

Conti-Ramsden, G., Botting, N. & Durkin, K. (2008) Parental perspectives during the transition to adulthood of adolescents with a history of specific language impairment (SLI). *Journal of Speech, Language and Hearing Research*, **51**, 84-96.

Abstract

Purpose:

This is the 2nd article of a companion set (the 1st article being on language and independence). It presents research examining parental perspectives on aspects of impairment in their offspring involving families rearing children with specific language impairment (SLI).

Method:

The same sample as that of the 1st study participated in this investigation: a total of 238 parents and their offspring (120 offspring with a history of SLI and 118 typically developing [TD] offspring). Parents were interviewed using the Transition Daily Rewards and Worries questionnaire (L.M. Glidden & B.M. Jobe, 2007; J. Menard, S. Schoolcraft, L.M. Glidden, & C. Lazarus, 2002). Measures of the adolescent's receptive and expressive language, reading, nonverbal IQ, and socioemotional functioning were obtained.

Results:

Parents of adolescents with a history of SLI had more negative expectations in the areas of future/adult life, socialization, and community resources. An exception was family relations, which was a source of reward for both sets of parents.

Conclusions:

Parents of adolescents with SLI have a range of perspectives regarding their offspring; some raise concerns, some are more positive. In addition, there is striking heterogeneity in the experiences of parents in the SLI group. Variables that influence being a concerned parent involve the adolescent's level of independence, quality of peer relations, his or her prosocial behaviour, and the presence of conduct problems.

Address for correspondence:

Professor Gina Conti-Ramsden, Division of HCD, School of Psychological Sciences, Ellen Wilkinson Building, University of Manchester, Oxford Road, Manchester, M13 9PL, UK

Acknowledgements

We gratefully acknowledge the support of the Nuffield Foundation (Grants AT 251 [OD], DIR/28, and EDU 8366) and the Wellcome Trust (Grant 060774). Thanks go to Laraine Glidden for providing a copy of the instrument and offering helpful discussion. Thanks also to Zoë Simkin for help with data analysis. We thank the research assistants involved in data collection as well as the schools and families that helped us with the research.

Specific language impairment (SLI) is a relatively common developmental disorder affecting approximately 7% of kindergarten-age children (Tomblin et al., 1997). It is an interesting disorder as it involves marked language difficulties in the context of normal general nonverbal abilities, adequate hearing, appropriate environmental exposure to language, and absence of obvious neural damage (Bishop, 1997; Leonard 1998). Although there has been much research into the development of children with SLI, the predominant focus has been on the children themselves, particularly on their psycholinguistic, cognitive, and information processing capacities. Yet, increasingly, researchers have become aware of the importance of the social contexts within which these young people develop. Initially, attention turned to peer relations showing that having SLI poses liabilities with respect to the child's engagements with others, reflected in problematic interactions and poorer

quality of friendships (Brinton & Fujiki, 2002; Durkin & Conti-Ramsden, 2007). Recent work has begun also to illuminate the children's family settings and, in particular, has shown that careful attention to parental concerns can afford valuable guides to developmental needs and to what should be the goals of service provision (Lindsay & Dockrell, 2004). It is increasingly recognized that, for theoretical and policy reasons, we need to enrich our understanding of the perceptions of the key people in the lives of young people with language disorders.

In this second article, we investigate the observations and expectations of parents of adolescents with SLI. Although parenting experiences in families with a range of impairments or disabilities, including children with SLI, have been examined, this has rarely been done for adolescents and young adults. The transition from childhood to adulthood is a crucial phase in the life of any individual, but it is an especially challenging one for young people with developmental disorders. Parents are well placed to observe and evaluate their adolescent children's needs and preparedness for this transition. We examine parents' perceptions in a study using the same sample as that used in the companion article on language and independence (which also appears in this issue).

Impairment and Parental Perspectives

Research into parents whose children have impairments has focused mainly on families in which children have intellectual and developmental disabilities. This work has resulted in a broader awareness that parental concerns can provide sensitive indicators of children's special needs (Glascoe, MacLean, & Stone, 1991). Not surprisingly, it also highlights the demands on the parents themselves. Furthermore, Glidden & Jobe (2007) found that parents of young people with special needs had more concern about their offspring than parents who did not have children with special needs. In a recent review, Glidden and Schoolcraft (2007) conclude that, in general, stress levels are higher among parents rearing children with developmental disabilities than among parents of typically developing (TD) children (see also Baker et al., 2003; Emerson, 2003). Investigators have proposed that more severe disabilities bring about more concern, more strain, and more stress (although these results have not been universal; cf. Blacher, Lopez, Shapiro, & Fusco, 1997; Shin, 2002). Type of disability may also play a role, with parents of children with autism generally experiencing more concern and stress than parents rearing children with Down syndrome (Hodapp, 1999; Holroyd & McArthur, 1976) and parents of children with behavior and conduct problems experiencing higher levels of concern and burden of care (Hastings, 2003; Orsmond, Seltzer, Krauss, & Hong, 2003; Ricci & Hodapp, 2003).

In recent years, there has been an important shift in the growing literature on parents of children with developmental disabilities. From a primarily pathology-oriented starting point, which sought to identify the negatives experienced, investigators have moved gradually to the acknowledgment that the parents also find positive rewards in their caregiver roles (Glidden & Schoolcraft, 2007; Hastings & Taunt, 2002). Such information is valuable not only because it offers a fuller and more balanced account of the family contexts but also because it has the potential to enrich our knowledge of milieux that may be supportive of positive outcomes. Helff and Glidden (1998) argue that positive and negative experiences are not necessarily mutually exclusive ends of a continuum but may be simultaneous and predicted by different factors. It is desirable to examine the extent to which concerns and rewards co-exist and to identify their sources.

Parental Perspectives in Families Rearing Children With SLI

Although there is a growing body of work on families rearing children with other disorders, relatively little evidence is available involving families rearing children with SLI. The research that has been conducted so far suggests that parental concerns change at different stages of a child's development. Initially, the concern is often related to the fact that the child has a problem that is not always recognized by professionals. Parents of children who present with delayed speech and language development are often told by the medical profession to "wait and see" if the child improves naturally in the early preschool period. Parents are concerned about the lack of a diagnosis and, hence, access to intervention (Glascoe et al., 1991; Rannard, Lyons, & Glenn, 2004). Once SLI is recognized, parental concerns become more focused on the amount and type of intervention and educational support that the child may be receiving, particularly during the primary school years (Band et al., 2002; Lindsay & Dockrell, 2004). Research into later childhood is sparse. Pratt, Botting, and Conti-Ramsden (2006) interviewed 52 mothers of 14-year-old children with a history of SLI and found that at this stage of development, the most common reported primary concern was the child's future (i.e., living independently, employability) followed by social and educational concerns. Interestingly, few mothers reported concerns regarding their children's speech and/or language difficulty.

The Present Study

There is a dearth of evidence relating to parental concerns during mid-adolescence. This gap in our knowledge

base stands in marked contrast to accumulating evidence that SLI is a long-term disorder continuing through adolescence and even adulthood (Clegg, Hollis, Mawhood, & Rutter, 2005; Howlin, Mawhood, & Rutter, 2000; Mawhood, Howlin, & Rutter, 2000). Young people with SLI as a whole have other associated problems that continue or emerge as they get older. These problems include social and behavioral difficulties (Brinton & Fujiki, 2002; Fujiki, Brinton, Hart, & Fitzgerald, 1999; Conti-Ramsden & Botting, 2004), difficulties with literacy and academic achievement (Snowling, Adams, Bishop, & Stothard, 2001; Stothard, Snowling, Bishop, Chipchase, & Kaplan, 1998), and potential lack of independence (Conti-Ramsden & Durkin, 2008). These are crucial issues in respect to the transition into the adult world. In the present study, we were interested in determining whether there are differences in parental perspectives during the transition to adulthood between parents of adolescents with SLI and TD adolescents. We were interested in what is most concerning and most important for parents during their offspring's transition to adulthood as well as what factors may be associated with type of parental experience—in particular, what factors differentiate those parents of adolescents with SLI who are very concerned from those who are not. Using an instrument developed by Menard et al. (2002), we examined parents' concerns about matters relating to their teenage child's interpersonal relations, friendships, and prospects for successful intimate relationships (Socialization); about matters concerning access to resources, career support, and income potential (Community Resources); and integration into the community and development as

autonomous adults (Future/Adult Life). In each case, we expected to find that if parents are indeed attuned to their adolescents' individual characteristics, then these characteristics should be identifiable as areas of greater concern for the parents of young people with SLI than for the parents of TD youth.

As stressed above, not all aspects of parenting children with developmental impairments are necessarily experienced or perceived as negative. Previous research has shown that parents of exceptional children also enjoy aspects of their roles and take pleasure in the personalities and lives of their children in much the same way that parents of TD children do. However, very little is known of family relations in contexts where an adolescent member of the household has SLI. To assess this, we solicited parents' evaluations of their child's engagement with the family (Family Relations). In this respect, we did not expect to find substantial differences among parents as a function of whether or not their child had SLI.

Method

Participants

The same sample as that described in the first study of language and independence participated in this investigation. Participants were 238 parents of young people with a history of SLI ($n = 120$) and TD adolescents ($n = 118$).

At the time of the study, all adolescents were attending the last year of compulsory secondary education. Table 1 presents the characteristics of the adolescents

Table 1. Ability profiles (psycholinguistic standard scores, social/emotional/behavioral functioning, and parental opinion of independence) of adolescents with specific language impairment (SLI) and typically developing (TD) adolescents.

Ability profile	SLI ($n = 120$)		TD ($n = 118$)	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
CELF-R Receptive subtest (Word Classes)	83.7	16.5	99.9	13.3
CELF-R Expressive subtest (Recalling Sentences)	73.6	10.3	97.5	14.9
WORD Reading Comprehension ^a	75.8	14.2	92.2	11.4
WISC-III PIQ	84.3	18.8	101.0	15.2
SDQ Prosocial score ^b	7.8	1.9	8.6	1.5
SDQ Hyperactivity score	4.6	2.5	3.7	2.3
SDQ Emotional Symptoms score	3.9	2.5	2.3	1.7
SDQ Conduct Disorder score	2.6	1.7	1.8	1.7
SDQ Peer Difficulties score	2.6	1.9	1.2	1.1
Parental Independence score ^c	7.0	2.7	9.7	1.0

Note. CELF-R = Clinical Evaluation of Language Fundamentals-Revised (Semel, Wiig, & Secord, 1987); WORD = Wechsler Objective Reading Dimensions; WISC-III PIQ = Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children-Third Edition, Performance IQ (Wechsler, 1992); SDQ = Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire.

^a $n = 63$ for TD adolescents. ^bSDQ Prosocial scale is scored positively so that higher scores are more favorable. All other SDQ scales are scored negatively so that higher scores are less favorable. ^cParental Independence scale is scored positively so that higher scores are more favorable.

with SLI and TD adolescents in terms of their current psycholinguistic profiles and social/emotional/behavioral functioning (as based on the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire [SDQ; Goodman, Meltzer, & Bailey, 1998], which is described fully below).

Tests and Materials

Transition Daily Rewards and Worries Questionnaire (TDRWQ; Glidden & Jobe, 2007; Menard, Schoolcraft, Glidden & Lazarus, 2002). The TDRWQ was developed as an inventory to measure the daily rewards and concerns that parents experience as their offspring make the transition to adulthood. These authors (Glidden & Jobe, 2007) report a series of five studies involving 823 respondents that provides evidence for a four-factor structure with acceptable internal reliability (Cronbach's alpha ranging from .74 to .85), split-half reliability (Pearson's correlation = .84), test-retest reliability (via a confirmatory factor analysis with acceptable level of fit and high correlations for each of the factors across time, .56 to .68) as well as adequate discriminant and convergent validity (based on analysis with a comparative measure; i.e., the Subjective Well-Being task; Andrews & Withey, 1976). The characteristics of the instrument and the availability of potential comparative data from the authors' research on typical as well as special needs groups made the TDRWQ the instrument of choice for the present study.

The TDRWQ is a 68-item questionnaire administered to parents designed to assess both the positive and negative aspects of a young person's transition to adult life. Each item comprises a statement describing common issues that arise during this period. Parents are told that these issues can sometimes be rewarding or they may become a source of stress. There are 34 reward items (e.g., "I believe that X is fully prepared for independent living") and 34 worry items (e.g., "I fear that others can easily take advantage of my child.").

Parents are first asked how strongly they agree with the statement using a five-point Likert scale (1 = *strongly disagree*, 2 = *disagree*, 3 = *neither agree nor disagree*, 4 = *agree*, 5 = *strongly agree*). Parents are then asked how important this issue is for them, using a four-point scale (0 = *not at all important*, 1 = *slightly important*, 2 = *somewhat important*, 3 = *very important*).

After reverse-scoring the concern items, the questionnaire yields four factors (subscales) based on 34 of the items: Future/Adult Life, Community Resources, Socialization, and Family Relations (see Appendix for examples of each subscale). For all factors (i.e., subscales), lower scores are less favorable.

Although the authors of the TDRWQ provide evidence for the reliability of the four subscales of the questionnaire, we repeated this analysis with our sample. Reliabilities

(Cronbach's alphas) for the subscales ranged from very good to excellent: Future/Adult Life, $\alpha = .88$, Socialization, $\alpha = .81$, Community Resources, $\alpha = .73$, and Family Relations, $\alpha = .75$.

Measures of language and cognition. The adolescents were given tests of receptive language, expressive language, and nonverbal IQ. These measures were the same as those used in the companion study on language and independence.

Social-emotional functioning. The SDQ-Self Report (Goodman et al., 1998) was completed by the adolescents. The SDQ is a brief behavioral screening questionnaire that can be completed by 11- to 16-year-olds providing coverage of young people's behavior, emotions, and relationships. It asks about 25 attributes, some positive (e.g., "I try to be nice to other people. I care about their feelings.") and others negative (e.g., "I am often unhappy, downhearted, or tearful."). The 25 items are divided between five scales of five items each, generating scores for conduct problems (e.g., "I get very angry and often lose my temper."), hyperactivity (e.g., "I am constantly fidgeting or squirming."), emotional symptoms (e.g., "I am nervous in new situations; I easily lose confidence."), peer difficulties (e.g., "I am usually on my own. I generally play alone or keep to myself."), and prosocial behavior (e.g., "I am helpful if someone is hurt, upset, or feeling ill."). All but the last are negatively scored (high scores are less favorable) and are summed to generate a Total Difficulties score.

Procedure

The procedure used was the same as that described in the first study on language and independence. The parents of the young people were interviewed using the TDRWQ separately at home for a single period of around 2 hr, within a working month of the interviews and assessments. The majority of the TDRWQs were completed by the mothers of the young people (SLI, 78%; TD, 83%) with the remainder completed by the fathers (SLI, 10%; TD, 7%) or both parents (SLI, 11%; TD, 10%). In one case, the guardian (an aunt) of a young person with SLI completed the questionnaire (1%).

Results

Are There Differences in Parental Perspectives During the Transition to Adulthood Between Parents of Adolescents With SLI and TD Adolescents?

The mean scores for each subscale of the TDRWQ are presented in Table 2. As predicted, parents of

Table 2. Mean scores for adolescents with SLI and TD adolescents for each of the four TDRWQ factors.

TDRWQ factor	Adolescents with SLI (n = 119)		TD adolescents (n = 117)	
	M	SD	M	SD
Future/Adult Life	3.4	0.8	4.4	0.4
Socialization	3.7	0.7	4.5	0.5
Community Resources	3.0	0.7	3.5	0.6
Family Relations	4.1	0.7	4.3	0.6

Note. TDRWQ = Transition Daily Rewards and Worries Questionnaire.

adolescents with SLI scored significantly lower than parents of TD adolescents on future/adult life, $F(1, 234) = 127.6, p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .35$; socialization, $F(1, 233) = 91.1, p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .28$; and community resources, $F(1, 234) = 41.8, p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .15$. The difference between groups regarding family relations was not significant, $F(1, 219) = 3.4, p = .067$, partial $\eta^2 = .02$; in both cases, the means were above the midpoint of the scale, consistent with the assumption that parents of adolescents with SLI do find rewards in this area of their children's lives that are comparable to those experienced by parents of TD young people.

What Is Most Concerning and What Is Most Important for Parents During Their Offspring's Transition to Adulthood?

The transition statements from the TDRWQ that were most concerning (defined by more than 30% of parents strongly disagreeing/strongly agreeing with transition statements) were as follows: Among parents of adolescents with SLI, 40.3% agreed with the statement "I fear that others can easily take advantage of my child," 35.3% strongly disagreed with the statement "I believe that there are a lot of resources available in my child's community," and 31.9% strongly disagreed with the statement "(My child) has a lot of choices for work." Among parents of TD adolescents, there were no transition statements that were most concerning (as defined previously).

Thus, the majority of the parents of TD adolescents did not consistently identify serious concerns among those listed. In contrast, approximately one third of parents of adolescents with SLI were worried about others taking advantage of their child, a lack of resources available in the community, and restricted employment options for their children.

Recall that the TDRWQ also included an importance scale for each of the issues examined. Table 3 presents

Table 3. The five most important transition issues for parents of adolescents with SLI and TD adolescents.

Adolescents	Percentage of parents to whom issue is "very important"
Adolescents with SLI	
Child will be a good parent	80
Optimistic about child's future ^a	79
Understands the responsibilities that accompany sex	76
Child enjoys socializing with other people ^a	74
Child has a lot of choices for work ^a	74
TD adolescents	
Opportunities available after child leaves school	71
Optimistic about child's future ^a	69
Resources available in child's community	62
Child has a lot of choices for work ^a	62
Others can easily take advantage of child	61
Child enjoys socializing with other people ^a	61

^aCommon to parents of adolescents with SLI and TD adolescents.

the top five most important transition issues (defined as parents rating them as very important).

Three issues were common to both parents of adolescents with SLI and TD adolescents: the young person's future (SLI, 79%; TD, 69%), choices for work (SLI, 74%; TD, 62%), and socializing with other people (SLI, 74%; TD, 61%). Although there was commonality across parents with regard to what was very important in the transition to adulthood, for parents of young people with SLI, these issues were a source of more concern and fewer rewards than for parents of TD adolescents—that is, parents of adolescents with SLI scored significantly lower on a composite of these three items than parents of TD adolescents, $F(1, 233) = 91.47, p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .28$.

What Factors Are Associated With Type of Parental Experience?

A question to be addressed was whether variables could be identified that related to the type of parental experience observed in the families participating in the study. Given that the TD group did not show much variation in measures relevant to this question, analyses in this area were related to the group with SLI only. Associated factors were examined in terms of the adolescents' psycholinguistic characteristics (language and literacy) and behavioral and emotional characteristics. Specifically, the future/adult life and socialization subscales of the TDRWQ were examined as dependent variables, as these had been demonstrated to show the

greatest difference between adolescents with SLI and TD adolescents. The Community Resources subscale was also found to be significantly different across groups but was not examined further. This decision was made because of the nature of our sample, which is geographically spread across the whole country. Thus, our participants are likely to have varied access to different types of resources, and we did not have enough information about the actual community resources available to interpret findings in a more fine-tuned way.

Hierarchical regressions were conducted using the Future/Adult Life and Socialization subscales, respectively, as the outcome variables. The first block for each regression consisted only of nonverbal IQ in order to control for this variable. The second block added the adolescents' psycholinguistic characteristics as well as the behavioral and emotional characteristics—that is, expressive and receptive language, reading comprehension, and also SDQ emotional difficulties, conduct problems, hyperactivity, peer difficulties, and prosocial scales. Table 4 shows the correlations between these measures. These correlations, in addition to collinearity statistics, suggest that none of these predictors have a strong linear relationship with other predictors.

Table 5 shows the results of the hierarchical regression analysis for predicting type of parental expectations about the future/adult life of their offspring with SLI. The SDQ Conduct and Peer subscales were found to significantly contribute 22% of the variance in parental concerns about future/adult life (using adjusted R^2).

To further explore parental concerns about future/adult life, level of independence (as reported in the companion article on language and independence [Conti-Ramsden & Durkin, 2008]; see also the "Parental Independence score" row in Table 1, this article) was added to the variables in the second step in a second analysis. Recall that level of independence was ascertained by developing a composite parental report independence score that summed 11 individual items, creating a variable with a minimum of 0 (*no independence*) to a maximum of 11 (*high independent functioning*). Level of independence was also found to be a significant predictor of parental concerns, with the model explaining 49% of the variance.

Table 6 shows the results of the hierarchical regression analysis for predicting type of parental expectations about the socialization of their offspring with SLI. The SDQ Prosocial and Peer subscales were found to contribute significantly to the variance in concerns about socialization (15%). Once again, a second analysis adding level of independence to the variables in Step 2 revealed that independence was a significant predictor of parental concerns, with the model explaining over 31% of the variance.

What Factors Differentiate Those Parents of Adolescents With SLI Who Are Very Worried From Those Who Are Not?

Parents of adolescents with SLI reveal considerably greater variation in levels of concern than did parents of TD adolescents. This indicates that although some

Table 4. Correlations among language, literacy, and behavioral/emotional characteristics.

Subtest	CELF Exp	CELF Rec	WORD RC	SDQ Prosocial	SDQ Hyper	SDQ Emotional	SDQ Conduct	SDQ Peer	Independence
PIQ	.24**	.57**	.58**	.07	.02	-.02	-.06	.01	.11
	.03	.22*	.50**	.00	-.17	-.16	-.21*	.02	.17
CELF Exp		.57**	.55**	-.09	.08	-.09	-.05	-.13	.16
		.36**	.11	-.08	-.12	-.02	-.05	-.14	.04
CELF Rec			.64**	-.07	-.11	-.13	-.09	-.07	.18
			.42**	.08	-.17	.06	-.17	-.13	-.05
WORD RC				.08	-.12	-.13	-.10	-.19*	.25*
				.01	-.08	-.16	.01	-.12	.19
SDQ Prosocial					-.22*	.13	-.26*	-.08	.22*
					-.13	.17	-.26**	-.15	-.03
SDQ Hyper						.24*	.51**	.16	-.13
						.16	.43**	.04	-.05
SDQ Emotional							.15	.51**	-.23*
							.21*	.16	-.05
SDQ Conduct								.15	-.16
								.17	.11
SDQ Peer									-.27**
									-.03

Note. Top values in each cell denote SLI; bottom values denote TD. Exp = Expressive; Rec = Receptive; RC = Reading Comprehension; Prosoc = Prosocial; Hyper = Hyperactivity; PIQ = Performance IQ.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 5. Hierarchical regression analysis predicting parent concern about the future/adult life of their adolescent child with SLI.

Variable	R ²	ΔR ²	f ²	B	SE B	β
Step 1	.01		.01			
WISC PIQ**				.06	.05	.11
Step 2	.30	.29	.42			
CELF Expressive subtest				.10	.12	.10
CELF Receptive subtest				.01	.08	.01
WORD Reading Comprehension				.04	.10	.06
SDQ Prosocial score				.50	.51	.10
SDQ Hyperactivity score				-.33	.45	-.08
SDQ Emotional Difficulties score				-.51	.42	-.13
SDQ Conduct Problems score*				-1.25	.60	-.22
SDQ Peer Difficulties score*				-1.20	.57	-.23

p* < .05. *p* < .01.

parents of children with SLI experience relatively high levels of anxiety about the future of the children, others are less worried.

A binary categorization “very worried” versus “not worried” was created. Those parents scoring more than 1 *SD* below and above the SLI mean for a particular factor were identified (≤ 30.2 or ≥ 50.6 for the future/adult life factor and ≤ 21 or ≥ 31 for the socialization factor). This yielded a group of 20 parents who appeared to be very worried about the future/adult life of their child ($M = 25.5$, $SD = 4.1$) and a group of 25 parents who were not worried ($M = 54.1$, $SD = 2.9$) and instead were having rewarding experiences in relation to this aspect of rearing their offspring. There were 24 parents who were very worried ($M = 18.8$, $SD = 2.3$) and 25 parents who were not worried ($M = 32.7$, $SD = 1.5$) about the socialization of their offspring. To ascertain how many parents who were worried about future life were also worried about socialization,

parental data regarding the presence/absence of concerns in both areas were examined ($n = 27$). Fifteen of 27 parents were not worried about either area of functioning in their offspring, and 12 of 27 parents were worried about both. Thus, there were no cases of parents who had concerns in one area but not the other.

In terms of the demographic distribution of these groups, maternal education was not significantly different between either the future/adult life very worried/not worried groups, $\chi^2(5, N = 44) = 6.4, p = .27$, or the socialization very worried/not worried groups, $\chi^2(6, N = 44) = 10.5, p = .11$. This was also true of household income: future very worried/not worried, $\chi^2(10, N = 48) = 16.5, p = .086$; socialization very worried/not worried, $\chi^2(11, N = 48) = 14.0, p = .23$. Descriptive statistics for each group are presented in Table 7. The adolescents in the group with parents who were very worried about their future/adult life had borderline lower performance IQ (PIQ),

Table 6. Hierarchical regression analysis predicting parental concern about the socialization of their adolescent child with SLI.

Variable	R ²	ΔR ²	f ²	B	SE B	β
Step 1	.01		.01			
WISC PIQ**				-.02	.03	-.03
Step 2	.23	.22	.29			
CELF Expressive subtest				-.01	.06	-.01
CELF Receptive subtest				-.05	.04	-.16
WORD Reading Comprehension				.01	.05	.04
SDQ Prosocial score*				.64	.27	.25
SDQ Hyperactivity score				-.11	.24	-.05
SDQ Emotional Difficulties score				-.36	.22	-.18
SDQ Conduct Problems score				.22	.32	.08
SDQ Peer Difficulties score*				-.66	.30	-.25

p* < .05. *p* < .01.

Table 7. Child characteristics of the parental very worried versus not worried groups in the areas of future/adult life and socialization.

	Future/adult life		Socialization	
	Very worried	Not worried	Very worried	Not worried
WISC PIQ	83.5 (22.1)	92.4 (14.5)	89.0 (20.5)	86.8 (13.7)
CELF-WC (receptive)	79.4 (15.5)	93.5 (15.3)	89.4 (21.0)	85.2 (13.5)
CELF-RS (expressive)	71.0 (8.5)	79.1 (10.2)	77.1 (13.7)	75.7 (10.2)
WORD Reading Comprehension	69.3 (11.4)	85.5 (11.5)	77.3 (15.6)	83.0 (12.2)
SDQ Prosocial Behavior	7.7 (1.7)	8.1 (1.6)	7.0 (2.0)	8.4 (1.3)
SDQ Hyperactivity	5.5 (1.9)	3.9 (2.3)	5.5 (2.1)	4.0 (2.5)
SDQ Emotional Symptoms	4.4 (2.1)	2.9 (1.9)	4.8 (2.5)	3.0 (2.1)
SDQ Conduct Disorder	3.8 (2.0)	1.9 (1.7)	3.0 (1.7)	2.1 (1.6)
SDQ Peer Difficulties	3.3 (1.8)	1.6 (1.2)	3.3 (2.1)	1.4 (1.2)
Parental Independence score	4.4 (2.9)	9.1 (1.2)	4.7 (2.3)	9.0 (1.3)

$F(1, 41) = 3.84, p = .057$, partial $\eta^2 = .09$; lower receptive language, $F(1, 42) = 10.44, p = .002$, partial $\eta^2 = .20$; lower expressive language, $F(1, 42) = 9.23, p = .004$, partial $\eta^2 = .18$; lower reading comprehension scores, $F(1, 40) = 20.15, p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .34$; and a lower parental independence score, $F(1, 39) = 51.09, p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .57$, than the group with parents who were not worried. The adolescents did not rate themselves as more or less prosocial, $F(1, 43) = 1.49, p = .229$, but did rate themselves as more hyperactive, $F(1, 43) = 4.52, p = .039$, partial $\eta^2 = .10$; having more emotional difficulties, $F(1, 42) = 7.04, p = .011$, partial $\eta^2 = .14$; having more conduct difficulties, $F(1, 43) = 11.74, p = .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .21$; and having more peer difficulties, $F(1, 43) = 11.29, p = .002$, partial $\eta^2 = .21$.

In terms of socialization, the adolescents in the group with parents who were very worried were not different in PIQ, $F(1, 44) = 0.11, p = .747$; receptive language, $F(1, 46) = 0.27, p = .605$; expressive language, $F(1, 46) = 0.04, p = .852$; or reading comprehension, $F(1, 45) = 2.44, p = .125$, from the group with parents who were not worried. However, they did have a lower parental independence score, $F(1, 43) = 60.56, p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .59$. The adolescents in the group with very worried parents rated themselves as less prosocial, $F(1, 47) = 9.50, p = .003$, partial $\eta^2 = .17$, having more emotional difficulties, $F(1, 47) = 7.40, p = .009$, partial $\eta^2 = .14$, and having more difficulties with peers, $F(1, 47) = 13.77, p = .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .23$, as well as a borderline difference on having more conduct difficulties, $F(1, 47) = 2.83, p = .099$, partial $\eta^2 = .06$. They did not rate themselves as more hyperactive, $F(1, 47) = 2.58, p = .115$.

Logistic regression was performed with the very worried/not worried group as the dependent variable. The first block of the regression consisted of nonverbal IQ. The second block added expressive language; receptive language; reading comprehension; the SDQ prosocial, emotional, hyperactivity, conduct, and peer difficulties scores; and parental independence score. A forward stepwise

procedure was used, with significance levels for entry set at $p = .05$. Logistic regression coefficients were used to estimate the odds ratios for each of the independent variables in the model.

Wechsler Objective Reading Dimensions (WORD; Wechsler, 1993). Reading Comprehension (odds ratio [OR] = .864, 95% confidence interval [CI] = .755–.988, $p = .033$) and Parental Independence scores (OR = .341, 95% CI = .149–.779, $p = .011$) were found to be significantly related to presence/absence of parental concern about their child's future/adult life. For every one-point decrease in Reading Comprehension scores, the probability of parental concern about the future of their child is increased by 14%. For every one-point decrease in the Parental Independence score, the probability of having concerned parents is increased by 66%.

In the case of socialization, Parental Independence score was the only variable significantly related to parental concern (OR = .185, 95% CI = .065–.526, $p = .002$). For every one-point decrease in the parental independence score, the probability of having concerned parents is increased by 81%.

Discussion

This study, to the authors' knowledge, is the first to investigate the perspectives of parents of young people with SLI when their offspring are making the transition to adulthood. A number of important findings emerge relating to parents' perceptions of rewards versus concerns, the nature of their concerns, and the characteristics of the young person that are predictive of concern.

Parental Perspectives During the Transition to Adulthood

The present study identified differences in perspective between parents of adolescents with and without a

history of SLI in the areas of future/adult life, socialization, and community resources. In contrast to parents of TD adolescents, parents of adolescents with a history of SLI had a number of concerns. The one exception was family relations. There was virtually no difference between the two groups of parents on this measure, with both indicating relatively positive appraisals.

These findings are in line with previous research using the same instrument but involving young people receiving special education. Glidden and Jobe (2007) found significant differences among American honors students, regular students, and special education students (all of whom were, on average, 18 years of age) in the same areas identified by the TDRWQ: adult life, socialization, and community resources. However, no differences among groups were obtained with respect to family relations, with results suggesting that this area was generally a source of reward and fewer concerns. This pattern of results is consistent with recent research demonstrating that although they do experience higher levels of stress, families can adapt to the demands of rearing children with developmental impairments and can find relations with their children rewarding (Flaherty & Glidden, 2000; Seltzer, Greenberg, Floyd, Pettee, & Hong, 2001). Importantly, then, the overall findings from the present study indicate that parents of adolescents with SLI are not reporting ubiquitously negative perspectives/experiences; this lends particular salience, of course, to those areas of their adolescents' lives that they do perceive as a source of concern.

What Concerns Parents Most, and What Is Most Important?

More than one third of parents of young people with SLI identified three specific issues that seriously concerned them: others taking advantage of their offspring, lack of resources available in the community, and restricted work choices. Interestingly, there were no particular issues of concern that were common to at least one third of the parents of TD adolescents. This more detailed information may be useful in directing support resources. For example, specific training might be desirable for those with SLI in how to manage their difficulties during interviews or when completing employment application forms; how to select appropriate careers and courses; and how to obtain personal–social education.

Why should parents fear that others might take advantage of their child with SLI? One contributing factor may be the child's history of social vulnerability. Recent research has demonstrated that children with SLI are disproportionately at risk of bullying. They are three times more likely to be bullied at school than TD peers (Knox & Conti-Ramsden, 2003). Furthermore, this was

the case whether the children were receiving special education in mainstream or special education placements. In addition, studies of peer relationships in younger children with SLI have found specific patterns of conflict and conflict-resolution behaviour, which may exacerbate poor social relationships, particularly in reconciliation after disagreement (Horowitz, Jansson, Ljungberg, & Hedenbro, 2006). Hence, it may be that parents have some awareness of their child's social difficulties and anticipate that these will continue, providing a handicap and risk of victimization during early adult interactions and beyond.

We also examined what parents considered to be the most important issues in the transition to adulthood. Between two-thirds and three-quarters of parents of adolescents with and without a history of SLI coincided in identifying three common transition issues: the young person's future, choices for work, and socialization. This analysis provided an opportunity to measure the degree of importance of a particular reward or concern for each of the parent groups participating in the study (see also Crnic & Greenberg, 1990, for a similar approach). Although both groups of parents tended to agree on the key importance of these specific issues, the types of experiences that the two groups reported were quite different. For parents of TD adolescents, these issues were a source of reward and fewer concerns, whereas for parents of adolescents with SLI, the reverse was observed (i.e., these issues were a source of concern and fewer rewards). A number of studies suggest that parenting children with impairments involves more concerns than does parenting TD children (Dyson, 1997; Glidden & Schoolcraft, 2007). The findings of the present investigation extend this body of research to parents of young people with a history of SLI in the transition to adulthood.

What Factors Are Associated With Type of Parental Experience?

Results suggest that there is no consistent pattern of associations between the psycholinguistic and social–behavioral characteristics of TD adolescents and the level of parental concern about transition to adulthood issues. Overall, in the present study, inspection of the mean item scores for each of these two factors (future/adult life and socialization; see Table 2) suggest high levels of reward for parents of TD adolescents, with not much variability observed. In contrast, clear patterns of association were found in the SLI parent group, particularly with respect to levels of parental concern and their offspring's level of independence and social–behavioral functioning. Quality of adolescents' social behavior and peer relations has a key influence on parental level of concern about their offspring's future/adult life and socialization. When parents see their adolescent child as being difficult to manage and not getting on well with

peers, these parents tend to anticipate less favorable outcomes in adulthood. But, even more crucially, parental concerns are closely associated with their offspring's level of independence (see the companion article on language and independence; Conti-Ramsden & Durkin, 2008). The critical conclusion for the present purposes is that the severity of dependence (lack of independence) predicts parental concerns about their offspring's future/adult life and about the young person's capacity to benefit from socialization opportunities. This finding, nonetheless, needs to be qualified. The measure of independence that we used aimed to tap activities outside the home (among others); thus, it is possible that the strong relationship between independence and parental concern about socialization is due, at least partly, to some overlap between these two variables.

In contrast, much like Pratt et al. (2006), child characteristics in terms of cognitive, language, and literacy skills did not appear to relate linearly to level of parental concern. Results from the companion article on language and independence (Conti-Ramsden & Durkin, 2008) suggest that language and literacy play an important role in adolescent independent functioning and a larger role than nonverbal abilities. Thus, young people with more severe language and literacy difficulties are less likely to be independent. What the results of this study further suggest is that by the time children reach adolescence, lack of independence is what is clearly associated with greater parental concern.

Compared with TD populations, there is marked heterogeneity in the subjective experience of parents of children with different types of impairments (e.g., Seltzer & Heller, 1997). The results of the present investigation suggest that parents of adolescents with SLI manifest similar variability. Some parents appeared to be very worried about their offspring future/adult life and socialization, whereas others were not. To investigate the sources of this differentiation, we identified two extreme groups within the SLI sample: those parents who were very worried and those parents who were not worried. Importantly, these two groups did not differ in terms of maternal education or household income. Overall, parents who were very worried about their adolescents' future/adult life had offspring with lower cognitive, language, and literacy skills and who were less independent and had more social-behavioral difficulties. Logistic regression analysis revealed that literacy (reading with understanding) and independence were the most significant predictors. Thus, language impairment seems to bear directly on parental concerns to the extent that literacy problems are a cause of anxiety about adult prospects. The most significant predictor, however, was level of independence. Furthermore, for socialization, level of independence was the only significant predictor. Taken together, these results suggest that lack of independence is the key concern of parents who are very worried about their offspring with SLI. In our companion article on language and independence (Conti-Ramsden & Durkin, 2008), we discuss concurrent and early predictive variables that increase the risk of lack of independence in adolescence. Such information is crucial for identifying particularly vulnerable subgroups within the SLI population. These results are also relevant to our theoretical understanding of the nature of SLI. Parental concerns suggest that there may be a number of areas of development that

can be problematic in SLI; some of these may not be necessarily directly related to, or be a consequence of, having a history of language problems. These possibilities emphasize, once again, the need for longitudinal studies involving children with SLI—studies that examine gradually developing competencies and their interrelationships.

This is not to claim that only child characteristics determine how parental concerns are formed about young people with SLI. As suggested by broader models of parenting (Belsky, 1984, 1990), the social context, resources and support, marital relations, and parental characteristics—including coping skills—are also very relevant (for examples in relation to parenting children with special needs, see Blacher, 2001; Minnes, 1988; Pratt et al., 2006). In this study, we found no differences in maternal education and household income when comparing worried and not worried parents, suggesting that resources are not a primary determinant of the present results. It remains to future research to investigate what is likely to be a complex interplay of family processes (including marital relations and parent-child attachments), support, and parenting styles as influences on parental anxieties about their adolescents. Given the tendency for language difficulties to run in families (Choudhury & Benasich, 2003), it is possible that some parental concerns about the child's future reflect observations of their own or relatives' experiences. Lindsay and Dockrell (2004), for example, found that parents of younger children with SLI often took family history into account in deciding to pursue diagnoses or interventions. Nevertheless, the present findings do establish that parents of young people with histories of SLI are more likely to experience concerns about their children's futures than are parents of TD adolescents.

Findings of the present study demonstrate that parents of adolescents with SLI have a range of perspectives regarding their offspring in the transition to adulthood; some of these are concerning (future/adult life, socialization, community resources), whereas others are more positive (family relations). In addition, striking heterogeneity in the experiences of parents was identified in the SLI parent group, and this was significantly more so than for parents of TD adolescents. On the one hand, our results suggest that for some parents, rearing a young person with SLI is mostly a rewarding experience. On the other hand, for some parents, it is mostly a concerning experience. Variables that influence being a very worried parent involve, in particular, the adolescent's level of independence. As reported in the companion article on language and independence (Conti-Ramsden & Durkin, 2008), level of independence is in turn associated with both language and literacy skills. In the light of accumulating evidence that parental concerns are reliable guides to their children's problems and needs (Glascoe et al., 1991), these findings indicate priorities for future research and for service provision. In the companion article (Conti-Ramsden & Durkin, 2008), we outline the need for support for the young people themselves. The findings of this paper emphasize the need for social support for some parents of young people with SLI for whom raising a young person with SLI is a very concerning experience. Such support is likely to involve access to professionals such as psychologists and social workers, who can provide parental counseling as well as information/advocacy for parents and their offspring with SLI during the transition to adulthood.

References

- Andrews, F. M., & Withey, S. B. (1976). *Social indicators of well-being. Americans' perceptions of life quality*. New York: Plenum.
- Baker, B. L., McIntyre, L. L., Blacher, J., Crnic, K., Edelbrock, C., & Low, C. (2003). Pre-school children with and without developmental delay: Behaviour problems and parenting stress over time. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research, 47*, 217–230.
- Band, S., Lindsay, G., Law, J., Soloff, N., Peacey, M., Gascoigne, M., & Radford, J. (2002). Are health and education talking to each other? Perceptions of parents of children with speech and language needs. *European Journal of Special Needs Education, 17*, 211–227.
- Belsky, J. (1984). The determinants of parenting: A process model. *Child Development, 55*, 83–96.
- Belsky, J. (1990). Parental and nonparental child care and children's socioemotional development: A decade in review. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 52*, 885–903.
- Bishop, D. V. M. (1997). *Uncommon understanding: Development and disorders of language comprehension in children*. Hove, United Kingdom: Psychology Press.
- Blacher, J. (2001). Transition to adulthood: Mental retardation, families, and culture. *American Journal on Mental Retardation, 106*, 173–188.
- Blacher, J., Lopez, S., Shapiro, J., & Fusco, J. (1997). Contributions to depression in Latina mothers with and without children with mental retardation. *Family Relations: Interdisciplinary Journal of Applied Family Studies, 46*, 325–334.
- Brinton, B., & Fujiki, M. (2002). Social development in children with specific language impairment and profound hearing loss. In P. K. Smith & C. H. Hart (Eds.), *Blackwell handbook of childhood social development* (pp. 588–603). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Choudhury, N., & Benasich, A. A. (2003). A family aggregation study: The influence of family history and other risk factors on language development. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research, 46*, 261–272.
- Clegg, J., Hollis, C., Mawhood, L., & Rutter, M. (2005). Developmental language disorders—a follow-up in later life. Cognitive, language, and psychosocial outcomes. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 46*, 128–149.
- Conti-Ramsden, G., & Botting, N. (2004). Social difficulties and victimization in children with SLI at 11 years of age. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research, 47*, 145–161.
- Conti-Ramsden, G., & Durkin, K. (2008). Language and independence in adolescents with and without a history of specific language impairment (SLI). *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research, 51*, 70–83.
- Crnic, K. A., & Greenberg, M. T. (1990). Minor parenting stresses with young children. *Child Development, 61*, 1628–1637.
- Durkin, K., & Conti-Ramsden, G. (2007). Language, social behavior, and the quality of friendships in adolescents with and without a history of specific language impairment. *Child Development, 78*, 1405.
- Dyson, L. (1997). Fathers and mothers of school-age children with developmental disabilities: Parental stress, family functioning, and social support. *American Journal on Mental Retardation, 102*, 267–279.
- Emerson, E. (2003). Mothers of children and adolescents with intellectual disability: Social and economic situation, mental health status, and the self-assessed social and psychological impact of the child's difficulties. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research, 47*, 385–399.
- Flaherty, E. M., & Glidden, L. M. (2000). Positive adjustment in parents rearing children with Down syndrome. *Early Education and Development, 11*, 407–422.
- Fujiki, M., Brinton, B., Hart, C. H., & Fitzgerald, A. (1999). Peer acceptance and friendship in children with specific language impairment. *Topics in Language Disorders, 19*, 34–48.
- Glascoc, F. P., MacLean, W. E., & Stone, W. L. (1991). The importance of parents' concerns about their child's behavior. *Clinical Pediatrics, 30*, 8–11.
- Glidden, L. M., & Jobe, B. M. (2007). Measuring parental daily rewards and worries in the transition to adulthood. *American Journal on Mental Retardation, 112*, 275–288.
- Glidden, L. M., & Schoolcraft, S. A. (2007). Family assessment and social support. In J. W. Jacobson & J. A. Mulick (Eds.), *Handbook of intellectual and developmental disabilities* (pp. 391–422). New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum.
- Goodman, R., Meltzer, H., & Bailey, V. (1998). The strengths and difficulties questionnaire: A pilot study on the validity of the self-report version. *European Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 7*, 125–130.
- Hastings, R. P. (2003). Child behavior problems and partner mental health as correlates of stress in mothers and fathers of children with autism. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research, 47*, 231–237.
- Hastings, R. P., & Taunt, H. M. (2002). Positive perceptions in families of children with developmental disabilities. *American Journal on Mental Retardation, 107*, 116–127.
- Heff, C., & Glidden, L. M. (1998). More positive or less negative? Trends in research on adjustment of families rearing children. *Mental Retardation, 36*, 457–465.
- Hodapp, R. M. (1999). Indirect effects of genetic mental retardation disorders: Theoretical and methodological issues. In L. M. Glidden (Ed.), *International review of research in mental retardation* (Vol. 22, pp. 27–50). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Holroyd, J., & McArthur, D. (1976). Mental retardation and stress on the parents: A contrast between Down's syndrome and childhood autism. *American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 80*, 431–436.
- Horowitz, L., Jansson, L., Ljungberg, T., & Hedenbro, M. (2006). Interaction before conflict and conflict resolution in preschool boys with language impairment. *International Journal of Language and Communication Disorders, 41*, 441–466.
- Howlin, P., Mawhood, L., & Rutter, M. (2000). Autism and developmental receptive language disorders—a follow up comparison in early adult life. II: Social, behavioral, and psychiatric outcomes. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 41*, 561–578.
- Knox, E., & Conti-Ramsden, G. (2003). Bullying risks of 11-year-old children with specific language impairment (SLI): Does school placement matter? *International Journal of Language and Communication Disorders, 38*, 1–12.
- Leonard, L. B. (1998). *Children with specific language impairment*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Lindsay, G., & Dockrell, J. E. (2004). Whose job is it? Parents' concerns about the needs of their children with language problems. *Journal of Special Education, 37*, 225–235.
- Mawhood, L., Howlin, P., & Rutter, M. (2000). Autism and developmental receptive language disorders—a comparative follow-up in early adult life. I: Cognitive and language outcomes. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 41*, 547–559.

- Menard, J., Schoolcraft, S., Glidden, L. M., & Lazarus, C.** (2002, March). *Transition daily rewards and worries*. Poster presented at the 35th Annual Gatlinburg Conference, San Diego, CA.
- Minnes, P.** (1988). Family resources and stress associated with having a mentally retarded child. *American Journal of Mental Retardation, 93*, 184-192.
- Orsmond, G. I., Seltzer, M. M., Krauss, M. W., & Hong, J.** (2003). Behavior problems in adults with mental retardation and maternal well-being: Examination of the direction of effects. *American Journal of Mental Retardation, 108*, 257-271.
- Pratt, C., Botting, N., & Conti-Ramsden, G.** (2006). The characteristics and concerns of mothers of adolescents with a history of SLI. *Child Language Teaching and Therapy, 22*, 177-196.
- Rannard, A., Lyons, C., & Glenn, S.** (2004). Children with specific language impairment: Parental accounts of the early years. *Journal of Child Health Care, 8*, 165-176.
- Ricci, L. A., & Hodapp, R. M.** (2003). Fathers of children with Down's syndrome versus other types of intellectual disability: Perceptions, stress, and involvement. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research, 47*, 273-284.
- Seltzer, M. M., Greenberg, J. S., Floyd, F. J., Pettee, Y., & Hong, J.** (2001). Life course impacts of parenting a child with a disability. *American Journal of Mental Retardation, 106*, 265-286.
- Seltzer, M. M., & Heller, T.** (1997). Families and caregiving across the life course: Research advances on the influence of context. *Family Relations, 46*, 321-323.
- Semel, E., Wiig, E. H., & Secord, W.** (1987). *Clinical Evaluations of Language Fundamentals—Revised*. London: The Psychological Corporation.
- Shin, J. Y.** (2002). Social support for families of children with mental retardation: Comparison between Korea and the United States. *Mental Retardation, 40*, 103-118.
- Snowling, M. J., Adams, J. W., Bishop, D. V. M., & Stothard, S. E.** (2001). Educational attainments of school leavers with a preschool history of speech-language impairments. *International Journal of Language and Communication Disorders, 36*, 173-183.
- Stothard, S. E., Snowling, M. J., Bishop, D. V. M., Chipchase, B. B., & Kaplan, C.** (1998). Language impaired preschoolers: A follow-up into adolescence. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research, 41*, 407-418.
- Tomblin, J. B., Records, N. L., Buckwalter, P., Zhang, X., Smith, E., & O'Brien, M.** (1997). Prevalence of specific language impairment in kindergarten children. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research, 40*, 1245-1260.
- Wechsler, D.** (1992). *Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children—Third edition*. London: The Psychological Corporation.
- Wechsler, D.** (1993). *Wechsler Objective Reading Dimensions*. London: The Psychological Corporation.

Appendix. Examples of items in TDRWQ factors.

Future/Adult Life

I worry that the community will not accept _____. (R)

I am afraid that my child will depend on me forever. (R)

I am confident that _____ will earn a good living.

Community Resources

I am pleased with _____'s ability to manage money.

_____ has a lot of choices for work.

I feel that school programs have not adequately prepared my child for independent living. (R)

Socialization

I am glad that _____ enjoys socialising with other people.

I feel that my child has ample opportunity to meet people.

_____ has very few friends and this bothers me. (R)

Family Relations

I feel good because _____ enjoys family activities.

I worry that _____'s siblings may come to resent him/her. (R)

I worry that _____ will not be able to rely on his/her siblings. (R)

Note. (R) is a reverse-scored item.