

Disproportionate opportunities: Fostering vocational choice for individuals with intellectual disabilities

Bradley McDaniels

University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY, USA

Tel.: +1 859 257 8592; Fax: +1 859 257 3835; E-mail: bradley.mcdaniels@uky.edu

Revised/Accepted: December 2015

Abstract.

BACKGROUND: Consumer preference and choice have been established as imperatives in effective employment service delivery for individuals with disabilities. Individuals with intellectual disabilities (ID), however, may face barriers in employment services that restrict their choices and opportunities for career development.

OBJECTIVE: The purpose of the current study is to analyze the vocational rehabilitation outcomes for individuals with ID compared with consumers with other disabilities in terms of the range of employment settings and earnings at closure.

METHODS: Rehabilitation Services Administration data for a southeastern US state were attained through the ExploreVR database for this analysis.

RESULTS: The results indicate that individuals with ID were placed into food preparation and serving-related occupations (24.1%) and building and grounds cleaning/maintenance occupations (28.2%) at a disproportionately high rate relative to those in other disability categories. Mean weekly earnings for these categories were from 24% to 39% below the mean weekly earning across all available occupational categories.

CONCLUSION: The results are discussed in terms of their implications for best practices in vocational rehabilitation with individuals with ID, and potential improvements to current practice are discussed.

Keywords: Vocational rehabilitation, consumer choice, intellectual disability, employment

1. Introduction

Consumer preference and choice have been established as imperatives in effective employment service delivery for individuals with disabilities. According to the Code of Federal Regulations, employment outcomes in the state-federal vocational rehabilitation (VR) program are to be “chosen by the eligible individual” and “consistent with the individual’s unique strengths, resources, priorities, concerns, abilities, capabilities, career interests, and informed choice” (Content of the Individualized Plan for Employment, 34 C.F.R. § 361.46(a)(1), 2015). Based on the array of employment options available and the intrapersonal diversity among individuals with disabilities,

one would expect to find a broad range of vocational outcomes among participants in the state-federal VR program. Unfortunately, research over the past two decades suggests that for individuals with intellectual disabilities (ID), such diversity in occupational outcomes has not been observed (Mueser, Becker, & Wolfe, 2001; Siperstein, Parker, & Drascher, 2013; Sowers, Cotton, & Malloy, 1994). Specifically, research suggests that for VR consumers with a primary diagnosis of ID or developmental disability (DD), vocational outcomes are generally clustered in a narrowly limited range of positions that are characterized by low pay, low educational and skill requirements, and limited opportunity for career development or advancement. Despite the relatively high

availability of such positions, it is critical to ensure that consumers are not limited to a restricted range of positions based simply on job availability, and that efforts are taken to expand employment choices and opportunities through effective employment services (Boeltzig, Timmons, & Butterworth, 2008).

For working-aged individuals with ID, the rate of employment relative to both the general population and persons with other disabilities remains consistently low. This “troubling and persistently wide ‘gap’” in comparative employment rates for individuals with ID has been well documented in the literature (Siperstein et al., 2013, p. 163). As recently reported by Getzel (2014), the employment rate for persons with disabilities has ranged in the past several years from 34% to 39%, compared to 76% to 79% for those without disabilities. In the same period, among persons with ID, the employment range was from 18% to 23%, and this rate represents a decline over prior years (p. 183).

Although the reasons for the very low employment rates and particularly the low competitive employment rates among persons with ID are complex and multifaceted, data suggest that aspects of the provision of employment services contribute to the issue. Over the past two decades, researchers have examined various facets of the employment situation for persons with ID, and particularly the relationships between VR and other employment services and various employment outcomes (e.g., Gilmore, Schuster, Timmons, & Butterworth, 2000; Moore, 2001; Moore, Harley, & Gamble, 2004; Siperstein et al., 2013; Wehman, Chan, Ditchman, & Kang, 2014; Yamaki & Fujiura, 2002). Among the consistent findings in this research is that persons with ID tend to be employed in a limited range of vocational settings and occupations.

Few of these investigations have utilized Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA) Case Service Report (Form-911) data or other forms of VR-based data, though several have employed other large data sets. For example, in their analysis of data from a nationally representative random sample of 1,017 parents/guardians of adult children with ID surveyed by Gallup, Siperstein et al. (2013) found that among the 18% who were competitively employed, the identified occupational fields included customer service (28%), retail (17%), restaurant work (16%), office work (9%), and manufacturing (8%). Although approximately 90% of those competitively employed in this sample were paid at or above the minimum wage for their state, only 26% were employed

full-time. Yamaki and Fujiura (2002) evaluated the employment and income status of adults with DD in a secondary analysis of the 1990 and the 1991 Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP) data. They found that the majority of employed adults with DD were working in either service occupations (23%) or laborer jobs (29%), with janitor being the most frequently reported job title. This was in contrast to the population of employees without DD, who were primarily employed in technical, sales, or administrative support positions (27.7%) or managerial or professional positions (24.4%).

As Storey (2006) suggested, consumers of employment services systems who have significant disabilities frequently report that no employment choices, or no meaningful choices, are made available to them. Providing consumers with more diverse employment opportunities and promoting vocational choice is not only consistent with current legislation, it is necessary for effective service provision and promotes more successful long-term outcomes for individuals with ID (Yamaki & Fujiura, 2002). The question of how to enhance consumer opportunities that result in purposeful and individualized employment remains the crux of the problem.

The purpose of this paper is twofold. First, I present the results of a comparative analysis of VR outcomes for individuals with ID in the state of Kentucky, based on RSA-911 data for fiscal year 2012. RSA data have seldom been used specifically to evaluate the diversity in vocational outcomes among people with ID, and no recent studies using these data were located in a comprehensive literature review. Second, I explore the system-based challenges related to the lack of job diversity for individuals with ID generally, and discuss several potential solutions. Specifically, I address the following issues: (a) expanding vocational choice and job exploration, (b) effective implementation of supported employment strategies, (c) increased focus on the demand-side approach to employment services, and (d) VR counselors expectations for employment professionals regarding appropriate supported employment implementation and employment outcomes.

2. Methods

Data for this study were extracted from the US Department of Education, Rehabilitation Service Administration (RSA-911) Case Service Report for

fiscal year 2012. This national database is provided annually to RSA by state vocational rehabilitation (VR) agencies and contains demographic characteristics, VR services received, and employment outcomes for all individuals closed as employed. The dataset for this analysis was 2012 RSA 911 data for the state of Kentucky obtained from ExploreVR, a research, policy, and web application providing state VR agencies easy and convenient access to a range of VR and related data for planning, evaluation, and decision-making. Data on occupation at closure were selected for this analysis. The dataset included information on 1,489 consumers with various disabilities closed into 10 standard occupational codes (SOC). Additionally, for the purpose of national comparison, Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) data on individuals with disabilities in the labor force for the same year were analyzed (BLS, 2013).

Descriptive statistics were performed to determine the proportion of consumers with ID who obtained employment among various occupational titles, and to compare those proportions to consumers with other disability types, BLS labor force characteristics data, and corresponding earnings associated with each job title.

3. Results

A detailed description of the demographic characteristics of the sample is included in Table 1. Approximately half (49.0%) of the sample, were male and approximately 79.5% identified as Caucasian.

Table 2 shows the breakdown of total case closures across all SOCs, the percentage of consumers by disability category closed in each job category, and the mean weekly earnings of associated SOCs in Kentucky for 2012. It also shows the percentage

Table 1
Sample demographics

Demographics	n	%
Gender		
Male	730	49.0
Female	759	51.0
Ethnicity		
Caucasian	1212	79.5
African American	268	17.6
Native American	7	0.5
Asian	6	0.4
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	6	0.4
Hispanic	24	1.6

Note: $n = 1,489$.

of individuals with disabilities employed in the various occupational categories on a national level. The data demonstrate that individuals with ID were primarily closed in one of two SOCs: (a) Food Preparation and Serving Related Occupations (24.1%) and (b) Building and Grounds Cleaning and Maintenance Occupations (28.2%). Comparatively, these rates are from four to five times higher than the majority of the other reported SOC closures among individuals with ID. For the remaining SOCs, 19.8% were closed in Office and Administrative Support positions, 8.9% in Production jobs, 6.5% in Personal and Care services, and 6.0% in Sales and Related Occupations. Closure rates in the remainder of SOCs were below 5%, as depicted in Table 2.

The mean weekly earnings for the food preparation (\$190.52) and building and grounds (\$239.69) occupations were appreciably lower (39% and 24%, respectively) than the overall mean weekly earnings for all the other occupational categories in Kentucky in 2012 (\$314.08). Interestingly, there was a high rate of individuals with ID placed into office and administrative support jobs (19.8%), but upon further analysis, the majority of these positions (76.6%) were stock clerks: positions that are at the lower end of the weekly earnings within that SOC (\$251.15).

4. Discussion

The results in this descriptive analysis are consistent with previous national analyses exploring the range of vocational closures or work settings of adults with ID or DD over the past 15 years (e.g., Gilmore et al., 2000; Moore, 2001; Moore et al., 2004; Siperstein et al., 2013; Yamaki & Fujiura, 2002). Specifically, with respect to the range of occupational settings, persons with ID appear to be placed predominantly in unskilled or low-skill entry level positions at essentially the same rates as have been reported consistently throughout this period. This range was relatively more restricted than for consumers with other disabilities. In short, despite considerable attention to self-determination and choice in the VR process, and to the development of person-based employment services, in the aggregate, people with ID remain essentially where they were at the beginning of the century in terms of employment rates, range of vocational placements, and pay.

As noted in the introduction, the social, developmental, personal, and economic factors underlying the restricted range and nature of the positions in

Table 2
Descriptive statistics for occupational outcomes

SOC	Total closures by disability type (%)						Mean weekly earnings
	ID	Hearing	Orthopedic	Mental Health	LD	All Disabilities (BLS)	
Education, Training, and Library	0.81	5.5	5.2	1.5	2.7	5	\$312.05
Healthcare Practitioners and Technical	0	5.9	11.6	7.3	3.8	3.6	\$795.37
Food Preparation and Serving Related	24.1	6.8	6.1	12.2	9.1	5.2	\$190.52
Building, Grounds Cleaning and Maintenance	28.2	17.7	8.6	18.2	12.4	6.1	\$239.69
Personal Care and Services	6.5	4.1	2.0	2.1	5.4	4.1	\$217.14
Sales and Related Occupations	6.0	13.2	9.6	14.0	13.4	10.4	\$263.23
Office and Administrative Support	19.8	28.2	37.4	27.5	22.0	13.1	\$286.88
Production	8.9	12.7	4.5	10.1	16.7	7.7	\$394.12
Transportation and Material Moving	4.8	4.1	8.6	4.9	10.2	7.8	\$378.69
Protective Services	0.81	1.8	5.2	2.1	4.3	2.2	\$357.69
Overall mean weekly earnings							\$314.08

which persons with ID are primarily employed are complex and interrelated. Research suggests that these factors include the relatively low level of occupational exposure and educational and vocational preparation of individuals with ID, the low expectations of parents and family members, the negative attitudes of employers, and the low expectations of employment professionals (Brooke, Wehman, Inge, and Parent 1995; Browder, Wood, Test, Karvonen, & Algozzine, 2001; McGrew & Evans, 2004; Migliore, Grossi, Mank, & Rogan, 2008; Szymanski & Hanley-Maxwell, 1996; Szymanski & Trueba, 1994). Unfortunately, the present data do not contribute to the understanding of the contributions of such factors. However, because VR and other employment services are a critical gateway to employment and career development, and because employment service providers have the potential to effect and promote change in many of these factors, the remainder of the discussion addresses VR and other employment service practices that may help to address this persistent issue of restricted vocational outcomes.

4.1. Vocational choice and occupational exploration

Wehman and Kregel (1998) defined choice as "having more than one option from which to make a selection... Choice is more than offering what is available; it involves working to develop what *should* be available" (p. 9). Choice and participation in the development of rehabilitation goals and planning are not only legislatively mandated in the state-federal VR program, but are also associated with more positive rehabilitation outcomes. When adults with ID make their own vocational decisions (Wehmeyer & Bolding, 2001; Wehmeyer & Palmer,

2003) and perform work consistent with their interests and abilities, they have greater job satisfaction and an increased likelihood of long-term employment (Holland, 1985). Thus, while it is not clear from the data whether employment specialists are encouraging clients to accept low-pay, entry-level positions, or whether clients are choosing these jobs based on informed vocational decision making, every client should be afforded the opportunity to choose from a range of job opportunities congruent with their skills and interests.

Wehmeyer (2007) concluded that a key aspect of quality choice lies in familiarity and experience with occupations, which according to Brown and Brown (2009), entails providing consumers with a broad range of work opportunities. The present data suggest that VR counselors and employment specialists should take time to help consumers with ID gain insight about their own values, interests, and abilities and explore the different occupations that are consistent with their interest and values.

Rehabilitation counselors and job placement specialists also need to help consumers become familiar with the demands and expectations of employers and do a better job matching consumers with jobs they like and can perform satisfactorily. One effective practice involves having consumers complete job trials in an attempt to assess fit and reassure employers about risks (Gilbride & Stensrud, 1999; Hagner, Noll, & Enein-Donovan, 2002; Levinson & Perry, 2009). Job trials allow consumers to assess their skills and interests while experiencing employer expectations.

4.2. Incorporating principles and practices of supported employment

As defined by the Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1998, supported employment (SE) functions to

assist individuals with disabilities to obtain “competitive work in integrated work settings . . . consistent with strengths, resources, priorities, concerns, abilities, capabilities, interests, and informed choice of the individuals...” Brooke et al. (1995) posited that it is possible that some of the key concepts of SE have been forgotten, or never learned, by VR professionals. Yet some key principles and evidence-based practices associated with SE, if employed in practice with VR consumers with ID, may help to expand the range of vocational placements. Although SE has demonstrated efficacy in assisting individuals with ID to obtain and maintain employment, Migliore et al. (2012) reported that fewer than half of the employment specialists utilized SE strategies supported in the research literature. These include a commitment to integrated employment, taking the time to get to know clients through careful interviewing and by gathering information through a variety of sources, networking, analyzing employer needs, and developing customized employment opportunities.

4.3. *Demand-side employment services*

Another important consideration is the historic reliance on supply-side rather than demand-side employment. Traditionally, job placement specialists have focused on the consumer, with an emphasis on preparing them with the necessary skills to obtain employment (i.e., supply side) and spent less time understanding the needs of employers (i.e., demand side; Chan et al., 2010).

The focus of demand side services is on the employer, work environment, and strategies that may facilitate the preparation of consumers for jobs that employers need to fill (Carlson, Smith, & Rapp, 2008; Domzal, Houtenville, & Sharma, 2008; Dutta, Gervey, Chan, Chou, & Ditchman, 2008). Grizzard (2005) reported that many employers need and want more accurate information in order to assuage negative perceptions about hiring individuals with disabilities. Furthermore, the customized-employment literature stresses the importance of focusing on employer’s needs and job-carving as promising strategies (Migliore et al., 2012). By developing relationships with employers, employment specialists begin to create a growing network, which is likely to result in increased and diverse employment opportunities for consumers (Bolles, 2009; Luecking, Fabian, & Tilson, 2004; Owens & Young, 2008).

4.4. *Counselor expectations in employment and supported employment referrals*

Typically, rehabilitation counselors employed in state VR agencies do not provide extensive placement or SE services directly, rather, they refer clients to agencies or professionals who specialize in placing individuals with disabilities. However, these referral sources directly affect VR outcomes. Thus, a final consideration is that VR counselors must evaluate and clarify their expectations for such referrals. It is important that VR counselors consider whether employment specialists working with consumers with ID are experienced with SE; are utilizing the necessary skills and protocols to afford clients the opportunity to articulate and discover their skills, interests, and abilities; and are performing job development tasks (e.g., thorough discovery, job trials, job matching, employer contacts) to create a broad range of employment options for each client. It is critical that VR counselors and employment specialists are on the same page with regard to the goals of employment and what will be considered acceptable placements.

5. Conclusion

The findings in this analysis of one state’s RSA-911 data are consistent with those consistently reported for people with ID. Specifically, they demonstrate that VR consumers with ID tend to be employed at closure in entry level, low-skill positions that are associated with limited opportunities for career development and advancement. Although the data are inherently limited in terms of increasing our understanding of the reasons for the continued pattern of restricted vocational outcomes, several general considerations were presented for increasing awareness of practices that may address this situation. Regardless of the causes, increased employment outcome diversity will result from attending to consumer preferences, promoting informed decision making, clarifying expectations with employment specialists, and an increased focus on employers and how their needs can be met.

Conflict of interest

None to declare.

References

- Boeltzig, H., Timmons, J. C., & Butterworth, J. (2008). Entering work: Employment outcomes of people with developmental disabilities. *International Journal of Rehabilitation Research, 31*(3), 217-223.
- Bolles, R. N. (2009). *The job-hunter's survival guide: How to find hope and rewarding work, even when "there are no jobs."* Berkeley, CA: Ten Speed Press.
- Brooke, V., Wehman, P., Inge, K., & Parent, W. (1995). Toward a customer-driven approach of supported employment. *Education and Training Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities, 30*(4), 308-320.
- Browder, D., Wood, W., Test, D., Karvonen, M., & Algozzine, B. (2001). Reviewing resources on self-determination: A map for teachers. *Remedial and Special Education, 22*, 233-244.
- Brown, I., & Brown, R. I. (2009). Choice as an aspect of quality of life for people with intellectual disabilities. *Journal of Policy and Practice in Intellectual Disabilities, 6*(1), 11-18.
- Bureau of Labor Statistics (2013). Persons with a disability: Labor force characteristics — 2012. Retrieved from http://www.bls.gov/news.release/archives/disabl_06122013.pdf.
- Carlson, L., Smith, G., & Rapp, C. A. (2008). Evaluation of conceptual selling as a job development planning process. *Psychiatric Rehabilitation Journal, 31*(3), 219-225.
- Chan, F., Strauser, D., Maher, P., Lee, E. J., Jones, R., & Johnson, E. T. (2010). Demand-side factors related to employment of people with disabilities: A survey of employers in the Midwest region of the United States. *Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation, 20*, 412-419.
- Content of the Individualized Plan for Employment, 34C.F.R. § 361.46 (2015).
- Domzal, C., Houtenville, A., & Sharma, R. (2008). *Survey of employer perspectives on the employment of people with disabilities: Technical report.* (Prepared under contract to the Office of Disability and Employment Policy, US Department of Labor). McLean, VA: CESSI.
- Dutta, A., Gervey, R., Chan, F., Chou, C. C., & Ditchman, N. (2008). Vocational rehabilitation services and employment outcomes of people with disabilities: A United States study. *Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation, 18*, 326-334.
- Getzel, E. E. (2014). United States congress, senate committee on health, education, labor and pensions: Introductory remarks. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation, 40*, 183-184.
- Gilbride, D., & Stensrud, R. (1999). Demand-side job development and system change. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin, 42*(4), 329-343.
- Gilmore, D. S., Schuster, J. L., Timmons, J. C., & Butterworth, J. (2000). An analysis of trends for people with MR, cerebral palsy, and epilepsy receiving services from state vocational rehabilitation agencies: Ten years of progress. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin, 44*(1), 30-39.
- Grizzard, W. R. (2005). *Meeting demand-side expectations and needs.* A presentation at the ADA 15th Anniversary Seminar, Washington, DC.
- Hagner, D., Noll, A., & Enein-Donovan, L. (2002). Identifying community employment program staff competencies: A critical incident approach. *Journal of Rehabilitation, 68*, 45-51.
- Levinson, J. C., & Perry, D. E. (2009). *Guerilla marketing for job hunters 2.0: 1001 unconventional tips, tricks, and tactics to land your dream job.* Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Luecking, R. G., Fabian, E. S., & Tilson, G. P. (2004). *Working relationships: Creating career opportunities for job seekers with disabilities through employer partnerships.* Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes.
- McGrew, K. S., & Evans, J. (2004). *Expectations for students with cognitive disabilities: Is the cup half empty or half full? Can the cup flow over?* (Synthesis Report 55). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, National Center on Educational Outcomes.
- Migliore, A., Butterworth, J., Nord, D., Cox, M., & Gelb, A. (2012). Implementation of job development practices. *Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities, 50*(3), 207-218.
- Migliore, A., Grossi, T., Mank, D., & Rogan, P. (2008). Why do adults with intellectual disabilities work in sheltered workshops? *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation, 28*(1), 29-40.
- Migliore, A., Hall, A. C., Butterworth, J., & Winsor, J. (2010). Job development: What do employment specialists really do? A national study on job development practices. *Research & Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities, 35*(1-2), 15-23.
- Millington, M., Szymanski, E. M., & Hanley-Maxwell, C. (1994). The effect of the label of mental retardation on employer concerns and selection. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin, 38*, 27-43.
- Moore, C. L. (2001b). Disparities in closure success rates for African Americans with mental retardation: An ex-post-facto research design. *Journal of Applied Rehabilitation Counseling, 32*(2), 30-35.
- Moore, C. L., Harley, D. A., & Gamble, D. (2004). Ex-post-facto analysis of competitive employment outcomes for individuals with mental retardation: National perspective. *Mental Retardation, 42*(4), 253-262.
- Mueser, K. T., Becker, D. R., & Wolfe, R. (2001). Supported employment, job preferences, job tenure and satisfaction. *Journal of Mental Health, 10*(4), 411-417.
- Owens, L., & Young, P. (2008). You're hired! The power of networking. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation, 29*(1), 23-28.
- Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1998, 29 U.S.C. § 701 et seq.
- Siperstein, G. N., Parker, R. C., & Drascher, M. (2013). National snapshot of adults with intellectual disabilities in the labor force. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation, 39*, 157-165.
- Sowers, J., Cotton, P., & Malloy, J. (1994). Expanding the job and career options for people with significant disabilities. *Developmental Disabilities Bulletin, 22*(2), 53-62.
- Storey, K. (2006). Informed choice: The catch 22 of self-determination. *Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities, 30*, 232-234.
- Szymanski, E. M., & Hanley-Maxwell, C. (1996). Career development of people with developmental disabilities: An ecological model. *Journal of Rehabilitation, 62*(1), 48-55.
- Szymanski, E. M., & Trueba, H. T. (1994). Castification of people with disabilities: Potential disempowering aspects of classification in disability services. *Journal of Rehabilitation, 60*(3), 12-20.
- Timmons, J., & Wolf, A. (2011). *The influential role of the job developer: Increasing self-determination and family involvement during the job search.* Research to Practice Brief, Issue No. 49. Boston, MA: Institute for Community Inclusion, University of Massachusetts-Boston.
- Wehman, P., Chan, F., Ditchman, N., & Kang, H. J. (2014). Effect of supported employment on vocational rehabilitation outcomes of transition-age youth with intellectual and developmental

- disabilities: A case control study. *Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities*, 52(4), 296-310.
- Wehman, P., & Kregel, J. (1998). *More than a job: Securing satisfying careers for people with disabilities*. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes.
- Wehmeyer, M. (2005). Self-determination and individuals with severe disabilities: Re-examining meanings and misinterpretations. *Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities*, 30, 113-120.
- Wehmeyer, M. L. (2007). *Promoting self-determination in students with developmental disabilities*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Wehmeyer, M., & Bolding, N. (2004). Enhanced self-determination of adults with mental retardation as an outcome of moving to community-based work or living environments. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*, 45, 371-383.
- Wehmeyer, M. L., & Palmer, S. B. (2003). Adult outcomes for students with cognitive disabilities, three years after high school: The impact of self-determination. *Education & Training in Developmental Disabilities*, 38(2), 131-144.
- Yamaki, K., & Fujiura, G. (2002). Employment and income status of adults with developmental disabilities living in the community. *Mental Retardation*, 40, 132-141.



本文献由“学霸图书馆-文献云下载”收集自网络，仅供学习交流使用。

学霸图书馆（www.xuebalib.com）是一个“整合众多图书馆数据库资源，提供一站式文献检索和下载服务”的24小时在线不限IP图书馆。

图书馆致力于便利、促进学习与科研，提供最强文献下载服务。

图书馆导航：

[图书馆首页](#) [文献云下载](#) [图书馆入口](#) [外文数据库大全](#) [疑难文献辅助工具](#)