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ABSTRACT

EXPECTATIONS AND ASPIRATIONS OF KUWAITI FATHERS AND MOTHERS TOWARDS TRANSITION OUTCOMES OF THEIR CHILD WITH A DISABILITY IN KUWAIT

Abrar M. Al-Jazzaf

There are many challenges that face individuals with disabilities and their families during the transition period from childhood to adulthood. As young adolescents exit high school many of their future transition options are influenced by their family context, especially the child’s parents. This study investigates parents’ expectations and aspirations for their children with disabilities in terms of transition outcomes in order to understand the needs of those parents in preparing their children as they exit school, and transition to adulthood in Kuwait, a country that has yet to address transition in its laws and policies on disabilities.

The proposed study investigated parental expectations and aspirations in their child’s preparation for transition. It also examined the role of some demographic variables found to be important in past research, such as parent’s gender, age, education level, monthly income, child’s gender, child’s age, and degree of child’s disability. These variables were examined in relation to Kuwaiti fathers’ and mothers’ transition expectations and aspirations in the following areas: future orientation, community resources, financial independence, employment, postsecondary education, residential and daily living, and social relationships.
An overall finding of this study is that parents, who are younger in age, have lower income and education levels, and have a younger child with a less severe disability tended to have higher expectations and aspirations for their children with disabilities. Despite the older age of the fathers and their higher education and income levels compared to the mothers, both fathers and mothers had generally similar expectations and aspirations towards transition outcomes for their children with disabilities. However, mothers had higher aspirations for their child’s social relationships than did the fathers, especially for their daughters. The best predictors for fathers’ and mothers’ expectations and aspirations for their children’s transition outcomes included, fathers’ education level, mothers’ education level, mothers’ income, child’s age, and degree of child’s disability. Parents’ high expectations and aspirations for employment, postsecondary education, and social relationships were a promising theme as their children transitioned to adulthood.

The results of this study have provided a framework for further research in the area of transition in Kuwait. Although transition is a vital area and concept that should influence national laws and policies, it still remains relatively new to Kuwait. This research study will potentially lead to an increased understanding of parents’ needs for support services to guide them and their children to a smoother transition to adulthood.
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Chapter I

Background and Need

Major challenges confront most individuals during the transition from adolescence to adulthood as young individuals exit the school system. Considerable physiological and intellectual development is associated with this time period in addition to biological changes as one progresses from puberty to adulthood. Cooney (2002) referred to two aspects that mark the transition phase. The first life transition, occurs during the time the individual is experiencing physiological, intellectual, and biological development. Also, during this phase, many young adults face uncertainties as they develop and experience growth and change (Kim & Turnbull, 2004). The second life transition, which is marked by social changes and achievement of the status of being an adult, occurs when an individual exits the school system and enters a postsecondary institution or employment. Exiting high school and moving to adulthood is indeed one of the most significant points of transition (Test, Mazzotti, Mustian, Fowler, Kortering, & Kohler, 2009). Transition is the time when youth with disabilities leave the school system and transition to adult roles (McIntyre, Kraemer, Blacher, & Simmerman, 2004). This time period carries with it many changes that affect the daily lives of young individuals with disabilities and their families (Neece, Kraemer, & Blacher, 2009). Individuals with disabilities may also face difficulties due to others’ perceptions of their disability (Will, 1984). In this research study, the term transition will be used to encompass both the first and second life transition phase of children with disabilities.
Although this is a crucial time for every individual, people with disabilities may have a different experience in transition and may need family support more than typically developing individuals (Bianco, Garrison-Wade, Tobin, & Lehmann, 2009). Blacher (2001) affirmed the importance of understanding the young individual’s and the family’s experience during the transition period as it is highlighted by vast challenges and uncertainties. The transition phase necessitates preparation for family support, living arrangements, and moving to employment or higher education. These components may vary depending on the individual’s disability, socioeconomic status, family involvement, and services provided within the community. As family involvement in the transition process is considered to be a central factor that supports the individual’s growth, it is particularly important to recognize the complexity of the issues and circumstances that families face as their adult child with an Intellectual Disability (ID) transitions to adulthood (Griffiths & Unger, 1994). The American Association on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities definition of ID is “a disability characterized by significant limitations both in intellectual functioning and in adaptive behavior, which covers many everyday social and practical skills. This disability originates before the age of 18” (Schalock, Borthwick-Duffy, Bradley, Buntinx, Coulter, Craig, et al., 2010). The family’s knowledge and perceptions are major contributors to enhancing the transition process and they may assist professionals and service providers in developing strategies for improving the transition (Chambers, Hughes, & Carter, 2004).

Just as individuals with disabilities may face challenges as they develop, parents of children with disabilities encounter as many, if not more, challenges over the years. Parents play a key role in supporting their transition-aged child (Grigal & Neubert, 2004).
Parents’ expectations, together with the school’s efforts in preparing young individuals with disabilities for their postsecondary years, contribute to expanding youths’ future opportunities and achieving successful transition outcomes for further education and/or employment (Grigal & Neubert, 2004). The school and family can help young individuals with disabilities achieve their postsecondary goals, “including increased independence and autonomy, satisfying vocational pursuits, community living opportunities, and increased social networks and supports” (Kraemer, McIntyre, & Blacher, 2003, p.259). Kraemer and Blacher (2001) noted the importance of the involvement of a collaborative team consisting of the individual with a disability, family, school, and service providers in order to ensure a smooth transition. Morningstar, Turnbull, and Turnbull (1995) encouraged individuals with disabilities and their families to be actively involved in the transition process and in planning for postsecondary outcomes.

**Transition Models and Initiatives**

The Division of Career Development and Transition (DCDT) of the Council for Exceptional Children adopted the following definition of transition: “Transition refers to a change in status from behaving primarily as a student to assuming emergent adult roles in the community. These roles include employment, participating in post-secondary education, maintaining a home, becoming appropriately involved in the community, and experiencing satisfactory personal and social relationships. The process of enhancing transition involves the participation and coordination of school programs, adult agency services, and natural supports within the community. The foundations for transition should be laid during the elementary and middle school years, guided by the broad concept of career development. Transition planning should begin no later than age 14,
and students should be encouraged, to the full extent of their capabilities, to assume a maximum amount of responsibility for such planning” (Halpern, 1994, p. 117).

While the DCDT has adopted a more comprehensive definition for transition including specific areas of importance in both preparation and transition to adult outcomes, Will’s (1984) Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS) Transition Model described transition in less detail with a broad focus on services leading to employment. Will’s (1984) description of transition was as follows: “The transition from school to working life is an outcome-oriented process encompassing a broad array of services and experiences that lead to employment” (p. 2). She further described the transition period as including high school, graduation from high school, additional postsecondary education or adult services, and the early years of employment. Will (1984) conceptualized the transition process as a bridge to the future of adolescents with disabilities. The bridge is between the security provided in schools and the risks that come with adult life. Similar to transition, a bridge needs a strong span and structure at both ends, and the transition from school to adulthood requires early preparation while the individual with a disability is still in secondary school, adequate support when leaving school, and services and opportunities when becoming an adult.

Halpern’s (1985) observation that the OSERS Transition model led to only one ultimate goal, employment, led him to revise the model with additional components to employment including residential environment and social and interpersonal networks. These additions resulted in a primary target goal of transitioning into adulthood by giving individuals with disabilities the opportunity to live successfully in their community. Halpern (1985) emphasized the importance of all three dimensions, employment,
residential environment, and social and interpersonal networks, functioning together as all of these dimensions have equal importance in transition. He further explained, if any of these dimensions is inadequate the whole revised Transition Model is in danger and the individual’s transition to living in the community is threatened.

The United Nations initiated policies over the past decades on the protection of human rights—especially for marginalized groups including individuals with disabilities. The United Nations Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) World Conference on Special Needs Education: Access and Quality in Salamanca, Spain was convened in June of 1994. More than 300 participants attended the conference from 92 governments and 25 international organizations. The goal of the Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action on Special Needs Education (UNESCO, 1994) was to initiate a worldwide consensus on future directions for the education of people with disabilities throughout the life span, in addition to transition. Topics promoting inclusive education and Education for All, and preparation for adult life were prominent in the framework.

Hegarty (1993) commented on important principles that were invoked in the Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action on Special Needs Education. He explained the principle of education as a right of citizenship for all people including those who may be denied that right such as individuals with disabilities, members of ethnic minorities, and females. Educating young individuals in schools is a form of preparing them for their adult life. Hegarty (1993) noted that many individuals with disabilities have only limited academic achievement by the time they leave the school system and therefore may not be ready for transitioning to adult life. Hegarty (1993) asserted, “the UNESCO Review found that a majority of countries responding had limited or no post-
school provisions for those with disabilities” (p. 24); this is the case in both developed and developing countries. Hegarty (1993) recommended that schools prepare young individuals transitioning to adulthood to live as independently as possible by providing work experience in career education and guidance and pre-vocational training (p. 24). In addition, the school’s role is to provide students with and without disabilities with a broad range of life skills rather than specific job training. Individuals with disabilities need assistance to prepare them to “become economically active and lead lives that are as full and independent as possible” (Hegarty, 1993, p. 24). The Salamanca Framework noted an entitlement for preparation for adult life, adult and continuing education, and employment (UNESCO, 1994).

The most recent UN initiative is the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNCRPD) adopted on December 13, 2006 and entered into force on May 3, 2008. The purpose of the Convention “is to promote, protect and ensure the full and equal enjoyment of all human rights and fundamental freedoms by all persons with disabilities, and to promote respect for their inherent dignity” (United Nations, 2006). Among the Articles in the CRPD document, Article 27 is dedicated to work and employment. Article 27, promotes equality in employment opportunities and working in inclusive settings which are accessible for individuals with disabilities. Schulze (2010) referred to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (CESCR) Committee comment on Article 27, stressing the prevalence of discrimination in employment, “In most countries the unemployment rate among persons with disabilities is two to three times higher than the unemployment rate for persons without disabilities” (p. 150). The CESCR Committee further explained that individuals with disabilities are
employed in low-paid jobs segregated from the mainstream labor market. The CESCR committee calls for all countries to support the integration of individuals with disabilities in the labor market.

Among the six Arabian Gulf countries, Kuwait is the only country in the region that has not, to this day, signed the CRPD. According to the Human Rights Watch (2011), in May 2010 at the UN Human Rights Council in Geneva, Kuwait promised to take on the signing of the CRPD, however, the government has not shown major progress towards this step.

**Region of Research Interest: Kuwait**

The State of Kuwait is located at the far northwestern corner of the Arabian Gulf, and borders with the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia on the south and southwest, and with Iraq, on the north and northwest side, and on the east with the Arabian Gulf. Due to its location, Kuwait has had a long-standing commercial importance to the region serving as a gateway to the northeast part of the Arabian Peninsula. The area of the State of Kuwait is 17,818 square kilometers, approximately seven thousand square miles. The climate is characterized by short warm winters, with some rain, and long dry hot summers due to its desert geographic location. The population of the State of Kuwait in 2010, according to latest published statistics, was a total of 3,566,437 of whom 1,133,214 are Kuwaitis and 2,433,223 are non-Kuwaitis (State of Kuwait Central Statistical Bureau, 2011). On June 19 of 1961, Kuwait gained its full independence after canceling the defense treaty with the United Kingdom. Kuwait owns 9% of the world’s oil reserves and has the fifth largest oil reserves in the world (Central Intelligence Agency, 2010).
History of general and special education in Kuwait.

Prior to the year 1911, children in Kuwait were educated by religious scholars and were instructed in the areas of math, reading, and religious matters (Huseen, Al-Saleh, & Al-Khalid, 2002). The first elementary school was opened in Kuwait in December of 1911 and was called Al-Mubarkiyah School. It was initiated and funded by the donations of citizens and started with 254 male students. Subjects in Islamic education and history, Arabic, mathematics, and geography were taught at that time. By 1921, a second elementary school called the Alahmadiyah School was established with additional courses such as health, general cultural studies, reading, and English (Huseen et al., 2002). By 1936, the Council of Education was established to outline educational plans, select appropriate curricula, set up educational regulations, appoint the director of General Education for school management, and add seven new elementary schools for male students in addition to a female elementary school (Huseen et al., 2002). By 1937, the council initiated a high school for male students and, in 1952, the first high school was established for girls. The Ministry of Education passed the Law for Compulsory Education in 1966, making education compulsory and free of charge up to an intermediate level (Huseen et al., 2002). Furthermore, Kuwait University was established in 1965 as a non-profit state university.

The Council of Education began to consider the rights of individuals with disabilities as early as the 1950’s and established the first school, Alnoor School, for students with blindness and visual impairment in 1955 (Barr, 1983). Alnoor School had two teachers and a student body of 36 male students, and by 1958 the Council of Education initiated a unit for female students in the school (Huseen et al., 2002). By
1959, the Council of Education established a school for the deaf, Alamal School, with 22 male and female students and one teacher, and by 1961 the number of students had increased to 60. Unlike the Alnoor School, Alamal School included a vocational rehabilitation unit besides the elementary level.

Individuals with intellectual disabilities (ID) and developmental disabilities (DD) were given the opportunity to be educated by the establishment of the School of Mental Education in 1961 and included 65 male students and 58 female students. Training in handicrafts was the main focus of the school, which included carpentry, sewing, and ceramics. Huseen et al. (2002) reported that students remained in this school until the age of 14 and then transferred to the School of Vocational Rehabilitation.

In 1965, the Ministry of Education started a vocational center, the Institute of Vocational and Rehabilitation, to provide placements for graduate students of Alamal School and the Mental Education School. The vocational program was set up as a four-year program, preparing students to work with handicrafts such as carpentry, carpeting, sewing, and ceramics (Huseen et al., 2002). Also, in 1963, the Ministry of Education started a school for individuals with physical disabilities called Alraja Institute. By 1970, the Ministry of Education moved all the buildings of all the self-contained schools for individuals with disabilities into one campus and called it the ‘Schools of Special Education’ and appointed an independent administration to direct these schools (Huseen et al., 2002).

Today, there are 15 public special education schools for individuals with the following disabilities: intellectual and developmental delay, deafness, blindness, motor disabilities, and autism with a total student body of 1,855. In addition to the public school
system, there are 23 private special education schools. The Ministry of Education (2008) has listed the number of students in both the public and private special education schools, a total of 38 schools, with 3,678 students, of whom 2,191 are males and 1,487 are females.

**Laws and rights for individuals with disabilities in Kuwait.**

The Higher Council for the Disabled (HCD) was established by the Ministry of Education as an office to oversee the national special education programs and to initiate a program serving young students with Down’s Syndrome and mild ID in special education classrooms integrated within public general education elementary schools in addition to overseeing all government services such as healthcare, rehabilitation, education social welfare, and advocacy (Almuhareb, 2007). The HCD has stated that Kuwait became known as the pioneer in serving individuals with disabilities in the Arabian Gulf region by passing the law titled Care for the Handicapped number 49 in 1996. Passage of the 1996 law has addressed the responsibility of the government towards people with disabilities in providing them with services that include housing specifications, rehabilitation centers, disability pensions, monthly allowances, and employment services. Al-Hilawani et al. (2008) have provided evidence that “to date, this law has served as a catalyst in promoting the rights of people with disabilities, although it has not brought about the necessary changes to improve quality of life for children and adults with disabilities” (p. 4). In addition, this law of 1996 has addressed the main issues related to providing medical services, education, transportation, employment, pay raises, maternity leave for pregnant women with disabilities, and accessibility to public facilitates,
however, it lacked any discussion of educational assessment, placement options, and definitions of terminology (Al-Hilawani, 2011).

Since 1996, it has been apparent that the law was not strictly implemented, and it did not bring the necessary changes due to its lack of guaranteeing judicial procedures even though it has served and provided the legal help needed to protect the rights of individuals with disabilities in Kuwait (Al-Hilawani, 2011). Due to these circumstances, the Kuwaiti government has passed a new law that would make up for the gaps and missing links in the previous law of 1996. This new law, the Rights of Individuals with Disabilities (Act No. 8 for the year 2010) was passed in 2010 and emphasizes the inclusion of individuals with disabilities at various educational levels by using suitable educational materials, curriculum adaptations, and making the community aware of the rights of people with disabilities (Al-Hilawani, 2011).

Al-Hilawani (2011) referred to one of the major changes in the new law— the use of the term “disabilities” which replaced the previously used term “handicapped.” Also, he noted the positive and radical changes in services introduced to people with disabilities to improve their quality of life and education. Al-Hilawani (2011) praised the 2010 law because it “addresses more demanding issues such as preparing qualified personnel to meet needs of individuals with disabilities and implementing the philosophy of inclusion in educational and non-educational settings.”

**Status of inclusion in Kuwait.**

The principle of inclusion has been embraced worldwide for many years as a global phenomenon and was emphasized and supported by the *Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action on Special Needs Education* (UNESCO, 1994) and the UNCRPD
(United Nations, 2006). Even though practitioners and education sectors in Kuwait have recognized inclusion as a model, it has been difficult to implement it fully in the public school system.

In most of the Middle Eastern and Gulf countries, the majority of individuals with disabilities have been confined away from the general public (Gaad, 2001; Al-Hilawani, Koch, and Braaten, 2008). One motive that is common in many cultures is the perception that the disability label brings shame to the family. Al-Hilawani et al. (2008) asserted that in the Middle East-Arabia Gulf cultures, families are affected negatively by the labeling of their children—this type of identification carries social consequences that motivate many families to hide their children at home and away from society. In the United Arab Emirates, a qualitative study was conducted and the following was a common perception believed by the majority of the population: “young women’s marital relationships and possible marriage plans were directly affected by the presence of a child with Down’s Syndrome in the family, especially in small communities where everyone knows everyone else” (Gaad, 2001). Thus, traditions and certain beliefs have restricted the opportunities of individuals with disabilities to take part in their community and be active participants sharing common rights along everyone else in this region. To this day, disability is still viewed by many people in Kuwait as a stigma (Al-Hilawani, 2011).

While segregation is practiced with most types of disabilities in Kuwait, individuals with physical disabilities are more likely to be welcomed and accepted in public schools and public areas. Individuals with ID and developmental disabilities are not given the same privilege. This can be referred to as the implementation of partial inclusion. Brown (2005), who wrote about inclusive education in the Middle East
cultures, noted, “The forces of tradition have worked to both protect and care for the disabled while maintaining psycho-social borders preventing their integration into the larger society. This internal contradiction is at the centre of the cautious and hesitant emergence of inclusive thinking throughout the region” (p. 257). The National Report in Development of Education in Kuwait listed several projects relating to the reform process that was presented at an educational reform conference in February of 2008. Among the 15 projects related to education, only one project promoted inclusion, but it only included one disability category—the “mobility disability” (National Report, 2008, p.104). The presentation of the Ministry of Education of Kuwait, The Future Vision in Reforming and Developing Education, does not endorse the full inclusion concept of integrating all individuals with disabilities with their peers without disabilities. However, it referred to inclusion as a major scheme that will be implemented socially and in the public education system and as a future plan that will enhance the quality of life for individuals with disabilities living in Kuwait. Al-Hilawani (2011) recognized various obstacles to the implementation of inclusion in Kuwait including the lack of qualified teachers, lack of preparation from the local community, and some resistance from the parents of typically developing students in the general education schools.

The initiative of placing self-contained classrooms in general education public schools in Kuwait has included students who are labeled as “slow learners” and students with Down’s Syndrome, while students with other disabilities are placed in self-contained special education schools (Al-Hilawani, 2011; Almuhareb, 2007). Al-Hilawani (2011) suggested that the current self-contained classrooms in some of the general education public schools could be a substitute for the implementation of full inclusion, since the
concept is not yet part of the education system in Kuwait. Furthermore, Al-Hilawani (2011) suggested that in order to implement full inclusion in accordance with the new law of 2010, there must be a paradigm shift in the education system by establishing standards for work ethics, professional conduct, accountability, proper teacher preparation programs, and collaborative team activities.

Gaad (2001), promoted awareness in the Middle East region, specifically in the United Arab Emirates, on the inclusion of people with disabilities. As she stated, “The advantage of sitting beside a normal child and interacting with him or her is much better than having a state-of-the-art computer in a closed environment with little contact with other non-disabled people” (p. 7). A positive integrated environment surrounding people with and without disabilities gives an incentive of belonging and being part of a community. The idea of believing and supporting individuals with disabilities and embracing their capabilities of doing work based on their strengths is the essence of the implementation of social inclusion (Grant, 2008).

As for the schools, Brodin (2007) stressed, “A school for all requires coordination in the integration process, and everyone involved must have continual training as well as access to all the assistive material they need in order to carry out their tasks” (p.141). Gradually, with the increase of several factors such as preparation programs in the education and employment sector, school and community building accessibility, and acceptance of all individuals without discrimination a social inclusion model may be ready to be executed in the societies of the Gulf region. Establishing partial inclusion as an alternative for full inclusion at the initiation and moving towards a full inclusion society (Brown, 2005), is a plan that will enhance the quality of living for many
individuals with disabilities and will promote equality among the whole population. Also, expectations will be set at all levels once full inclusion is implemented in the schools. The inclusion model will reflect upon society, which allows individuals to be active participants with equal opportunities. “It is difficult to imagine that students with significant support needs, who have been fully included through high school, and their families, will continue to accept less than full inclusion into typical adult life after graduation” (Certo, Mautz, Pumpian, Sax, Smalley, Wade, Noyes, Luecking, Wechsler, & Batterman, 2003, p.4). Another study assured the importance of inclusion as a way of life by emphasizing that “the goal for the individual should be independence and self-sufficiency, both socially and later in his/her working life” (Brodin, 2007, p.141).

The recently mandated Kuwaiti law, the Rights of People with Disabilities 2010, emphasizes a full inclusion model, thus it may lead the way for implementing inclusion in all parts of the society in order to promote awareness among the Kuwaiti population of all ages. Consequently, it may serve as a framework for providing further education and career opportunities for individuals with disabilities as they transition to adulthood.

Statement of the Problem/Purpose of the Study

There is very little research, if any, on transition in the Gulf region and in Kuwait. In fact, research in the area of special education is scarce in this part of the world (Almuhareb, 2007; Al-Shammari, 2005; Negata, 2003). Preparation for the transition to adulthood is a vital period in an individual’s life as the individual exits the school system and enters adulthood (Test, Mazzotti, Mustian, Fowler, Kortering, & Kohler, 2009). The challenges of the transition period may not only affect the individual but also the family caring for the individual (Neece et al., 2009).
The intention of this research study is to understand Kuwaiti parents’ expectations and aspirations regarding transition outcomes for their children with disabilities transitioning from school to adulthood. The current Rights of Individuals with Disabilities (Act No. 8 for the year 2010) law in Kuwait does not include an entitlement for transition services for individuals with disabilities. Its main focus is on education and post-education employment. Thus, bridging the gap between the secondary education years and postsecondary years by understanding the parents’ needs and involvement may help practitioners in initiating and implementing transition support programs. These support programs may give parents the opportunity to gain knowledge and tools that would eventually benefit their adult child in his/her future and enhance the family’s well being (Blacher, 2001).

Alazami (2010) suggests that governmental authority in Kuwait and the Gulf region needs to provide effective program models and support services in Kuwait for parents of children with disabilities to improve the families’ quality of life. This research study may help agencies and stakeholders, in both the government and private sectors, to work collaboratively with individuals with disabilities and their families to better ensure their quality of life by understanding the parents’ future education and career expectations and aspirations as their children are still at an early stage of their adolescent years prior to exiting the school system. In summary, this study will measure the level of expectations and aspirations of Kuwaiti fathers and mothers with children with disabilities towards their children’s postsecondary transition outcomes.
Chapter II

Review of Relevant Literature

This chapter provides an overview of research related to transition. The chapter begins with the theoretical framework, which includes three key factors as part of transition. These factors are defined in terms of the theory of Normalization and Social Role Valorization, Self-determination, and Halpern’s Transition Model. Then, the foundations of transition from adolescence to adulthood are examined in the areas of legislation and progress in the United States. This is followed by an overview of factors affecting transition, such as the importance of family involvement during the transition period, the implications of collaboration among school personnel and families for young individuals with disabilities, and the role of employment opportunities for young adults with disabilities. After that, international transition movements are discussed. Then, brief coverage is provided of the research studies on disabilities pertaining to Kuwait and its population. The chapter concludes with a summary and rationale for the study followed by research questions.

Theoretical Framework for the Study

The theories reviewed for this study address the fact that many individuals with disabilities have been devalued or excluded by others in their societies. The normalization principle was initially proposed to endorse the goal that individuals gain active and legitimate roles in society. It leads to the development of the Social Role Valorization (SRV) theory, which supports socially valued roles in society by increasing positive values pertaining to individuals with disabilities. Self-determination is a widely
accepted educational outcome for youth with disabilities who aim to achieve positive adult outcomes (Wehmeyer & Schwartz, 1997). Finally, the Halpern’s Transition Model (1985) was chosen as a comprehensive model to illustrate that transition to adulthood includes several components that need to be addressed in order to achieve positive adult outcomes.

Normalization/Social Role Valorization theory.

The theory of normalization is relevant to this proposed research study on Kuwaiti parents’ expectations and aspirations for their children with disabilities transitioning to adulthood. According to Wolfensberger (1980), the concept of normalization was first described in a theoretical context before 1968 by Bank-Mikkelsen, who at the time was the head of the Danish Mental Retardation Service and who had included this concept in the Danish law regarding individuals with intellectual disability (ID). Bank-Mikkelsen (1980) referred to the Danish Act of 1959, which stated, “to create an existence for the mentally retarded as close to normal as possible” as the starting point for the international discussion of the normalization concept. By 1969, the normalization principle had been included and elaborated on in the literature by Bengt Nirje, who then held the position of executive director of the Swedish Association for Retarded Children.

In his early work, Wolfensberger (1972) described society’s perception of individuals with disabilities in terms of deviance. He further explained that individuals’ behavior is affected by the roles assigned to them. He provided a list of historical roles of deviant persons that people with disabilities have been categorized under. The role categories included: (a) subhuman organism, (b) menace, (c) unspeakable object of dread, (d) object of pity, (e) holy innocent, (f) diseased organism, (g) object of ridicule, and (h)
the eternal child. He suggested that there are four categories of responses to individuals viewed as deviant: (1) destruction of deviant individual, (2) their segregation, (3) reversal of their condition, and (4) prevention thereof (Wolfensberger, 1972). The author provided several solutions for avoiding perceptions of deviancy, “by not attaching negative value to certain types of differentness” (p. 25). Other ways to prevent perceptions of deviancy are by training, education, and treatment.

Wolfensbereger (1980) provided three very similar definitions for the normalization principle. According to him, the most used definition is “Utilization of means which are as culturally normative as possible in order to establish, enable, or support behaviors, appearances and interpretations which are culturally normative as possible” (Wolfensbereger, 1980, p. 80). Wolfensberger (1980) elaborated on the term “culturally normative as possible” referring to valued tools, techniques, and methods used in human services. He explained, “Because if a culturally devalued or alien method is used in human service, its image of oddity and devaluation transfers to the person or group served—perhaps even to the server” (Wolfensberger, 1980, p. 14).

In a societal context, normalization proclaims that every person needs to experience the life cycle (Wolfensberger, 1980). Pertaining to the topic of this research, parents experience concern as their children transition to adulthood. Nirje (1980) suggested that as individuals with ID grow and see marked changes as they transition to adulthood, they should be experiencing independence and should be placed in adult settings. Additionally, they should be trained in maintaining their daily routines and developing their social skills to integrate into their communities. Moreover, training in
decision-making leads to enhancing the individual’s maturity and makes them more competent (Nirje, 1980, p. 42).

Normalization, especially for individuals with disabilities transitioning to adulthood, allows them to gain an active and legitimate role in society and hence gain a sense of achieving status. According to Bowman and Weinkauf (2004), there is a great need for individuals with ID to participate in activities that achieve status instead of imitating roles, as many of them have been doing. In transitioning to a postsecondary setting, many individuals with disabilities have been integrated into education campuses and vocational programs, which brings with it a value in today’s world. Even though individuals with disabilities are integrated in postsecondary settings, they have not always been given the opportunity to achieve the same individualized status as other individuals without disabilities. In an example, Bowman and Weinkauf (2004) referred to the common status of individuals with disabilities volunteering at a work place and holding jobs without pay. Even though individuals with disabilities have the status of an employee, they often have not been given the opportunity to earn an income like other employees without disabilities. The competency that one gains as he or she integrates into society and participates in postsecondary activities enhances one’s status and value in society (Bowman & Weinkauf, 2004). For individuals with disabilities, normalization is not only an idea to advocate, but also a right that allows them to integrate and be physically and socially included in their societies and in all aspects of life (Wolfensberger, 1980).

The normalization principle was reformulated by Wolfensberger as “Social Role Valorization (SRV)” in 1983 and “it continues to be the founding principle of state-of-
the-art service provision for people with disabilities and has had a profound effect on the
quality of their lives” (Harry, Rueda, & Kalyanpur, 1999, p. 123). The intent of SRV is to
increase positive value in others, with the word valorization defined as “adding of value.”
SRV is based on social role theory, which refers to people being devalued or at risk of
being devalued by others and by major sectors in their society (Wolfensberger, 2000).
The concept of SRV, as explained by Wolfensberger (2000), generates the possibility of
judgments being placed on vulnerable people who are devalued by others. The
consequences of these actions for these people are perceived negatively; whereas the
feeling of worth makes people who are valued by others experience positive conditions.
He further explained, “SRV draws on empirical knowledge and social science theory to
understand how people’s social roles are shaped so as to be positively or negatively
valued in the eyes of beholders” (p. 106).

According to Osburn (2006), the main goal of SRV is to create and support
socially valued roles in society in order to give people with such roles the opportunity to
gain “good things” available in their society. The term “good things in life”, initially
explained by Wolfensberger, Thomas, and Caruso (1996) referred to the universal needs
people share. Osburn (2006) further explained the good things in life, which may include:
(1) home and family, (2) friendship, (3) being accorded dignity, respect, acceptance, (4) a
sense of belonging, (5) an education, and the development and exercise of one’s
capacities, (6) a voice in the affairs of one’s community and society, (7) opportunities to
participate, (8) a decent material standard of living, (9) an at least normative place to live,
and (10) opportunities for work and self-support. Since SRV was formulated in reaction
to the historical phenomenon of social and societal devaluation, it may be pertinent to
two classes in society. The first class includes those individuals who are socially
devalued, and the second class includes those who are at high risk of being devalued
(Osburn, 2006).

**Self-Determination**

The self-determination construct supports individuals with disabilities in seeking
their rights to self-governance and having control over their lives and destiny (Wehmeyer
& Bolding, 2001). Self-determination was defined by Wehmeyer (1996) as “acting as the
primary causal agent in one’s life and making choices and decisions regarding one’s
quality of life free from undue external influence or interference” (p. 22). Wehmeyer and
Bolding (2001) defined causal agency as “the individual who makes or causes things to
happen in her or his life. An agent is a person or thing through which power is exerted or
an end is achieved” (p. 373). According to Wehmeyer (1996), self-determination is
reflected in four essential characteristics of the individual’s functional actions and
behaviors:

1. **Individual Acts Autonomously:** acting independently to his or her own
   preferences and free from external influence;
2. **The Behaviors are Self-Regulated:** examining tasks, taking actions, and
   evaluating outcomes;
3. **Psychological Empowerment:** initiating and responding to events in a
   psychologically empowered manner to influence outcomes; and
4. **Self-Realization:** capitalizing on a comprehensive knowledge of one’s strengths
   and limitations.
In order to be self-determined, Wehmeyer (1996) stressed 11 basic skills or attitudes as components of the individual’s behaviors attained by learning experiences. These skills or attitudes include choice-making skills, decision-making skills, goal-setting and attainment skills, self-management skills, problem-solving skills, self-advocacy skills, leadership skills, internal locus of control, self-awareness and self-knowledge, and positive self-efficacy and outcome expectations. Furthermore, Wehmeyer and Bolding (2001) asserted that self-determination emerges through the life span of children and adolescents as they learn skills and develop attitudes to become causal agents in their own lives. The authors suggested three primary factors impacting the emergence of self-determination including the individual capacity, opportunity influenced by the environment and experiences, and supports and accommodations in the environment.

Wehmeyer and Schwartz (1997) found that self-determination is an important educational outcome for youths with disabilities who aim to achieve positive adult outcomes when exiting the school system. They have also found a trend of self-determined youth to do better than their peers one year after exiting school. Among the self-determined group, individuals expressed a preference to live outside the family home, have a savings or checking account, and be employed for pay. Factors leading to positive outcomes in environments defined as community-based and individually focused are those pertaining to integration, self-determination, and inclusion (Wehmeyer & Bolding, 2001). The authors promoted this idea of enabling and supporting individuals with disabilities to maintain meaningful jobs and live independently by identifying the best ways to support those people in such environments that ultimately lead to the enhancement of their self-determination.
Halpern’s Transition Model

Halpern’s Transition Model (1985) will serve as a comprehensive model for this dissertation study. The model comprehensively includes a three dimensional portrayal of community adjustment. High School preparation is at the top of the model, the three-dimensional adult outcome components are at the bottom, and community adjustment is at the center of the model (see Figure 1). The three dimensions are defined as residential environment, employment, and social and interpersonal networks. Halpern (1985) asserted that if any of the three components are inadequate, then the whole model is in danger and the individual’s likelihood to live in his or her community is threatened. The first component, employment, includes a variety of constituents such as job finding networks, job search skills, minimum wage levels, employer incentives, job discrimination, and structural unemployment. The second component, residential environment, includes not only the person’s home, but also the quality and safety of the neighborhood and the availability of community and recreational services within close proximity to the person’s home. The third component, social and interpersonal networks, includes areas of human relationships such as friendship, family support, daily communication, self-esteem, emotional maturity, and intimate relationships. Halpern’s (1985) work through the Rehabilitation Research and Training Center in Mental Retardation at the University of Oregon has found that successful efforts aimed at a single component of community adjustment does not necessarily mean improvements along the other two components, and therefore it is unlikely that one would reach his/her desired goal of community adjustment. This is contrary to the OSERS Transition Model,
which suggested that success in employment is likely to bring improvement and achievement in other areas (Will, 1984).

The foundation of the Halpern’s Transition Model is High School, which is the starting point for transitional programming (Halpern, 1985). He listed a number of areas that need to be addressed by the high school. These include, identifying and utilizing appropriate instructional methods, inclusion of a vocational education component within the curriculum, improvement of mainstreaming opportunities for students with disabilities into regular classrooms, the improvement of collaborative efforts between special education and vocational education as well as general administrative school support for programs serving individuals with disabilities, and establishing useful contacts between the schools and community transition agencies. Halpern (1985) suggested strengthening the foundational role of high school programs to prepare individuals with disabilities for their transition into adulthood with an ultimate goal of transitioning into a successful community adjustment by focusing on positive transition outcomes in all three components of residential environment, employment, and social and interpersonal networks.
Figure 1. Halpern's Transition Model (Halpern, 1985).
Foundations of Transition from Adolescence to Adulthood

Transition Legislation in the United States

A study by Phelps and Hanley-Maxwell (1997) was designed to review the factors affecting youth with disabilities and their transition into the workplace in their communities. The study examined the initiatives in education reform emphasizing the improvement of career outcomes for individuals with disabilities. Phelps and Hanley-Maxwell (1997) referred to the social commitments for improving and providing extended educational opportunities, for young individuals from poor and diverse ethnic backgrounds, which the civil rights movement of the 1960s brought about. The authors referred to the civil rights movement beginning with the Supreme Court decision in Brown v. Board of Education in 1962 and culminating in the enactment of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, which has generated benefits for young individuals with disabilities. The Vocational Education Act of 1968 brought along with it the career education movement, which was “broadly structured as a general education movement” (Halpern, 1992, p.205). In 1990 the Education for All Handicapped Children Act was reauthorized and renamed as the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). One of the major components of the IDEA was to ensure the delivery of an education designed for individuals with disabilities to transition into employment, further education, training, and independent living (Phelps & Hanley-Maxwell, 1997). The authors of the review sought to align the outcomes of youth with disabilities with the proposed components in the national school-to-work movement reform, which includes, (a) integrating academic and vocational learning, and (b) providing expanded opportunities for work experience (Phelps & Hanley-Maxwell, 1997).
PL 94-142, now called the IDEA, which was first amended in 1990 and then was reauthorized in 1997 and later in 2004, mandated the inclusion of a statement of transition services, independent living, and community participation in the Individualized Education Program (IEP) no later than age 14, even though the actual transition can occur anytime from age 14 to 26 (Rueda, Monzo, Shapiro, Gomez, & Blacher, 2005). It included four key phrases, “a coordinated set of activities” “outcome-oriented process” “based on student’s preferences and interests” and “promotes movement from school to post-school activities” (Zhang, Ivester, Chen, & Katsiyannis, 2005). Also, the IDEA encourages parental involvement in their son’s and daughter’s education and active participation in the IEP (Chambers et al., 2004).

The Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS) has also been involved in the transition initiatives by promoting a grant program in 1991 that federally funded five year state systems change projects (Zhang et al., 2005). Their support resulted in changes in the delivery of services where the programs were implemented. According to Zhang et al. (2005), these programs have increased awareness of transition services needs, participation of students and parents, enhanced collaboration, and developed further transition regulations and policies.

Powers, Geenen, and Powers (2009) have referred to the shift, which IDEA made between the 1990 enactment and the 1997 and 2004 reauthorization of it, from focusing on serving students with disabilities to directing the spotlight towards the outcomes of special education. This resulted in the mandate of transition planning as a main element in secondary education and the IEP documentation. In the 2004 reauthorization of IDEA, transition planning is defined as “a coordinated set of activities for a child with a
disability that is designed within a results-oriented process that is focused on improving the academic and functional achievement of the child with a disability to facilitate the child’s movement from school to post-school activities including post-secondary education, vocational education, integrated employment (including supported employment), continuing and adult education, adult services, independent living, or community participation” (IDEA, 2004). Also, Powers et al. (2009) referred to the accelerated progress in the graduation rates, postsecondary enrollment, and employment of individuals with disabilities ever since transitioning planning became mandatory.

**Transition Progress in the United States**

The U.S has used a variety of approaches since the 1960s and is looked upon as successful by many countries, such as Ireland (Coyle & Moloney, 1999). Yet, many researchers and educators have indicated that additional progress is necessary to ensure a smoother transition for individuals with disabilities. Test et al. (2009) have referred to the slight increase of positive post school outcomes over the years; however, the authors stated that there still need to be improvements in the employment, education, and independent living areas. Halpern (1992) included several recommendations in order to resolve issues and improve the quality of transition services for individuals with disabilities. He believed new policies should be developed to educate the general population about the needs and priorities of people with disabilities. Also, enhancing the capacity to address unresolved issues through legislation and careful planning for the development of programs, and implementing and evaluating new programs and services in the local communities will contribute to the development of a smoother transition to
adulthood. This can be achieved only when the individual is followed up throughout his or her progress in school and after transitioning to adult life.

Research has also shown the effectiveness of transition assessment in the process of vocational training and employment. Leconte (2006) asserted that assessment should be a lifelong tool and embedded within the individual’s progress. Furthermore, assessments have assisted in finding intervention programs that may help individuals in their transition to adulthood. In addition, assessments “serve as the common thread in the transition process and form the basis for defining goals and services to be included in the Individualized Education Plan” (Sitlington, Neubert, & Leconte, 1997).

**Factors Affecting Transition**

**Family Involvement**

The family’s involvement in transition planning and decision making for their child with a disability is a crucial element that affects the individual’s education and employment future (Migliore et al., 2007). In order to establish a successful transition plan, a collaborative team is necessary including the individual, the parents, school officials, and service providers (Powers et al., 2009). As many parents are in need of additional information on transition issues, service providers are required to offer the parents information on the transition process and to inform them of policies and regulations. Parents, mothers in particular, sometimes feel that service providers prefer that mothers have less information on transition and have less involvement in the process (Rueda et al., 2005). It may be necessary for service providers to provide parents with extensive information pertaining to transition and create a collaborative teamwork involving all the members to take active roles and be informed on their parts.
The National Longitudinal Transition Study-2 (NLTS2) reported that youths with disabilities at transition age have strong and positive relationships with their parents and that parents are the ones that the youths turn to for support (Wagner, Newman, Cameto, Levine, & Marder, 2007). In addition, individuals with disabilities have reported higher levels of parental attention than the general population (Wagner et al., 2007). Chambers et al. (2004) found that younger siblings of individuals with ID, who are still in school, were expected to be more involved in their family member’s transition planning than older siblings. Although all of the parents and siblings were hopeful for their family member with ID to transition into post-secondary education in the future, none of them actually expected it to happen, even though academic programs for individuals with significant cognitive disabilities are growing.

Haveman, Berkum, Reijnders, and Heller (1997), in a study on families’ involvement with their adult child with ID, framed transition in terms of a reflection on the time demands of a life span of care giving burden. Families of younger children use more formal services, an average of 19 services, and families of older children use fewer services, an average of fewer than nine services. As for time demands, families of children up to nine years old spend more time with their child with ID, averaging from 31 to 60 hours a week, in comparison to families of older children, which average to 15-30 hours a week. Results of the study indicated that families of older children reported lower quality of life, a more negative perception of having a family member with ID, less family support, and greater worries about the future care arrangements of the adult with ID. Thus, this study aimed to help families receive consistent formal services throughout the life span of their children with ID (Haveman et al., 1997).
Chou, Lee, Lin, Kroger, and Chang (2009) compared younger and older family caregivers. The findings of the Chou et al. (2009) study, conducted in Taiwan, reported that as individuals with ID age they continue to live at their family’s home with their aging parents, who are likely to have lower SES, poorer health, lower education level, be a single parent, and report lower Quality of Life (QOL) and lower social support. Results yielded a finding of significant differences among older and younger caregivers, in addition to male family caregivers outnumbering female family caregivers among the older group. The majority of the participants, 80%, agreed that out-of-home placements were not predictable as an alternative to family care giving. A large number of caregivers, around 70%, reported not using any social services. The authors concluded that the towns the families live in might not have accessible social services, or that the caregivers learned to cope without the use of any of the services. Also, younger caregivers were less likely to make future plans and more likely to seek an out-of-home residential facility. The findings on sibling caregivers suggested that they were more likely to place the family member with ID in a residential facility in the future than the parents. Chou et al. (2009) studied differences between younger and older caregivers and concluded that it is essential to look into the family composition when future care giving plans are being established.

In another study, by Kraemer and Blacher (2001), it was reported that 88.5% of the sampled adult children living in California with severe ID were living in their parent’s home during the interviews. The study also found that one third of the sampled parents was not sure whether their adult child had an Individualized Transition Plan (ITP) or not. The authors concluded that this could be due to the school district not being in
compliance with the transition mandate of IDEA, and if the individual did have a plan but
the parent was not aware of it, then the parent was not given the opportunity to be
involved in their adult child’s transition planning process.

Blacher (2001) introduced a conceptual model from a family’s perspective on the
transition of young adults with ID to adulthood. The conceptual model examines two
major outcome domains. The primary outcome domain is family well-being which “will
be an aggregate of positive and negative indicators of individual, dyadic, and family
adjustment” (Blacher, 2001, p.174). The secondary outcome domain is transition success.
The author has hypothesized “that during this period, a major influence on family well-
being is the extent to which transition outcomes are viewed by individuals served and
their family members as positive and successful” (Blacher, 2001, p.174). Several factors,
in the conceptual model, point to the impact of transition success on family well being,
these include (a) individual factors, (b) environment and culture, and (c) family
involvement or detachment as a coping strategy during the transition period. The
proposed conceptual model by Blacher (2001) guides researchers in identifying life long
transition processes that influence the individual with a disability and the family’s well-
being by the identified factors and predictors that may impact the future of the young
adult with a disability and his or her family.

Powers et al. (2009) and other researchers in the field of transition (Beresford,
2004; Bianco et al., 2009; Blacher, 2001; Chambers et al., 2004; Glidden & Jobe, 2007;
Grant, 2008; Kraemer & Blacher, 2001; Leconte, 2006; Neece et al., 2009) recommended
seeking more assessments of both the parents’ and youths’ expectations and desires on
transition outcomes and the engagement in further research to understand the factors impacting future outcomes for young adults with disabilities.

**Collaboration**

According to Cooney (2002) families of individuals with ID seek empowerment in order to achieve the best for their adult children and provide them with the least restrictive environment setting. Although this may not be the case for all families, those who request services are sometimes overwhelmed by social policy and regulations that do not acknowledge their requests (Cooney, 2002). Consequently, many families and their young adult children may experience a loss of empowerment during the transition process as their goals are not met and acknowledged (Cooney, 2002). To avoid this type of misguidance, a collaborative effort during the transition planning period is an essential factor (Kraemer & Blacher, 2001). In understanding the perspectives of service providers and families, Cooney (2002) conducted a qualitative study on a small sample of young adults, professionals, and parents exploring their perspectives on transition. The findings of the study highlighted the limitations of resources in modern delivery systems with respect to placements for young individuals and the parents’ unrecognized needs and requests. Thus, the transition process can lead to the deterioration of the young individual’s placement and development. As Cooney (2002) noted, “What they wanted was not out of the ordinary… What they encountered were policy guidelines that restricted necessary services. What they were offered were manufactured programs unsuited to their individual needs” (p. 432).

Bianco et al. (2009) supported collaboration between parents and service providers and encouraged efforts to prepare the parents for the future of their children’s
growth and development. This study examined the parents’ perceptions of post-secondary education for their children with developmental disabilities. The findings indicated that parents experienced few opportunities to learn about their roles after their child exited high school and did not feel prepared for the future responsibilities of their child’s transition to adulthood. A common feeling of stress, anxiety, and fear of taking on future parental roles was also reported. Furthermore, Powers et al. (2009) emphasized the importance of collaborative efforts between the youth, family, teachers, support staff, and service providers to ensure that goals in transition planning are in effect and achieved in order for the young adult with a disability to transition into an independent adult life.

Families seek out information on transition services and outreach for transition outcomes and placements, which may not always be accessible in many communities. Parents have a need to plan for their adult children’s futures and to consider possible transition outcomes based on their child’s capabilities from an early age. Some of the parents’ concerns included their child’s prospective employment opportunities, residential setting, education, recreation, and social networking. According to Chambers et al. (2004), professionals need to take the families’ knowledge and concerns into consideration and determine their expectations and involvement in order to provide services that adjust to the families and their adult children’s needs. The findings of Chambers et al.’s (2004) study on the families’ perspectives on the individual’s transition to adult life were that parents and siblings lacked knowledge of transition options, and that family members rarely talked about future options with each other. The results of the Chambers et al. (2004) study suggested that parents predicted that their adult child would transition into a segregated employment setting, such as a day center with other
individuals with disabilities, and would probably live at their family’s home. Parents’ involvement with their adult child’s transition into employment was highlighted by their concern about the employers’ readiness to hire the individual with the disability and provide pay and support to help the individual maintain the job.

On the other hand, a study by Bianco et al. (2009) found that some parents felt that their adult child’s employer collaborated with them and supported their child. “One parent described how her relationships with her son’s employers offered a sense of support and relief when they noticed and responded to her son’s signs of ill health” (Bianco et al., 2009, p. 189). Other participants in this particular study had different experiences with employers and service providers that led to their dissatisfaction because they felt that they were not listened to, having to deal with constant changes of the service provider staff, and the parents’ concerns about their adult children with a disability building a trusting relationship with the service providers. Bianco et al. (2009) recommended that parents form support groups and peer-mentoring programs as they follow the transition process and maintain a consistent relationship between themselves and the service providers. By doing this, both the parents and service providers may be able to avoid the tensions that can build up easily between them, which consequently can affect the future of the individual with a disability.

**Employment Opportunities**

Research has indicated that there are differences and unequal opportunities experienced by individuals with ID compared with their non-disabled peers, especially during the years between high school and employment. According to Flannery, Yovanoff, Benz, and Kato (2008), “two years out of high school, only 42.9% of students with
disabilities are employed, compared with 55% of their nondisabled peers” (p.26). Other findings in the US indicated that the employment rate is three out of ten working age adults with disabilities compared to eight out of ten non-disabled adults, in addition to the 25% of unemployed individuals with severe and profound disabilities (Certo et al., 2003).

Kiernan (2000) referred to employment as a means to one’s economic independence, a way of social identification, and an opportunity for personal networking. Furthermore, he added that adults identify themselves by their careers, support their lifestyles by their wages, and meet friends through their work settings. These benefits are not always available for individuals with disabilities. Some of the common employment opportunities for individuals with disabilities are categorized under several options including sheltered employment, supported employment, and competitive employment.

Sheltered employment is referred to as a range of segregated vocational and non-vocational settings for individuals with disabilities including sheltered workshops, adult activity centers, work activity centers, and day treatment centers (Kregel & Dean, n.d.; Hsu, Huang, & Ososkie, 2009). Nelson (1971) provided a description of sheltered workshops from the National Association of Sheltered Workshops and Homebound programs, which adopted the following definition: “A sheltered workshop is a nonprofit rehabilitation facility utilizing individual goals, wages, supportive services, and a controlled work environment to help vocationally handicapped persons achieve or maintain their maximum potential as workers” (p. 127). Training in sheltered workshops includes basic skills of completing sequenced steps in multiple tasks and the ability to attend to long periods of work tasks (Kiernan, 2000). According to Migliore, Mank, Grossi, and Rogan (2007), activities in sheltered workshops are easy to learn and
perform, however, individuals with disabilities are always subordinate to staff members. Furthermore, adults with disabilities are paid below the minimum wage with tasks that may include packaging, assembly work, manufacturing, etc. The establishment of sheltered workshops is designed to provide employment for individuals with physical and cognitive disabilities who are not ready for independent community employment (Hsu et al., 2009; Migliore et al., 2007). Therefore, this type of sheltered environment isolates individuals with disabilities from the rest of their community contributing to lowered expectations and negative public attitudes (Wehman, 1981). Sheltered employment has been largely phased out today.

As an alternative to sheltered employment, supported employment, has developed as an option for individuals with disabilities. Parent, Hill, and Wehman (1989) characterized this type of employment program by “intensive skill training and on-going support services directly at the employment site after job placement” (p. 51). According to Kregel and Dean (n.d.), supported employment is viewed as competitive employment in an integrated work setting especially for individuals who are not qualified to maintain a job in the open labor market. The definition of supported employment in the Developmental Disabilities Act of 1984 (P.L. 98-527), is: “(i) paid employment for persons with developmental disabilities for whom competitive employment at or above minimum wage is unlikely and who need ongoing support to perform in a work setting, (ii) is conducted in a variety of settings in which persons without disabilities are employed, and (iii) is supported by any activity needed to sustain paid work including supervision, training, and transportation” (p. 2665). Supported employment has been criticized for some short falls including concerns about individuals with disabilities being
able to retain their jobs for a long period of time after their initial placements, especially that these placements are often low-paid jobs not satisfying the individual’s need for economic self-sufficiency; furthermore, these types of programs sometimes fail to meet ongoing support needs for individuals with significant disabilities (Kregel & Dean, n.d.).

Competitive employment allows individuals to identify themselves as individuals, develop friendships, and support their lifestyles in an integrated work setting (Kiernan, 2000). According to Moore (2001), competitive employment is composed of high-quality employment outcomes and it gives individuals with disabilities from vocational rehabilitation programs the ability to acquire transferrable skills as well as earning higher salaries. Competitive employment may be referred to as integrated employment, which can be defined as work in the general labor market “where the proportion of workers with disabilities does not exceed the natural proportions in the community and where wages are at or above the minimum wage” (Migliore et al., 2007). Kregel and Dean (n.d.) stated that integrated employment improves consumer employment outcomes and costs less than other adult day programs, sheltered workshops, and activity centers for individuals with disabilities.

Employment is a means for adults to gain economic self-sufficiency, a source of personal networking, and a route to social identification (Moore, Feist-Price, & Alston, 2002). Employment is one of the main possible outcomes of transitioning out of high school for individuals with disabilities, as it is associated with independence and community integration (Moore et al., 2002). According to Schur (2002), employment may have a positive effect on groups of people who may have been denied access to jobs and have been socially marginalized. Thus, promoting employment for individuals with
disabilities helps them integrate into mainstream society and develop their skills (Schur, 2002).

A study by Wehmeyer and Palmer (2003) addressed the possible impact of self-determination on the lives of young people with disabilities at one and three years after graduation from high school. The study noted a strong correlation between high self-determination traits in students with disabilities and post-graduation outcomes including employment, community integration, and independent living (Wehmeyer & Palmer, 2003). The authors referred to the extensive literature on enhancing the self-determination of individuals with disabilities; however, they found few previous studies that linked self-determination and positive outcomes in the lives of individuals with disabilities. The findings of the Wehmeyer and Palmer (2003) study support the need to enhance self-determination in young individuals with disabilities for more positive transition outcomes.

The 1990 National Longitudinal Transition Study (NLTS) and 2005 National Longitudinal Transition Study-2 (NLTS2) are similar reports highlighting postsecondary outcomes of youth with disabilities in the U.S. up to four years after high school. The NLTS was a 6-year-long study of youth with disabilities in grade seven or above and ages 13 through 21 in the 1983-84 school year, where as, the “NLTS2 is a 10-year-long study of the characteristics, experiences, and outcomes of a nationally representative sample of youth with disabilities who were 13 to 16 years old and receiving special education services in grade seven or above on December 1, 2000” (Newman et al., 2010, p. xii). The NLTS and NLTS2 findings differ in the area of post-secondary outcomes in the following key domains: (a) Postsecondary education, enrollment in 2-year or 4-year
colleges or postsecondary vocational, business, or technical schools; (b) employment
rates and job characteristics; (c) overall engagement in the community through
participation in school, work, or preparation for work; (d) Living arrangements, marital
and parental status, and aspects of financial independence; and (e) social and community
involvement in both positive and negative ways (Newman et al., 2010).

Some of the major differences in the findings of the two studies happened in the
areas of postsecondary education and employment. The rates of postsecondary school
enrollment (within four years of leaving high school) among individuals with disabilities
in the NLTS2 report were higher than those in the NLTS report. The postsecondary
school enrollment rate for youth with disabilities in NLTS was 26 percent and in NLTS2
it was 46 percent, marking a 19 percent increase. Furthermore, the rates were higher in
the NLTS2 report in three areas of post high school placements that included two-year or
community college (32 percent vs. 14 percent), four-year college (14 percent vs. 5
percent), and vocational, business, or technical school (23 percent vs. 10 percent). Even
though, the rates of postsecondary school placements were higher in the NLTS2,
individuals with ID remained among those disability categories least likely to attend
postsecondary schools (Newman et al., 2010).

NLTS2 defined employment as “a pathway to financial independence and self-
reliance for youth with disabilities as they move toward adulthood” (Newman et al.,
2010). The authors emphasized the importance of keeping a job that offers benefits,
provides opportunities for development, and pays a living wage. The findings in the two
reports, NLTS and the NLTS2, in overall employment status did not differ significantly
(62 percent vs. 56 percent). The average duration of a job was higher in the NLTS than in
the NLTS2 (15 vs. 13.2 months) and the percentage of youth working full time, which is 35 hours or more per week, was also higher in NLTS than in NLTS2 (71.3 percent vs. 54.9 percent). The differences between the NLTS and NLTS2 reports may be due to the changes in American economy and society over the past 15 years and in addition to other trends including the increase in population diversity, new technology and forms of communications, and the globalization of the economy (Newman et al., 2010).

Powers et al. (2009) reported differences in expectations between youth with disabilities and their parents surveyed by the NLTS2. Youth with disabilities held much higher expectations for their future achievement than their parents; 52 percent of the youth expected to attend college in the future in comparison to the 29 percent of the parents’ expectation. Also, 81 percent of the youth expected to get a drivers’ license in comparison to 68 percent of the parents’ expectation. Furthermore, 72 percent of the youth expected to live on their own without supervision in the future in comparison to 54 percent of the parents’ expectation. Powers et al. indicated a limitation of the NLTS2 survey, as there was a two-year gap between the parents’ survey and the youth with disability survey, which may have resulted in lower rates of expectations from the parents since their children with disabilities were younger. Powers et al. (2009) affirmed that there is evidence of youth with disabilities valuing their parents’ support, however, there appear to be differences in expectations of transition outcomes between parents and the youth. These outcomes include level of support they will need when they reach adulthood and current and future goals of independence. Powers et al. (2009) concluded that parents’ intentions during the transition period were to support their children’s development by keeping them away from harm, therefore, parental support during this
period is important even though they may have different expectations for some components of the transition plan.

A feeling of belonging and being part of an active society may provide encouragement in pursuing a career. In order to enhance this idea in developing societies, support programs and parent involvement may be one way of helping many individuals with ID transition smoothly into employment by avoiding possible obstacles. Assisting individuals with their transition into employment and giving them a chance to explore their choices, may not only help in maintaining an active system that provides placements based on preferences, but may also simultaneously satisfy the needs of the employers in the community. This kind of support system may lead to making a good match between the skills and abilities that an individual with a disability has and the requirements and needs of the job matched. This may also ensure that both the employer and employee have the support of the community (Grant, 2008).

**International Transition Movements**

In the United Kingdom, Beresford (2004) found “the process of transition from children’s services to adult services, and from childhood to adulthood is more complex, extremely problematic and, in many cases, highly unsatisfactory” (p.582). Other factors, which significantly contributed to the insufficient transition phase, included the reduction of services and lack of comparable provisions to meet ongoing needs such as training and working cooperatively with peers (Beresford, 2004). Beresford (2004) reported findings in the UK in which people with disabilities were less likely to be employed, live independently, and manage their own finances in comparison to their non-disabled peers. Beresford’s (2004) research in the UK supported the need to have “adequate preparation,
active case management shared across agencies, strong therapeutic relationships between practitioners and the young person and their family, and independent advocates” (p.584). Beresford (2004) stated that there is a major need for evidence-based research, especially with changes occurring in the disability field and with the implementation of new policies to ensure individuals with disabilities and their families have positive outcomes in the transition process beginning with early planning to secure employment.

Underemployment within the disability population is common in New Zealand. Grant (2008) asserted that the cause of high underemployment and unemployment rates is due to the isolation of people with disabilities from the society and the stigma of labeling them. Grant (2008) acknowledged his country’s progress, in recent years, by pointing to deinstitutionalization and the creation of a more inclusive society by empowering individuals with disabilities. He revealed that these changes were as recent as 2007 and they ensure extended assistance with employment, including a Transition to Work Grant which was announced by the Ministry of Social Development. This movement was mandated in The New Zealand Disability Strategy, “it envisages a society that highly values people with disability and continually enhances their full participation, with clear focus on the creation of opportunities in employment and economic development” (Grant, 2008, p.95).

Also, another amendment that has been announced in New Zealand is Pathways to Inclusion, which ensures vocational training and gaining skills and jobs (Grant, 2008). Previously, employment and vocational training occurred in secluded and sheltered places, individuals with disabilities were not encouraged to live independently and be self-determined. The changing attitudes of the country have provided support for those
individuals by focusing on their strengths and abilities to experience a better quality of life that enhances their social participation in their society (Grant, 2008). According to Grant (2008), supported employment has been around in New Zealand for the past 15 years, yet, he believes there must be more support in an inclusive setting rather than in sheltered environments. He further analyzed the case of New Zealand by stating that the support should not only include assistance in the job search and placements, but also, there should be full support in matching the person’s capabilities to the job requirements and helping employers to understand and be aware of the abilities of people with disabilities. By taking this into consideration in addition to moving to a more inclusive society, Grant (2008) believes that New Zealand will offer smoother transitional processes for its citizens.

In Australia, adults with disabilities were traditionally cared for at home or in an institution and expectations for these individuals to successfully contribute to society or learning were minimal (Boulton-Lewis, Buys, & Tedman-Jones, 2008). However, today, adults with disability are living independently, with their families, in group homes, or in supported communities (Boulton-Lewis et al., 2008).

In Ireland, programs are planned to serve and engage young adults with ID and other developmental disabilities by looking at the individual’s outcomes in employment and day-by-day living. One of these programs serving people with ID is the person-centered planning program, which is developed to enable self-determination for individuals with ID and to support the development of a vision for a desired future (Coyle & Moloney, 1999). O’Brien and Lovett (1992) referred to the term person centered planning as “a family of approaches to organizing and guiding community change in
alliance with people with disabilities and their families and friends.” However, Coyle and Moloney (1999) have found little research on Person-centered planning approaches. They reviewed the Irish agency (KARE), which provides services to persons with ID in employment support within the mainstream Irish life. They concluded that the agency provides opportunities for individuals to have more control over their own lives. The authors recommended three important points to take into consideration when working on a person-centered approach. First, provide a coaching/monitoring approach as a training option. Second, involve other people in the community besides the staff to assume support roles to make desired futures a reality. Finally, use different models of service that may result in positive outcomes for service users.

These different timelines and service delivery trends from one country to the other reflect related differences in the initiation of legislation of laws and regulations which depend on the awareness of the community, advocating agencies and empowered individuals, and the educational progress of the country. Current research can greatly assist practitioners and policy makers in the gradual improvement of the transitional process and types of service delivery.

**Research Studies on Disabilities Pertaining to Kuwait**

Research studies dealing with disabilities in the Gulf region, specifically in Kuwait, are sparse and limited, especially those studies associated with cultural and social issues (Almuhareb, 2007). Al-Shammari (2005) stressed the limited studies on disabilities and special education in Kuwait dating 15 years prior to his study. Furthermore, accurate and reliable statistics on the number of individuals with disabilities still remain a major concern in Kuwait (Brown, 2005) and other countries in the Gulf
region including the UAE (Bradshaw, Tennant, & Lydiatt, 2004). Former Assistant Executive Manager at the HCD, Souad Al-Mutairi, stated in a Kuwaiti daily newspaper, Alwatan, “No Authority in Kuwait has accurate statistics regarding the number of disabled people. This is a result of the poor management of those responsible for the disabled people” (Al-Sayyid, 2010).

There has been a slight increase in research studies that have investigated the attitudes of educators and administrators in the education field in Kuwait towards individuals with disabilities and inclusive education (Abdulrahim, 1987; Al-Abdulghafour, 1999; Bazna, 2003; Al-Shammari, 2005; Brown, 2005; Salih & Al-Kandari, 2007; Al-Hilawani, Koch, & Braaten, 2008). However, there are only a few recent studies that have shed light on disability issues from a parental perspective (AlAzemi, 2010; Al-Shammari & Yawkey, 2008). AlAzemi’s (2010) dissertation looked at differences in the stress level between Kuwaiti fathers and mothers of children with specific learning disabilities (SLD). AlAzemi (2010) found significant differences in overall stress level between Kuwaiti fathers and mothers, with mothers having significantly higher stress levels than fathers. The author recommended that the ministry of education and the ministry of health in Kuwait and the Gulf region offer effective quality of life programs to support parents of children with disabilities and their families.

In another research study, Al-Shammari and Yawkey (2008) investigated the degree of parental involvement in relation to the students’ levels in special education programs in Kuwait. The research study found that over 70% of the sampled parent participants were engaged and involved in their child’s special education programs. This percent reflected the positive involvement of Kuwaiti parents in taking part in their
child’s education. Al-Shammari and Yawkey (2008) indicated that parents who are in specific age groups might be more or less involved in their child’s special education programs, and thus, they recommended that school officials and teachers consider the mean age of the parents who participated in this study. The mean age of the sampled parents was 41, the majority being employed at the time of the study; this age characteristic yielded lower levels of parental involvement in their child’s special education program compared to parents less mature and with less work experience. Therefore, the authors suggested additional strategies to be developed to engage more mature parents with work experience in their children’s special education programs in order to foster parental involvement in school. Findings of the study are similar to other research findings in other countries, such as the United States of America, in which the “results support the idea the Kuwaiti parents can positively take part in and impact their children’s’ education by their involvement” (Al-Shammari & Yawkey, 2008).

As for transition, there is a disappointing lack of research related to this area. In his research study on the education of individuals with disabilities in Kuwait, Almuhareb (2007) referred to the system of public special education schools in Kuwait, which provide their students with disabilities with limited and narrowly defined academic and career tracks that are defined as failure-proof. He further argued that the system works in a way that “makes special education participation simply, a process- a tightly controlled cycle with predetermined ins and outs – in which individuals with special needs operate within a fatalistically safe environment” (p. 71). Consequently, participants in Almuhareb’s (2007) study stated that there are no defined arrangements for transition to a vocational track after graduation for students with disabilities being educated in the
public special education schools. One of the participants, a program supervisor, in Almuhareb’s (2007) study said, “We teach them some skills that could enable them to take certain jobs. But social attitudes prevent them from taking a simple job such as a cashier at a supermarket” (p. 105). Only recently has the Public Authority for Disability Affairs (PADA) in Kuwait issued eight new project initiatives (“Eight new projects,” 2011). Among the potential eight projects is a center for individuals with disabilities 21 years of age and older called Markaz-21. The director general of the PADA, Dr. Jassem Al-Tammar confirmed the great needs of this age group (21 years of age and older) arguing that “parents demand that disabled people over 21 years old should continue to study as they have nothing else they can do” (“Eight new projects,” 2011).

Just as there is a lack of research pertaining to special education, there are also a limited number of studies on the employment of individuals with disabilities in Kuwait. Barr’s (1983) research study on the education of individuals with disabilities in the Arabian Peninsula, including Kuwait, referred to the recommendation by the Kuwaiti government to reserve 6% of all factory jobs for individuals with disabilities. Today, with the new 2010 Kuwaiti law, the Rights of Individuals with Disabilities in Article 14, the government and private sectors with 50 or more employees are obliged to reserve at least 4% of their employed workforce for individuals with disabilities (Act No. 8 for the year 2010).

Negata (2003), found the rehabilitation and employment opportunities for individuals with disabilities to be poor in Kuwait. Kuwaiti women with disabilities constituted 2 percent compared to 10 percent of the workforce for working women in Kuwait, and 20 percent of employed men with disabilities compared with 67 percent of
the total Kuwaiti male population (Negata, 2003). Among the 2 percent of working
Kuwaiti women with disabilities, 52 percent were employed in professional and technical
fields, and 35 percent were in the clerical field. Also, among the 20 percent of employed
Kuwaiti men with disabilities 38 percent were employed in the field of services, 25
percent in clerical work, and 16 percent as laborers (Negata, 2003). These low rates of
employment in Kuwait affect the progress and development of many individuals with
disabilities, and contribute to the current trend of staying at home instead of holding a job
or continuing in higher education after 21 of age. Today, Kuwait’s unemployment rate is
2.2% for the general population (Central Intelligence Agency, 2010). Menial jobs are
culturally looked down upon in the Kuwaiti society, and therefore foreign labor
employees take on those kinds of jobs.
Summary and Rationale

The transition period carries many opportunities and risks with it. Typically developing individuals usually attend college or enter the workforce after exiting high school, but individuals with disabilities often have limited post-school options (Neece et al., 2009). There are many challenges individuals with disabilities and their families face during the transition period from childhood to adulthood. Blacher (2001) suggested that “Satisfaction with transition experiences and placements will likely bear a strong relationship to family well-being during this developmental period” (p. 179). Neece et al. (2009) further explained that the influence of a successful transition of the child on family well-being is still unknown. It has been suggested that there is a need for more extensive research that involves assessing transition outcomes by examining the characteristics of the individual with a disability, available resources, cultural attitudes and beliefs, and the involvement of family members (Blacher, 2001).

Even though the Kuwaiti law assures the inclusion and integration of individuals with disabilities in all aspects of the Kuwaiti society such as schools, workplace, social activities, and in the community (Salih & Al-Kandari, 2007), Kuwait has yet to address transition in its policy and laws on disabilities. Almuhareb (2007) referred to the limited and narrowly defined academic and career tracks that are defined as failure-proof by the public special education schools run by the Kuwait Ministry of Education. Previous studies have shown low rates of employment for individuals with disabilities in Kuwait (Negata, 2003; Almuhareb, 2007). For example, women with disabilities constituted only two percent compared to ten percent of women in the workforce and men with disabilities constituted 20 percent compared with 67 percent of the total Kuwaiti male population.
Taking this into consideration, it is necessary to investigate parents’ expectations and aspirations for their adolescent child with a disability in terms of transition outcomes in order to understand the needs of those parents in preparing their children as they exit school and transition to adulthood in Kuwait.

Furthermore, this study will investigate differences in expectations and aspirations of transition outcomes based on parents’ gender and child’s gender in relation to the following outcome variables: future orientation, community resources, financial independence, employment, postsecondary education, residential and daily living, and social relationships. Gender differences are apparent in the Kuwaiti culture. Previous studies have found significant differences between males’ and females’ stress level (AlAzemi, 2010) and employment status with males with disabilities outnumbering females with disabilities in the workforce (Negata, 2003). A study on Kuwaiti parents’ stress levels has shown significant differences in overall stress level between Kuwaiti fathers and mothers, with mothers having significantly higher stress level than fathers (AlAzemi, 2010).

As for family involvement with their child’s life, Al-Shammari and Yawkey (2008) found 70% of the total sampled Kuwaiti parents in their study to be involved in their child’s special education programs. The sample of participants consisted of 50% male parents and 50% female parents. This indicates a high rate of parental involvement, but the majority of the sampled parents were parents of children with disabilities at the elementary level. Parental involvement with older children and those close to transition age might yield different results. Rueda et al. (2005) found that mothers feel that service providers prefer that parents are less aware and involved in the transition process.
The proposed study investigates parental involvement in their child’s preparation for transition and examines the role of some demographic variables found to be important in past research such as parent’s gender, age, education level, monthly income, child’s gender, child’s age, and severity of disability in relation to Kuwaiti fathers’ and mothers’ transition expectations and aspirations.

Halpern’s Transition Model (1985) has provided a comprehensive model for transition to adulthood in the USA. This model also provides a broad framework for further investigating the role of the outcome variables in order to understand their relationship with fathers’ and mothers’ expectations and aspirations in Kuwait, where there may be cultural, legal, and economic differences influencing transition outcomes and the hierarchy of the outcome variables based on the parents’ responses. This study is designed to examine parents’ expectations and aspirations in Kuwait in order to inform parents, individuals with a disability, policymakers, program developers, and researchers about the needs in preparing youth with disabilities transition to adulthood.

Potential studies on transition outcomes will eventually provide the basis for policymakers and service providers to provide the tools that may help individuals with disabilities and their families experience successful postsecondary transition outcomes in Kuwait. Consequently, the following research questions are addressed in this research study to investigate the expectations and aspirations of Kuwaiti parents about the future of their children with disabilities as they exit school and transition to adulthood. It is necessary to investigate which factors of postsecondary transition outcomes are important to parents of children with disabilities to better understand how to prepare youth with disabilities for the transition to adulthood. This research study will potentially lead to an
increased understanding of parents’ needs for support services to guide them and their children to a smoother transition to adulthood, extend the limited literature on persons with disabilities in Kuwait, and provide policymakers and program developers with information to promote effective preparation for the transition to adulthood of individuals with disabilities.
Research Questions

1. Is there a difference between Kuwaiti fathers’ and mothers’ expectations and aspirations about transition outcomes for their child with a disability as measured by:
   A) Transition Daily Rewards and Worries Questionnaire (TDRWQ)
   B) Parent Perspectives on the Transition to Adulthood Questionnaire (PPTAQ)

2. Is there a difference between Kuwaiti fathers’ and mothers’ expectations and aspirations about transition outcomes for their male child with a disability as measured by:
   A) Transition Daily Rewards and Worries Questionnaire (TDRWQ)
   B) Parent Perspectives on the Transition to Adulthood Questionnaire (PPTAQ)

3. Is there a difference between Kuwaiti fathers’ and mothers’ expectations and aspirations about transition outcomes for their female child with a disability as measured by:
   A) Transition Daily Rewards and Worries Questionnaire (TDRWQ)
   B) Parent Perspectives on the Transition to Adulthood Questionnaire (PPTAQ)

4. What are the relationships between key demographic variables (child’s gender, child’s age, child’s degree of disability, fathers’ age, fathers’ education level, fathers’ income, mothers’ age, mothers’ education level, mothers’ income) and the dependent variables as measured by fathers’ and mothers’ responses to the:
A) Transition Daily Rewards and Worries Questionnaire (TDRWQ)
B) Parent Perspectives on the Transition to Adulthood Questionnaire (PPTAQ)

5. Which set of demographic variables best predicts fathers’ and mothers’
expectations and aspirations about the transition outcomes for their child with a
disability as measured by:
   A) Transition Daily Rewards and Worries Questionnaire (TDRWQ)
   B) Parent Perspectives on the Transition to Adulthood Questionnaire (PPTAQ)
Chapter III

Method

Participants

Participants in this research study were Kuwaiti parents of children with disabilities between the age of seven and 21 years old. The sample was restricted to Kuwaiti parents only. The researcher recruited parents through five sites in Kuwait: Kuwaiti Society for Guardians of the Disabled (KSGD), Al-Kharafi Activity Kids Center, Manarat School, Khalifa School, and the Ideal Education School. In addition, surveys were passed along to parents by using a form of snowballing as one family has referred me to another family. The KSGD and Al-Kharafi Activity Kids Center have registered parents of children with disabilities that may include the following disabilities: (1) Intellectual disability (ID), (2) Learning disability (LD), (3) Visual impairment/Blindness, (4) Hearing impairment/Deafness, (5) Autism, (6) Physical disability, (7) Emotional and Behavior disturbance (EBD), (8) Multiple disabilities (MD), or (9) other types of disabilities that the parent specifies.

Both non-school sites, the KSGD and Al-Kharafi Activity Kids Center, highly promote family involvement by providing opportunities, for parents and siblings of children and adults with disabilities, to participate in social and educational events held on a weekly basis. Events may include field trips, festive celebrations, sports events, educational and social events, awareness campaigns, musical performances by individuals with disabilities, and workshops introducing new methods and tools to parents, siblings, and educators to improve the quality of life for both the individual with
a disability and their family. Both sites’ mission is to support and promote inclusion and full integration in the Kuwaiti society, whereas many of their events are held in public places and are attended by a diverse group of people, including individuals without disabilities.

The three school sites are all self-contained private special education schools. Manarat School is for students with learning difficulties and students with mild Autism. Khalifa School is for students with moderate to severe disabilities, including individuals with ID, MD, and Cerebral Palsy (CP). The Ideal Education School is for students ranging from mild to moderate to severe disabilities including a wide range of disabilities such as Autism, ID, MD, and CP. For research purposes, the participants were asked in the demographic questionnaire to identify the source of the disability diagnosis, even though the only source of diagnosis in Kuwait is a medical report, which is certified by the Public Authority for Disability Affairs (PADA), to be eligible for services and benefits for individuals with disabilities. Schools were selected based on recommendations from parents and professionals in the field.

Surveys were distributed to approximately 1,000 parents. The Ideal Education School received a total of 250 surveys and 210 (84%) were returned and 162 (65%) were completed, Manarat School received a total of 200 surveys and 115 (58%) were returned and 89 (45%) were completed, Khalifa School received 160 surveys and 58 (36%) were returned and 40 (25%) were completed, KSGPD received 160 surveys and 74 (46%) were returned and 55 (34%) were completed, and Al-Kharafi Activity Kids Center received 130 surveys and 50 (38%) were returned 33 (25%) were completed. One hundred surveys were distributed to parents who received it through snowballing and 72 (72%) were
returned and 57 (57%) were completed. Inclusionary criteria for qualifying surveys to be part of the final sample were that the surveys had no missing responses. Surveys with missing responses, a total of 143 (25%) were dropped from this study due to the large sample size and for the purpose of avoiding missing data. A total of 436 (44%) surveys, from the surveys returned, were completed with no missing items.

For the purpose of this dissertation study, a decision was made to focus on the 145 father/mother pairs from the same family on the premise that comparing fathers and mothers of the same child could provide the clearest answers to the research questions posed. Thus 290 parents out of the 436 respondents who completed the survey were included in the data analyses for this study. The 290 subjects consisted of pairs of fathers and mothers of the child that the survey was completed for. Therefore, 145 families participated in this dissertation study. Demographics for the sample are reported in the next section.

**Demographic Characteristics**

Demographic information included: a) father’s age, b) father’s marital status, c) father’s education level, d) father’s monthly income, e) father’s province, f) mother’s age, g) mother’s marital status, h) mother’s education level, i) mother’s monthly income, j) mother’s province, k) child’s gender, l) child’s age, m) child’s disability, n) degree of child’s disability, o) child’s school, p) number of children in the family, and q) number of children with a disability in the family. With regard to parents’ demographics, the father’s mean age was 48.28 with a standard deviation (SD) of 7.21, and the mother’s mean age was 44.17 with an SD of 6.92. One hundred forty one (97.2%) of the fathers were married while 4 (2.8%) were divorced, and 141 (97.2%) of the mothers were
married while 4 (2.8%) were divorced. Divorced parents were included in this study only when both the father and mother returned their surveys in the same envelope. In regards to education level, 11 (7.6%) of the fathers had a doctoral degree, 10 (6.9%) had a masters degree, 51 (35.2%) had a bachelors degree, 23 (15.9%) had a diploma (associate degree), and 50 (34.5%) had a high school or below. Two (1.4%) of the mothers had a doctoral degree, one (.7%) had a masters degree, 62 (42.8%) had a bachelors degree, 33 (22.8%) had a diploma (associate degree), and 47 (32.4%) had a high school degree or below. Monthly income level varied among fathers and mothers. There were 32 (22.1%) fathers who made less than $3,600 a month, 91 (62.8%) fathers who made $3,600 to $10,800, 15 (10.3%) fathers who made $10,800 to $18,000, and there were 7 (4.8%) fathers who made more than $18,000. There were 89 (61.4%) mothers who made less than $3,600 a month, 49 (33.8%) mothers who made $3,600 to $10,800, 2 (1.4%) mothers who made $10,800 to $18,000, and 5 (3.4%) mothers who made more than $18,000. As for the provinces, 52 (35.9%) fathers were listed in Al-Asimah, in Al-Farwaiyah 14 (9.7%), in Al-Jahra’a 11 (7.6%), in Al-Ahmadi 7 (4.8%), in Mubarak Al-Kabeer 19 (13.1%), and in Hawalli 42 (29%). Of the Mothers, 50 (34.5%) were listed in Al-Asimah, 16 (11%) in Al-Farwaniyah, 11 (7.6%) in Al-Jahra’a, 7 (4.8%) in Al-Ahmadi, 18 (12.4%) in Mubarak Al-Kabeer, and 43 (29.7%) in Hawalli. A summary of the mothers’ and fathers’ demographic characteristics is presented in Table 1.
Table 1

*Frequencies (f) and Percents (%) of Fathers’ and Mothers’ Demographic Characteristics, N=145*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fathers’ Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>97.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mothers’ Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>97.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fathers’ Education Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school or below</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma (Associate Degree)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mothers’ Education Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school or below</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma (Associate Degree)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fathers’ Monthly Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $3,600</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,600 - $10,800</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,800 – 18,000</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 18,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mothers’ Monthly Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $3,600</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,600 - $10,800</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,800 – 18,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 18,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With regards to children’s demographics, parents reported that 89 (61.4%) of their children were male and 56 (38.6%) were female. In regards to the age of the children, the mean was 14.42 and the SD was 3.39. The range of ages was between seven to 21 years old. Of those children 37 (25.5%) had an Intellectual Disability (ID), 29 (20%) had a Learning Disability (LD), 11 (7.6%) were deaf, 14 (9.7%) had autism, 12 (8.3%) had a physical disability, 1 (.7%) had an emotional and behavior disorder, and 41 (28.3%) had Multiple Disabilities (MD). Parents reported the degree of their child’s disability as follows: 25 (17.2%) mild, 66 (45.5%) moderate, and 54 (37.2%) severe. Of the sampled parents, 123 (84.4%) indicated that their children attended a private special education school, while 13 (9%) of their children attended a public special education school, 4 (2.8%) attended a private school, and 5 (3.4%) did not indicate the type of school their child attended. The mean for the total number of children in each family was M= 4.82 (SD= 1.66), the mean for the number of children with a disability in the family was M=1.17 (SD= .43), and the mean birth order of child with a disability was M= 3.20 (SD= 2.36).
1.81). The majority of the parents, 123 (84.4%), indicated that they only had one child with a disability, while 19 (13.1%) indicated that they had two children with a disability in their family, and 3 (2.1%) of the parents indicated that they had three children with a disability in their family. A summary of the demographic characteristics for male and female children is presented in Table 2.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child’s Disability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID*</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD**</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD***</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autism</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deafness</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBD****</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of Disability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mild</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Special Education School</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>88.8%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>84.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Special Education School</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private School</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*ID= Intellectual Disability
**MD= Multiple Disabilities
***LD= Learning Disability
**** EBD= Emotional/Behavior Disorder
Research Design

This research study utilized a quantitative design to explore differences in the expectations and aspirations of Kuwaiti fathers and mothers for their child’s transition outcomes. The quantitative data were collected using a survey comprised of two instruments in addition to a researcher-designed demographic questionnaire. The two instruments included the Transition Daily Rewards and Worries Questionnaire (TDRWQ) by Glidden and Jobe (2007) and a modified version of the Parent and Sibling Perspectives on the Transition to Adulthood Questionnaire by Chambers et. al (2004), which will be referred to in this study as the Parent Perspectives on the Transition to Adulthood Questionnaire (PPTAQ). The responses of fathers and mothers were also compared separately for their male and female children.

The independent variables for the correlational and prediction phases of this study included the following: fathers’ and mothers’ age, education level, monthly income, child’s gender, child’s age, and degree of child’s disability. These continuous and categorical variables were selected because they were prominent predictors that showed a significant correlation with the dependent variables in previous studies. They are also commonly utilized variables in past research studies as they identify the participants’ general background.

The dependent variables included the fathers’ and mothers’ expectation levels for the future transition outcome domains of Positive Future Orientation (FO), Community Resources (CR), Financial Independence (FI), and Family Relations (FR), which were measured by the TDRWQ, and fathers’ and mothers’ aspiration levels for their child in
the areas of Employment (EM), Postsecondary Education (PE), Residential and Daily Living (RL), and Social Relationships (SR), which were measured by the PPTAQ.

The relationship between key demographic variables and dependent variables were examined based on the responses of fathers’ and mothers’ responses. Additionally, sets of demographic variables that best predict fathers’ and mothers’ expectations and aspirations about the transition outcomes for their child with a disability were investigated.

**Materials/Instruments**

**Demographic Questionnaire**

A demographic questionnaire designed by the researcher was utilized in this study to gain relevant information on the background of the parents and on their child. Questions in the demographic questionnaire pertained to fathers’ and mothers’ gender, age, marital status, education level, occupation, monthly income, province location, gender of child with disability, age of child with disability, type of child’s disability, degree of child’s disability, type of school the child is attending, number of children in the family, number of children with a disability in the family, and the birth order of the child with a disability among his or her siblings (A copy of the Demographic Questionnaire is included in Appendix B).

**Transition Daily Rewards and Worries Questionnaire (TDRWQ)**

The Transition Daily Rewards and Worries Questionnaire (TDRWQ) was developed by Glidden and Jobe (2007). This questionnaire is an inventory, measuring daily rewards and concerns that parents experience as their child transitions to adulthood,
in the domains of Positive Future Orientation (FO), Community Resources (CR), Financial Independence (FI), and Family Relations (FR). The questionnaire consisted of 28 items with the last seven items pertaining to siblings only. For the purpose of this study, only the first 21 items pertaining to parents were utilized. The psychometric properties for the TDRWQ will reported on page 73.

Glidden and Jobe (2007) emphasized the importance of taking into account the parents’ perspective on their child with a disability’s period of transition to adulthood. Thus, they discussed the need for a measurement instrument that would help in identifying the parents’ role, as they are the primary caretakers and source of support. The instrument, Transition Daily Rewards and Worries Questionnaire (TDRWQ), was developed to help identify the issues faced by parents or caretakers of children in the transition period to adulthood (Glidden & Jobe, 2007). Glidden and Jobe (2007) recognized that the development of the instrument presents transition in a normative context for persons with and without disabilities. The inventory by Glidden and Jobe (2007) consists of 28 items in addition to 7 items related to siblings. Even though the TDRWQ was administered to a sample of convenience, “the TDRWQ may also prove useful in assessing service needs and the success of service provision” (Glidden & Jobe, 2007). The internal consistency of its factors scored in acceptable ranges. Findings of this study found that the use of the developed instrument TDRWQ would introduce an inventory assessing parents’ experience with daily rewards and worries as their child prepares for the transition to adulthood.

The internal consistency reliability analysis for the TDRWQ, reported by Glidden and Jobe (2007), on all 28 items demonstrated that each factor was reliable with a
Cronbach alpha of .90 for Positive Future Orientation, .84 for Community Resources, .85 for Financial Independence, and .66/.81 for Family Relations/With Sibling items. Glidden and Jobe (2007) explained that the reliability for the three-item Family Relations factor was slightly lower than the commonly accepted criterion for alpha of .70, however, “each of the items was similarly correlated with each other item, with a range of .33 to .46” (p. 278). The FR domain had a very low reliability in the present sample; therefore, the FR domain was dropped from the analysis.

The TDRWQ was designed to allow the researcher to understand parents’ expectations of their child transitioning to adulthood by looking at a variety of collective domains related to the individual with a disability and his or her surroundings from the parents’ perspective. Parents were instructed to respond to all of the questionnaire statements by marking the most appropriate response (A copy of the TDRWQ is included in Appendix B).

**Parent Perspectives on the Transition to Adulthood Questionnaire (PPTAQ)**

The Parent and Sibling Perspectives on the Transition to Adulthood Questionnaire by Chambers et. al (2004), originally consisted of 43 items in total for both the parents and siblings. The researcher modified this questionnaire based on consultation with professionals in the field of disability in Kuwait, the researcher’s experience in the disability field in Kuwait and the USA, and available research on individuals with disabilities in Kuwait. The modified version, Parent Perspectives on the Transition to Adulthood Questionnaire (PPTAQ), included only 37 out of the 43 original items by Chambers et. al (2004). The selected items related solely to parents’ aspirations. Omitted items from the questionnaire included items in the Leisure and Recreation (LR) domain,
which were omitted from the modified version PPTAQ due to its items being similar to other items in the TDRWQ and also items addressed to siblings of individuals with disabilities. The questionnaire was then translated into Arabic, since the sampled parents’ first language was Arabic, and piloted online. After the completion of the pilot of the PPTAQ with the 37 items, additional modifications were made and the number of items was reduced to a total of 24 items. These changes to the number of items resulted from modifications made by omitting some items and by combining some items with other items that had similar content. These 24 items were modified from the original English questionnaire version for the purpose of word choice in the Arabic language and cultural differences between the USA and Kuwait. The psychometric properties for the PPTAQ will reported on page 73.

Then, the researcher utilized a measurement matrix, see Table 3, to categorize the 24 items in the PPTAQ instrument to ensure equal numbers of items and balance across the four domains, which included Employment (EM), Postsecondary Education (PE), Residential and Daily Living (RL), and Social Relationships (SR). After that, themes were identified based on the content of the items in each of the four domains. The five themes included Involvement, Importance, Parent/Child interaction, Knowledge, and Descriptive Questions. It appeared that there were two cells, the “Residential and Daily Living (RL)/Importance” cell and the “Social Relationships (SR)/Descriptive Questions” cell, that had no items. Also, some domains had more items than other domains across the same theme. As a result, the researcher added four newly developed items to cells that had no items or fewer items than other cells in the same theme across the domains. The four newly developed items have an asterisk at the beginning of the items in Table 3.
These additions were included in the following cells: One item in the “Postsecondary Education (PE)/Importance”, two items in the “Residential and Daily Living (RL)/Importance”, and one item in the “Social Relationships (SR)/Descriptive Questions”.

In one case, the researcher deleted an item, in the “Residential and Daily Living (RL)/Descriptive Questions” cell, due to it being closely related to another item in the same cell as well as to make the number of items in each domain consistent across the Descriptive Questions theme. In another case, the researcher split an item into two items, in the “Employment (EM)/Involvement” cell to make the number of items in that cell consistent with the number of items in other cells in the four domains across the Involvement theme. The process of adding newly developed items and the deletion of one item resulted in a final total number of 28 items for the PPTAQ for this study (A copy of the PPTAQ is included in Appendix B).
Table 3

Parent Perspectives on the Transition to Adulthood Questionnaire (PPTAQ) questions across domains and themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Employment (EM)</th>
<th>Postsecondary Education (PE)</th>
<th>Residential &amp; Daily Living (RL)</th>
<th>Social Relationships (SR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Involvement</strong></td>
<td>How involved will you be in assisting and supporting your child to FIND and CHOOSE a job after he or she finishes high school?</td>
<td>How involved are you in your child's preparation for education after high school?</td>
<td>How involved will you be in deciding where your child will live after high school?</td>
<td>CURRENTLY, how involved are you in helping your child make friends?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How involved will you be in assisting and supporting your child to KEEP a job after he or she finishes high school?</td>
<td>If your child were to continue in education after high school, how involved would you be in providing your child with educational support?</td>
<td>How involved will you be in supporting your child’s daily activities AFTER he or she finishes high school?</td>
<td>AFTER your child finishes high school, how involved do you plan to be in helping your child make friends?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Importance</strong></td>
<td>How important is it for your child to have a paid job AFTER he or she finishes high school?</td>
<td>How important is it to your child’s future that he or she participates in education after high school?</td>
<td>*How important is it that your child lives with his or her parents after finishing high school?</td>
<td>How important is it for your child to have friends WITHOUT disabilities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How important is it that your child work alongside people WITHOUT disabilities?</td>
<td>*How important is it that your child continues in education after high school alongside people WITHOUT disabilities?</td>
<td>*How important is it to your child’s future that he or she lives independently outside the family’s home?</td>
<td>How important is having a job to helping your child establish friendships?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parent/Child Interaction</strong></td>
<td>How often do you talk to your child about his or her job interests?</td>
<td>How often do you talk to your child about his or her desire to participate in education after high school?</td>
<td>How often do you talk to your child about living options for after high school?</td>
<td>How often do you talk to your child about his or her friends?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge</strong></td>
<td>How much do you know about job options for people with disabilities?</td>
<td>How much do you know about education opportunities after high school for people with disabilities?</td>
<td>How much do you know about living options for people with disabilities?</td>
<td>How concerned are you about your child’s social life AFTER high school?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Descriptive Questions</strong></td>
<td>Where will your child MOST LIKELY work after completing high school?</td>
<td>Which of the following education options would your child MOST LIKELY enter after high school?</td>
<td>Who will your child MOST LIKELY live with after finishing high school?</td>
<td>*Where will your child MOST LIKELY establish friendships after finishing high school?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Translation of Instruments into Arabic

Since these two instruments were used with a Kuwaiti sample, whose first language is Arabic, the researcher translated these two questionnaires into Arabic. The researcher went through several steps to guarantee the quality of the translation. The researcher translated both questionnaires with the assistance of a professional translator from Kuwait. The second step consisted of piloting the translated Arabic survey version. Only 19 of the 28 participants (67%) who attempted to take the survey online, on www.surveymonkey.com, actually completed it. Many participants suggested modifications to the language and context of the questions in regards to the Arabic language and Kuwaiti culture. The suggestions were taken into consideration by the researcher and changes were made. Then, a Kuwait University professor from the Mass Communication Department, Maher Al-Hajji, PhD, looked it over and modified the terminology and question structure. The next step was to send both copies, the original English version of the survey and the translated Arabic version, to a linguist and a certified translator at the Kuwait Ministry of Justice-Translation Department, Mrs. Huda Al-Medlij, who also suggested further modifications to the language of the Arabic version questionnaires based on her experience in the Arabic language and her work in translation. Mrs. Rehab Boresli, chairman of the Kuwaiti Society for Guardians of the Disabled, modified the Arabic version even further with minor changes to several terms addressed to individuals with disabilities made suggestions to omit or combine questions. Then, the Arabic version was back translated into English by Ali Bourisly, PhD. Finally, a professor at NYU, Peter Valenti, PhD, compared the original questionnaires, which
were in English, with the back-translated English versions to ensure that they conformed to the original.

Major modifications were made for the Arabic version of the PPTAQ based on language and cultural differences. For the purpose of this study, the Leisure and Recreation (LR) domain was omitted from the modified version of the PPTAQ due to its items being similar to other items in the TDRWQ. Also, the researcher wanted the participants to complete the survey and not be overwhelmed by a long version of it. Some other modifications included, replacing the term “high school” with the term “education level”, to refer to schooling years in the Arabic language, throughout the questionnaire. Also, on item 46 on expected work settings after high school, alternative terms for the answer options were modified based on the availability of job placements in Kuwait.

Several items were combined due to similar meaning in the Employment domain. The following two items were combined to form a single question: “How important is it for your child to have a job AFTER he or she finishes high school?” and “How important is it that your child receives pay for his or her job?” The new formulated question is Q41 “How important is it for your child to have a paid job AFTER he or she finishes high school?” Another set of combined questions are, “How involved will you be in assisting your child to FIND a job after he or she finishes high school?” and “How involved will you be in CHOOSING the type of job your child will hold after he or she finishes high school?” The newly formulated question is Q43 “How involved will you be in assisting and supporting your child to FIND and CHOOSE a job after he or she finishes high school?” The decision to combine these two questions was due to the high paid pension provided by the Kuwaiti government to any individual with a disability that does not have
a job; this is explained in article 43 in the Rights of People with Disabilities 2010 Kuwaiti law. Therefore, many families would not accept a non-paid job for their young adult children with disabilities because the government already provides financial support for non-employed individuals with disabilities.

Furthermore, an item regarding employment and friendship was moved from the Employment (EM) domain to the Social Relationships (SR) domain because it related more to the parents’ aspirations for their child’s relationships with others. The item is Q67 “How important is having a job to helping your child establish friendships?”

Another modification was made to an answer option for item 56, this is due to cultural lifestyle in Kuwait. The item is Q56 “Who will your child MOST LIKELY live with after finishing high school?” one of the answer options “with roommate” was replaced with “a family relative” which is more appropriate in the Kuwaiti culture.

Finally, a statement in the TDRWQ was refined for cultural reasons. The statement was originally written in the English version, Q23, as “I am confident that ___ will be O.K. even after I die” was changed to in the Arabic version, “I am confident that ___ will be O.K. without me.” These changes were made based on recommendations from Mrs. Rehab Boresli, who has experience in policy and social change in the field of disabilities in Kuwait, and a professional translator, Mrs. Huda Al-Medlij. Also, suggestions were provided from the researcher’s dissertation committee members and colleagues at Teachers College-Columbia University.

Reliability

The internal consistency reliability analysis for the TDRWQ, with the sample of 145 parent pairs who participated in this study, demonstrated that each domain for fathers
and mothers was either reliable or borderline reliable except for the Family Relations (FR) domain. For fathers, Cronbach alpha reliabilities were .88 for Future Orientation (FO), .73 for Community Resources (CR), .72 for Financial Independence (FI), and -.40 for Family Relations (FR). For mothers, reliabilities were a Cronbach alpha of .88 for FO, .68 for CR, .66 for FI, and -.14 for FR. The low reliability in the FR domain for both fathers and mothers can possibly be explained by the trend of contradictory answers that parents gave for two out of the three questions within the FR domain. Q27, which was reverse coded, was “I am disappointed that ____ prefers friends over family” and Q31 was “I feel good because ____ enjoys family activities.” For Q27, 41% of mothers answered the question strongly agree (SA), 39.3% answered agree (A), and 37.2% of fathers answered the question SA and 42.1% answered A. On Q31, 28.3% of mothers answered SA, 49% answered A, and 18.6% of fathers answered SA and 53.1% answered A. These percentages showed low variability and a contradictory trend in the way mothers and fathers answered Q27 and Q31. As for Q38, which was reverse coded, “I am sad that my child is missing out on important family interactions” there appeared to be some variability in the way mothers and fathers answered the question. 29.7% of mothers answered A, 22.1% answered Disagree (D), and 18.6% answered SA, while 30.3% of fathers answered A, 22.8% answered D, and 16.6% answered SA. The FR domain was removed from the analysis for both fathers and mothers due to its very low reliability.

The internal consistency reliability analysis, for the PPTAQ with the sample of 145 parent pairs who participated in this study, demonstrated that each scale for fathers and mothers was either reliable or borderline reliable. For fathers, the Cronbach alphas were .80 for Employment (EM), .80 for Postsecondary Education (PE), .53 for
Residential & Daily Living (RL), .73 for Social Relationships (SR). For mothers, the EM scale had a Cronbach alpha of .76, PE had an alpha of .75, RL had an alpha of .53, and SR had an alpha of .71. RL scale for both mothers and fathers had the lowest reliability. This was due to the inconsistency within the parents’ answers to the seven questions in the RL scale. Some of the questions related to living outside the family home, living independently, and discussing different living options with the child, may be looked upon differently in the Kuwaiti culture. The majority of young adults in Kuwait live in their parents’ homes until the individual is married. In many cases, many married couples remain living with their parents. This might have affected the reliability of the scale due to the weight of the questions, which were presented to individuals with a different cultural and religious background than those for whom the original questionnaire was tailored.

**Procedure**

**Pilot Study**

A pilot study was conducted to test the Arabic language of the translated survey that included the demographics questionnaire, the PPTAQ, and the TDRWQ. The researcher evaluated the time it took to complete the survey by observing two of the 28 participants. Completion time reported for the whole survey by those two participants indicated a range of time between 15-30 minutes. Participants were all parents of both children with and without a disability. Based on the feedback of the participants of the pilot study, it was reported that the content of the survey was well-developed, however, there were suggestions on modifying the (Arabic) language of the questions.
Procedure for Current Study

For this current research study, the researcher recruited parents during social and educational events at the KSGD and Al-Kharafi Activity Kids Center and through three private special education schools, which included Manarat School, Khalifa School, and the Ideal Education School.

The researcher contacted the five sites and gained permission to distribute the surveys to the parents. At the KSGD and Al-Kharafi Activity Kids Center, the surveys were passed out during public social and educational events, seminars and workshops with the assistance of the KSGD and Al-Kharafi Activity Kids Center employees. At the three schools the researcher worked with the school psychologist of each school and listed the number of students that fit the age criteria and gave the surveys to students in each classroom. Each envelope included two surveys, with a father and a mother label. Each survey had a cover letter that explained the purpose of the study to the parents and attached to the survey were the consent forms. The schools included a formal note posted on each envelope, requesting parents to complete the survey and return it to their child’s classroom teacher by a given date. The schools also made extra efforts in contacting the parents via text message, emails, and sending reminder notes home to encourage parents to return their completed surveys.

Participants were guaranteed that no personally identifiable information would be utilized in the study; only group data were used for the analysis. Once the completed surveys were compiled, the data were entered into SPSS. The surveys were kept in a safe filing cabinet, and the researcher began the quantitative data analyses.
Scoring and Data Analysis

The instruments used to measure the dependent variables of fathers’ and mothers’ expectations of postsecondary transition outcomes included the TDRWQ and PPTAQ. The Demographic questionnaire was used to measure the demographic characteristics of the gender of both parents and the child. The Demographic subscale contains 19 items. The following key demographic variables were used: fathers’ and mothers’ age, education level, monthly income, child’s gender, child’s age, and degree of child’s disability. Fathers’, mothers’, and child’s age were continuous variables, while the other variables were categorical. Some of these variables, such as degree of child’s disability and child’s age were prominent in the analyses as they corresponded to fathers’ and mothers’ expectations and aspirations towards their child’s transition outcomes.

The subscales on the three domains of the TDRWQ to be included in the data analyses are as follows: Positive Future Orientation (FO) subscale contains six items, the Community Resources (CR) subscale contains seven items, and the Financial Independence (FI) subscale contains five items. In this research study, all items were rated on a five-point scale with answer options of Strongly Disagree (1) and Strongly Agree (5), with a Neutral response of neither agree nor disagree (3). The higher the score on each domain the more optimistic parents are about their expectations for their child’s transition outcomes.

The subscales on each domain of the PPTAQ’s 28 items are as follows: Employment (EM) subscale contains seven items, Postsecondary Education (PE) subscale contains seven items, Residential and Daily Living (RL) subscale contains seven items, and Social Relationships (SR) subscale contains seven items. Each subscale was
scored separately. All items were rated on a four-point scale, except for four items, Q46, Q51, Q56, and Q66, which were descriptive questions. These four items were treated separately than the rest of the items in the scales and analyzed in the additional analyses section of the results chapter. As for all other questions, depending on the type of question some items had a scale with answer options of Extremely (3), Very (2), Somewhat (1), Not At All (0); While some questions had answer options of A lot (3), Some (2), Not Much (1), Nothing (0); and each scale ends with a question with answer options of Daily (3), About Once a Month (2), A Few Times a Year (1), and Never (0). The higher the score on each scale the higher the parents’ aspirations about their child’s transition outcomes. A summary of all independent and dependent variables as well as their source and range of scores can be found in Table 4.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Score Range</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demographic Questions</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>IVs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents’ Gender</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents’ Age</td>
<td>30-67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents’ Educational Level</td>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents’ Monthly Income</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child’s Gender</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child’s Age</td>
<td>7-21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of Child’s Disability</td>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transition Daily Rewards and Worries Questionnaire (TDRWQ) (Glidden & Jobe, 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Score Range</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Future Orientation (FO)</td>
<td>6-30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Expectation (FO): DV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Resources (CR)</td>
<td>7-35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Expectation (CR): DV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Independence (FI)</td>
<td>5-25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Expectation (FI): DV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parent Perspectives on the Transition to Adulthood Questionnaire (PPTAQ)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Score Range</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment (EM)</td>
<td>0-18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Aspiration (EM): DV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>Aspiration (DV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q46</td>
<td>Postsecondary Education (PE)</td>
<td>0-18</td>
<td>Aspiration (PE): DV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q51</td>
<td>Residential &amp; Daily Living (RL)</td>
<td>0-18</td>
<td>Aspiration (RL): DV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q56</td>
<td>Social Relationships (SR)</td>
<td>0-18</td>
<td>Aspiration (SR): DV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* IV=Independent Variable; DV= Dependent Variable
Chapter IV

Results

This study examined fathers’ and mothers’ expectations and aspirations for their child’s transition outcomes in Kuwait using the Transition Daily Rewards and Worries Questionnaire (TDRWQ) and the Parent Perspectives on the Transition to Adulthood Questionnaire (PPTAQ) in relation to the independent variables of parents’ and their child’s demographics. The results are presented in the following sections: preliminary analyses, reporting the frequencies, means, and standard deviations for demographic characteristics of fathers, mothers, and their child in addition to group comparisons between fathers’ and mothers’ key demographic variables including age, education level, and income, and comparisons between children’s key demographic variables including age and degree of child’s disability; main analyses, reported in relation to the research questions using the following statistical procedures: paired t-tests, Pearson correlations, and stepwise multiple regression analyses; and additional analyses, analyzing responses to four descriptive questions from the PPTAQ and using independent t-tests to examine child gender differences.

Preliminary Analyses

Demographic Analyses

Group comparisons of fathers’ and mothers’ age, education level, and income are reported in addition to comparisons between children’s age and degree of child’s disability.
A paired t-test was performed to determine group differences between fathers’ and mothers’ ages. There was a significant difference ($t(144) = -11.98$, $p = .000$) between fathers’ and mothers’ ages. The results of the paired t-test indicated that fathers (M=48.28) were older than mothers (M=44.17). A summary of the paired t-test results for fathers’ and mothers’ age is presented in Table 5.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fathers</td>
<td>48.28</td>
<td>7.21</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>-11.98</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td>44.17</td>
<td>6.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *$p<.05$*

A Pearson chi-square test was conducted to determine group differences between fathers’ and mothers’ education level. The results of the Pearson chi-square test showed that education level significantly differed, $\chi^2 (4, N= 290) = 15.65$, $p = .004$, between fathers and mothers. A summary of the Pearson chi-square test results for fathers’ and mothers’ educational level is presented in Table 6. A majority of both fathers and mothers hold a high school or below degree or a bachelors degree. It is interesting to note, that a higher proportion of mothers than fathers hold a bachelors degree, but a higher proportion of fathers than mothers hold a masters and a doctoral degree.
Table 6

**Pearson Chi-Square test Comparing Fathers’ and Mothers’ Education Level:**
**Crosstabulation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High school or Below</th>
<th>Diploma (Associate Degree)</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
<th>Masters</th>
<th>Doctoral</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fathers</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent within</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mother and Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mothers</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent within</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td>.7%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mother and Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>98.0</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>113.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent within</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mother and Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *p<.05

Another Pearson chi-square test was conducted to determine group differences between fathers’ and mothers’ income. The results of the Pearson chi-square test showed that the proportions of fathers’ and mothers’ income in the four income categories significantly differed, \( \chi^2 (3, N=290) = 49.73, p=.000 \). A summary of the Pearson chi-square test results for fathers’ and mothers’ income is presented in Table 7. The significant difference between fathers’ and mothers’ reflected the fact that a higher proportion of fathers made $3,600-$10,800 per month while a higher proportion of
mothers made Less than $3,600. The exchange rate at the time of this study was 1.0 Kuwait Dinar to $3.56 U.S Dollar.

Table 7

*Pearson Chi-Square test Comparing Fathers’ and Mothers’ Income: Crosstabulation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Less than $3,600</th>
<th>$3,600-$10,800</th>
<th>$10,800-$18,000</th>
<th>More than $18,000</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fathers Count</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers Expected Count</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>145.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers Percent within Mother and Father</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers Count</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers Expected Count</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>145.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers Percent within Mother and Father</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Count      | 121             | 140            | 17             | 12                | 290   |
| Total Expected Count | 121.0         | 140.0          | 17.0           | 12.0              | 290.0 |
| Total Percent within Mother and Father | 41.7%          | 48.3%          | 5.9%           | 4.1%              | 100.0% |

*Note. *p*<.05

An independent t-test was run to determine group differences between male (n = 89) and female (n = 56) children on child’s age. There were no significance differences found between male and female children based on child’s age. A summary of the independent t-test results for male and female children based on child’s age is presented in Table 8.
Table 8

*Means, Standard Deviations (SD), and Independent t-Test Results Comparing Male and Female Children based on Child’s Age*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14.22</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>14.73</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *p<.05

A Pearson chi-square test was conducted to test for any group differences in degree of child’s disability based on the child’s gender. The results of the Pearson chi-square test showed that degree of child’s disability was not significantly different, $\chi^2(2, N=145) = .26, p = .876$, based on child’s gender. A summary of the Pearson chi-square test results for male and female children and degree of child’s disability is presented in Table 9. The degree of disability of majority of male and female children was similar, it was between moderate to severe disabilities.
Table 9

Pearson Chi-Square test Comparing Male and Female Children Degree of Disability: Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Mild</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Severe</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>89.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent within Child Gender</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>56.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent within Child Gender</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>145.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent within Child Gender</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p<.05
Main Analyses

Research Question #1: Is there a difference between Kuwaiti fathers’ and mothers’ expectations and aspirations about transition outcomes for their child with a disability as measured by:

A) Transition Daily Rewards and Worries Questionnaire (TDRWQ)

B) Parent Perspectives on the Transition to Adulthood Questionnaire (PPTAQ)

A paired t-test was conducted to determine if there were differences between Kuwaiti fathers’ and mothers’ expectations and aspirations about transition outcomes on three of the domains of the TDRWQ and on the four scales of the PPTAQ. On the TDRWQ questionnaire, there were no significant differences between fathers’ and mothers’ expectations in the following domains: Future Orientation (FO) and Community Resources (CR). However, the Financial Independence (FI) domain showed a difference of marginal significance ($t(144) = 1.96, p = .052$) between fathers’ and mothers’ expectations about transition outcomes. The results of this paired t-test for FI indicated that mothers were somewhat more optimistic (M=17.46) than fathers (M=16.81) about their child’s financial independence as their child transitions to adulthood. A summary of the paired t-test results for the TDRWQ is presented in Table 10.
Table 10

Means, Standard Deviations (SD), and Paired t-Test Results Comparing Fathers and Mothers on the Transition Daily Rewards and Worries Questionnaire (TDRWQ)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Future Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers</td>
<td>17.85</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td>17.77</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers</td>
<td>19.43</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>.290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td>19.77</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Independence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers</td>
<td>16.81</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td>17.46</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p<.05

There were no significant differences between fathers and mothers expectations on the following scales of the PPTAQ: Employment (EM), Postsecondary Education (PE), and Residential and Daily Living (RL). However, the Social Relationships (SR) scale showed a significant difference (t(144) = 3.05, p= .003) between fathers’ and mothers’ expectations about transition outcomes. The results of this paired t-test for SR indicated that mothers had higher aspirations (M= 12.37) for their child’s social relationships than fathers (M= 11.52). A summary of the paired t-test results for the PPTAQ is presented in Table 11.
Table 11

Means, Standard Deviations (SD), and Paired t-Test Results Comparing Fathers and Mothers on the Parent Perspectives on the Transition to Adulthood Questionnaire (PPTAQ)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers</td>
<td>10.74</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td>10.68</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postsecondary Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers</td>
<td>10.09</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td>10.53</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential &amp; Daily Living</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers</td>
<td>10.18</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td>10.12</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers</td>
<td>11.52</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td>12.37</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p<.05

Research Question #2: Is there a difference between Kuwaiti fathers’ and mothers’ expectations and aspirations about transition outcomes for their male child with a disability as measured by:

A) Transition Daily Rewards and Worries Questionnaire (TDRWQ)

B) Parent Perspectives on the Transition to Adulthood Questionnaire (PPTAQ)

A paired t-test was run to determine differences between fathers’ and mothers’ expectations and aspirations for male children (n = 89) on the three domains of the TDRWQ and four scales of the PPTAQ. No significant differences were found between fathers’ and mothers’ expectations towards their male children in the TDRWQ: Future
Orientation (FO), Community Resources (CR), and Financial Independence (FI). There were also no significant differences found between fathers’ and mothers’ aspirations for their male children in all four scales of the PPTAQ: Employment (EM), Postsecondary Education (PE), Residential & Daily Living (RL), and Social Relationships (SR). A summary of the paired t-test results for male children on the TDRWQ is presented in Table 12 and on the PPTAQ is presented in Table 13.

Table 12

Means, Standard Deviations (SD), and Paired t-Test Results Comparing Fathers and Mothers on the Three Domains of the Transition Daily Rewards and Worries Questionnaire (TDRWQ) for Male Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Future Orientation (FO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers</td>
<td>18.28</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td>18.15</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Resources (CR)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers</td>
<td>19.49</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td>19.93</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Independence (FI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers</td>
<td>16.60</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td>17.36</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p<.05
Table 13

Means, Standard Deviations (SD), and Paired t-Test Results Comparing Fathers and Mothers on the Four Scales of the Parent Perspectives on the Transition to Adulthood Questionnaire (PPTAQ) for Male Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers</td>
<td>10.76</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td>10.97</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postsecondary Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers</td>
<td>10.40</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>.564</td>
<td>.574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td>10.62</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential &amp; Daily Living</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers</td>
<td>10.29</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers</td>
<td>11.49</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td>12.15</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p<.05
Research Question #3: Is there a difference between Kuwaiti fathers’ and mothers’ expectations and aspirations about transition outcomes for their female child with a disability as measured by:

A) Transition Daily Rewards and Worries Questionnaire (TDRWQ)

B) Parent Perspectives on the Transition to Adulthood Questionnaire (PPTAQ)

A paired t-test was run to determine differences between fathers’ and mothers’ expectations and aspirations for female children (n = 56) on the three domains of the TDRWQ and four scales of the PPTAQ. No significant differences were found between fathers’ and mothers’ expectations towards their female children in all three domains of the TDRWQ: Future Orientation (FO), Community Resources (CR), and Financial Independence (FI). On the PPTAQ, there was a significant difference between fathers’ and mothers’ aspirations for their female children only on the Social Relationships (SR) scale (t(55) = 2.93, p = .005). On the SR scale, mothers (M=12.73) had higher aspirations for their female children’s social relationships than fathers (M=11.57). A summary for the paired t-test results for female children on the TDRWQ is presented in Table 14 and on the PPTAQ is presented in Table 15.
Table 14

*Means, Standard Deviations (SD), and Paired t-Test Results Comparing Fathers and Mothers on the Three Domains of the Transition Daily Rewards and Worries Questionnaire (TDRWQ) for Female Children*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Future Orientation (FO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers</td>
<td>17.16</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>-.67</td>
<td>.503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td>16.84</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Resources (CR)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers</td>
<td>19.32</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td>19.52</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Independence (FI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers</td>
<td>17.16</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td>17.61</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *p*<.05
Table 15

Means, Standard Deviations (SD), and Paired t-Test Results Comparing Fathers and Mothers on the Four Scales of the Parent Perspectives on the Transition to Adulthood Questionnaire (PPTAQ) for Female Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment (EM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers</td>
<td>10.70</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>-1.12</td>
<td>.268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td>10.25</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postsecondary Education (PE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers</td>
<td>9.59</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td>10.39</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential &amp; Daily Living (RL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>.729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td>9.89</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Relationships (SR)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers</td>
<td>11.57</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td>12.73</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p < .05
Research Question #4: What are the relationships between key demographic variables (child’s gender, child’s age, child’s degree of disability, fathers’ age, fathers’ education level, fathers’ income, mothers’ age, mothers’ education level, mothers’ income) and the dependent variables as measured by fathers’ and mothers’ responses to the:

A) Transition Daily Rewards and Worries Questionnaire (TDRWQ)

B) Parent Perspectives on the Transition to Adulthood Questionnaire (PPTAQ)

Using Pearson Correlations, intercorrelations were calculated between key demographic characteristics and the dependent variables. On the three domains of the TDRWQ for fathers, there were significant negative correlations found between the Future Orientation (FO) domain and the following independent variables: child’s age (r = -.25), degree of child’s disability (r = -.31), fathers’ age (r = -.17), and fathers’ education level (r = -.17). These results indicated that when the child was younger, with less severe disability, and fathers were younger with lower education level, fathers were more optimistic about their child’s future orientation. The Community Resources (CR) domain was significantly negatively correlated with the following independent variables: child’s age (r = -.26), degree of child’s disability (r = -.21), and fathers’ age (r = -.23). These results also indicated that fathers were more optimistic about the community resources provided for their children if their child was younger, the disability was less severe, and when the father was younger in age. The financial Independence (FI) domain was significantly negatively correlated with fathers’ income (r = -.19) indicating that the lower the fathers’ income the more optimistic fathers were about their child’s financial independence.
On the four scales of the PPTAQ for fathers, the Employment (EM) scale was significantly negatively correlated with child’s age ($r = -.17$) and degree of child’s disability ($-.17$). These results indicated that the younger the child and the less severe the disability, the higher the fathers’ aspirations are for their children’s employment transition outcomes. The Social Relationships (SR) scale was also significantly negatively correlated with fathers’ education level ($r = -.20$) and fathers’ income ($r = -.19$), indicating that the lower the fathers’ education level and income, the higher the fathers’ aspirations are for their children’s social relationships. No significant correlations were found between the independent variables and the Postsecondary Education (PE) scale or with the Residential and Daily Living (RL) scale. A summary of correlations of independent and dependent variables for fathers is presented in Table 16.

Table 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TDRWQ (FO)</th>
<th>TDRWQ (CR)</th>
<th>TDRWQ (FI)</th>
<th>PPTAQ (EM)</th>
<th>PPTAQ (PE)</th>
<th>PPTAQ (RL)</th>
<th>PPTAQ (SR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child’s Gender</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child’s Age</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of Disability</td>
<td>-.31**</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers’ Age</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers’ Education</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers’ Income</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *$p<.05$ and **$p<.01$*
On the three domains of the TDRWQ for mothers, there were significant negative correlations found between Future Orientation (FO) and child’s age ($r = -0.22$), FO and degree of child’s disability ($r = -0.24$), and FO and mothers’ education level ($r = -0.29$). These results indicated that when the child was younger and had a less severe disability, and when mothers had a lower education level, the mothers were more optimistic about their child’s future orientation. There were also significant negative correlations found between Community Resources (CR) and child’s age ($r = -0.31$), CR and degree of child’s disability ($r = -0.24$), CR and mothers’ age ($r = -0.18$), and CR and mothers’ education level ($r = -0.24$). These results indicated that when the child was younger with less severe disability, and mothers were younger with lower education level, the mothers were more optimistic about the availability of community resources for their children. A significant negative correlation was also found between Financial Independence (FI) and mothers’ income ($r = -0.19$), indicating the lower the income of the mother the more optimistic she is about her child’s financial independence.

On the four scales of the PPTAQ for mothers, there were significant negative correlations found between Employment (EM) and child’s age ($r = -0.17$), EM and degree of child’s disability ($r = -0.23$), EM and mothers’ education level ($r = -0.17$), and EM and mothers’ income ($r = -0.25$). These results indicated that the younger the child, the less severe the disability, and the lower the mothers’ education level and income, the higher the mothers’ aspirations are towards their expectations for their children’s transition outcomes in employment. There were also significant negative correlations found between Postsecondary Education (PE) and child’s age ($r = -0.26$), PE and degree of child’s disability ($r = -0.20$), PE and mothers’ education level ($r = -0.17$), and PE and
mothers’ income ($r = -.19$). These results indicated that the younger the child, the less severe the disability, and the lower the mothers’ education level and income, the higher the mothers’ aspirations are for their child’s postsecondary education transition outcomes. There was a significant negative correlation found between Social Relationships (SR) scale and mothers’ income ($r = -.17$), indicating that the lower the mothers’ income, the higher the mothers’ aspirations are about their child’s social relationships. No correlations were found between Residential & Daily Living (RL) scale of the PPTAQ and independent variables. A summary of correlations of independent and dependent variables for mothers is presented in Table 17.

Table 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TDRWQ (FO)</th>
<th>TDRWQ (CR)</th>
<th>TDRWQ (FI)</th>
<th>PPTAQ (EM)</th>
<th>PPTAQ (PE)</th>
<th>PPTAQ (RL)</th>
<th>PPTAQ (SR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child’s Gender</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child’s Age</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>-.31**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of Disability</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers’ Age</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers’ Education</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers’ Income</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *$p < .05$ and **$p < .01$*
Research Question #5: Which set of demographic variables best predicts fathers’ and mothers’ expectations and aspirations about the transition outcomes for their child with a disability as measured by:

A) Transition Daily Rewards and Worries Questionnaire (TDRWQ)

B) Parent Perspectives on the Transition to Adulthood Questionnaire (PPTAQ)

To establish the set of predictors to be entered into the full model for TDRWQ and PPTAQ, the independent variables that were significantly correlated with each of the three domains of the TDRWQ and each of the four scales of the PPTAQ were entered into separate stepwise multiple regression analyses for fathers and mothers. In addition, a rule was set such that stepwise regression was performed on an dependent variable only when two or more independent variables were significantly correlated with any of the three domains of the TDRWQ and with any of the four scales of the PPTAQ. Applying these decision rules, there was a total of four multiple regressions conducted for fathers and four multiple regressions for mothers.

TDRWQ. Future Orientation (FO) for Fathers. Independent variables that were significantly correlated with the FO domain for fathers and entered into the stepwise multiple regression were child’s age, degree of child’s disability, fathers’ age, and fathers’ education level. Degree of child’s disability, child’s age, and fathers’ education level explained 18% of the variance ($r^2 = .18; p<.01$) of fathers’ expectations in the TDRWQ (FO) domain. Degree of child’s disability alone was the strongest predictor and it accounted for 10% of the variance ($r^2 = .10; p<.01$). With the addition of child’s age into the model, an increase in variance accounted for 5% ($r^2\Delta = .05; p<.01$), and with the addition of fathers’ education level, an increase in variance accounted for 3% ($r^2\Delta = .03$);
p<.01). A summary of the model of stepwise multiple regression for the TDRWQ (FO) can be found in Table 18.

Table 18

Model Summary for Transition Daily Rewards and Worries Questionnaire (TDRWQ)-Future Orientation (FO) Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis (Child and Fathers’ demographic variables)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>r²</th>
<th>r²Δ</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree of Disability</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td>460.51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>460.51</td>
<td>15.439**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of Disability, Child’s Age</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>689.71</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>344.86</td>
<td>12.124**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of Disability, Child’s Age, Fathers’ Education</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>827.53</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>275.84</td>
<td>9.970**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p<.05 and **p<.01

TDRWQ, Community Resources (CR) for Fathers. Independent variables that were significantly correlated with the CR domain for fathers and entered into the stepwise multiple regression were child’s age, degree of child’s disability, and fathers’ age. Child’s age alone accounted for 7% of the variance (r²=.07; p<.01). Adding degree of child’s disability into the model accounted for 10% of the variance (r²=.10; p<.01) of fathers’ expectations in the TDRWQ (CR) domain. This addition of degree of child’s disability into the model increased the variance to 3%. A summary of the model of stepwise multiple regression for the TDRWQ (CR) can be found in Table 19.
Table 19

Model Summary for Transition Daily Rewards and Worries Questionnaire (TDRWQ)-Community Resources (CR) Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis (Child and Fathers’ demographic variables)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
<th>$r^2\Delta$</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child’s Age</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td>273.53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>273.53</td>
<td>10.734**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child’s Age, Degree of Disability,</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>403.36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>201.68</td>
<td>8.150**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *$p<.05$ and **$p<.01$

PPTAQ, Employment (EM) for Fathers. Independent variables that were significantly correlated with the EM scale for fathers and entered into the stepwise multiple regression were child’s age and degree of child’s disability. Only child’s age, which explained 3% of the variance ($r^2= .03$; $p<.05$) contributed significantly to the prediction of fathers’ aspirations in the PPTAQ (EM) scale. A summary of the model of stepwise multiple regression for the PPTAQ (EM) can be found in Table 20.

Table 20

Model Summary for Parent Perspectives on the Transition to Adulthood Questionnaire (PPTAQ)-Employment (EM) Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis (Child and Fathers’ demographic variables)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
<th>$r^2\Delta$</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child’s Age</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>82.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>82.02</td>
<td>4.38*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *$p<.05$ and **$p<.01$
**PPTAQ, Social Relationships (SR) for Fathers.** Independent variables that were significantly correlated with the SR scale for fathers and entered into the stepwise multiple regression were fathers’ education level and fathers’ income. Fathers’ education level explained 4% of the variance ($r^2 = .04; p<.05$) of fathers’ aspirations in the PPTAQ SR scale. A summary of the model of stepwise multiple regression for the PPTAQ (SR) can be found in Table 21.

Table 21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
<th>$r^2\Delta$</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fathers’ Education Level</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td>90.80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>90.80</td>
<td>5.63*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *$p<.05$ and **$p<.01$*

**TDRWQ, Future Orientation (FO) for Mothers.** Independent variables that were significantly correlated with the FO domain for mothers and entered into the stepwise multiple regression were child’s age, degree of child’s disability, and mothers’ education level. Mothers’ education level, degree of child’s disability, and child’s age explained 20% of the variance ($r^2 = .20; p<.01$) of mothers’ expectations in the TDRWQ (FO) domain. Mothers’ education level alone accounted for 8% of the variance ($r^2 = .08; p<.01$), with the addition of degree of child’s disability into the model, 17% of the variance was accounted for ($r^2\Delta = .17; p<.01$), with an increase in variance that accounted for 9% ($r^2\Delta = .09; p<.01$). A summary of the model of stepwise multiple regression for the TDRWQ (FO) can be found in Table 22.
Table 22

*Model Summary for Transition Daily Rewards and Worries Questionnaire (TDRWQ)-Future Orientation (FO) Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis (Child and Mothers’ demographic variables)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
<th>$r^2\Delta$</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mothers’ Education Level</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td>428.52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>428.52</td>
<td>12.862**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers’ Education Level, Degree of Disability,</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>862.84</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>431.421</td>
<td>14.105**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers’ Education Level, Degree of Disability, Child’s Age</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1024.31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>341.44</td>
<td>11.513**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *$p<.05$ and **$p<.01$*

*TDRWQ, Community Resources (CR) for Mothers.* Independent variables that were significantly correlated with the CR domain for mothers and entered into the stepwise multiple regression were child’s age, degree of child’s disability, mothers’ age, and mothers’ education level. Child’s age, mothers’ education level, and degree of child’s disability explained 21% of the variance ($r^2=.21; p<.01$) of mothers’ expectations in the TDRWQ (CR) domain. Child’s age alone accounted for 10% of the variance ($r^2=.10; p<.01$), with the addition of mothers’ education level into the model, 15% of the variance was accounted for ($r^2=.15; p<.01$), with an increase in the variance that accounted for 5% ($r^2\Delta=.05; p<.01$). Adding degree of child’s disability into the model accounted for 6% more of the variance ($r^2\Delta=.06; p<.01$). A summary of the model of stepwise multiple regression for the TDRWQ (CR) can be found in Table 23.
Table 23

**Model Summary for Transition Daily Rewards and Worries Questionnaire (TDRWQ)-Community Resources (CR) Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis (Child and Mothers’ demographic variables)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>r²</th>
<th>r²Δ</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child’s Age</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td>355.43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>355.43</td>
<td>15.245**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child’s Age, Mothers’ Education Level</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>540.39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>270.19</td>
<td>12.184**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child’s Age, Mothers’ Education Level, Degree of Disability</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>780.81</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>260.27</td>
<td>12.617**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *p<.05 and **p<.01

**PPTAQ, Employment (EM) for Mothers.** Independent variables that were significantly correlated with the EM scale for mothers and entered into the stepwise multiple regression were child’s age, degree of child’s degree, mothers’ education level, and mothers’ income. Mothers’ income and degree of child’s disability explained 14% of the variance (r²=.14; p<.01) of mothers’ aspirations in the PPTAQ (EM) scale. Mothers’ income alone accounted for 6% of the variance (r²=.06; p<.01). Adding degree of child’s disability into the model accounted for 8% more variance (r²Δ=.08; p<.01) than mothers’ income alone. A summary of the model of stepwise multiple regression for the PPTAQ (EM) can be found in Table 24.
Table 24

*Model Summary for Parent Perspectives on the Transition to Adulthood Questionnaire (PPTAQ) - Employment (EM) Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis (Child and Mothers’ demographic variables)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
<th>$r^2\Delta$</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mothers’ Income</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td>139.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>139.50</td>
<td>9.376*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers’ Income, Degree of Disability</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>323.42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>161.71</td>
<td>11.815**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *$p<.05$ and **$p<.01$*

*PPTAQ, Postsecondary Education (PE) for Mothers.* Independent variables that were significantly correlated with the PE scale for mothers and entered into the stepwise multiple regression were child’s age, degree of child’s disability, mothers’ education level, and mothers’ income. Child’s age, mothers’ income, and degree of child’s disability explained 15% of the variance ($r^2 = .15; p<.01$) of mothers’ aspirations in the PPTAQ (PE) scale. Child’s age alone accounted for 7% of the variance ($r^2 = .07; p<.01$), with the addition of mothers’ income level into the model, 10% of the variance was accounted for ($r^2 = .10; p<.01$), this addition into the model increased the variance by 3% ($r^2\Delta = .03; p<.01$). And adding degree of child’s disability into the model accounted for 5% more variance ($r^2\Delta = .05; p<.01$). A summary of the model of stepwise multiple regression for the PPTAQ (PE) can be found in Table 25.
Table 25

Model Summary for Parent Perspectives on the Transition to Adulthood Questionnaire (PPTAQ)- Postsecondary Education (PE) Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis (Child and Mothers’ demographic variables)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
<th>$r^2$Δ</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child’s Age</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td>157.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>157.75</td>
<td>10.394**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child’s Age, Mothers’ Income</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>239.96</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>119.98</td>
<td>8.159**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child’s Age, Mothers’ Income, Degree of Disability</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>346.37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>115.46</td>
<td>8.215**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *$p<.05$ and **$p<.01$
Additional Analyses

Parent Perspectives on the Transition to Adulthood Questionnaire (PPTAQ)
Descriptive Questions

The PPTAQ had four descriptive questions that were treated separately to examine fathers’ and mothers’ aspirations for their child with a disability in Employment (EM), Postsecondary Education (PE), Residential and Daily Living (RL), and Social Relationships (SR). Each of the four questions were examined based on the fathers’ and mothers’ responses.

For the descriptive question on the Employment (EM) scale, “Where will your child MOST LIKELY work after completing high school?” 53 (36%) of fathers expected their child to work in Competitive Employment, 32 (22.1%) in Work Activity/Day Center, 31 (21.4%) in Sheltered Workshop, and 29 (20%) in other places that may include staying at home or family business. Forty-two (29%) mothers expected their children to work after completing high school in Competitive Employment, 36 (24.8%) in Work Activity/Day Center, 35 (24.1%) in Sheltered Workshop, and 32 (22.1%) in other places that may include staying at home or family business. A summary of fathers’ and mothers’ responses to Q46 are presented in Table 26.
Table 26

*Male and Female Children and Total Frequencies and Percents of Fathers’ and Mothers responses to Q46 in the Employment (EM) Scale*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 46: Where will your child MOST LIKELY work after completing high school?</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fathers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive Employment</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Activity/Day Center</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheltered Workshop</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mothers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive Employment</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Activity/Day Center</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheltered Workshop</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the descriptive question on the Postsecondary Education (PE) scale, “Which of the following education options would your child MOST LIKELY enter after high school?” 36 (24.8%) of fathers expected their child to attend Four Year College, 21 (14.5%) expected attendance in a Community College, 45 (31%) fathers expected their child to attend Vocational Training, and 43 (29.7%) expected their children not to attend a postsecondary setting. Thirty-nine (26.9%) mothers expected their child to attend Four Year College, 20 (13.8%) expected attendance in a Community College, 51 (35.2%) mothers expected their child to attend Vocational Training, and 35 (24.1%) expected their children not to attend a postsecondary setting. A summary of fathers’ and mothers’
responses to Q51 are presented in Table 27.

Table 27

| Male and Female Children and Total Frequencies and Percents of Fathers’ and Mothers responses to Q51 in the Postsecondary Education (PE) Scale |
|---------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| **Question 51:** Which of the following education options would your child MOST LIKELY enter after high school? | Male | Male | Female | Female | Total | Total |
| **Fathers** | | | | | | |
| 4-Year College | 20 22.5% | 16 28.6% | 36 24.8% | | | |
| Community College | 14 15.7% | 7 12.5% | 21 14.5% | | | |
| Vocational Training | 30 33.7% | 15 26.8% | 45 31.0% | | | |
| None | 25 28.1% | 18 32.1% | 43 29.7% | | | |
| **Mothers** | | | | | | |
| 4-Year College | 21 23.6% | 18 32.1% | 39 26.9% | | | |
| Community College | 13 14.6% | 7 12.5% | 20 13.8% | | | |
| Vocational Training | 34 38.2% | 17 30.4% | 51 35.2% | | | |
| None | 21 23.6% | 14 25.0% | 35 24.1% | | | |

For the descriptive question in the Residential and Daily Living (RL) scale, “Who will your child MOST LIKELY live with after finishing high school?” the majority of fathers 135 (93.1%) expected their child to live with their parents. Also, the same was found for mothers, 138 (95.2%) expected their child to live with their parents. A summary of fathers’ and mothers’ responses to Q56 are presented in Table 28.
Table 28

**Male and Female Children and Total Frequencies and Percents of Fathers’ and Mothers’ responses to Q56 in the Residential & Daily Living (RL) Scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 56: Who will your child MOST LIKELY live with after finishing high school?</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Parents</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>92.1%</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>93.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Sibling</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With a Family Relative</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Parents</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>94.1%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>96.4%</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Sibling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With a Family Relative</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the descriptive question on the Social Relationships (RL) scale, “Where will your child MOST LIKELY establish friendships after finishing high school?” the majority of fathers 73 (50.3%) expected their children to establish friendships within Family Relatives, 36 (24.8%) expected their children to establish friendships in an Educational Settings, 24 (16.6%) in a Workplace Setting, and 12 (8.3%) in a Recreational Setting. As for mothers, also the majority 76 (52.4%) expected their children to establish friendships within Family Relatives, 32 (22.1%) expected in an Educational Settings, 29 (20%) in a Workplace Setting, and 8 (5.5%) in a Recreational Setting. A summary of fathers’ and mothers’ responses to Q66 are presented in Table 29.
Table 29

*Male and Female Children and Total Frequencies and Percents of Fathers’ and Mothers responses to Q66 in the Social Relationships (SR) Scale*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 66: Where will your child MOST LIKELY establish friendships after finishing high school?</th>
<th>Male f</th>
<th>Male %</th>
<th>Female f</th>
<th>Female %</th>
<th>Total f</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fathers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Family Relatives</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At an Educational Setting</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At a Workplace Setting</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At a Recreational Setting</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Family Relatives</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At an Educational Setting</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At a Workplace Setting</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At a Recreational Setting</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Independent t-test for child gender differences**

Independent t-tests were also run to determine if differences existed between fathers’ overall expectations for male and female children and between mothers’ overall expectations for male and female children. No significant differences were found in fathers’ expectations for their male and female children on all three domains of the TDRWQ: Future Orientation (FO), Community Resources (CR), and Financial Independence (FI). There were also no significant differences found in mothers’ expectations for male and female children on all three domains of the TDRWQ: FO, CR, and FI. A summary of independent t-test results is presented in Table 30 for fathers and in Table 31 for mothers.
Table 30

*Independent t-test Fathers: Means, Standard Deviations, and p-value Comparing Male and Female Children on Transition Daily Rewards and Worries Questionnaire (TDRWQ)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Future Orientation (FO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>18.28</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>.157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>17.16</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Resources (CR)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>19.49</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>.781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>19.32</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Independence (FI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>16.60</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>17.16</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 31

Independent *t*-test Mothers: Means, Standard Deviations (SD), and *p*-value Comparing Male and Female Children on Transition Daily Rewards and Worries Questionnaire (TDRWQ)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Future Orientation (FO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>18.35</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>.299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>16.84</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Resources (CR)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>19.93</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>19.52</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Independence (FI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>17.36</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>.822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>17.61</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the PPTAQ, no significant differences were found in fathers’ aspirations for male and female children on all four scales of the PPTAQ: Employment (EM), Postsecondary Education (PE), Residential and Daily Living (RL), and Social Relationships (SR). There were also no significant differences found in mothers’ expectations for male and female children on all four scales of the PPTAQ. A summary of independent *t*-test results is presented in Table 32 for fathers and Table 33 for mothers.
Table 32

*Independent t-test Fathers: Means, Standard Deviations, and p-value Comparing Male and Female Children on Parent Perspectives on the Transition to Adulthood Questionnaire (PPTAQ)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment (EM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>10.76</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>10.70</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postsecondary Education (PE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>10.40</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>.607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>9.59</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential &amp; Daily Living (RL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>10.29</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>11.49</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>11.57</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 33

*Independent t-test Mothers: Means, Standard Deviations, and p-value Comparing Male and Female children on Parent Perspectives on the Transition to Adulthood Questionnaire PPTAQ*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment (EM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>10.97</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>10.25</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postsecondary Education (PE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>10.62</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>.926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>10.39</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential &amp; Daily Living (RL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>.576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>9.89</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>12.15</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>12.73</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of the Results**

The purpose of this study was to explore Kuwaiti fathers’ and mothers’ transition expectations and aspirations for their child with a disability. Preliminary analyses were reported to describe group differences in key demographic characteristics between fathers’ and mothers’ age, education level, and income and male and female children’s age and degree of disability.

Paired t-test analyses revealed some significant differences between fathers’ and mothers’ expectations and aspirations about transition outcomes for their child with a disability as measured by the three domains of the Transition Daily Rewards and Worries Questionnaire (TDRWQ) and the four scales of the Parent Perspectives on the Transition
to Adulthood Questionnaire (PPTAQ). Results indicated that mothers were more optimistic about their children’s financial independence than fathers, and mothers had higher aspirations for their child’s social relationships than fathers. There were no significant differences found between fathers’ and mothers’ expectations or aspirations for their male children on the TDRWQ and PPTAQ. However, there was a significant difference between fathers and mothers aspirations for their female children’s social relationships on the PPTAQ; mothers had higher aspirations than fathers for their female children’s social relationships.

Variables that were significantly correlated with each dependent variable were entered into a stepwise multiple regression analyses as possible predictors. The best predictors for fathers’ expectations on the TDRWQ included: child’s age, degree of child’s disability, and fathers’ education level. These variables together accounted for (17.5%) of the variance of fathers’ expectations for their children’s future orientation. Child’s age and degree of child’s disability accounted for (10.3%) of the variance of fathers’ expectations in the children’s community resources. On the PPTAQ, child’s age accounted for 3% of the variance of fathers’ aspirations for their children in employment and fathers’ education level accounted for (3.8%) of the variance of fathers’ aspirations for their children’s social relationships. The best predictors for mothers’ expectations on the TDRWQ included: mothers’ education level, degree of child’s disability, and child’s age. These variables accounted for (19.7%) of the variance of mothers’ expectations for their child’s future orientation and accounted for (21.2%) of the variance of mothers’ expectations for their child’s community resources. On the PPTAQ, mothers’ income and degree of child’s disability accounted for (14.3%) of variance of mothers’ aspirations for
their children’s employment, and the following variables: child’s age, mothers’ income, and degree of child’s disability accounted for (14.9%) of the variance of mothers’ aspirations for their children’s postsecondary education.

Additional analyses were run to determine the trend of fathers’ and mothers’ responses on the four descriptive questions on the PPTAQ. Common trends were found between fathers’ and mothers’ responses towards their expectations for their child’s transition outcomes in employment, postsecondary education, residential and daily living, and social relationships. Fathers and mothers appeared to have high aspirations for their children’s employment as the majority aspired that their child would work in competitive employment and many of them aspired for their children to enter a four-year college after completing high school. The majority of fathers and mothers had high aspirations for their children to live with them in the future and to establish friendships with family relatives. Finally, additional analyses was run indicating that there were no significant differences in parents’ expectations on the TDRWQ and in parents aspirations on the PPTAQ for their male and female children.
Chapter V

DISCUSSION

The present study examined the expectations and aspirations regarding transition outcomes for fathers and mothers of children with disabilities in Kuwait in the areas of future orientation, community resources, financial independence, employment, postsecondary education, residential and daily living, and social relationships.

Overall, it was found that, although fathers were older and reported higher income levels and a higher proportion of graduate education degrees than mothers, many of the fathers’ and mothers’ expectations and aspirations for their children with disabilities regarding transition outcomes were similar to each other. However, mothers had higher aspirations for their child’s social relationships than fathers, especially for their daughters. The best predictors for fathers’ and mothers’ expectations and aspirations for their children’s transition outcomes included, fathers’ education level, mothers’ education level, mothers’ income, child’s age, and degree of child’s disability. However, the best sets of predictors varied according to the domain in question. This chapter begins with a focus on each of these findings for both the Transition Daily Rewards and Worries Questionnaire (TDRWQ) and the Parent Perspectives on the Transition to Adulthood Questionnaire (PPTAQ), and is followed by sections on implications for practice and limitations of the study. The chapter concludes with suggestions for future research.
Parents’ Expectations as Indicated by their Responses to the Transition Daily Rewards and Worries Questionnaire (TDRWQ)

Of the 145 pairs of parents, the majority of fathers and mothers were optimistic about their children’s financial independence in the future on the Transition Daily Rewards and Worries Questionnaire (TDRWQ). However, there was a trend of borderline significance for mothers to be more optimistic than fathers for their child’s financial independence, especially for their sons. The results of this study indicated that the only significant negative correlate for the TDRWQ financial independence (FI) domain for fathers’ and mothers’ transition outcome expectations was fathers’ and mothers’ income. In both cases, income was significantly negatively correlated with positive expectations on the FI domain. This indicated that the lower the fathers’ and mothers’ income the more optimistic fathers and mothers were about their child’s financial independence. This may be due to the Kuwaiti government policy of life-long financial support for individuals with disabilities. The Kuwaiti government supports low-income families with a child with a disability financially as equally as families with high income. Families with high income may not be very optimistic for their child’s financial independence due to their need for continuous personal financial support that may surpass the Kuwaiti government financial support. Even though mothers in this study had lower income than fathers, results indicated that fathers and mothers with low income may be more optimistic about their child’s financial independence than families with high-income as they may be relying solely on the government’s support for basic financial needs for their children to make a living. It is worth mentioning that mothers were more optimistic than fathers for their child’s financial independence, even though in
the Kuwaiti culture the father is the primary caretaker of the family’s expenses and budget. Also, women that are not in the workforce and that do not have a source of income may be eligible for a stipend from the Kuwait Ministry of Social Affairs. A multiple regression was not run for (FI) since it did not meet the criterion of two or more independent variables that were significantly correlated with the domain score on the TDRWQ.

The majority of both fathers and mothers indicated that they had no concerns about their child’s financial stability in the future. They were not worried about their child’s income being inadequate. They were not afraid about their child depending on them forever nor were they worried that their child would never be self-supporting, and they were not concerned about their child’s ability to maintain a steady job. This may partly be due to the Kuwaiti government policy of life-long financial support, pensions, and incentives for individuals with disabilities. The Kuwait Public Authority for Disability Affairs (PADA) revises the value of financial allocations granted to individuals with disabilities every three years in order to make sure that the individual with a disability and his/her family are still eligible for these financial benefits (Act No. 8 for the year 2010).

The results of this study also identified the best predictors for fathers’ and mothers’ transition outcome expectations for the TDRWQ future orientation (FO) domain and community resources (CR) domain. The best set of predictors for both fathers’ and mothers’ expectations in the FO domain included the degree of child’s disability, child’s age, and fathers’ or mothers’ education level. These predictors were negatively correlated with the FO domain, which indicated that fathers and mothers were more optimistic about
their child’s future orientation when their child was younger, with less severe disability, and when fathers or mothers had lower education levels. Further, it was found that degree of child’s disability accounted for the most variance (9.7%) for future orientation by fathers making it the strongest predictor for fathers’ expectations for their child’s future orientation. Fathers may have identified their child’s future orientation based on the degree of their child’s disability being mild, moderate, or severe. Even though the transition period carries with it many changes that affect the daily lives of young individuals with disabilities and their families (Neece et al., 2009) both, fathers and mothers, had similar expectations about their child’s future orientation in terms of being optimistic about their child having a fulfilled future and optimistic about adequate social activities.

The best predictors for the TDRWQ community resources (CR) domain for fathers were child’s age and degree of child’s disability. These predictors were negatively correlated with CR domain, which indicated that fathers were more optimistic about the community resources provided for their children, as their child was younger and with a less severe disability. It was found that the child’s age alone accounted for the most variance (7.0%) of the full model of community resources. This may be helpful in understanding the community resources available for adults with disabilities in Kuwait. Fathers may have based their expectations on their own knowledge of the availability of resources for adults in the community based solely on their child’s age and the resources that their young children are currently involved in. Many parents are members in disability organizations and associations, even though they may not be active. Some of the organizations were included in this study, such as the Kuwaiti Society for Guardians
of the Disabled (KSGD) and Al-Kharafi Activity Kids Center. Other available active resources may include, Kuwait Society for the Handicapped, Kuwait Down Syndrome Society, Kuwait Center for Autism, Center for Child Evaluation and Teaching, Kuwait Society for Learning Differences, Training Gate International, and Abeer2.

Similarly, the best predictor for the TDRWQ community resources (CR) for mothers was child’s age, degree of child’s disability, and with an addition of mothers’ education level. These predictors were negatively correlated with CR domain, which indicated that mothers were more optimistic about the availability of community resources for their children when their child had a less severe disability. Similar to fathers, child’s age alone accounted for the most variance (10%) of the model for mothers. Mothers might be more concerned about the availability of resources in their community based on their child’s age since Kuwaiti mothers carry more of the day to day responsibilities in helping their child with school related activities making them more aware than fathers about the learning challenges that the child may encounter as they grow up (AlAzemi, 2010). This may also be explained by the mothers’ involvement in her child’s life as having a better insight of resources from their daily interactions in the school and with other mothers in the community. Both, father and mothers, had similar expectations in terms of the availability of resources in their community in terms of school preparing their children for independent living, adequate employment placement services, and resources available in the community.
Parent Aspirations as Indicated by their Responses on the Parent Perspectives on the Transition to Adulthood Questionnaire (PPTAQ)

There were no significant differences between fathers and mothers aspirations on the majority of scales of the Parent Perspectives on the Transition to Adulthood Questionnaire (PPTAQ). Both fathers and mothers had similar aspirations for their children’s employment, postsecondary education, and residential and daily living transition outcomes. However, mothers had higher aspirations about their children’s social relationships than fathers. When responses for male and female children were looked at separately, mothers had higher aspirations than fathers about their female children’s social relationships, but there was no significant difference for male children. It was also found that the only predictor for fathers’ aspirations for their child’s social relationship was fathers’ education level. While there were no significant predictors for mothers on the social relationships scale.

Even though parents’ involvement rate appeared not to be very high, yet mothers were more involved in helping their children establish friendships than fathers were. Parents’ involvement rate was identified by the fathers’ and mothers’ responses to “Currently, how involved are you in helping your child make friends?” and “After your child finishes high school, how involved do you plan to be in helping your child make friends?” Both fathers and mothers had answers concentrated in having little or no involvement in helping their child establish friendships. Unlike previously reported studies (Chambers et al., 2004; Whitney-Thomas & Hanley-Maxwell, 1996), parents generally were “extremely” or “very” concerned about their child’s social life after high school. According to Chambers et al. (2004), this might be related to parents’ knowledge
regarding social networks as they plan for the transition period. Social relationships may include having friends without disabilities, concerns about social life after transitioning out of high school, parent’s current and future involvement in helping their child making friends, importance of holding a job to establish friendships, and parents involvement in talking to their child about his or her friends.

The majority of fathers (68.3%) and mothers (70.3%) reported that it is “extremely” important for their child to have a paid job after exiting high school. However, 119 (82.1%) of fathers and 123 (84.8%) of mothers indicated that they know “nothing” or “not much” about job options for individuals with disabilities based on their responses to “How much do you know about job options for people with disabilities?” This finding is similar to Chambers et al. (2004) findings, but the difference is in parents’ responses to their expected work setting for their children. In the Chambers et al. (2004) study, it was reported that the majority of the parents expected their children to be in segregated work settings, such as sheltered workshops, in order to be in a protected environment. Interestingly, a good number of fathers (36.6%) and mothers (29%) in the present study had high aspirations for their children to work in competitive employment, even though they have no knowledge of job availabilities in Kuwait for individuals with disabilities. Fathers and mothers second most preferred work setting was a work activity/day center, followed by sheltered workshops. This finding is similar to Blue-Banning, Turnbull, and Pereira (2002). In the Blue-Banning et al. (2002) study, the majority of Hispanic parents were members of family support groups which may have given them the opportunity to have an outlook on potential job options for their children, unlike participants in this study that had no knowledge of potential job options.
Furthermore, about half of the fathers and mothers, found it “extremely” important for their child to work alongside individuals without disabilities. Chambers et al. (2004) explained this low phenomenon as a lack of awareness towards supported employment, which allows individuals with more significant disabilities to work in integrated employment settings with employees without disabilities.

The results of this study indicated that the only significant predictor for fathers’ transition outcome aspirations for employment (EM) on the PPTAQ was child’s age, which accounted for only (3%) of the variance. This predictor was significantly negatively correlated with EM, which indicated that fathers had higher aspirations for their children’s employment outcomes, if their child was younger. The best predictors for mothers’ employment transition outcome expectations were mothers’ income and degree of child’s disability, which accounted for (14%) of the variance, while degree of child’s disability alone accounted for (8%) of the variance making it the strongest predictor. These predictors were significantly negatively correlated with EM, which indicated that mothers had higher aspirations when the mothers had lower income and the degree of child’s disability was less severe. These differences in predictors for fathers and mothers aspirations for their child’s employment transition outcomes may be due to the different roles that fathers and mothers play in their children’s life. As mentioned earlier, in general, Kuwaiti mothers spend more time with their children during the day than fathers do (AlAzemi, 2010), and this may have led to one of the predictors for mothers to be the child’s degree of disability. Fathers’ may not have an insight as much as the mothers do about the child’s abilities and skills, and therefore, age is the only predictor that fathers’ expectations relies on towards future employment.
As for postsecondary education transition outcomes, 81 (55.9%) of fathers and 91 (62.8%) of mothers found it to be “extremely” important for their child to participate in postsecondary education after exiting high school based on their responses to “How important is it to your child’s future that he or she participates in education after high school?” Nevertheless, When asked “How much do you know about education opportunities after high school for people with disabilities?” 122 (84%) of fathers and 116 (80%) of mothers had no knowledge or little knowledge about postsecondary education opportunities after high school for individuals with disabilities. This finding is similar to the findings reported by Chambers et al. (2004), and it is explained that this may be a result in respondents’ expectation that their child will not have the opportunity to attend a four-year or community college as a future postsecondary outcome. However, in this present study, fathers and mothers held their highest aspirations for their child’s postsecondary education option in Vocational training. Fathers held their second highest aspiration for their child not to attend a postsecondary setting, while mothers held their second highest aspiration for their child to attend a four-year college. This may be related to the mothers’ role with her child’s care taking, and the fathers’ lack of involvement in the education of their children (Alazemi, 2010). Also, aligned with Chambers et al. (2004) findings, (50.4%) of fathers and (55.2%) of mothers do not have a four-year college degree (bachelors) in this study, instead they indicated having a diploma (associate degree), high school degree or below credentials. This educational aspect may have limited the parents’ expectations and aspirations for their child’s potential post-secondary education transition outcome.
There were no significant predictors for fathers’ aspirations for their child’s postsecondary education. However, there were three predictors for mothers’ aspirations towards their child’s postsecondary education. Child’s age, mothers’ income, and degree of child’s disability were found to play a role in mothers’ aspirations in postsecondary education accounting for (15%) of the regression analysis. Child’s age alone accounted for (7%) of the variance, making it the strongest predictor, which may seem logical in that many parents plan for their children’s postsecondary education as the child develops in age. Taking into account the child’s age and degree of child’s disabilities, mothers may have a better outlook on their child’s postsecondary education as they follow the progress of the child’s academic track. Mothers’ demands regarding their child may include school visits and attending meetings, working with the child on homework and life skills, and caretaking of the child. In another study, it was found that Kuwaiti mothers were more involved in supporting their child than Kuwaiti fathers (AlAzemi, 2010). The results of the present study indicated that child’s age, degree of child’s disability, and mothers’ income were significantly negatively correlated with mothers’ aspirations about their child’s postsecondary education. Therefore, mothers had higher aspirations for their child’s postsecondary education transition outcomes when their child was younger and had less severe disability and mothers’ income was lower.

It is noteworthy that there was an apparent pattern as a good number of fathers (45.5%) and mothers (51%) responded that it is extremely important for their child to have a job to establish friendships when asked, “How important is having a job to helping your child establish friendships?” Interestingly, a small number of fathers (16.6%) and mothers (20%) expected their children to establish friendships in a workplace setting.
While the majority expected their children to establish friendships within family relatives. This perspective may be due to the family involvement in the Kuwaiti culture as many children spend more time with family relatives than friends as cultural obligations permits for several family gatherings over a week.

The only significant predictor for fathers’ expectations for transition outcomes in social relationships (SR) was fathers’ education level, which accounted for only (3.8%) of the variance. This predictor was significantly negatively correlated with SR, which indicated that fathers had high aspirations for their child’s social relationships when they had a lower education level. As was mentioned earlier, fathers who held a bachelors degree were (42.8%), and the majority’s monthly income was $3,600-$10,800 (62.8%). In addition, all individuals with disabilities receive financial and educational benefits from the Kuwait PADA that helps many parents with their children’s needs. Fathers’ with higher education degree who work at a stable government or private sector job may be more aware of their children’s social relationships may be due to the time they spend with their children after work especially that they may not be as restricted to financial obligations as fathers with lower education level and jobs that pay less. Fathers with a high school degree or below were (34.5%) of the fathers’ sample, and those that made less than $3,600 a month were (22.1%).

As for mothers, the only significant negative correlation with mothers’ aspirations in the social relationship (SR) domain included mothers’ income. Income was significantly negatively correlated with SR, which indicated that mothers had higher aspirations for their child’s social relationships when they had a lower income. A multiple regression was not run for social relationships for mothers since it did not meet
the criterion that two or more independent variables were significantly correlated with the domain of the PPTAQ.

Although some of the fathers’ and mothers’ responses to the employment (EM), postsecondary education (PE) and social relationships (SR) items were sometimes inconsistent when describing their aspirations as compared with their knowledge of the availability of resources, there appeared to be a consistency in the residential and daily living (RL) items. Almost all fathers (93.1%) and mothers (95.2%) expected their children to live with them as they transition to adulthood. This finding was similar to (Chambers et al., 2004; Blue-Banning et al., 2002) where the majority of parents expected their children to live with them after they exited high school. When parents were asked about the importance of their child living independently outside the family home after finishing high school, the majority of fathers (61.4%) and mothers (69.7%) in this study responded, as it is not important at all. On the other hand, in the Chambers et al. (2004) study parents envisioned their children to live independently. According to the Kuwait Law no. 8 of 2010, article 25, families are obliged to provide care to their family member with a disability. Article 25 stated “Providing care for people with disabilities shall be undertaken by the mother, then the father, the husband or wife depending on the circumstances.” Article 25, described the line of hierarchy of care takers if the parents are not able to provide care, and it includes the person, who is a family relative that is legally in charge and is residing in Kuwait, and it includes the children, the brothers, and if it was not agreed between them then the Kuwait PADA will decide the residence setting and it may be in a social care center. As part of the Kuwaiti culture, almost the majority of
adults reside in their parent’s homes and in many cases married adult children will continue to live in their parents’ homes.

An overarching perspective from this study is a general trend of parents having higher expectations and aspirations towards their child’s adulthood transition outcomes when the parents are younger in age, with lower income and education level and as the child is younger with a less severe disability.

**Implications for Practice**

Findings of the present study demonstrated that parents of children with disabilities have a range of perspectives regarding their children’s transition outcomes. Although findings yielded many similarities between fathers’ and mothers’ expectations and aspirations, there were also differences in some areas. Parents’ high expectations and aspirations for employment, postsecondary education, and social relationships were a promising theme as their children transition to adulthood.

The main findings of this study are important and valuable to the field because they provide a basis for transition services to be implemented in Kuwait in terms of policy and practice. Understanding parents’ needs, roles, and goals through their expectations and aspirations can ultimately help school professionals and government officials to provide young individuals with disabilities preparation tools as they transition to adulthood. Parents are vital in the process of transition as they may have an important role in decision making and supporting their children. Policymakers could consider results and information reported in this study as they introduce the transition concept into the field and recognize the importance of it as it may direct the individual with a disability, their families, and society as a whole to the future roles of young adults with
disabilities. As the Kuwaiti law mandates that individuals with disabilities have the right
to education and employment, a step forward would be to include a transition article in
the Kuwaiti law to guarantee the practice of preparation and planning of young
adolescents before exiting the school system by recognizing transition.

Further, notable findings of differences between parents’ expectations and
aspirations and parents’ lack of knowledge of employment and postsecondary education
may have further implications towards policy practice. Lack of knowledge on the
parent’s part affects the child’s transition process negatively (Hitchings, Luzzo, Ristow,
Horvath, Retish, & Tanners, 2001). Parents’ should be provided with adequate
information on job and postsecondary opportunities available for individuals with
disabilities in Kuwait in order for the parents to have aligned goals with the availability
of resources in their society. In addition, providing them with information regarding
available future options, entitlements, and their child’s rights as mandated by the Kuwaiti
law. The results of this study have provided a framework for further research in the area
of transition in Kuwait, in which the concept is not recognized and therefore many
individuals with disabilities fall behind as they exit the school system and have no where
to go except to stay at home.

Gaining information from fathers and mothers about their expectations for their
children is valuable, especially in understanding the family context and in enriching the
literature of transition that may help in providing positive transition outcomes (Conti-
Ramsden, Botting, & Durkin, 2008). Also, as young adolescents exit high school many of
their future transition options are influenced by their family context, especially the child’s
parents. The preparation process for children transitioning to adulthood is a shared

As supported by previous studies (Grigal & Neubert, 2004; Kraemer et al., 2003; Kraemer & Blacher, 2001; Morningstar et al., 1995) it would be beneficial to create a collaborative team consisting of the individual with a disability, family, school, and service providers in order to ensure a smooth transition and contributes to expanding youths’ future opportunities by achieving successful transition outcomes for postsecondary education and/or employment.

**Limitations of the Study**

There are limitations to this study. First, the sample may not represent the broader range of parents of children with disabilities in Kuwait as subjects were selected from five defined sites. In addition, participants were not evenly selected from the five sites. Also, it is worth mentioning that all sites are considered to represent the most advanced educational and recreational settings in Kuwait, especially the schools selected. They are private special education schools that are bilingual and utilize westernized curriculums. Therefore, many parents may have had a positive experience when dealing with the school or the organizations as they may have access to more resources than parents of children in the public school system or who are not members of any organizations. Second, despite the sample including 145 pairs of parents, participation was on a voluntary basis. Also, only two-parent families were included in the study. Even though the consent forms guaranteed confidentiality and anonymity, many parents did not agree to participate.
Although the instruments went through an extensive process of translation from English to Arabic, some items might have not been applicable to the Kuwaiti culture due to the context of the item or the way it was translated. In other words some items may have been lost in translation. Most domains had reliable or close to reliable Cronbach Alphas. However, the Family Relations domain on the Transition Daily Rewards and Worries Questionnaire (TDRWQ) had to be dropped from the main analyses due to a very low reliability on the Arabic translated version. It was decided to drop the domain in order to gain validity for the Arabic translated instrument of the TDRWQ. Furthermore, items included in the residential and daily living domain on the Parent Perspectives on the Transition to Adulthood Questionnaire (PPTAQ) were flagged by many parents as not being culturally appropriate in Kuwait, as the majority of adult children continue to live at home as adults, especially individuals with disabilities who are more vulnerable to live with their parents for the rest of their lives. This aspect has to be taken into consideration especially for future research. Questions regarding residential living should be tailored to the living style of the Kuwaiti culture.

As for the quantitative method used in this study in utilizing a survey, additional qualitative information about parents’ experiences, which may include observations, focus groups, interviews, etc. could have been beneficial to the research database, especially because transition is an unknown concept in Kuwait and many parents struggle with postsecondary options as their children exit the school system. Based on the method used in this study, which is based on an individual construct of father’s and mothers’ expectations and aspirations for their children’s future, further research must be focused on multiple constructs that may include the involvement of the individual with a
disability, school professionals, postsecondary education professionals, government officials, employers, and siblings to see if those other perspectives converge. This may lead to a better understanding of the needs and missing links to a more efficient transition process from adolescents to adulthood with a common understanding among all individuals and sectors involved.

Lastly, due to the small sample of this study, it may not be feasible to draw strong conclusions based on the results. This study represented a number of individuals with different types of disabilities; future research should focus on specific disabilities in order to understand the differences in parents needs for individuals with an intellectual disability and physical disability. Parents’ expectations and aspirations might differ for children without disabilities; it would be worthwhile for future research to investigate and see differences or similarities between parents of children with disabilities and parents of children without disabilities.

This study may be looked at as a step forward towards more research based studies and interventions in exploring the transition to adulthood concept in the context of the Kuwaiti society and may be an addition to the literature of the disabilities studies. This study may also add to the knowledge of policymakers and parents themselves in understanding the needs and services that need to be in place to help young individuals transition to adulthood. This study echoed some of the pre-existing themes in the western literature, and has shown that there are many barriers to the parents’ knowledge of transition outcomes, which may alleviate the urgent need for ongoing research and law implementation in the area of transition and adulthood in Kuwait.
Implications for Future Research

While there is considerable research on transition in the United States, there is little or no research available in specifically exploring the transition of individuals with disabilities to adulthood in Kuwait and the Gulf region. As a result, there is considerable need for future research in the area of transition, and specifically in the areas of postsecondary education and employment.

Since previous studies have shown a lack of a research database in the field of disability in Kuwait, it is important to initiate and encourage more research and evidence-based studies on special education, individuals with disabilities, families of those individuals, school professionals, program evaluations and interventions, and adulthood experiences. Also, it is essential to expand the research on the collaboration of the school and other professional entities with the parents and the individual with a disability in ensuring the active participation of people with disabilities in the Kuwaiti society.

Furthermore, additional research should be carried out in all areas that concern the disability field and should be explored extensively to have a better understanding of improving the lives and status of individuals with disabilities in their society. Factors that should be explored in depth may be in the context of a social, cultural, religious, environmental, or political explorations. The utilization of both quantitative and qualitative types of research may be necessary for this type of exploration to gain information that will add to the literature.

Future studies may consider sampling a larger group of people that is more representative and including more sites in all school districts including private and public special education schools. A larger sample would allow additional analyses that could
help in understanding common trends among a diverse group of people instead of a focus on a sub group that may have similar privileges. Sampling a larger group may also reveal additional predictors to help understand the relationships between variables.

Lastly, future research should consider and take into account the area of transition as a concrete concept that needs to be understood, studied, and potentially be mandated by the Kuwaiti law to ensure that young individuals have the support and preparation in planning to transition to adulthood before exiting the school system. By implementing transition laws in the Kuwaiti society, there will be a shared responsibility among the schools, government officials, parents, individual with a disability, and postsecondary settings and employers to collaborate in planning and setting future goals that will help individuals with disabilities earn their equality as citizens as they transition smoothly to adulthood.
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Appendix A

Dear Parent,

My name is Abrar Al-Jazzaf. I am a doctoral student at Teachers College, Columbia University, in the United States of America. I am conducting a research study on Kuwaiti parents’ expectations towards postsecondary transition outcomes of their child with a disability in Kuwait. The purpose of this research study is to understand the needs of the parents of young individuals with disabilities transitioning from school to adulthood by identifying the parents’ expectations and attitudes towards their children future life as they become adults. This will thus lead to the initiation of seeking out support services and guidance from agencies and the government sectors and creating parent education support programs in Kuwait.

All information provided in this questionnaire will remain confidential and personal identification is not required for the respondent.

The questionnaire will approximately take (20-30 minutes) to complete. It is important to answer the questions to the best of your ability. Please read the instructions carefully and answer or mark the most appropriate options.

Please, do not hesitate to ask for more information on this research study if needed. I really appreciate your participation in this study. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Abrar Al-Jazzaf
Appendix B

(Participation in this study is voluntary)

SURVEY-ENGLISH

Participant #: _________________

*Child = refers to male or female.

A. Background Information

1. Gender:
   - Female
   - Male

2. What is your relationship to the child with a disability:
   - Mother
   - Father
   - Other: _______

3. My age: _______

4. Marital Status:
   - Married
   - Divorced
   - Separated
5. **Education Level:**

- High School Degree or below
- Diploma Degree
- Bachelors Degree
- Masters Degree
- Doctoral Degree

6. **What is your occupation?**

__________________________

7. **Monthly Income?**

- Less than KD 1,000
- KD 1,000- KD 3,000
- KD 3,000- KD 5,000
- More than KD 5,000

8. **In which province do you live?**

- Al-Asimah
- Al-Farwaniyah
- Al-Jahra
- Al-Ahmadi
- Mubarak Al-Kabeer
- Hawalli

9. **What is the gender of your child with a disability?**

- Female
- Male
10. What is the age of your child with a disability?

____________________________________

11. What is your child’s disability?
   ○ Intellectual Disability
   ○ Learning Disability
   ○ Visual Impairment/Blindness
   ○ Hearing Impairment/Deafness
   ○ Autism
   ○ Physical Disability
   ○ Emotional and Behavior Disturbance
   ○ Multiple Disabilities
   ○ Other: ________________________________

12. Specific diagnosis:

____________________________________________________________

13. Degree of disability:
   ○ Mild
   ○ Moderate
   ○ Severe

14. Source of disability diagnosis:

____________________________________________________________

15. Your child attends:
   ○ Public School
   ○ Public Special Education School
   ○ Private School
   ○ Private Special Education School
   ○ Other: ________________________________
16. Specify the name of the school your child attends:

_________________________________________________________

17. How many children do you have?

_______

18. Among your children, how many of them are with a disability?

_______

19. What is the birth order of your child with a disability among his/her siblings?

______________
### B. Transition Daily Rewards and Worries Questionnaire (TDRWQ)

Instruction: Please respond to all of the following statements by marking the most appropriate response. While you may not find a response that exactly states your feelings, please mark the one response that comes closest to describing how you feel. Please select one answer option.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20. I am excited by the prospects for my child’s future.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I feel pleased that my child’s school program is good preparation for employment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I believe that there are a lot of resources available in my child’s community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I am confident that _____ will be O.K. even after I die.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. _____ will lead a fulfilled life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I am concerned about my child’s financial stability in the future.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. There are adequate job placement services available for _____</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I am disappointed that ______ prefers friends over family.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I worry that ______’s income will be inadequate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I am afraid that my child will depend on me forever.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. I am optimistic that my child will have adequate social activities in the future.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. I feel good because ______ enjoys family activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. I worry that _____ will never be self-supporting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. I am optimistic about my child’s future.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. I am pleased that _____’s community has adequate transportation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. I am concerned about _____’s ability to maintain a steady job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. I feel that school programs have not adequately prepared my child for independent living.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. I am happy with the job preparation available to my son/daughter.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. I am sad that my child is missing out on important family interactions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. I am optimistic about my child’s adjustment to living outside the home.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. _____’s education has been excellent preparation for community living.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Parent Perspectives on the Transition to Adulthood Questionnaire (PPTAQ)

Instruction: While you may not find a response that exactly states your feelings, please mark the one response that comes closest to describing how you feel. Please select one answer option.

41. How important is it for your child to have a paid job AFTER he or she finishes high school?

- Extremely
- Very
- Somewhat
- Not at All

42. How important is it that your child work alongside people WITHOUT disabilities?

- Extremely
- Very
- Somewhat
- Not at All

43. How involved will you be in assisting and supporting your child to FIND and CHOOSE a job after he or she finishes high school?

- Extremely
- Very
- Somewhat
- Not at All
44. How involved will you be in assisting and supporting your child to KEEP a job after he or she finishes high school?

- Extremely
- Very
- Somewhat
- Not at All

45. How much do you know about job options for people with disabilities?

- A Lot
- Some
- Not Much
- Nothing

46. Where will your child MOST LIKELY work after completing high school?

- Work Activity or Day Center
- Sheltered Workshop
- Competitive Employment
- Other ______________________

47. How often do you talk to your child about his or her job interests?

- Daily
- About Once a Month
- A Few Times a Year
- Never
48. How much do you know about education opportunities after high school for people with disabilities?

○ A Lot
○ Some
○ Not Much
○ Nothing

49. How important is it to your child's future that he or she participates in education after high school?

○ Extremely
○ Very
○ Somewhat
○ Not at All

50. How important is it that your child continues in education after high school alongside people WITHOUT disabilities?

○ Extremely
○ Very
○ Somewhat
○ Not at All

51. Which of the following education options would your child MOST LIKELY enter after high school?

○ 4-Year College
○ Community College
○ Vocational Training
○ None
52. How involved are you in your child's preparation for education after high school?

- Extremely
- Very
- Somewhat
- Not at All

53. If your child were to continue in education after high school, how involved would you be in providing your child with educational support?

- Extremely
- Very
- Somewhat
- Not at All

54. How often do you talk to your child about his or her desire to participate in education after high school?

- Daily
- About Once a Month
- A Few Times a Year
- Never

55. How much do you know about living options for people with disabilities?

- A lot
- Some
- Not Much
- Nothing
56. Who will your child MOST LIKELY live with after finishing high school?
- With parents
- With Sibling
- With a family relative
- With Personal Assistant
- Alone
- Other ______________________

57. How involved will you be in deciding where your child will live after high school?
- Extremely
- Very
- Somewhat
- Not at all

58. How involved will you be in supporting your child’s daily activities AFTER he or she finishes high school?
- Extremely
- Very
- Somewhat
- Not at all

59. How important is that your child continues to live with his or her parents after finishing high school?
- Extremely
- Very
- Somewhat
- Not at all
60. How important is it to your child’s future that he or she lives independently outside the family’s home after finishing high school?

- Extremely
- Very
- Somewhat
- Not at all

61. How often do you talk to your child about living options for after high school?

- Daily
- About Once a Month
- A Few Times a Year
- Never

62. How important is it for your child to have friends WITHOUT disabilities?

- Extremely
- Very
- Somewhat
- Not at all

63. How concerned are you about your child’s social life AFTER high school?

- Extremely
- Very
- Somewhat
- Not at all
64. CURRENTLY, how involved are you in helping your child make friends?

- Extremely
- Very
- Somewhat
- Not at all

65. AFTER your child finishes high school, how involved do you plan to be in helping your child make friends?

- Extremely
- Very
- Somewhat
- Not at all

66. Where will your child MOST LIKELY establish friendships after finishing high school?

- Within his/her family members
- At an educational setting
- At a recreational setting
- At a workplace setting
- Other places: ______________________

67. How important is having a job to helping your child establish friendships?

- Extremely
- Very
- Somewhat
- Not at All
68. How often do you talk to your child about his or her friends?

- Daily
- About Once a Month
- A Few Times a Year
- Never