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Abstract: The purpose of the study was to investigate practices that high school teachers in Taiwan use to facilitate school-to-work transition, and to determine the importance ratings of each of these transition practices. A questionnaire with 28 transition practices was developed and sent out to the 125 participants in 24 special high schools in Taiwan; 106 completed surveys were used for data analysis. Results from this study identified several key transition practices that were important and also revealed several transition practices that were less valued or less implemented by Taiwanese teachers. Limitations and implications are discussed to improve future research, practice, and cultural diversity in teacher education and transition practices.

Inspired by federal legislation (e.g., IDEA and its 1997 Amendments), practitioners and researchers have made many efforts to improve transition outcomes for students with disabilities. Several follow-up studies of former special education students, however, have revealed negative postsecondary transition outcomes. For example, The NCD (National Council on Disability, 2004) analyzed research on transition, postsecondary outcomes for 14 to 22 year old youth and young adults with disabilities for the past three decades. They reported that 27% of students receiving special education graduated from high school with diplomas while 75% of their peers without disabilities graduated with diplomas. Furthermore, over one third of students with disabilities dropped out or discontinued their education for unknown reasons. The low graduation rate of students with disabilities indicated there was less likelihood of them being employed, receiving postsecondary education, and living independently.

Previous research in U.S. has indicated the importance of identifying critical transition practices in order to improve the quality of transition services and student outcomes (Hughes et al., 1997). Several studies have tried to identify important components and skills essential to specific areas associated with successful transition outcomes (Agran, Snow, & Swaner, 1999; Benz, Johnson, Mikkelsen, & Lindstrom, 1995; Foley & Mundschenk, 1997; Kerka, 2000; Miner & Bates, 1997; Zhang, Katsiyannis, & Zhang, 2002). However, even with these studies, little consensus exists about identification of best transition practices (Johnson & Rusch, 1993; Kohler, 1993). Hughes et al. and Rusch (1992) also suggested that service delivery would be more coordinated and transition outcomes improved if best practices could be identified and disseminated to practitioners.

Efforts have been made to identify comprehensive school-to-work (STW) transition practices in U.S. (Aspel, Bettis, Test, & Wood, 1998; Hughes et al., 1997; Kohler, 1993; Kohler, 1998; Kohler, DeStefano, Wermuth, Grayson, & McGinty, 1994; Mahan & Baer, 2001; Zhang et al., 2002). Practices identified have generally been related to areas focused on student planning and development, vocational education, interagency/interdisciplinary collaboration, family involvement, and program structures and policies. However, few empirical findings have confirmed that the implementation of these practices lead to successful transition outcomes (Kohler, 1993). In addition, many transition practices lack social validation from practitioners (Blanchett,
The importance of studying teacher perceptions to improve teacher practices has also been noted by researchers in general education (Pajares, 1992; Richardson, 1996). Studies are needed to understand practitioners’ views of best transition practices because what teachers believe are important may have a great impact on what and how they deliver transition services.

In Taiwan, transition is a still new concept. Infused by U.S. literature and legislation, the first regulations related to the provision of transition services, the 1998 Regulation Rules of Special Education Act, mandated that transition services in Taiwan should be identified in the Individualized Education Programs for students from kindergarten to 12th grade. However, the dissemination of research on best practices in transition did not seem to influence many teachers in Taiwan, and most special educators thought transition only meant referral to agencies or job placement (Chen, 2002). Instead of addressing transition issues in a more comprehensive way, most of the transition studies in Taiwan seemed to focus primarily on investigating vocational education (Chou, Yeh, & Chan, 2003; Lin & Shih, 2003) or interagency and interdisciplinary collaboration (Lin, 2004). Chen and Chang (2003) studied transition services needs and services received by youth with disabilities in Taiwan. They found that transition services needed by youth with disabilities were greater than services they received. Chen and Chang suggested that teachers might have had delivered quality transition services if they had more knowledge and skills about transition services delivery.

In order to improve transition service delivery and teacher preparation, it is important to know what transition practices special education teachers in Taiwan implement and what practices they believe are important. Although this information would benefit programs in Taiwan, knowledge of transition practices used and valued by teachers in Taiwan might also benefit programs in the United States. Several researchers have called for multicultural/linguistic teacher preparation in special education (Geenen, Powers, & Lopez-Vasquez, 2001; Obiakor, 2001; Voltz, 1998) and the recruitment and retention of culturally and linguistically diverse teachers (Campbell-Whatley, 2003; Dillard, 1994; Patton, Williams, Floyd, & Cobb, 2003). Transition practices from Taiwan could contribute to the understanding of culture diversity in relation to best transition practices, and may lead to the improvement of teacher preparation programs in the United States by providing teachers with information that can improve their sensitivity to cultural differences.

In Taiwan, most secondary-aged students with disabilities who receive transition services are enrolled in special high schools or special education classes in vocational high schools. To understand current transition practices in Taiwan and teachers’ perceptions of the importance of those practices, this study investigated Taiwanese teachers’ perceptions to transition practices identified in the U.S. There were two reasons for using U.S. transition practices in this study: (a) there is a lack of a comprehensive and rich literature about important transition practices in Taiwan, and (b) it was believed important to understand how well these practices could (or could not) fit into the Taiwanese culture and education system. Past research has indicated that the primary disability of students might be a differentiating factor for students’ transition needs and services (Chen & Zhang, 2003), and training received might influence teachers’ perceptions of transition related issues. Therefore, this study also examined if type of training and primary disability of students taught would have an impact on teachers’ perceptions of transition practices. The following research questions were addressed:

What transition practices do special high school teachers in Taiwan implement and how do special high school teachers rate the importance of these practices?
To what extent do demographic factors (e.g., disability of students, teacher preparation programs) influence special high school teachers’ current transition practices and their importance ratings of transition practices?

Method

Survey Instrument

A questionnaire, Survey of School-To-Work Transition Practices (SSTWTP), was used in this
study. The conceptual framework of the survey was based on the NTA (National Transition Alliance for Youth and Disabilities) Transition Practice Framework (NTA, 1998). Based on the consensus of transition experts and field practitioners, the framework grouped transition practices into five categories (i.e., student-focused transition planning, student-focused development, interagency/interdisciplinary collaboration, family involvement, structures/policies). The SSTWTP used the NTA framework, but combined the first two categories into one category student-focused transition planning and development because of their similar features. Specific questionnaire items for the SSTWTP were primarily adapted from the Nomination packet: Promising transition practices and programs for youth with disabilities (NTA), which was used to evaluate exemplary transition programs in the U.S. The SSTWTP was first developed in English and then translated into Chinese, and each edition was piloted with three practitioners from Taiwan. Based on their comments, the SSTWTP was revised and translated back into English.

The SSTWTP contained two parts: (a) demographic information (i.e., gender, age, years of teaching special education and special high school, certification status, types of certificate program attended, disabilities of students taught), and (b) implementation and importance ratings of STW transition practices. A 3-point Likert scale was used in the implementation ratings (1 = not often implemented, 2 = sometimes implemented, and 3 = very often implemented) and a 4-point scale was used in importance ratings (1 = unimportant, 2 = somewhat important, 3 = important, and 4 = very important). Twenty-eight transition practices were identified and grouped into four categories: (a) student-focused transition planning/development, (b) interagency/interdisciplinary collaboration, (c) family involvement, and (d) structures/policies. The participants were asked to rate how often they implemented each practice and the importance of the practice for improving the transition outcomes of youth with disabilities.

Population and Participants

The population of interest was 866 Taiwanese teachers in 24 special high schools that were established for students with moderate to severe disabilities who wanted to receive high school education but generally did not pass the entrance exams for regular high schools. There were five types of special high schools, based on the primary disabilities of the enrolled students: mental retardation, hearing impairments, visual impairments, physical impairments, and multiple disabilities. A sample of 125 teachers was recruited for this study using a systematic sampling method to randomly select 14.5% of the teachers from each school. The contact person in each school, the head of the Office of Student Practicum Counseling (similar to the vocational coordinator in U.S.), was asked to recruit every fourth person on their teacher lists as a participant until they had 14.5% of their school population. Surveys were returned by 116 teachers for a response rate 92.8%. Excluding surveys with missing data for more than 5 items, 106 surveys were used for data analysis.

Of the 106 participants, 58.5% were female (n = 62) and 41.5% were male (n = 44). The majority of the participants (77.3%) were 31 to 54 years old, and 17% were 30 or under. The majority of teachers, 84.9% (n = 90), had been teaching special education for over 4 years, and 79.2% (n = 84) had been teaching in special high schools for over 4 years. At the time of the study, 67 out of the 106 participants (63.2%) taught students with mental retardation. Regarding certification status, 97 of the participants (91.5%) were certified special education teachers and received their training from the following type of certificate programs listed in most-to-least order of training intensity: (a) 4-year college certificate program (n = 17), (b) 2-year post-college certificate program (n = 22), similar to the Master certificate programs in U.S. but without a degree, (c) master/40-credit program (n = 26), which is more research-oriented, and (d) 20-credit certificate program (n = 19), one-semester curriculum for certified general educators.

Data Collection and Analysis

Data collection was completed over a 6-week period of time. First, a formal letter was sent to the contact person in each school to inform them about the study. One week after the
formal letter was sent out, the investigator made telephone calls to the contact persons in order to ask for their help in participant recruitment and data collection. Surveys, along with the instructions for recruitment and data collection procedures, were mailed to contact persons once they consented to facilitate the study. Contact persons were asked to follow the recruitment procedures to select participants and to distribute and collect the surveys. After questionnaires were distributed, the investigator tracked the status of the surveys with the contact persons once a week. Once all the completed surveys were collected, the contact persons mailed them back to the investigator using a self-addressed envelope.

For data analysis, frequency and percentage were used for descriptions of the demographic information and the implementation and importance ratings. In addition, standard deviations and means were also provided for the rating scales. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to test if the following variables had statistically significant influences on teachers' implementation and importance ratings of transition practices: (a) whether the primary disability of the students taught was mental retardation, and (b) the type of teacher preparation programs. Since the majority of the participants in this study were teachers of students with mental retardation, and only a few teachers taught students with other primary disabilities, this study focused on examining the group differences between teachers of students with or without mental retardation. With regard to differences in type of teacher preparation programs, the major difference among the four teacher preparation programs was the training intensity. Researchers found that hours and type of training might influence teachers’ perceptions of transition services (Baer, Simmons, & Flexer, 1996; Katsiyannis, deFur, & Conderman, 1998). Therefore, the training intensity of the four different types of teacher training programs was chosen for studying group differences. When a significant group difference was found, Scheffe’ test was used in order to find out which group means were significantly different.

Results

Internal Consistency

Cronbach’s coefficient alpha was used to determine the internal consistency of items in each category of transition practices. Several researchers suggest a minimum reliability of .70 for research purposes (Nunnally, 1978; Siegle, 1997). As shown in Table 1, Cronbach’s alpha scores for the four categories ranged from .69 to .89, and were all above .70 except for the category interagency/interdisciplinary collaboration in implementation ratings ($\alpha = .69$). Although the alpha score was slightly below .70, the items in this category were retained because the literature has identified the importance of interagency and interdisciplinary collaboration. Overall, questionnaire items met the research criteria for internal consistency.

Ratings and Nomination of Transition Practices

Mean rating scores of the transition practices were high, ranging from 2.02 to 2.75 ($SD$ ranged from .50 to .74) in the implementation ratings and from 3.14 to 3.73 ($SD$ ranged from .44 to .76) in the importance ratings. Small standard deviations indicated small variability in participants’ responses. Especially for the importance ratings, over 97% of the ratings were 3 (important) and 4 (very important).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach’s Alpha Scores by Questionnaire Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Focused Transition Planning/Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interagency/Interdisciplinary Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structures and Policies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Because there were on average only two to three responses in the somewhat important and unimportant categories for each practice, these two categories were included in the important category when presenting results.

Table 2 and Table 3 show descriptive statistics of the 10 transition practices with the highest rated scores. Practices identified in both scales (i.e., implementation & importance) overlapped with one another. In particular, the top four practices in both scales were the same: job placement prior to exit, instruction addresses employment skills, functional/community-referenced curriculum, and community-based work experiences prior to exit. Other overlapping practices included: establish linkage/relationship among school/agents, establish collaborative agreements among schools/service providers, review goal progress annually, and schools support full access/participation in STW activities.

Two practices, paid work experiences prior to exit and provide access to postsecondary education, had the lowest importance rating scores ($M = 3.14$). Paid work experiences also had the lowest implementation rating scores ($M = 2.02$).

Table 2 and 3 also show the mean implementation and importance ratings of the four transition categories: student-focused transition planning/development ($M = 2.43$ and 3.51), interagency/interdisciplinary collaboration ($M = 2.34$ and 3.55), family involvement ($M = 2.19$ and 3.37), and structures/policies ($M = 2.24$ and 3.45). Those transition practices identified as being the most implemented and important were primarily from the categories student-focused transition planning/development and interagency/interdisciplinary collaboration. The practices from the category family involvement and structure/policies were less valued and implemented.

**Group Differences**

In both implementation and importance ratings, no statistically significant differences with an alpha level of .05 were found between teachers of students with and without mental retardation in their total and sub-category scores. Additionally, no statistically significant differences ($p < .05$) were found in the implementation ratings among teachers from
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**TABLE 2**

Frequency, Percentage, Mean, and Standard Deviation of Implementation Ratings of Transition Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category/Practices</th>
<th>Not Often (1)</th>
<th>Sometimes (2)</th>
<th>Very Often (3)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student-Focused Transition Planning/Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job placement prior to exit</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction addresses employment skills</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional/community-referenced curriculum</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based work experiences prior to exit</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review goal progress annually</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specified transition service providers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interagency/Interdisciplinary Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish linkages/relationship among school/agents</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative agreements established among schools/service providers</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structures/Policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools support full access/participation in STW activities</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition policy/procedures/practices articulated/described in your school</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
different training programs. However, results showed statistically significant differences in importance rating scores among teachers from the four different teacher preparation programs in the total scale, $F(3,80) = 4.19$, $p < .01$, and in the following transition categories: student-focused planning/development, $F(3,80) = 3.29$, $p < .05$; interagency/interdisciplinary collaboration, $F(3,80) = 5.08$, $p < .01$; and structures/policies, $F(3,80) = 2.78$, $p < .05$. Further analysis with the Sheffe’s test revealed only one statistically significant difference between teachers from college certification programs and teachers from 20-credit programs for the category interagency/interdisciplinary collaboration, $F(3,80) = 4.19$, $p < .05$: the mean rating scores of the former were 1.29 larger than that of the latter.

**Discussion**

Results revealed several significant findings. First, transition practices related to family involvement and structures/policies were less often implemented and valued by Taiwanese educators, even though the literature in both the United States and Taiwan have identified the importance of family involvement (Asselin, 1995; Chen, 1997; Katsiyannis et al., 1998; Knott & Asselin, 1999; Lin, 1998) and structures and policies (Baer et al., 1996; Chen, 1997). It is possible that the Taiwanese teachers’ lower ratings for family involvement and structures/policies might be due to their lack of training on these issues. Lower ratings for family involvement may have also been due to findings by Caplan, Hall, Lubin, and Fleming (1997) who found that the degree of parent involvement decreased when their children were older, especially after entering middle or high school. Additionally, the long distance between home and school and low family socioeconomic status might discourage the implementation of these transition services. Most Taiwanese students attending special high schools live far away from school. The long distance between home and school might dis-
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**TABLE 3**

Importance Ratings of Transition Practices and Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category/Practices</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th></th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Focused Transition Planning/Development</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>71.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job placement prior to exit</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>69.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction addresses employment skills</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>68.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional/community-referenced curriculum</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>61.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based work experiences prior to exit</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>55.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify natural supports in all areas</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review goal progress annually</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>65.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative agreements established among schools/service providers</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>60.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interagency/interdisciplinary Collaboration</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish linkages/relationship among school/agents</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools support full access/participation in STW activities</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>52.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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courage parents from being involved in transition planning, which in turn, might effect teachers’ ratings. Clark and Kolstoe (1995) stated that families with varying socioeconomic status showed differences in their willingness and capacity to be involved in their children’s transition planning and curriculum; families with higher socioeconomic status were more engaged in transition planning and were more capable of retrieving information about their children’s welfare. According to the League of Disability (2001), 44.78% of Taiwanese families with children with disabilities were unable to make ends meet, while 46.15% had low to moderate socioeconomic status; lower socioeconomic status might create difficulties for family involvement. Teachers’ beliefs often come from personal experience, experiences with schooling and instruction, and experience with formal knowledge (Richardson, 1996). The lack of knowledge and experiences with families might keep Taiwanese teachers from implementing transition practices related to family involvement.

A second finding was that providing access to postsecondary education was not considered important nor was it implemented frequently by the participants, even though this is a key practice in U.S. literature (Aspel et al., 1998; Kohler et al., 1994; Stodden & Whelley, 2004). According to the Special Education Transmit Net (2004), there are 5,757 students with disabilities receiving postsecondary education and most of them have disabilities other than mental retardation. To receive a college education in Taiwan, one must take the College Entrance Examination (CEE), similar to the SAT in U.S., or be selected through a recommendation system, which means one’s academic performance in one of the core subjects (e.g., math, science, English, Chinese) must be top 5% of the peers in order for being recommended by his/her school. For students who take the CEE, their scores must be higher than the test standard of that year for being assigned to a college. Because of the education system and corresponding policies, it has been difficult for students with disabilities to receive a postsecondary education in Taiwan (Chen, 2000). For most special high school teachers in this study, the majority of their students had mental retardation. Therefore, it was not surprising that the participants considered postsecondary education unimportant for most of their students; this finding also may reveal a difference in educational philosophy between the United States and Taiwan.

Finally, statistically significant group differences in importance ratings were found among teachers from training programs of different training intensities, but the post hoc comparisons only revealed that teachers from 20-credit programs had significantly higher rating scores for the category “interagency/interdisciplinary collaboration” than teachers from 4-year college certificate programs. Baer et al. (1996) found that hours of training received by teachers had an impact on their implementation of transition practices, and Knott and Asselin (1999) found that teacher implementation and importance ratings were highly correlated. Thus, intensity of training might also have an impact on teacher importance ratings. However, this study indicated that teachers with more intense training did not place higher values on transition practices. A possible explanation for this finding might be that teachers from 20-credit programs used to be general education teachers and their teaching experiences in general education might have impacted their perceptions of the importance of interagency/interdisciplinary collaboration. In addition, teachers might learn their transition knowledge through other sources (e.g., inservice training, professional journals). It might be necessary to identify participants whose transition knowledge were primarily learned from their certificate programs in order to find out if there are any group differences in these teacher preparation programs.

Implications for Practice

This study has several implications for practice. First, teacher preparation and inservice training in Taiwan may need to put more emphases on knowledge and competencies in implementing culturally-sensitive practices related to family involvement and structures/policies. Katsiyannis et al. (1998) found inservice training was an effective way to improve the implementation of transition practices. Thus, improvement of inservice training as
well as preservice preparation programs might result in the enhancement of transition outcomes for students with disabilities. In addition, the Taiwanese government and other stakeholders should also make efforts to establish clear policies and guidelines in transition related issues in order to assist the implementation of transition practices (Chen, 1997).

This study found that Taiwanese teachers placed less value on transition practices related to family involvement. This finding may have implications for U.S. teachers working with students with disabilities from Taiwan. Parents from different cultural backgrounds, such as Taiwan, might have a different level of involvement in their children’s education. Caplan et al. (1997) stated that parents from minority groups had less involvement in their children’s school events and activities for several reasons, such as past bad experiences with schools, deference to education in their cultures, and poor English skills. Teachers prepared in the United States should be aware of and sensitive to cultural diversity and this should be an important consideration when promoting family involvement in transition planning. In addition, it is also necessary to recruit and retain teachers with diverse cultural background and languages in special education in order to meet the needs of increasing culturally and linguistically diverse population with disabilities (Campbell-Whatley, 2003; Patton et al., 2003).

Limitations

There were several limitations to this study that need to be addressed. First, the representativeness of the participants might reflect a bias. Although the contact person in each school was asked to randomly select the participants, it was unknown if the sample was randomly selected or if it was voluntary sampled. In addition, the majority of study participants were teachers of students with mental retardation. Their perceptions may not represent teachers of students with other disabilities, such as learning disabilities. Furthermore, the sample might be too small to generalize the findings to the general population. Second, the implementation and importance rating scores in this study showed low variability. As noted earlier, this might have been caused by a positive response bias. Third, survey research measures the perceptions of the participants, not their actual behaviors. It is unknown if there were discrepancies between what participants perceived and what they really did. Finally, the survey instrument was developed based on the U. S. literature and translated into Chinese. Some terms might have been misunderstood by the participants. Even with these limitations, this study makes a contribution by studying a more global and international view of transition practices and providing insight for practice and future research.

Recommendation for Future Research

After reviewing results and limitations of this study, further investigation is warranted in several areas. First, future studies should recruit teachers of students with other types of disabilities and should use a larger sample in order to improve the comprehensiveness and representativeness of the research sample. Second, teacher knowledge and training could be an important predictor of teachers’ perceptions. It would be important to investigate how well prepared teachers are in the area of transition and to note their perceptions for each transition practice and where they get their knowledge or training. Lastly, interviews with more in-depth questions could be combined with survey research. Qualitative data would be useful to interpret quantitative data, overcome the limitation of survey research, and enhance the research quality.
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