research practices (Kover & Abbeduto, 2023 a and b); and centering people with IDD in the process and outcomes of science (Shogren, 2023; Shogren and Dean, 2023). These suggestions and opportunities are consistent with the principles of the SCP regarding promoting the engagement and full participation of people with disabilities as equal, respected, valued, and contributing members of society.

The potential research opportunities discussed below are referenced to the SCP's foundation pillars, and incorporate components of the measurement model discussed earlier. Due to page limitations, the opportunities discussed should not be considered as exhaustive; rather, they should be viewed as both potential and exemplary. For example:

- When one integrates the four perspectives on disability into one's thinking, multiple research opportunities emerge. Examples include: (a) expanding one's research activities to include the multiple risk factors (biomedical, psychoeducational, sociocultural, and justice) associated with IDD; (b) determining the efficacy of prevention and amelioration strategies associated with each perspective; and (c) researching the best way for multi-

disciplinary or individual support teams to synthesize and address risk factors that extend across the four perspectives and inhibit shared citizenship.

- When context is treated as an intervening variable, contextual factors, such as policies, practices, leadership style, and social-political conditions, create multiple research opportunities. Examples include: (a) conducting pre-post comparisons on shared citizenship indicators (see Table 1) associated with changes in policies or practices; (b) conducting cross-cultural implementation and impact studies; and (c) determining the influence on shared citizenship indicators of organization or system characteristics or leadership style.
- When disability principles are the research focus, research opportunities emerge related to: (a) how best to incorporate principles into action; (b) what knowledge transfer mechanisms are most effective in the diffusion of shared citizenship principles into disability-related policies and practices; and (c) determining how disability-related principles can best be communicated within a community to raise consciousness and sensitize community members regarding the rights and potential of people with disabilities.
- When person-centered thinking becomes the focus, terminology and associated actions come into sharp focus. In terms of research opportunities: (a) co-engagement and co-production become the foundational goals; (b) disability policy is evaluated based on the shared citizenship domains of human dignity and autonomy, human endeavor, and human engagement (see Table 1); and (c) person-centered outcome evaluation employs an integrative, multivariate approach that incorporates personal variables and

environmental/contextual factors in identifying significant predictors of shared citizenship indicators.

Thoughtful Planning and Evaluation

The successful implementation and advancement of the SCP requires thoughtful planning and collaborative work among policy makers, service/support providers, people with disabilities and their families, and researchers, as together they work to bring about and sustain a meaningful transformation in services and supports provided to people with disabilities. Initial steps in this direction have already been made. As discussed previously, the international community has identified the need to transform services and supports for people with disabilities; the field of disabilities is transforming, and a paradigm shift has occurred; a value-based and relevant paradigm (i.e., the SCP) has emerged to guide the change process; and as reflected in this article, the emerging SCP can be operationalized and implemented in terms of a systematic process that brings about meaningful transformation.

In conclusion, the next steps in advancing the SCP involve policy-makers, organizations, systems, and societies analyzing their current policies and practices (see Table 3), and engaging in explicit value-based change planning and implementation (see Table 2). During this process, all participants should remember that people with disabilities are the fulcrum of the SCP. Therefore, the five innovation diffusion stages discussed in this article need to be validated through engagement and collaboration with people with disabilities and their families to ensure that they are co-producers of the process of reimagining and transforming their services, supports, and research participation.

References

- Baker, A., Salisbury, B., & Collins, D. (2016). Changing service delivery systems: An example from Community Living-British Columbia. In R.L. Schalock and K.D. Keith (Eds.), *Cross-cultural quality of life: Enhancing the lives of people with intellectual disability* (2nd ed.) (pp. 149-166). American Association on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities.
- Benn, S., Edwards, M., & Williams, T. (2018). *Organizational change for corporate sustainability*. Routledge.
- Bonham, G. S., Basehart, S., Schalock, R. L., Marchand, C. B., Kirchner, N., & Rumenap, J. M. (2004). Consumer-based quality of life assessment: The Maryland As Me! Project. *Mental Retardation*, 42, 338-355.
- Bonney, E., & Elison, J. T. (2023). Confronting the epistemic injustice and inequity in IDD research: The value of theorizing beyond dominant culture's perspective. *American Journal on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities*, 128, 375-378.
- Bradley, V. J. (2021). International advances in self-direction: Themes from a disability leadership exchange. *Journal of Integrated Care*, 29, # 3.
- Bradley, V. J., Fenton, M., & Mahoney, K. J. (2021). *Self-direction: A revolution in human services*. State University of New York.
- Bradley, V. J., Hiersteiner, D., & Bonardi, A. (2016). A focus on systems-level outcome indicators. In R.L. Schalock and K.D. Keith (Eds.), *Cross-cultural quality of life: Enhancing the lives of people with intellectual disability* (2nd ed.) (pp. 121-132). American Association on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities.

- Burke, M. H., & Taylor, J.L. (2023). To better meet the needs of autistic people, we need to rethink how we measure services. *Autism*, 27, 873-875.
- Claes, C., Vandenbussche, H., & Lombardi, M. (2016). Human rights and quality of life domains: Identifying cross-cultural indicators. In R. L. Schalock & K. D. Keith (Eds.), *Cross-cultural quality of life: Enhancing the lives of people with intellectual disability* (2nd ed., pp. 167-174). American Association on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities.
- Cummins, R. A. (2004). *Instruments for assessing quality of life*. In J. H. Hogg and A. Langa (Eds.), *Approaches to the assessment of adults with intellectual disabilities: A service providers guide* (pp. 132-152). London, U.K.: Blackwell.
- European Association of Service Providers for Persons with Disabilities (2021). EASPD Innovations Awards: 25 innovative practices for the inclusion of persons with disabilities. Available at: <https://www.easpd.eu/resources/innovation-awards/>
- European Commission (2021). *Union of equality: Strategy for the rights of persons with disabilities 2021-2030*. Luxembourg: Publication Office of the European Commission.
- Fetterman, D.M., Kaftarian, S.J., & Wandersman, A. (2015). *Empowerment evaluation: Knowledge and tools for self-assessment, evaluation, and capacity building and accountability*. Sage Publications.
- Friedman, C. (2023). Medicaid home-and community-based service waivers for people with intellectual and developmental disabilities. *Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities*, 61, 269-279.
- Fullan, M. (2005). *Leadership & sustainability: System thinkers in action*. Corwin Press.

- Gomez, L. E., Moran, L., Al- Halabi, S., Swerts, C., Verdugo, M.A., & Schalock, R. L. (2022). Quality of life and International Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities: Consensus indicators for assessment. *Psicothema*, *34*, 182-191.
- Gomez, L. E., Moran, L., Navas, P., Verdugo, M. A., Schalock, R. L. Lombardi, M.....Monsalve, A. (2023). Using the quality of life framework to operationalize and assess the UNCRPD articles and the sustainable development goals. *Journal Policy and Practice in Intellectual Disabilities*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jppi.12470>
- Gomez, L. E., Schalock, R. L., & Verdugo, M. A. (2021). A new paradigm in the field of intellectual and developmental disabilities: Characteristics and evaluation. *Psychothemia*, *33*, 28-35.
- Hargreaves, A., & Fink, D. (2000, April). The three dimensions of reform. *Educational Leadership*, 30-34.
- Hartley, S. L., & MacLean, W. E. Jr. (2006). A review of the reliability and validity of Likert-type scales for people with intellectual disability. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*, *50*, 813-827.
- International Classification of Functioning, Disability, and Health (ICF) (2001). World Health Organization. Geneva.
- Kakoullis, E. J., & Johnson, K. (2020) (Eds.), *Recognizing human rights in different cultural contexts: The United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities*. Singapore, Springer/Nature.
- Kapucu, N., Healy, B.F., & Arslan, T. (2011). Survival of the fittest: Capacity building for small nonprofit organizations. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, *34*, 236-245.

- Kover, S. T., & Abbeduto, L. (2023a). Toward equity in research on intellectual and developmental disabilities. *American Journal on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities, 128*, 350-370.
- Kover, S. T., & Abbeduto, L. (2023b). The work ahead for intellectual and developmental disabilities research. *American Journal on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities, 128*, 388-392.
- Kuhn, T. (1974). *The structure of scientific revolutions* (2nd ed). University of Illinois Press.
- Lombardi, M., Vandenbussche, H., Claes, C., Schalock, R. L., DeMeyer, J., & Vandeveldel, S. (2019). The concept of quality of life as a framework for implementing the UNCRPD. *Journal of Policy and Practice in Intellectual Disabilities, 16*, 180-190.
- Luckasson, R., Schalock, R L., Tassé, M. J., & Shogren, K. A. (2022). The intellectual and developmental disability Shared Citizenship Paradigm: Its cross-cultural status, implementation and confirmation. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research, 67* (1), 64-76.
- Luckasson, R., Tassé, M. J., Shogren, K. A., & Schalock, R. L. (2022). Professional responsibility in the field of intellectual and developmental disabilities: Its definition, application, and impacts. *Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities, 60*, 183-198.
- McDonald, K. E., & Raymaker, D. M. (2013). Paradigm shifts in disability and health: Toward more ethical public health research. *American Journal of Public Health, 103*(2), 2165-2173.
- MacDonald, K. E., Schwartz, A. E., Feldman, M.F., Nelik, T., & Raymaker, D. M. (2023). A call for allyship and anti-ableism in intellectual disability research. *American Journal on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities, 128*, 398-410.

- Mittler, P. (2015). The UN convention on the rights of persons with disabilities: Implementing a new paradigm shift. *Journal of Policy and Practice in Intellectual Disabilities, 12*, 79-89.
- Moran, L., Gomez, L. E., Verdugo, M. A., & Schalock, R. L. (2023). The quality of life supports model as a vehicle for implementing rights. *Behavioral Sciences, 13*, 365-377.
- Mostert, R. (2016). Personal involvement and empowerment. In R. L. Schalock & K. D. Keith (Eds.), *Cross-cultural quality of life: Enhancing the lives of people with intellectual disability* (2nd ed., pp. 49-58). American Association on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities.
- National Center on Advancing Person-Centered Practices and Systems (2020). Engaging people who receive services: A best practices guide. Available at: <https://ncapps.acl/docs.pdf>
- Nussbaum, M.C. (2011). *Creating capabilities: The human development approach*. Belknap Press of Harvard.
- Patton, M. Q. (2008). *Essentials of utilization-focused evaluation*. Sage. Guilford Press.
- Patton, M. Q. (2018). *Principle-focused evaluation: The GUIDE*. Sage. Guilford Press.
- Quinn, G. (2022). Transformation of services for persons with disabilities. Report of the Special Rapporteur on the rights of persons with disabilities. *UN General Assembly, Human Rights Council, Fifty-second session, February 27-March, 2023.A/HRC/52/32*. Available at <https://www.ohchr.org/en/documents/thematic-reports/ahrc5232-transformation-services-persons-disabilities>
- Rogers, E. M. (1995). *Diffusion of innovations* (4th ed.). Free Press.
- Rogers, E. M. (2003). *Diffusion of innovations* (5th ed.). Free Press.
- Schalock, R.L., & Luckasson, R. (2021). Enhancing research practices in Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities through person-centered outcome evaluation. *Research in*

Developmental Disabilities, 117, 104043-104052.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ridd.2021.104043>

Schalock, R. L., Luckasson, R., & Tassé, M. J. (2021). Ongoing transformation in the field of intellectual and developmental disabilities: Taking action for the future. *Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities*, 59, 380-391.

Schalock, R. L., Luckasson, R., Tassé, M. J., & Shogren, K. A. (2022). The IDD paradigm of shared citizenship: Its operationalization, application, evaluation, and shaping for the future. *Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities*, 60, 426-443.

Schalock, R. L., & Keith, K. D. (2016). *Cross-cultural quality of life: Enhancing the lives of people with intellectual disability* (2nd ed.). American Association on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities.

Schalock, R. L., Verdugo, M. A., & van Loon, J. (2018). Understanding organization transformation in evaluation and program planning. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 67, 53-60.

Shogren, K.A. (2023). The right to science: Centering people with ID in the process and outcomes of science. *Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities*, 61, 172-177.

Shogren, K.A., & Dean, E. E. (2023). Introduction to the special issue on centering the voices of people with IDD in the process and outcomes of science. *Inclusion*.

Shogren, K. A., Luckasson, R., & Schalock, R. L. (2021). Leveraging the power of context in disability policy development, implementation, and evaluation: Multiple applications to enhance personal outcomes. *Journal of Disability Policy Studies*, 3, 230-243.

Shogren, K. A., Schalock, R. L., & Luckasson, R. (2018). The use of a context-based change model to unfreeze the status quo and drive change to enhance personal outcomes of

- people with intellectual and developmental disabilities. *Journal of Policy and Practice in Intellectual Disabilities*, 15, 101-109.
- Sobeck, J., & Aguis, E. (2007). Organization capacity building: Addressing a research and practice gap. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 30, 237-246.
- Standards of Educational and Psychological Testing (2014). American Psychological Association. <https://www.apa.org>.
- Symons, F. J. (2023 a). Changing perspectives and meaningful problems. *American Journal on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities*, 128, 397.
- Symons, F. J. (2023 b). On language and the context of discovery for research in intellectual and developmental disability – An introduction to a special issue on equity in IDD research. *American Journal on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities*, 128, 349.
- Thompson, J. R., Schalock, R. L., Agosta, J., Teninty, L., & Fortune, J. (2014). How the supports paradigm is transforming the developmental disabilities service system. *Inclusion*, 2, 86-99.
- United Nations. (2006). *Convention on the rights of people with disabilities and optional protocol*. <http://www.un.org/disabilities/documents/convention/convoptprot-e.pdf>
- United Nations (2015). Transforming our world: The 2030 agenda for sustainable development. <http://www.unfpa.org/sites/default/files/resources-pdf/resolution>
- Verdugo, M. A., Schalock, R. L., & Gomez, L. E. (2021). The quality of life supports model: 25 years of parallel paths have come together. *Siglo Cero*, 52(3), 9-28.
- Verdugo, M. A., Schalock, R. L., & Gomez, L. E. (2023). The quality of life supports model as a major component in applying the quality of life framework. *Journal of Policy and Practice in Intellectual Disabilities*, 1-5. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jppi.12468>

Verdugo, M. A., Schalock, R. L., Gomez, L. E., & Navas, P. (2023). A systematic approach to implementing, evaluating, and sustaining the shared citizenship paradigm. *Behavioral Sciences, 13*(12), 970-983. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs13120970>

Verdugo, M.A., Schalock, R. L., Keith, K.D., & Stancliffe, R. (2005). Quality of life and its measurement: Important principles and guidelines. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research, 49*, 707-717.