

COMPARISON OF THOUGHTS IN TEACHERS AND PARENTS ON  
STUDENT/PARENT INVOLVEMENT IN INDIVIDUALIZED TRANSITION  
SUPPORT PLANS (STUDY 5)

Earlier in this chapter, the thoughts of teachers at Japanese special high schools for students with intellectual disabilities and the thoughts of parents were examined. As Chapter 3 (Study 2) identified, teachers and parents seemed to have similar thoughts although not completely the same. If the differences in thoughts of teachers and parents can be clarified, it may lead to helpful suggestions for future practice.

**Purpose**

The purpose of Study 5 is to clarify the differences in thoughts between special high school teachers and parents of students with intellectual disabilities concerning the amount of student and parent involvement needed in individualized transition support plans and career counseling meeting.

**Method**

***Participants and Sampling***

The participating teachers in Study 5 were the same as

in Study 3 and the participating parents were the same as for Study 4. To see the method of sampling, please see the corresponding section in Study 3 and 4.

#### *Development of Questionnaire, Procedures and Data Collection*

Please see the corresponding sections in Study 3 and 4.

#### *Data Analysis*

For most questions in the questionnaire, respondents were asked to check  if they thought it was "needed"; a maximum of 3 sub-items could be checked as , "very needed", and unmarked sub-items were processed as "not needed."

Contingency tables were developed for the chi-square test to compare teachers and parents on the 25 questions depending on their characteristics. The data was further examined by the residual analysis. The independent variables were the position either as a teacher or a parent, and the dependent variables were all the sub-items in the questionnaire.

### **Results**

#### *Differences in Thoughts of Individualized Transition Support Plans*

The contingency tables of 3×2 for all the questions'

sub-items and their positions as either a teacher or a parent were examined by using the chi-square test and further examined by residual analysis. There were 9 sub-items that demonstrated significance at the .01 level regarding the individualized transition support plans: (a) students' hopes for the individualized transition support plans ( $\chi^2 = 13.01$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $p<.01$ ); (b) post-secondary settings in the individualized transition support plans ( $\chi^2 = 11.3$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $p<.01$ ); (c) recreation/leisure in the individualized transition support plans ( $\chi^2 = 19.4$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $p<.01$ ); (d) medical care/health in the individualized transition support plans ( $\chi^2 = 18.6$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $p<.01$ ); (e) evaluation from the job training for future goal setting ( $\chi^2 = 11.4$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $p<.01$ ); (f) students' hopes for the future as the reference for goal setting ( $\chi^2 = 17.2$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $p<.01$ ); (g) likes and dislikes as the reference for goal setting ( $\chi^2 = 9.8$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $p<.01$ ); (h) using questionnaires to ask for student/parent input to the plans ( $\chi^2 = 16.8$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $p<.01$ ); and (i) confirming student/parent consent for the plan by providing the plans as they are ( $\chi^2 = 18.8$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $p<.01$ ). Compared to parents, teachers thought students' hopes were 'very needed' (Table 4.33), and that post-secondary setting and medical care/health were 'needed' as domains in the individualized transition plans (Tables 4.34 & 4.35). Parents thought that

Table 4.33. Respondents and Students' Hopes in the Individualized Transition Support Plans.

		Students' Hopes in the Individualized Transition Support Plans			
		not needed	needed	very needed	total
Respondents	Teachers	2 (5.8) -2.3 *	46 (53.6) -2.1 *	53 (41.6) 3.2 **	101
	Parents	10 (6.2) 2.3 *	65 (57.4) 2.1 *	33 (44.4) -3.2 **	108
total		12	111	86	209

*Note.* Numbers in left of the parenthesis are observed values in the questionnaire answers.

Numbers in parenthesis are expected values and the numbers below those are adjusted residuals.

\*\*  $p < .01$ , \*  $p < .05$ , †  $p < .10$  +/- significance/significant tendencies as results of residual analysis

Table 4.34. Respondents and Post-Secondary Settings in the Individualized Transition Support Plans.

		Post-Secondary in the Individualized Transition Support Plans			
		not needed	needed	very needed	total
Respondents	Teachers	25 (36.2)	67 (55.6)	9 (9.2)	101
		-3.2 **	3.2 **	-0.1	
	Parents	50 (38.8)	48 (59.4)	10 (9.8)	108
		3.2 **	-3.2 **	0.1	
total		75	115	19	209

*Note.* Numbers in left of the parenthesis are observed values in the questionnaire answers.

Numbers in parenthesis are expected values and the numbers below those are adjusted residuals.

\*\* p<.01, \* p<.05, † p<.10 +/- significance/significant tendencies as results of residual analysis

Table 4.35. Respondents and Medical Care/Health in the Individualized Transition Support Plans.

		Medical Care/Health in the Individualized Transition Support Plans			
		not needed	needed	very needed	total
Respondents	Teachers	26 (41.0) -4.2 **	69 (54.1) 4.1 **	6 (5.8) 0.1	101
	Parents	59 (43.9) 4.2 **	43 (57.9) -4.1 **	6 (6.2) -0.1	108
total		85	112	12	209

*Note.* Numbers in left of the parenthesis are observed values in the questionnaire answers.

Numbers in parenthesis are expected values and the numbers below those are adjusted residuals.

\*\* p<.01, \* p<.05, † p<.10 +/- significance/significant tendencies as results of residual analysis

recreation/leisure (Table 4.36) and students' hopes (Table 4.33) were needed in the individualized transition support plans. Compared to the parents, teachers tended to think that evaluation in job-training (Table 4.37), students' hopes for the future (Table 4.38), and students' likes and dislikes (Table 4.39) should be referred to for the students' future goal setting. Unlike parents, teachers thought questionnaires were 'very needed' and 'needed' in order to input students' and parents' hopes into the transition plans (Table 4.40), although parents thought receiving the plans as they were was 'very needed' and 'needed' compared to the teachers (Table 4.41).

There were 5 sub-items that demonstrated significance at .05 level: (a) goals and objectives for employment in the individualized transition support plans ( $\chi^2 = 8.7$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $p<.05$ ); (b) students as responsible persons for their future goal setting ( $\chi^2 = 8.2$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $p<.05$ ); (c) parents as responsible persons for the goal setting ( $\chi^2 = 8.4$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $p<.05$ ); (d) parents' hopes for the students' future referenced for the goal setting ( $\chi^2 = 6.5$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $p<.05$ ); and (e) evaluation in daily school life for the goal setting ( $\chi^2 = 6.9$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $p<.05$ ). Compared to parents, teachers thought goals for employment were needed as a domain in individualized transition support plans (Table 4.42), looking at daily school life was the best way to evaluate students (Table 4.43), and that it was 'very needed' for students be responsible for the goal setting (Table 4.44).

Table 4.36. Respondents and Recreation/Leisure in the Individualized Transition Support Plans.

		Recreation/Leisure in the Individualized Transition Support Plans			
		not needed	needed	very needed	total
Respondents	Teachers	33 (44.5) -3.2 **	66 (50.7) 4.2 **	2 (5.8) -2.3 *	101
	Parents	59 (47.5) 3.2 **	39 (54.3) -4.2 **	10 (6.2) 2.3 *	108
total		92	105	12	209

Note. Numbers in left of the parenthesis are observed values in the questionnaire answers.

Numbers in parenthesis are expected values and the numbers below those are adjusted residuals.

\*\* p<.01, \*p<.05, † p<.10 +/- significance/significant tendencies as results of residual analysis

Table 4.37. Respondents and Evaluation at Job Training as Reference for the Goal Setting

		Evaluation at Job Training as Reference for the Goal Setting			
		not needed	needed	very needed	total
Respondents	Teachers	13 (21.2) -2.8 **	65 (63.3) 0.5	23 (16.4) 2.5 *	101
	Parents	31 (22.7) 2.8 **	66 (67.7) -0.5	11 (17.6) -2.5 *	108
total		33	131	34	209

*Note.* Numbers in left of the parenthesis are observed values in the questionnaire answers.

Numbers in parenthesis are expected values and the numbers below those are adjusted residuals.

\*\* p<.01, \* p<.05, † p<.10 +/- significance/significant tendencies as results of residual analysis

Table 4.38. Respondents and Students' Hopes for the Future as Reference for the Goal Setting.

		Students' Hopes for the Future as Reference for the Goal Setting			
		not needed	needed	very needed	total
Respondents	Teachers	6 (15.9) -3.8 **	50 (49.8) 0.1	45 (35.3) 2.8 **	101
	Parents	27 (17.0) 3.8 **	53 (53.2) -0.1	28 (37.7) -2.8 **	108
total		33	103	73	209

*Note.* Numbers in left of the parenthesis are observed values in the questionnaire answers.

Numbers in parenthesis are expected values and the numbers below those are adjusted residuals.

\*\* p<.01, \* p<.05, † p<.10 +/- — significance/significant tendencies as results of residual analysis

Table 4.39. Respondents and Students' Likes and Dislikes as Reference for the Goal Setting.

		Students' Likes/Dislikes as Reference for the Goal Setting			
		not needed	needed	very needed	total
Respondents	Teachers	40 (40.6) -0.2	55 (47.4) 2.1 *	6 (13.0) 3.8 **	101
	Parents	44 (43.4) 0.2	43 (50.6) -2.1 *	21 (14.0) -3.8 **	108
total		84	98	27	209

*Note.* Numbers in left of the parenthesis are observed values in the questionnaire answers.

Numbers in parenthesis are expected values and the numbers below those are adjusted residuals.

\*\* p<.01, \* p<.05, † p<.10 +/- significance/significant tendencies as results of residual analysis

Table 4.40. Respondents and Method of Integrating Student/Parent Hopes in the Plans.

		Questionnaire			total
		not needed	needed	very needed	
Respondents	Teachers	38 (51.7) -3.8 **	51 (42.0) 2.5 *	12 (7.2) 2.5 *	101
	Parents	69 (55.3) 3.8 **	36 (45.0) -2.5 *	3 (7.8) -2.5 *	108
total		107	87	15	209

*Note.* Numbers in left of the parenthesis are observed values in the questionnaire answers.

Numbers in parenthesis are expected values and the numbers below those are adjusted residuals.

\*\* p<.01, \* p<.05, † p<.10 +/- — significance/significant tendencies as results of residual analysis

Table 4.41. Respondents and Method of Confirming Student/Parent Consent of the Plans.

		Providing the Plans as They Are			
		not needed	needed	very needed	total
Respondents	Teachers	80 (65.2) 4.2 **	16 (24.6) -2.8 **	5 (11.1) -2.7 **	101
	Parents	55 (69.8) -4.2 **	35 (26.4) 2.8 **	18 (11.2) 2.7 **	108
total		135	51	23	209

*Note.* Numbers in left of the parenthesis are observed values in the questionnaire answers.

Numbers in parenthesis are expected values and the numbers below those are adjusted residuals.

\*\* p<.01, \* p<.05, † p<.10 +/ - significance/significant tendencies as results of residual analysis

Table 4.42. Respondents and Goals for Employment in the Individualized Transition Support Plans.

		Goals for Employment in the plans			
		not needed	needed	very needed	total
Respondents	Teachers	20 (29.4)	58 (50.0)	23 (21.7)	101
		-2.9 **	2.3 *	0.4	
	Parents	41 (31.5)	45 (53.2)	22 (23.3)	108
		2.9 **	-2.3 *	-0.4	
<b>total</b>		<b>61</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>209</b>

*Note.* Numbers in left of the parenthesis are observed values in the questionnaire answers.

Numbers in parenthesis are expected values and the numbers below those are adjusted residuals.

\*\* p<.01, \*p<.05, † p<.10 +/- significance/significant tendencies as results of residual analysis

Table 4.43. Respondents and Evaluation from Daily School Life as Reference for the Goal Settings.

		Evaluation from Daily School Life as Reference for the Goals			
		not needed	needed	very needed	total
Respondents	Teachers	21 (29.0)	57 (53.6)	23 (18.3)	101
		-2.4 *	0.9	1.7 †	
	Parents	39 (31.0)	54 (57.4)	15 (19.6)	108
		2.4 *	-0.9	-1.7 †	
total		60	111	38	209

*Note.* Numbers in left of the parenthesis are observed values in the questionnaire answers.

Numbers in parenthesis are expected values and the numbers below those are adjusted residuals.

\*\*  $p < .01$ , \*  $p < .05$ , †  $p < .10$  +/- significance/significant tendencies as results of residual analysis

Table 4.44. Respondents and Students as Responsible Persons for Their Goal Settings.

		Students as Responsible Persons for Goal Setting			
		not needed	needed	very needed	total
Respondents	Teachers	12 (17.7) -2.1 *	35 (38.7) -1.1	52 (42.6) 2.7 **	101
	Parents	25 (19.3) 2.1 *	46 (42.2) 1.1	37 (46.4) -2.7 **	108
total		37	81	89	209

*Note.* Numbers in left of the parenthesis are observed values in the questionnaire answers.

Numbers in parenthesis are expected values and the numbers below those are adjusted residuals.

\*\* p<.01, \* p<.05, † p<.10 +/- significance/significant tendencies as results of residual analysis

Parents tended to think that it was 'very needed' that they were the ones *responsible* for students' goal setting (Table 4.45), although their actual *hopes* for the students' future were 'not needed' to be referred to for the goal setting (Table 4.46).

#### *Differences in Thoughts of Career Counseling Meetings*

Contingency tables of 3X2 and 2X2 for all the questions' sub-items and their positions as either a teacher or parent were examined by using the chi-square test and further examined by residual analysis. There were 13 sub-items demonstrating significance at the .01 level regarding career guidance meetings: (a) parents' hopes to be discussed at career counseling meetings ( $\chi^2 = 18.0$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $p<.01$ ); (b) post-secondary settings to be discussed at counseling meetings ( $\chi^2 = 10.5$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $p<.01$ ); (c) students to attend the meetings ( $\chi^2 = 15.0$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $p<.01$ ); (d) parents to express their opinions and hopes at the meetings ( $\chi^2 = 17.6$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $p<.01$ ); (e) parents to ask questions at the meetings ( $\chi^2 = 25.8$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $p<.01$ ); (f) parents to answer questions ( $\chi^2 = 12.6$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $p<.01$ ); (g) students to express their opinions and hopes at the meetings ( $\chi^2 = 27.5$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $p<.01$ ); (h) students to ask questions ( $\chi^2 = 31.2$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $p<.01$ ); (i) students to answer questions ( $\chi^2 = 11.4$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $p<.01$ ); (j) supervisors of job training to be expected to attend ( $\chi^2 = 15.5$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $p<.01$ ); (k) supervisors of post-secondary settings to be expected to attend the meetings ( $\chi^2 = 23.3$ ,  $df=2$ ,

Table 4.45. Respondents and Parents as Responsible Persons for Their Goal Settings.

		Parents as Responsible Persons for Goals Setting			
		not needed	needed	very needed	total
Respondents	Teachers	16 (12.0) 1.7 †	63 (58.3) 1.3	20 (28.7) -2.7 **	101
	Parents	9 (13.0) -1.7 †	59 (63.7) -1.3	40 (31.3) 2.7 **	108
total		25	122	60	209

*Note.* Numbers in left of the parenthesis are observed values in the questionnaire answers.

Numbers in parenthesis are expected values and the numbers below those are adjusted residuals.

\*\*  $p < .01$ , \*  $p < .05$ , †  $p < .10$  +/- significance/significant tendencies as results of residual analysis

Table 4.46. Respondents and Parents' Hopes for Students' Future as Reference for the Goals Setting.

		Parents' Hopes for Students' Future as Reference for the Goals			
		not needed	needed	very needed	total
Respondents	Teachers	30 (38.7) -2.5 *	53 (47.8) 1.4	18 (14.5) 1.4	101
	Parents	50 (41.3) 2.5 *	46 (51.2) -1.4	12 (15.5) -1.4	108
total		80	99	30	209

*Note.* Numbers in left of the parenthesis are observed values in the questionnaire answers.

Numbers in parenthesis are expected values and the numbers below those are adjusted residuals.

\*\* p<.01, \* p<.05, † p<.10 +/- significance/significant tendencies as results of residual analysis

$p < .01$ ); (l) the schedule of career guidance teachers to be a priority in setting the time and place of meetings ( $\chi^2 = 9.4$ ,  $df = 2$ ,  $p < .01$ ); and (m) parents' schedules to be a priority when setting meetings ( $\chi^2 = 11.6$ ,  $df = 2$ ,  $p < .01$ ).

Teachers tended to think that both students and parents had important roles at the career counseling meetings. As for the students, teachers thought that students 'needed' to attend the career counseling meetings (Table 4.47), students 'very needed' to express their opinions and hopes at the meetings (Table 4.48), 'very needed' and 'needed' to ask questions (Table 4.49), and 'needed' to answer questions at the career counseling meetings (Table 4.50). As for the parents, teachers thought that parents' hopes were 'needed' to be discussed in the career counseling meeting (Table 4.51), parents were 'very needed' to speak their opinions and hopes (Table 4.52), 'very needed' and 'needed' to ask questions (Table 4.53) and 'needed' to answer the questions (Table 4.54). They also thought that parents' schedules were 'very needed' as a priority for scheduling the meetings (Table 4.55).

Parents thought that discussion about the students' post-secondary settings was 'very needed' as well as teachers who thought it was 'needed' (Table 4.56). They also thought that supervisors working where the student did job training (Table 4.57) and where the students would be going in the post-secondary settings (Table 4.58) were 'very needed' to attend

Table 4.47. Respondents and Students' Attendance at the Career Counseling Meetings.

		Students' Attendance at the Career Counseling Mtg.			
		not needed	needed	very needed	total
Respondents	Teachers	4 (13.0) -3.7 **	76 (66.2) 2.9 **	21 (21.7) -0.3	101
	Parents	23 (14.0) 3.7 **	61 (70.8) -2.9 **	24 (23.3) 0.3	108
<b>total</b>		<b>27</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>209</b>

*Note.* Numbers in left of the parenthesis are observed scores in the questionnaire answers.

Numbers in parenthesis are expected scores and the numbers below those are adjusted residuals.

\*\* p<.01, \*p<.05, †p<.10 +/ - significance/significant tendencies as results of residual analysis

Table 4.48. Respondents and Students Speaking the Opinions/Hopes in the Career Counselling Meetings.

		Students Speaking the Opinions/Hopes in the Mtg.			
		not needed	needed	very needed	total
Respondents	Teachers	1 (12.1)	55 (55.1)	45 (33.7)	101
		-4.8 **	0	3.3 **	
	Parents	24 (12.8)	58 (57.9)	24 (35.3)	106
		4.8 **	0	-3.3 **	
total		25	113	69	207

Note. Numbers in left of the parenthesis are observed scores in the questionnaire answers.

Numbers in parenthesis are expected scores and the numbers below those are adjusted residuals.

\*\* p<.01, \*p<.05, †p<.10 +/- — significance/significant tendencies as results of residual analysis

Table 4.49. Respondents and Students Asking Questions in the Career Counseling Meetings.

		Students Asking Questions In the Mtg.			
		not needed	needed	very needed	total
Respondents	Teachers	14 (32.2) -5.4 **	74 (60.5) 3.8 **	13 (8.3) 2.4 *	101
	Parents	52 (33.8) 5.4 **	50 (63.5) -3.8 **	4 (8.7) -2.4 *	106
total		66	124	17	207

*Note.* Numbers in left of the parenthesis are observed scores in the questionnaire answers.

Numbers in parenthesis are expected scores and the numbers below those are adjusted residuals.

\*\* p<.01, \*p<.05, †p<.10 +/ - significance/significant tendencies as results of residual analysis

Table 4.50. Respondents and Students Answering to the Questions in the Career Counseling Meetings.

		Students Answering to the Questions in the Mtg.			
		not needed	needed	very needed	total
Respondents	Teachers	20 (31.2) -3.4 **	71 (61.5) 2.7 **	10 (8.3) 0.9	101
	Parents	44 (32.8) 3.4 **	55 (64.5) -2.7 **	7 (8.7) -0.9	106
total		64	126	17	207

*Note.* Numbers in left of the parenthesis are observed scores in the questionnaire answers.

Numbers in parenthesis are expected scores and the numbers below those are adjusted residuals.

\*\* p<.01, \* p<.05, † p<.10 +/ - significance/significant tendencies as results of residual analysis

Table 4.51. Respondents and Parents' Hopes to Be Discussed in the Career Counseling Meetings.

		Parents' Hopes to be Discussed in the Career Counseling Mtg.			
		not needed	needed	very needed	total
Respondents	Teachers	5 (15.9)	77 (70.0)	19 (15.0)	101
		-4.2 **	2.1 *	1.6	
	Parents	28 (17.1)	68 (74.9)	12 (16.0)	108
		4.2 **	-2.1 *	-1.6	
total		33	145	31	209

*Note.* Numbers in left of the parenthesis are observed scores in the questionnaire answers.

Numbers in parenthesis are expected scores and the numbers below those are adjusted residuals.

\*\*  $p < .01$ , \*  $p < .05$ , †  $p < .10$  +/ - significance/significant tendencies as results of residual analysis

Table 4.52. Respondents and Parents Expressing the Opinions/Hopes in the Career Counseling Meetings.

		Parents Express the Opinions/Hopes in the Career Counseling Mtg.			
		not needed	needed	very needed	total
Respondents	Teachers	2 (10.2) -3.8 **	57 (57.6) -0.2	42 (33.2) 2.6 **	101
	Parents	19 (10.8) 3.8 **	61 (60.4) 0.2	26 (34.8) -2.6 **	106
total		21	118	68	207

*Note.* Numbers in left of the parenthesis are observed scores in the questionnaire answers.

Numbers in parenthesis are expected scores and the numbers below those are adjusted residuals.

\*\*  $p < .01$ , \*  $p < .05$ , †  $p < .10$  +/- — significance/significant tendencies as results of residual analysis

Table 4.53. Respondents and Parents Asking Questions in the Career Counseling Meetings.

		Parents Asking Questions in the Career Counseling Mtg.			
		not needed	needed	very needed	total
Respondents	Teachers	7 (21.0)	72 (64.9)	22 (15.1)	101
		-4.8 **	2.1 *	2.7 **	
	Parents	36 (22.0)	61 (68.1)	9 (15.9)	106
		4.8 **	-2.1 *	-2.7 **	
total		43	133	31	207

*Note.* Numbers in left of the parenthesis are observed scores in the questionnaire answers.

Numbers in parenthesis are expected scores and the numbers below those are adjusted residuals.

\*\* p<.01, \* p<.05, † p<.10 +/- significance/significant tendencies as results of residual analysis

Table 4.54. Respondents and Parents Answering Questions in the Career Counseling Meetings.

		Parents Answering Questions in the Career Counseling Mtg.		
		not needed	needed	total
Respondents	Teachers	28 (40.5)	73 (60.5)	101
		-3.5 **	3.5 **	
	Parents	55 (42.5)	51 (63.5)	106
		3.5 **	-3.5 **	
<b>total</b>		<b>83</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>207</b>

*Note.* Numbers in left of the parenthesis are observed scores in the questionnaire answers.

Numbers in parenthesis are expected scores and the numbers below those are adjusted residuals.

\*\* p<.01, \* p<.05, † p<.10 +/- significance/significant tendencies as results of residual analysis

Table 4.55. Respondents and Parents' Schedules for the Meetings.

		Parents' Schedules for the Mtg.			total
		not needed	needed	very needed	
Respondents	Teachers	8 (13.7) -2.3 *	55 (59.0) -1.1	38 (28.3) 3 **	101
	Parents	20 (14.3) 2.3 *	66 (62.0) 1.1	20 (29.7) -3 **	106
total		28	121	58	207

*Note.* Numbers in left of the parenthesis are observed scores in the questionnalre answers.

Numbers in parenthesis are expected scores and the numbers below those are adjusted residuals.

\*\* p<.01, \*p<.05, † p<.10 +/- significance/significant tendencies as results of residual analysis

Table 4.56. Respondents and Discussion about Post-Secondary in the Career Counseling Meetings.

		Post-Secondary to be Discussed in the Career Counseling Mtg.			
		not needed	needed	very needed	total
Respondents	Teachers	29 (36.7) -2.2 *	69 (58.0) 3.1 **	3 (6.3) -1.9 †	101
	Parents	47 (39.3) 2.2 *	51 (62.0) -3.1 **	10 (6.7) 1.9 †	108
total		76	120	13	209

*Note.* Numbers in left of the parenthesis are observed scores in the questionnaire answers.

Numbers in parenthesis are expected scores and the numbers below those are adjusted residuals.

\*\* p<.01, \* p<.05, † p<.10 +/- significance/significant tendencies as results of residual analysis

Table 4.57. Respondents and Supervisors at Job Training Attending in the Career Counseling Meetings.

		Supervisors at Job Training Attending in the Mtg.			total
		not needed	needed	very needed	
Respondents	Teachers	67 (55.8) 3.1 **	32 (37.4) -1.5	1 (6.8) -3.2 **	100
	Parents	48 (59.2) -3.1 **	45 (39.6) 1.5	13 (7.2) 3.2 **	106
total		115	77	14	206

Note. Numbers in left of the parenthesis are observed scores in the questionnaire answers.

Numbers in parenthesis are expected scores and the numbers below those are adjusted residuals.

\*\* p<.01, \* p<.05, † p<.10 +/- significance/significant tendencies as results of residual analysis

Table 4.58. Respondents and Supervisors at Post-Secondary Settings Attendance at the Meetings.

		Supervisors at Post-Secondary Settings Attendance at the Mtg.			
		not needed	needed	very needed	total
Respondents	Teachers	68 (51.0) 4.7 **	26 (36.9) -3.1 **	6 (12.1) -2.6 **	100
	Parents	37 (54.0) -4.7 **	50 (39.1) 3.1 **	19 (12.9) 2.6 **	106
total		105	76	25	206

*Note.* Numbers in left of the parenthesis are observed scores in the questionnaire answers.

Numbers in parenthesis are expected scores and the numbers below those are adjusted residuals.

\*\* p<.01, \* p<.05, † p<.10 +/- significance/significant tendencies as results of residual analysis

the career counseling meetings. As well as these supervisors, parents also thought that career guidance teachers 'needed' to attend the meetings (Table 4.59).

There were 5 sub-items that demonstrated significance at the .05 level: (a) classroom teachers to attend career counseling ( $\chi^2=7.2$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $p<.05$ ); (b) parents to attend the meetings ( $\chi^2=7.2$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $p<.05$ ); (c) parents to listen to others' opinions and hopes at the meetings ( $\chi^2=7.2$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $p<.05$ ); (d) students to listen to others' opinions and hopes at the meetings ( $\chi^2=6.7$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $p<.05$ ); and (e) students to be a priority when scheduling the meetings ( $\chi^2=7.1$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $p<.05$ ).

Teachers thought that students' schedules are 'very needed' as a priority for the career counseling meetings (Table 4.60). Parents were more likely than teachers to think that classroom teachers were 'not needed' to attend (Table 4.61) and also to think that their own attendance at the meetings might 'not be needed' (Table 4.62). However it was 'very needed' for both themselves and students to listen to others' opinions and hopes (Table 4.63 and 4.64).

#### *Differences in Thoughts of Parent Involvement*

The contingency tables of 3X2 for all the questions' sub-items and their positions either as a teacher or parent were examined by using the chi-square test and further examined by residual analysis. There were 4 sub-items that demonstrated

Table 4.59. Respondents and Career Guidance Teachers' Attendance at the Meetings.

		Career Guidance Teachers' Attendance at the Mtg.			total
		not needed	needed	very needed	
Respondents	Teachers	52 (41.5) 3 **	41 (47.8) -1.9 †	8 (11.7) -1.6	101
	Parents	33 (43.5) -3 **	57 (50.2) 1.9 †	16 (12.2) 1.6	106
total		85	98	24	207

*Note.* Numbers in left of the parenthesis are observed scores in the questionnaire answers.

Numbers in parenthesis are expected scores and the numbers below those are adjusted residuals.

\*\* p<.01, \* p<.05, † p<.10 +/- significance/significant tendencies as results of residual analysis

Table 4.60. Respondents and Parents Attendance at the Meetings.

		Parents Attendance at the Mtg.			total
		not needed	needed	very needed	
Respondents	Teachers	1 (5.3) -2.7 **	73 (70.0) 0.9	27 (25.6) 0.4	101
	Parents	10 (5.7) 2.7 **	72 (74.9) -0.9	26 (27.4) -0.4	
total		11	145	53	209

*Note.* Numbers in left of the parenthesis are observed scores in the questionnaire answers.

Numbers in parenthesis are expected scores and the numbers below those are adjusted residuals.

\*\* p<.01, \* p<.05, † p<.10 +/- — significance/significant tendencies as results of residual analysis

Table 4. 61. Respondents and Classroom Teachers' Attendance at the Meetings.

		Classroom Teachers' Attendance at the Mtg.			
		not needed	needed	very needed	total
Respondents	Teachers	1 (5.39) -2.7 **	82 (78.2) 1.2	18 (17.4) 0.2	101
	Parents	10 (5.7) 2.7 **	80 (83.7) -1.2	18 (18.6) -0.2	108
total		11	162	36	209

*Note.* Numbers in left of the parenthesis are observed scores in the questionnaire answers.

Numbers in parenthesis are expected scores and the numbers below those are adjusted residuals.

\*\* p<.01, \* p<.05, † p<.10 +/- — significance/significant tendencies as results of residual analysis

Table 4.62. Respondents and Students Listening to Others' Opinions/Hopes at the Meetings.

		Students Listening to Others at the Mtg.			
		not needed	needed	very needed	total
Respondents	Teachers	41 (42.4)	56 (49.8)	4 (8.8)	101
		-0.4	1.7 †	-2.4 *	
	Parents	46 (44.6)	46 (52.2)	14 (9.2)	106
		0.4	-1.7 †	2.4 *	
total		87	102	18	207

*Note.* Numbers in left of the parenthesis are observed scores in the questionnaire answers.

Numbers in parenthesis are expected scores and the numbers below those are adjusted residuals.

\*\*  $p < .01$ , \*  $p < .05$ , †  $p < .10$  +/- — significance/significant tendencies as results of residual analysis

Table 4.63. Respondents and Parents Listening to Others' Opinions/Hopes at the Meetings.

		Parents Listening to Others at the Mtg.			total
		not needed	needed	very needed	
Respondents	Teachers	41 (35.1) 1.7 †	55 (55.6) -0.2	5 (10.2) -2.4 **	101
	Parents	31 (36.9) -1.7 †	59 (58.4) 0.2	16 (10.8) 2.4 **	
<b>total</b>		<b>72</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>207</b>

*Note.* Numbers in left of the parenthesis are observed scores in the questionnaire answers.

Numbers in parenthesis are expected scores and the numbers below those are adjusted residuals.

\*\* p<.01, \* p<.05, † p<.10 +/- — significance/significant tendencies as results of residual analysis

Table 4.64. Respondents and Students Listening to Others' Opinions/Hopes at the Meetings.

		Students Listening to Others at the Mtg.			
		not needed	needed	very needed	total
Respondents	Teachers	41 (42.4)	56 (49.8)	4 (8.8)	101
		-0.4	1.7 †	-2.4 *	
	Parents	46 (44.6)	46 (52.2)	14 (9.2)	106
		0.4	-1.7 †	2.4 *	
total		87	102	18	207

*Note.* Numbers in left of the parenthesis are observed scores in the questionnaire answers.

Numbers in parenthesis are expected scores and the numbers below those are adjusted residuals.

\*\* p<.01, \* p<.05, † p<.10 +/- — significance/significant tendencies as results of residual analysis

significance at the .01 level regarding parent involvement: (a) the image of actively involved parents in individualized transition support plans as the ones who express their opinions about the plans at meetings ( $\chi^2=19.1$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $p<.01$ ); (b) schools to promote parent involvement by listening to them ( $\chi^2=17.9$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $p<.01$ ); (c) schools to promote parent involvement by daily communication ( $\chi^2=13.6$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $p<.01$ ); and (d) parents to be expected to express their opinions about the plans at meetings ( $\chi^2=17.3$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $p<.01$ ). There were 0 items that demonstrated significance at the .05 level.

Teachers felt strongly that the image of actively involved parents were the ones who expressed their opinions about the transition plans (Table 4.65), and that it was 'very needed' for them to express their opinions about the plans at the meetings (Table 4.66). Teachers thought that schools could promote parent involvement by listening closely to them (Table 4.67) and by communicating with them daily (Table 4.68).

#### *Differences in Thoughts of Student Involvement*

The contingency tables of  $3 \times 2$  for all the questions' sub-items and their positions as either a teacher or parent were examined by using the chi-square test and further examined by residual analysis. There were 3 sub-items that demonstrated significance at the .01 level regarding student involvement: (a) the image of actively involved students as those who express

Table 4.65. Respondents and the Image of Actively Involved Parents.

		Parents Express Their Opinions about the Plans			
		not needed	needed	very needed	total
Respondents	Teachers	25 (35.7) -3.1 **	53 (51.2) 0.5	21 (12.1) 3.8 **	99
	Parents	49 (38.3) 3.1 **	53 (54.8) -0.5	4 (12.9) -3.8 **	106
total		74	106	25	205

*Note.* Numbers in left of the parenthesis are observed scores in the questionnaire answers.

Numbers in parenthesis are expected scores and the numbers below those are adjusted residuals.

\*\* p<.01, \*p<.05, †p<.10 +/- significance/significant tendencies as results of residual analysis

Table 4.66. Respondents and Expressing the Opinions about the Plans as Parent Involvement.

		Expressing the Opinions about the Plans as Parent Involvement			
		not needed	needed	very needed	total
Respondents	Teachers	24 (37.4) -3.9 **	63 (54.4) 2.4 *	13 (8.3) 2.4 *	100
	Parents	53 (39.6) 3.9 **	49 (57.6) -2.4 *	4 (8.7) -2.4 *	106
total		77	112	17	206

*Note.* Numbers in left of the parenthesis are observed scores in the questionnaire answers.

Numbers in parenthesis are expected scores and the numbers below those are adjusted residuals.

\*\* p<.01, \*p<.05, †p<.10 +/- — significance/significant tendencies as results of residual analysis

Table 4.67. Respondents and Schools for Promoting Parent Involvement.

		Teachers Listen to the Parents			
		not needed	needed	very needed	total
Respondents	Teachers	16 (28.2)	74 (66.0)	10 (5.8)	100
		-3.8 **	2.3 *	2.5 *	
	Parents	42 (29.8)	62 (70.0)	2 (6.2)	106
		3.8 **	-2.3 *	-2.5 *	
total		58	136	12	206

Note. Numbers in left of the parenthesis are observed scores in the questionnaire answers.

Numbers in parenthesis are expected scores and the numbers below those are adjusted residuals.

\*\* p<.01, \* p<.05, † p<.10 +/ - significance/significant tendencies as results of residual analysis

Table 4.68. Respondents and Schools for Promoting Parent Involvement by Daily Communications.

		Promoting Parent involvement by daily Communications			
		not needed	needed	very needed	total
Respondents	Teachers	18 (30.1)	62 (53.4)	20 (16.5)	100
		-3.7 **	2.4 *	1.3	
	Parents	44 (31.9)	48 (56.6)	14 (17.5)	106
		3.7 **	-2.4 *	-1.3	
total		62	110	34	206

*Note.* Numbers in left of the parenthesis are observed scores in the questionnaire answers.

Numbers in parenthesis are expected scores and the numbers below those are adjusted residuals.

\*\* p<.01, \*p<.05, †p<.10 +/- significance/significant tendencies as results of residual analysis

their opinions ( $\chi^2=23.2$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $p<.01$ ); (b) school promoting student involvement by listening to them ( $\chi^2=11.6$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $p<.01$ ); and (c) students expected to speak their opinions about the plans ( $\chi^2=20.3$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $p<.01$ ).

Teachers felt strongly that the image of actively involved students in transition planning were the ones who spoke their opinions (Table 4.69), and they had high expectations that students should express their opinions about the plans at the meetings (Table 4.70). Teachers also thought that schools could promote student involvement by listening to them (Table 4.71).

There was 1 sub-item which demonstrated significance at the .05 level: promoting student involvement by teaching them how to be involved in their own transition planning in class ( $\chi^2=13.6$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $p<.05$ ). Parents thought that schools could promote student involvement by teaching skills to make them more involved in transition planning during class (Table 4.72).

#### *Other Differences in Thoughts*

Significance was seen in 1 item asking whether student involvement with self-determination and parent involvement with equal partnership should be regulated by law ( $\chi^2=46.2$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $p<.01$ ). Parents tended to think that student and parent involvement should be mandated by law or educational regulation, whereas teachers thought that, rather than mandating it, more

Table 4.69. Respondents and the Image of Actively Involved Student in Transition Planning.

		Express the Opinions about the Plans as Student Involvement			
		not needed	needed	very needed	total
Respondents	Teachers	25 (41.2) -4.6 **	61 (50.0) 3.1 **	14 (8.8) 2.6 **	100
	Parents	59 (42.8) 4.6 **	41 (39.4) -3.1 **	4 (9.2) -2.6 **	104
total		84	102	18	204

*Note.* Numbers in left of the parenthesis are observed scores in the questionnaire answers.

Numbers in parenthesis are expected scores and the numbers below those are adjusted residuals.

\*\* p<.01, \*p<.05, †p<.10 +/- — significance/significant tendencies as results of residual analysis

Table 4.70. Respondents and Student Involvement and Expressing Their Own Opinions about the Plans.

		Students Express Their Own Opinions about the Plans			
		not needed	needed	very needed	total
Respondents	Teachers	23 (37.6) -4.2 **	59 (50.7) 2.3 *	18 (11.7) 2.7 **	100
	Parents	54 (39.4) 4.2 **	45 (53.3) -2.3 *	6 (12.3) -2.7 **	105
total		77	104	24	205

*Note.* Numbers in left of the parenthesis are observed scores in the questionnaire answers.

Numbers in parenthesis are expected scores and the numbers below those are adjusted residuals.

\*\* p<.01, \*p<.05, † p<.10 +/- — significance/significant tendencies as results of residual analysis

Table 4.71. Respondents and Promoting Student Involvement by Listening to Them.

		Promoting Student involvement by Listening to Them.			
		not needed	needed	very needed	total
Respondents	Teachers	16 (26.3)	71 (63.9)	13 (9.8)	100
		-3.3 **	2.1 *	1.5	
	Parents	38 (27.7)	60 (67.1)	7 (10.2)	105
		3.3 **	-2.1 *	-1.5	
total		54	131	20	205

*Note.* Numbers in left of the parenthesis are observed scores in the questionnaire answers.

Numbers in parenthesis are expected scores and the numbers below those are adjusted residuals.

\*\* p<.01, \*p<.05, † p<.10 +/- significance/significant tendencies as results of residual analysis

Table 4.72. Respondents and Promoting Student Involvement by Teaching Skills in the Class.

		Teaching Student Involvement Skills in the Class.			
		not needed	needed	very needed	total
Respondents	Teachers	46 (41.5) 1.3	51 (50.2) 0.2	3 (8.3) -2.7 **	100
	Parents	39 (43.5) -1.3	52 (52.8) -0.2	14 (8.7) 2.7 **	105
total		85	103	17	205

*Note.* Numbers in left of the parenthesis are observed scores in the questionnaire answers.

Numbers in parenthesis are expected scores and the numbers below those are adjusted residuals.

\*\* p<.01, \*p<.05, †p<.10 +/- — significance/significant tendencies as results of residual analysis

involvement should be gradually achieved (Table 4.73).

## Discussion

### *Differences in Thoughts of Individualized Transition Support Plans*

Teachers respected students' hopes more than parents, although both recognized the importance. These positive results probably occurred because the teachers surveyed were ones teaching at the special high schools experimentally practicing individualized transition support plans in Tokyo (Japanese Association of Special Schools Principals, 2002a; 2002b). Teachers placed more importance on students' hopes, perhaps because they saw students more objectively than parents (Study 2). Teachers were also more likely to think that goals for the future should be referred to students' own hopes and likes and dislikes - probably because they considered student self-determination as more important than did the parents.

Teachers thought that the post-secondary setting and medical care/health, and goals for employment were needed as domains in the individualized transition support plans and that evaluation in job-training should be a reference for the students' future goal setting, while the parents thought that recreation/leisure should be. Teachers seemed to consider that post-secondary settings, especially job training, were important domains while parents seemed to think the

Table 4.73. Respondents and Regulations of Student/Parent Involvement.

		Regulations of Student/Parent Involvement			
		Yes	No	Others	total
Respondents	Teachers	8 (27.1) -6.1 **	76 (63.3) 3.8 **	15 (8.5) 3.3 **	99
	Parents	46 (26.9) 6.1 **	50 (62.7) -3.8 **	2 (8.5) -3.3 **	
total		54	126	17	197

Note. Numbers in left of the parenthesis are observed scores in the questionnaire answers.

Numbers in parenthesis are expected scores and the numbers below those are adjusted residuals.

\*\* p<.01, \*p<.05, †p<.10 +/ — significance/significant tendencies as results of residual analysis

recreation/leisure was the most important thing for their transitioning sons and daughters.

Teachers thought questionnaires seemed to be an effective way to input students' and parents' hopes into the transition plans, more so than the parents, probably because they were too busy to meet and interview all the students and the parents. Parents liked to receive the plans as they were probably because simplified plans might include exactly the same contents as the original plans.

Parents seemed to feel that they should be more responsible for the students' future because they might consider that they would live together even after the students graduated high school, and they might think they were good advocates to reflect the students' hopes. However, the results of Study 2 (Chapter 3) revealed that the thoughts of young adults and parents were not exactly the same. Thus, professionals might be more neutral and objective and therefore in a better position to participate in the students' transition planning, even though the teachers generally thought students should be responsible for their own goal setting. Teachers might tend to think that the students' current school life is the most important thing and might not be as interested in the students' future as the parents. Some special high school students with intellectual disabilities might not be ready to be responsible for their post-school settings, not only because of their

disabilities, but also because of a lack of experience and learning about their career and life. Therefore, students, parents, and the teachers might be better off working together and sharing the responsibility for the transition planning.

### *Differences in Thoughts of Career Counseling Meetings*

Teachers tended to think that both students and parents had important roles at the career counseling meetings. According to the teachers, the student's role was to attend the career counseling meetings in order to express their opinions and hopes and to ask and answer questions. Teachers seemed to think that the parents' role at the career counseling meetings was to bring up their hopes for the student's future, to express their opinions and hopes, and to ask and answer questions. Teachers prioritized both parents' and students' schedules when setting the meetings, whereas in contrast, parents tended to think that their own attendance at the meetings might not even be needed, even though parents felt that it was 'very needed' for themselves and students to listen to others' opinions and hopes. It seems that there are some contradictions in thinking between the teachers and parents about the career counseling meetings, although it might be because parents were more realistic and teachers were more idealistic in answering the questionnaire. Or maybe teachers expected both students and parents to be actively involved, whereas parents didn't wish

to be involved as much as the teachers think they should. Parents might have thought they had sufficient daily communication with the teachers (Study 4) so therefore expected teachers to already know their hopes and opinions about the plans without the meetings being necessary.

Parents thought career guidance teachers and supervisors in job training and at post-secondary settings should attend the meetings. They seemed more likely than teachers to rely on those professionals to serve and help in their sons' or daughters' transition to a post-school setting, but it could also be that they thought that the classroom teachers or they themselves might not be a great help in the students' transition.

#### *Differences in Thoughts of Parent Involvement*

Teachers seemed to expect parents to express their opinions about the transition plans and wanted to listen daily to the parents. They might expect parents to have and express opinions more than the parents themselves wished. The teachers seemed to be ready to listen to the parents' opinions although they seemed to prefer that this listening would happen through daily communication rather than holding conferences or at other event settings.

### *Differences in Thoughts of Student Involvement*

Teachers seemed to expect students to express their opinions, and would like to promote student involvement by listening to them. Teachers were likely to trust that students had the ability to be actively involved themselves, while parents depended more on teachers for student involvement and wanted the teachers to teach students skills to become more involved in making their transition plans in class. This is probably because parents believed in the effectiveness of such a class, or they thought that students were not ready to be involved in their own transition planning and needed to learn how to become involved.

### *Other Differences in Thoughts*

Parents tended to think that student/parent involvement should be mandated by law or educational regulations, probably because they thought it would be the fastest way to realize higher student/parent involvement and they hope that this should happen in the future. Teachers, however, thought that it should be gradually achieved rather than by mandating it - probably because they thought it should happen voluntarily.

### **Summary**

Teachers thought students should be centered on more positively compared to parents. This is probably because

teachers who responded to the questionnaire work at schools that participate in the experimental practice of individualized transition support plans in Tokyo, and they looked at the students more objectively than the parents. Parents did not show a positive attitude towards their own participation in the career guidance meetings that would make the individualized transition support plans. However, parents did think that they themselves should be the one most responsible for the future goal-setting for their sons or daughters, which might mean that parents are not necessarily negative about their participation in the decision making process of the transition plans. It is probable that parents might have thought that since they had sufficient daily communication with teachers, they would not need to also attend the career counseling meetings. Parents also hoped that participation would be mandated in the future, therefore further suggesting that they think that both student and parent participation in the individualized transition support plan process is desirable.