

COMPARISON OF PERCEPTIONS TOWARD PERSON-CENTERED PLANNING (PCP) OF
SECONDARY SPECIAL EDUCATORS IN THE US AND KOREA

BY

Copyright 2010

Hyunjoo Lee

Submitted to the graduate degree program in Special Education
and the Graduate Faculty of the University of Kansas
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science in Education.

Chairperson

Committee members

Date Defended: _____

The Thesis Committee for Hyunjoo Lee
certifies that this is the approved version of the following thesis:

COMPARISON OF PERCEPTIONS TOWARD PERSON-CENTERED PLANNING (PCP)
OF SECONDARY SPECIAL EDUCATORS IN THE US AND KOREA

Chairperson

Date approved: _____

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to investigate secondary special educators' knowledge of person-centered planning and attitudes toward person-centered planning between the U.S. and Korea. This study is designed to identify the relationship between implementation levels of person-centered planning and perceptions toward person-centered planning. In addition, this study examines the relationship between knowledge of person-centered planning and attitudes toward person-centered planning. An extensive literature review has been conducted regarding person-centered planning for youth with disabilities.

This study uses the *Secondary Special Educators Person-Centered Planning Survey* (SSEPCP) which was developed specifically for the purpose of this study. The SSEPCP was designed to gather information about secondary special educators' knowledge of and attitudes toward person-centered planning as well as implementation levels of person-centered planning. Twenty-three items were identified and the survey was translated into English and Korean.

The result of this study indicated that US educators had more positive attitudes toward person-centered planning than Korean educators. In addition, U.S. educators facilitated person-centered planning more often than Korean educators. There was a positive correlation between knowledge of person-centered planning and attitudes toward person-centered planning. However, there was no relationship between implementation levels of person-centered planning and perceptions of person-centered planning. Moreover, the results revealed that there were no different perceptions of person-centered planning and implementation levels of person-centered planning between the U.S. and Korea. Finally, limitations of this study and implications for further research are discussed.

Acknowledgements

I wish to express my sincere gratitude to all the people who have encouraged me and provided assistance throughout my graduate work at the University of Kansas. I deeply appreciate my advisor Dr. Mary Morningstar, who was always there to listen and to give wise advice over the past two years of my Masters program. This thesis would not have been possible without her support, guidance, and advice. She encouraged me to approach different ways of research questions and guided me to accomplish my goals. Besides my advisor, I would like to thank Dr. Wayne Sailor and Dr. Earle Knowlton who are my thesis committee members. I would like to express my gratitude for their thoughtful consideration and feedback.

A great deal of thanks also goes to 116 U.S. and Korean special educators who gave their time to complete the survey. Special acknowledgements are given to my friends in Korea and also to my advisor and Dr. Debora Benitez for their assistance throughout this survey. I would like to thank my friends in Lawrence who have shown concern for me and encouraged me a lot. I am also greatly indebted to many teachers in the past, especially, Dr. Park (Ewha Woman's University in Korea) who guided me to have an interest in secondary special education for youth with disabilities.

Finally and most importantly, I respectfully express my love and gratitude to my family who always trusted me throughout my Masters program all the time. Especially, my mother, I greatly appreciate your special love and support from the bottom of my heart.

Table of Contents

Chapter I: Introduction.....	1
The Need for the Study.....	1
Purpose.....	2
Chapter II: Literature Review.....	5
Characteristics of Person-Centered Planning.....	5
Procedures of Person-Centered Planning.....	7
Types of Person-Centered Planning.....	9
Person-Centered Planning (PCP) Research in the US.....	11
Person-Centered Planning (PCP) Research in Korea.....	16
Person-Centered Planning (PCP) as a Culturally Responsiveness Strategy.....	19
Chapter III: Research Methodology.....	25
Participants.....	25
The Survey Instrument.....	25
Data Collection.....	27
Data Analysis.....	28
Reliability of the Survey.....	29
Chapter IV: Results.....	31
Demographic Data for US Educators.....	31
Demographic Data for Korea Educators.....	33
Level of Implementation of Person-centered Planning Domain.....	35
Research Question 1.....	35
Research Question 2.....	36
Research Question 3.....	37
Research Question 4.....	38

Research Question 5.....	39
Research Question 6	40
Chapter V: Discussion.....	41
Summary of Results.....	41
Limitations.....	43
Future Research.....	45
References.....	48
Appendix A	
Secondary Special Educators Person-Centered Planning Survey for the US.....	67
Appendix B	
Secondary Special Educators Person-Centered Planning Survey for Korea.....	71

List of Tables

Table 1. Examples of Person-centered Planning.....	54
Table 2. Types of Person-Centered Planning.....	55
Table 3. Demographic Data of the Respondents.....	56
Table 4. Means and Standard Deviations of 23 Survey Items.....	59
Table 5. Means and Standard Deviations on the Dependent Variables for the Groups.....	62
Table 6. Frequency and Percent for 23 Survey Items.....	63
Table 7. Correlations among the Knowledge Items and Attitudes Items.....	65
Table 8. MANOVA results on the Dependent Variables for the Groups.....	66

Chapter I: Introduction

The Need for the Study

A seamless transition from school to the community is an issue for successful outcomes of students with disabilities. Transition education and services are critical for individuals with disabilities to have a smooth transition. In research conducted by Kohler and Field (2003), the term “transition-focused education” is defined as “a shift from disability-focused, deficit-driven programs to an education and service-delivery approach based on abilities, options, and self-determination” (p. 176). These authors identified effective transition practices as: student-focused planning, student development, interagency and interdisciplinary collaboration, family involvement, and program structure and attributes. In order to obtain meaningful transition outcomes for youth with disabilities, special educators or related professionals should provide adequate transition planning from school to the community (Seo, 2007; Sitlington & Clark, 2006). One of the transition planning approaches that focuses on individuals with disabilities’ strengths and needs as well as empowers them with their families is person-centered planning (Everson, 1996; Kim & Turnbull, 2004; O'Brien & O'Brien, 2002; Rasheed, Fore III & Miller, 2006).

Person-centered planning contributes to the transition planning process by finding the student’s preferences, connecting the students to supports in the community, involving family and community members, and providing experience in the community (Keyes & Owen-Johnson, 2003; Kincaid & Fox, 2002; Michaels & Ferrara, 2005; O'Brien & O'Brien, 2002; Rasheed et al., 2006). In the US, there have been increased studies which investigated the effectiveness of person-centered planning process, for example: increased self-determination skills (Miner & Bates, 1997); increased involvement of an individual and family members within the planning process (Whitney-Thomas, Shaw, Honey, & Butterworth, 1998); promoting collaborative relationship between school and families (Michaels & Ferrara, 2005);

identifying the individual's preferences in transition areas (Menchetti & Garcia, 2003); and providing an individualized and collaborative support plan (Weir, 2004). In addition, person-centered planning has been recognized as a culturally responsive strategy for individuals and families with culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds (Blue-Banning, Turnbull, & Pereira, 2000; Bui & Turnbull, 2003; Callicott, 2003; Trainor, 2007).

Interestingly, in Korea, there has been no research related to person-centered planning. However, issues related to transition education have been increasing and some researchers have emphasized the importance of transition planning in school settings (Bae & Clark, 2004; Cho, 2001; Kim, 2006). Studies mentioned that implementation of transition assessments can develop a student-focused transition plan which includes the student's preferences and dreams and the available community support network. As a structured transition planning method, Bae and Clark (2004) suggested person-centered planning (PCP) and the transition planning inventory (TPI) which can facilitate at the school settings by secondary educators. However, because of culturally different perspectives on self-determination and transition issues within Korea culture, implementation of person-centered planning at the school settings may be difficult. Therefore, there is an urgent need for a study to review person-centered planning literature and to investigate the effectiveness of person-centered planning in Korea. Moreover, there is a need to study person-centered planning as a culturally responsive strategy by comparing different cultures.

Purpose

The purpose of this study is to investigate knowledge of and attitudes toward person-centered planning of secondary special educators in the US and Korea and to compare perceptions between these two countries. In addition, this study is designed to identify the relationship between implementation level of person-centered planning and perceptions toward person-centered planning. This study used the *Secondary Special Educators Person-*

Centered Planning Survey (SSEPCP) which was developed specifically for the purpose of this study and translated into English and Korean.

The research is conducted to gain an increased understanding about the following questions:

1. What is the perception of person-centered planning of secondary special educators in Korea?
2. What is the perception of person-centered planning of secondary special educators in the US?
3. What are differences in educators' knowledge of and attitude toward person-centered planning between the US and Korean educators?
4. Is there a correlation between educators' knowledge of person-centered planning and attitudes toward person-centered planning?
5. What are differences in educators' knowledge of and attitudes toward person-centered planning based on educators' implementation levels of person-centered planning?
6. What are differences in implementing person-centered planning based on knowledge of and attitudes toward person-centered planning between the US and Korean educators?

The researchers hypothesized that US educators will be more knowledgeable of person-centered planning and have more positive attitudes toward person-centered planning than Korean educators. US educators will implement person-centered planning more frequently than Korean educators. In addition, educators from both countries will have more positive attitudes toward person-centered planning as they know more about person-centered planning. Lastly, the researcher hypothesized that educators from both countries will implement person-centered planning more frequently if they are knowledgeable of person-

centered planning and have positive attitudes toward person-centered planning.

Chapter II: Literature Review

The following chapter will review person-centered planning (PCP) literature including definition, characteristic, procedures, and types of person-centered planning. This chapter will also review research related to person-centered planning in the US and Korea. Finally, person-centered planning as a culturally responsiveness method will be reviewed.

Person-centered planning is a process that focuses on individuals with disabilities' strengths and needs as well as empowers individuals and their families. According to Everson (1996), person-centered planning is a "value-based approaches for thinking about, communicating with, assessing, planning for, and supporting people with disabilities" (p.7). Kim and Turnbull (2004) defined person-centered planning as a family support approach that organizes community resources and assists families. In addition, Flannery and colleagues defined person-centered planning as a process for designing support from the perspective and goals of the person receiving support (Flannery, Newton, Horner, Slovic, Blumberg, & Ard, 2000). Lastly, Keyes and Owen-Johnson (2003) suggested person-centered planning as a method to develop collaborative and goal-oriented Individualized Educational Plan (IEP) for school-aged youth with disabilities.

Characteristics of Person-Centered Planning

Person-centered planning is a shift from an institution-centered planning process for individuals with disabilities (Trainor, 2007). Institution-centered planning is a traditional planning approach which focuses on individual's deficits and is led by professionals. However, person-centered planning focuses on individual's strengths and needs by placing the individual at the center of planning. The following features make person-centered planning different from traditional planning approaches.

First of all, person-centered planning is led by a facilitator and not exclusively by professionals. Various participants, including family members, friends, community members,

and professionals, all have equal representation during meetings (Callicott, 2003). The team members actively share their stories and information. The process is active and creative, which is different from traditional planning process that was more passive and formal (Rasheed et al., 2006). In addition, the atmosphere and location of the meeting is very informal. Perspectives toward the individual with disabilities and the systems of support are strength-based (Turnbull, Turnbull & Blue-Banning, 1994). This means the team describes the individual's dreams for the future. The team has a priority to find out the individual's strengths and contributions rather than focusing only on the availability of disability services (Bae & Clark, 2004; Trainor, 2007). Lastly, person-centered planning places emphasis on learning self-advocacy skills at the meeting (Rasheed et al., 2006; Turnbull et al., 1994).

Different types of person-centered planning have common features and these characteristics are discussed next. First and foremost, in person-centered planning, individuals with disabilities spend time describing their strengths, abilities, dreams, and desires rather than deficits and limitations (Kincaid & Fox, 2002; Rasheed et al., 2006). This is a distinguishing characteristic of person-centered planning as compared to other traditional planning methods such as the IEP meeting. A positive perspective of the individual makes his or her future hopeful (Hagner, Helm & Butterworth, 1996). For example, the individual with disabilities has an opportunity to make choices or express their preferences through person-centered planning. These choices and desires are then supported by team members and connected to the future plan.

Second, individuals with disabilities and their families are placed at the center of person-centered planning (Hagner et al., 1996). In other words, the individual and family describe their dreams and preferences. Then, the team members develop and find the available supporting services based on both the dream as well as needs. This is a different approach from traditional planning methods in which already designed services are delivered

to people with disabilities (Turnbull et al., 1994). Making services and systems more person-centered and responsive is a main value of person-centered planning (Kincaid & Fox, 2002).

Third, person-centered planning makes participants more empowered to explore options and make decisions (Bui & Turnbull, 2003). Traditionally, professionals are in control of the decision making process (Magito-McLaughlin, Spinosa, & Marsalis, 2002). In person-centered planning, the control has shifted from professionals to all of the participants. According to Michaels and Ferrara (2006), problem solving skills and collaboration are important elements needed to plan the individual's future life. Using this approach, the participants can create a shared vision of the individual's future and develop a shared action plan.

Last, person-centered planning focuses on building access to community resources and development of a circle of support (Bui & Turnbull, 2003; Kincaid & Fox, 2002). For example, family members or friends may become a primary accessible supporting resources of an individual with disabilities by involving in the individual's meeting as participants.

Procedures of Person-Centered Planning

Four steps are basic to person-centered planning: (a) organize a date, time, place, and participants for a meeting; (b) develop a personal profile; (c) construct a vision and develop an action plan; and (d) plan a follow-up meeting (Hagner et al, 1996; Miner & Bates, 1997; "Person-centered Planning", 2004; Rasheed et al., 2006).

Most often, an individual with disabilities, his or her family, and a facilitator start the process of person-centered planning. First, a list of people who will participate in the meeting is developed ("Person-centered Planning", 2004). For example, team members can be family members, friends, special educators, general educators, adult services providers, and case managers. Then, the date and time for an initial meeting is determined. The most convenient place for every participant is also considered (e.g., home, conference room, or restaurant,

Rasheed et al., 2006). Although the individual with disabilities (i.e., the focus person) leads the meeting, the facilitator supports the process so that the entire meeting runs smoothly. Thus, a facilitator should be good at listening, collaborating, solving problems, discovering positive things, and developing plans more creatively (Michaels & Ferrara, 2005; “Person-centered Planning”, 2004).

At the start of the meeting or several days before, the facilitator develops a personal profile of the focus person by asking the individual and family members. The personal profile is the focus person’s life story which focuses on major development, medical issues, social relationships, critical event in life, and personal preferences (“Person-centered Planning”, 2004). The personal profile includes a description of the individual’s support circle, present community services, and the individual’s preferences and capacities (Miner & Bates, 1997). The information from the personal profile will be shared with all participants in the meeting in order to understand the focus person better and make the future plan better (Kincaid & Fox, 2002).

With the review of the personal profile, the team members then share visions of the focus person’s future. This can be a very hard process because it requires strategies such as brainstorming, negotiation, and creativity (Rasheed et al., 2006). However, this is the most important part of person-centered planning (Hagner et al., 1996; Michaels & Ferrara, 2005). The team members develop specific steps to accomplish the shared vision of the focus person, which is called action plans (“Person-centered Planning”, 2004). The action plans includes specific written goals that describe what will be done, when it will happen, who will do it, and how will be done (“Person-centered Planning”, 2004). Thus, the shared visions for the future become more focused and clear with action plans.

The last step is planning follow-up meetings. The team members set the date, time, and place to meet again after they worked the action plans. Therefore, person-centered

planning can be an ongoing process of supporting the individual with disabilities (Rasheed et al., 2006). In other words, the follow-up meeting can be set up in order to support ongoing needs of the focus person or to adjust changeable support system within community.

Types of Person-Centered Planning

Person-centered planning is a general term of various planning methods. Over the past twenty years, several person-centered planning approaches has been developed. Commonly used are: *Making Action Plans* (MAPS; formerly known as the McGill Action Planning System; Vandercook, York & Forest, 1989); *Personal Futures Planning* (Mount, 1987); *Group Action Planning* (Turnbull & Turnbull, 1996); *Whole Life Planning* (Butterworth, Hagner, Heikkinen, Faris, DeMello, & McDonough, 1993); *Planning Alternative Tomorrows with Hope* (PATH; Pearpoint, P'Brien, & Forest, 1993); and *Essential Lifestyle Planning* (ELP; Smull, Sanderson & Harrison, 1996).

Making Action Plan. One of most well-known and commonly used person-centered planning approaches is *Making Action Plans* (MAPs). MAPs develops a roadmap for students with disabilities that includes what his or her needs and goals are as well as how these can be supported (Vandercook et al., 1989). The emphasis of MAPs is on the inclusion of students with disabilities into general education and the community (Rasheed et al., 2006). As part of an hour-long meeting, a facilitator asks six questions to elicit the groups' responses: student's history, dreams, nightmares, strengths, talents, and needs (See Table 1). MAPs is known as an effective person-centered planning methods because of addressing the individual's needs and developing future plans at the school settings.

Personal Futures Planning. *Personal Futures Planning* is a future-oriented person-centered planning that leads to a comprehensive understanding of the individual with disabilities' life in the areas of home, school, community, an individual's choices and preferences, and an individual's social relationship (Rasheed et al., 2006). Team members

identify how to support the individual with disabilities and determine an appropriate timeline to accomplish these goals (See Table 1). Even though it may take longer to complete this method than other person-centered planning methods, *Personal Futures Planning* gives very comprehensive information about the individual with disabilities by identifying the individual's life in the areas of home, work, school, community, preferences, and relationships (Kincaid & Fox, 2002).

Group Action Planning. *Group Action Planning* (GAP) is a student-directed planning process that includes active participation of the individuals with disabilities in their meeting (Wehmeyer, 2002). According to Turnbull and Turnbull (1996), the focus person actively invites planning team members with creating social connections, making shared expectations, solving problems, and celebrating success. The distinguished characteristic of GAP is empowering self-advocacy skills of the individual with disabilities as well as his or her family members throughout the meeting.

Whole Life Planning. *Whole Life Planning* focuses on making new community relationships by including various people from the community in the meeting and developing future plans of individual with disabilities. According to Butterworth and colleagues (1993), participation in and contribution to the meeting of the individual are critical factors in the *Whole Life Planning*. The team members identify the individual's preferences, talents, and dreams rather than focusing only on limitations. In addition, they organize community resources in order to accomplish the goals of the individual with disabilities (See Table 1).

Planning Alternative Tomorrows with Hope. Another effective person-centered planning approach is the *Planning Alternative Tomorrows with Hope* (PATH). PATH is an ongoing process that leads development of future goals of the individual with disabilities. In addition, it is easy to use by filling out the graphic plan and does not take as long as other methods (Kincaid & Fox, 2002). Describing the individual's dreams, called the North Star, is

the critical first step of PATH. Then, the team members describe the current life of the individual. They collaborate in order to develop short-term and long-term goals that will help to reach the North Star (See Table 1). Because of step-by-step manner, PATH is an effective method of person-centered planning (Employment and Disability Institute, n.d.).

Essential Lifestyle Planning. Lastly, *Essential Lifestyle Planning* (ELP) was developed to support the individuals with disabilities who move from institutionalization into the community (Sanderson, 2002). Therefore, ELP emphasizes getting the information of the individual's preferences and choices by identifying his or her "non-negotiables", "strong preferences", and "highly desirable" regardless of severity of disabilities (See Table 1). The simple but important information from ELP helps to make the future plans of the individuals with disabilities and encourages them to live within the community (O'Brien & O'Brien, 2002).

Summary. Educators may implement different types of person-centered planning approaches in different settings to assist individuals with disabilities and their families. Although each approach has its own characteristics and framework, these are known as person-centered planning (See Table 2). This is because they share common values and characteristics of person-centered planning. According to Kincaid and Fox (2002), there are similar goals across all person-centered planning approaches: (a) participate in the community; (b) have social connections; (c) express preferences and strengths; (d) make decision and solving problems; (d) have personal empowerment and dignity; (e) create ongoing development of personal competencies.

Person-Centered Planning (PCP) Research in the US

In the US, person-centered planning has been described as a best practice in transition services for students with disabilities (Michaels & Ferrara, 2005). Issues related to transition assessments has increased once it was introduced in the Individuals with

Disabilities Education Act of 2004, as a component of transition planning: “appropriate measureable postsecondary goals based upon age appropriate transition assessments related to training, education, employment, and, where appropriate, independent living skills” (20 U.S.C. Sec. 1414(d)(1)(A)(i)(VIII)(aa)). One approach to transition assessment is person-centered planning. There have been studies of effectiveness of person-centered planning regarding increased self-determination skills of individuals with disabilities (Miner and Bates, 1997), promoting collaboration and problem solving between team members (Michaels & Ferrara, 2005), and providing individualized and collaborative supports for individuals with disabilities (Weir, 2004).

Miner and Bates (1997) investigated the impact of person-centered planning activities on IEP/ transition planning of high school students with mental retardation. Twenty-two students and their families participated and were divided by two groups: treatment group (with person-centered planning activities), and control group (without person-centered planning activities). The person-centered planning activities were adapted from the *Personal Futures Planning* method which developed circle of support maps and a personal profile, and created visions and goals of the students. These researchers found that there was a statistically significant difference in parents’ participation within IEP/ transition planning meetings between the two groups. For example, parents within the treatment group spoke more often and participated at a higher level than parents within the control group (Treatment group $M = 26.00$, Control group $M = 14.26$, $p < .025$). However, there was not a statistically significant difference among the two groups regarding levels of discussion about the student’s post-school outcomes. Among the two groups, the level of satisfaction toward the meetings was similar. A follow-up study was conducted to compare perceptions of the current IEP/transition planning meeting for those in the treatment group who received person-centered planning activities and prior to receiving training. As a result, the treatment group

had more positive perceptions about current meetings which included person-centered planning activities than previous meetings. These results indicated that person-centered planning helped parents to get more involved in their children's future planning process. Person-centered planning activities can be an effective method to increase families' participation in the transition meeting and to improve collaborative relationships between educators and families.

One of the benefits of person-centered planning is increased participation of the student. Whitney-Thomas, Shaw, Honey, and Butterworth (1998) conducted a qualitative study to identify students' participation levels while planning their transitions from school to adult life using the *Whole Life Planning* model. The authors observed that the level of students' participation were categorized into four types: (a) active participation (e.g., student talks and contributes to their planning); (b) controlling participation (e.g., student changes the course of the discussion); (c) limited participation (e.g., student loses attention, display escape behaviors, or give brief noncommittal responses to questions); and (d) absent participation (e.g., a student leaves or is not at the meeting). In addition, the students' participation in the meeting was influenced by four factors: (a) a student's conversation style (e.g., gregarious or withdrawn type); (b) the size of the meeting (e.g., large or small group meeting); (c) the level of abstraction of issues (e.g., high or low abstraction); and (d) behaviors and expectations of others toward the student (e.g., verifying meaning, speaking at the student's level).

The student's participation in the meeting was increased when the student had an active conversation style, the issues were discussed in concrete way, and team members had respectful behaviors toward the student. When the size of meeting was well matched with the student's preferred meeting size, the student participated in the meeting highly. Person-centered planning is known as a useful planning method for individuals with disabilities to

plan their transitions from school to the community. However, this research results suggested careful consideration of some factors when facilitating person-centered planning. These four factors (i.e., conversational style, the size of meeting, the level of abstraction, and behaviors of team members toward the student) impacted to the individual's level of participation in the meeting. Individualized person-centered planning appeared to maximize the individual's participation in the meeting, not in study.

There is not enough research that has investigated the effectiveness of person-centered planning. A study conducted by Menchetti and Garcia (2003) examined the effectiveness of person-centered planning specifically focused on career choice and employment outcomes. Eighty-three adults with developmental disabilities in supported employment participated in the *Personal Career Plan*, a variation of person-centered planning for the purpose of career planning. A career preference matching analysis was conducted between career-related vision statements from person-centered planning and current job. As a result, seventy-two of these adults (87%) had high correlations between their job and preferred career statements. However, there was no correlation between career statements and current employment outcomes, such as the wages they earned and the length of their employment. These results indicated person-centered planning appeared to individuals with disabilities to express their career preferences and obtain preferred jobs. Person-centered planning can be a powerful method of empowering individuals with disabilities regarding planning the early stage of employment area.

However, Reid, Everson, and Green (1999) warned that person-centered planning should be carefully implemented. By using a systematic preference assessment, these authors evaluated the accuracy of leisure preferences of adults with profound multiple disabilities that were developed from person-centered planning. Twenty-four preferred leisure items that were collected from person-centered planning were measured through approach-and-avoidance

behavior response assessment. Among these, 8 items (33%) were identified as highly preferred preferences, 10 items (42%) were identified as moderate preferences, and only 6 items (25%) as non-preferred preferences. In addition, two adults had higher percentage of non-preferred items than the other two (25% and 40%). These results indicated that person-centered planning should not be the only method to identify individual's preferences. Even though person-centered planning is a good method to find out individual's preferences, systematic assessment needs to be conducted together.

Flannery, Newton, Horner, Slovic, Blumberg, and Ard (2000) investigated the effectiveness of a training workshop on person-centered planning for secondary special educators, students, and parents. With high levels of satisfaction about the person-centered planning process, there was a significant increase in perceptions regarding the description of students' vision, preferences, and strengths after the PCP training. Educators perceived that person-centered planning helped to have increased involvement of family and student (Pre M = 3.00, Post M = 3.80, $p < .001$); better understanding of family (Pre M = 2.56, Post M = 3.50, $p < .001$); positive perspectives about the student (Pre M = 2.33, Post M = 3.70, $p < .001$); and more information about resources (Pre M = 2.0, Post M = 3.60, $p < .05$). In addition, students and parents reported that person-centered planning was supportive in planning their dreams and future (Pre M = 2.60, Post M = 3.60, $p < .05$). The students' written goals related to community activities increased (Pre M = 0.30, Post M = 5.9), and the number of people who could support the student also increased significantly (Pre M = 2.5, Post M = 4.7, $p < .001$). Overall, all groups (i.e., educators, parents, and students) had positive perceptions toward person-centered planning after they took the workshop about person-centered planning. From these results, providing an opportunity to participate in a workshop related to person-centered planning is an effective way for educators and parent to facilities person-centered planning for individuals with disabilities.

Summary. Measuring person-centered planning accomplishments are important to examine the validity of implementing person-centered planning. According to several studies, person-centered planning is an effective method to plan an individual's adult life areas because of: (a) promoting self-determination skills by involving the individual and families in the meeting process; (b) finding out career preferences that lead actual job choice; (c) having positive perspectives about the individual; and (d) getting to know available community resources. In addition, person-centered planning should be carefully facilitated with consideration of the individual's conversational style, team members' behaviors toward the individual, and the structure of the meeting. In school settings, person-centered planning can be an alternative method to develop IEPs more outcome-based and collaborative (Keyes & Owen-Johnson, 2003). However, there is a need for further research related to examining person-centered planning's outcomes in various adult life areas including: (a) autonomy and choice-making; (b) home life; (c) work or day activities; (d) health; (e) relationships; (f) community places; (g) respect; (h) competence; and (i) life satisfaction (Holburn, Jacobson, Vietze, Schwartz, & Serson, 2000). In addition, future research is needed in the areas of investigating a relationship between person-centered planning and IEPs and in examining people' (i.e., a student, an educators, and family members) perceptions toward person-centered planning.

Person-Centered Planning (PCP) Research in Korea

In Korea, transition education is emerging as one trend with the inclusive education movement in the field of special education. According to a study conducted by Park and Cho (2006) of secondary educators, transition education was perceived as a best practice in school settings. Yoon and Yoo (2008) also identified that educators have realized the importance of vocational education programs in the school curriculum. In Korea, schools that serve individuals with mental retardation and emotional disabilities have allocated more than 30%

of the school curriculum to vocational education programs (Kim, 2006). Although there have been increased interest in transition education, the implementation level is still low (Park & Cho, 2006; Yoon & Yoo, 2008).

Issues related to transition assessment is one effort toward successful transition education in Korean school settings. Some researchers have emphasized the importance of implementing transition assessments in order to provide meaningful transition services and to promote meaningful post-school outcomes for individuals with disabilities. Kim (2006) emphasized that facilitation of transition assessments is a critical process of planning a student's transition from school to the community. Transition assessment should be a comprehensive and continuous student-focused process that includes the student's future and the available support system. In addition, Cho (2001) identified the need for an individualized transition plan (ITP) based on the student's preferences within all of the transition domains.

Various types of transition assessments that have been considered by several researchers include: background information and psychometric instruments (Cho, 2001); interview and questionnaires (Bae & Clark, 2004); curriculum-based assessments, situational assessments, ecological analysis; transition profiles; and work samples (Cho, 2001; Kim, 2006). Kim (2006) recommended the importance of informal transition assessments for individuals with developmental disabilities for successful transition outcomes. Informal assessments evaluate both an individual's transition abilities and environmental information.

Even though several researchers indicated the importance of transition assessment, it is not actively implemented in school settings. According to the Korea Department of Education and Human Resource (2008), only half of special educators (51%) wrote an ITP. Among facilitated transition assessments, most educators used social skills assessments (68%) and independent living skills assessments (58%). They reported barriers in the lack of information of transition and career services (72%) and low level of administrative and

financial supports (50%).

In a study conducted by Yoon and Yoo (2008), data related to implementation levels of transition assessments was collected. Half of the 45 secondary special educators reported that they used transition assessments, mostly informal assessments (e.g., interview, survey, and observation). However, actual implementation levels for transition assessment was low. The rest of secondary special educators in this study (50%) did not implement transition assessments in their class. This was because they did not know how to implement assessments, and they thought that assessment tools are not adequate or available to use.

Park and Kim (2003) investigated both secondary educators and parents' perceptions about transition planning for adult life of students with disabilities. The researchers found that both educators and parents groups dissatisfied with the student's transitional goals. Both groups thought they had lack of information regarding career choice and adult services. Interestingly, there were discrepancy of perceptions between educators group and parents group. First, more educators agreed with the statements (i.e., I know the definition of transition education, I describe transitional goals through IEP meeting, Parents and students involve in IEP meeting) than parents group. However, with the statement "The student has transition skills for adult life", parents group agreed more than educators group. These results indicated there was a gap between school and families regarding how to perceive transition education and services. The lack of collaborative relationships between schools and families can be a barrier in the student's transition planning. Therefore, collaborative effort between the school and family is needed for successful transition planning for students with disabilities.

Bae and Clark (2004) reported that special educators have implemented informal assessment in their class for a long time in order to find out about the individuals' behavioral and academic information. For example, special educators have used behavioral observations

and interviews with parents. However, these were not referred to as informal transition assessments. This was because these transition assessment methods were not structured and did not have a clear purpose related to transition outcomes. Therefore, the researchers suggested using transition-related informal assessments, for example, person-centered planning (PCP), and the transition planning inventory (TPI) for transition planning.

Person-centered planning (PCP) is individualized to develop a future plan based on the individual's preferences, environment, barriers, and hopes. Within person-centered planning, the individual with disabilities is the focus person who has a role of determining his/ her own future life and who takes responsibilities for the decision. However, according to Bae and Clark (2004), there are limitations to implementing person-centered planning. A heavy time commitment is required. In addition, culturally different perspectives on self-determination and transition issues within Korean family may make person-centered planning difficult to implement.

Summary. In Korea, person-centered planning is not implemented widely in school settings. In addition, there was no research related to person-centered planning. However, there were some literature reviews about reporting the importance of transition assessments including person-centered planning. Therefore, there is a need to study about person-centered planning in Korea.

Person-Centered Planning (PCP) as a Culturally Responsiveness Strategy

There is an increasing need for transition services and policies for students with disabilities from culturally diverse background in the United States. According to the National Longitudinal Transition Study-2 (NLTS-2, 2009), employment rates for African American youth with disabilities were lower than White youth with disabilities (47% vs. 80%). White youth live more independently than Hispanic youth with disabilities (29% vs. 10%). It would appear that lack of attention to cultural diversity in transition services for students with

disabilities can result in poor post-school outcomes. Kim and Morningstar (2005) emphasized the importance of transition planning for successful post-school outcomes of student with disabilities and reported the importance of involvement of parents in the transition planning process especially families from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds.

In this sense, there is little in the way of literature and research emphasizing the use of person-centered planning as a culturally responsive strategy for families with individuals with disabilities (Blue-Banning et al., 2000; Bui & Trunbull, 2003; Callicott, 2003; Trainor, 2007). As one possible transition planning method, person-centered planning can support diverse cultural aspects of a student related to promoting collaboration and problem-solving during transition planning (Michaels & Ferrara, 2005). Educators can consider the families' unique qualities regarding ethnicity, disability, race, gender, social class, culture, and language through person-centered planning (Morton Pengra, 2000; Keyes & Owens-Johnson, 2003).

The need of culturally diverse students, families, and services providers regarding program planning was the focus of the study by Blue-Banning, Turnbull and Pereira (2000). These researchers conducted focus group interviews with both Hispanic families of adults with developmental disabilities and secondary special educators regarding the implementation of *Group Action Planning*, a person-centered planning approach. As a result, the parent groups perceived *Group Action Planning* as potentially beneficial for collaboration, offering supports, sharing responsibility, and being flexible during planning. The researchers identified unique cultural features of Hispanic families, such as familism and a collectivistic orientation, which could be incorporated within *Group Action Planning*. The characteristic of emphasizing empowerment and reliable allies of *Group Action Planning* could help Hispanic families to feel empowered during the planning process. In addition, educators groups perceived *Group Action Planning* as an effective mechanism to use with families because it

provided information about community resources. Educators also indicated it could reduce parental intimidation and improve communication between educators and families.

Interestingly, however, the educators perceived *Group Action Planning* as less beneficial for themselves because of the extra work and time involved.

Bui and Turnbull (2003) discussed how the values of person-centered planning both conflicted and agreed with Asian American culture. Asian cultures are characterized by values such as: modesty, humility, and polite behaviors, family loyalty and solidarity, respect for elders and authority, hierarchical family system, extended family system, and high expectation for children's behaviors. Among these features, extended family system, family obligation, and respect for elders/ authority are consistent with the features of person-centered planning. This is because person-centered planning emphasizes collaboration and shared action planning between participants by gathering information about community services and supports.

However, they cautioned that there were conflicting values between person-centered planning and Asian American cultures. Asian American families may be reluctant to seek help from others within community because of their cultural beliefs of a disability as shameful. In addition, low expectations for their disabled children's independent life conflicts with the values inherent in person-centered planning which encourages self-determination and productivity. Asian families' hierarchical systems may conflict with the equal participation of members of a person-centered planning meeting. In addition, Asian families prefer deferring to professional's knowledge rather than share their own knowledge of their children. While person-centered planning can focus on the individual's preferences and desires, Asian American culture places family cohesion before individual's needs. Therefore, Bui and Turnbull suggested modifications to person-centered planning for Asian American families including: (a) being sensitive to the Asian culture; (b) establishing a relationship and

credibility with Asian families; (c) arranging for a convenient time for families and supports such as transportation and having interpreter; (d) showing respect for the family's authority; and (e) paying attention to any non-verbal cues during meeting (e.g., silence).

Callicott (2003) reviewed person-centered planning as a method of culturally sensitive collaboration when working with individuals and families who have culturally diverse needs. Because person-centered planning is responsive to the individual's needs and supports the people closest to the individual, it is easy to respond to the culturally diverse needs of the individual and family. In addition, person-centered planning makes the individual's future plan more individualized and can be based on their cultural background because of the process of communicating and sharing between all participants during planning meetings. Educators can be common sensitive to culturally diverse levels of participation in community as well as the level of positive relationships with others. In addition, culturally diverse families can have increased participation and positive relationships through the person-centered planning process.

According to Callicott, there are some difficulties in implementing person-centered planning with culturally diverse individuals and families. First of all, the level of participation with cultural sensitivity during the person-centered planning meeting can be a barrier. This is because active participation and integration of various opinions from participants are important features during the person-centered planning meeting. Second, in some cultures, professional roles and responsibilities are more influential than a personal commitment to developing plan. For example, parents may feel uncomfortable in speaking their opinion and they may prefer to follow professional's opinions. Furthermore, self-determination skill is not a familiar concept in some cultures, while it is a critical skill to implementing person-centered planning. Third, facilitators may have difficulty interacting during person-centered planning because of cultural differences related to communication styles. Last, the outcome

values of person-centered planning may be different within different cultural groups. For example, in Asian cultures, the families' success within their community is more valued than an individual's success. For these reasons, therefore, the author suggests careful use of person-centered planning for the purpose of collaboration with culturally diverse families. The six suggested principles were: (a) know your focus individual; (b) encourage interaction; (c) provide effective feedback; (d) encourage parent participation; (e) appreciate and incorporate cultural diversity; and (f) reduce prejudice.

Summary. Cultural differences such as the family system operation as well as family perspectives about having a child with a disability can be critical factors when implementing person-centered planning. According to the literature, person-centered planning can help families to plan an individual's future goals if careful consideration is given to cultural differences. Therefore, there is a need for research to examine person-centered planning as a culturally responsive method.

Specifically, this study is designed to investigate knowledge of and attitudes toward person-centered planning of secondary special educators in the US and Korea in order to compare perceptions between these two countries. In addition, this study identifies the relationship between implementation levels of person-centered planning and perceptions toward person-centered planning. Followings are the research questions:

1. What is the perception of person-centered planning of secondary special educators in Korea?
2. What is the perception of person-centered planning of secondary special educators in the US?
3. What are differences in educators' knowledge of and attitude toward person-centered planning between the US and Korean educators?

4. Is there a correlation between educators' knowledge of person-centered planning and attitudes toward person-centered planning?
5. What are differences in educators' knowledge of and attitudes toward person-centered planning based on educators' implementation levels of person-centered planning?
6. What are differences in implementing person-centered planning based on knowledge of and attitudes toward person-centered planning between the US and Korean educators?

Chapter III: Research Methodology

The primary purpose of this study was to investigate knowledge of and attitudes toward person-centered planning (PCP) of secondary special educators in the US and Korea and to compare perceptions between these two countries. In addition, this study was designed to identify the relationship between current status of implementing person-centered planning and knowledge of and attitudes toward person-centered planning in the US and Korea. The *Secondary Special Educators Person-Centered Planning Survey* (SSEPCP) was developed specifically for this study. Data was collected from 98 educators. This chapter includes a description of the participants, the survey instrument, data collection, and data analysis methods.

Participants

The participants in this study included secondary special educators from the US and Korea. To collect data, a convenience sampling procedure was employed. Ninety-nine secondary special educators responded in this study, with 38 educators from the US and 61 educators from Korea. Most participants were responsible for teaching youth with mental retardation (MR), learning disabilities (LD), and emotional and behavioral disabilities (EBD). Participants were asked to provide information related to years they have been teaching, their students' disability, type of classroom setting, grade level of teaching, number of transition courses taken, number of person-centered planning trainings completed, implementation level of person-centered planning, knowledge of person-centered planning, and attitude toward person-centered planning. Demographic information on these participants is provided in Table 3.

The Survey Instrument

The *Secondary Special Educators Person-Centered Planning Survey* (SSEPCP) was developed and used for this study. The SSEPCP was developed to gather information

regarding educators' knowledge of and attitudes toward person-centered planning as well as levels of implementation. To develop this instrument, the researcher conducted a content analysis of a review of literature and research on person-centered planning to identify: (a) key features of person-centered planning; (b) effective person-centered planning practices; and (c) educators' perceptions of their own implementation of person-centered planning (Blue-Banning et al., 2000; Bui & Turnbull, 2003; Callicott, 2003; Flannery et al., 2000; Holburn et al., 2000; Keyes & Owen-Johnson, 2003; Kincaid & Fox, 2002; Michaels & Ferrara, 2005; Miner and Bates, 1997; O'Brien & O'Brien, 2002; Rasheed et al., 2006; Reid et al., 1999; Trainor, 2007; Whitney-Thomas et al., 1998). In addition, to ensure content validity of the items, comparison of survey items between the researcher and an expert knowledgeable of person-centered planning was conducted (Salkind, 2009).

The research articles and literature yielded 49 possible survey items related to person-centered planning. Items for the SSEPCP were then determined by working with an expert in person-centered planning to classify those items most often identified as critical features in person-centered planning. As a result, 23 items were identified for the SSEPCP. These items fell within two domains: (a) Knowledge of Person-Centered Planning, and (b) Attitudes of person-centered planning (included positive and negative attitudes).

The SSEPCP consisted of three sections: (a) demographic information, (b) implementation level of person-centered planning practices, and (c) perceptions of person-centered planning. Part I included demographic information including: (a) types of classroom setting, (b) classifications of students taught, (c) grade levels of students taught, (d) number of years teaching, (e) number of transition courses, and (f) number of person-centered planning training. Part II provided specific information about implementation levels of person-centered planning within the participants' current classrooms or programs. Part III of the survey was designed to elicit participants' perceptions about person-centered planning.

Specifically, 23 items are categorized according into two domains: (a) knowledge of person-centered planning, and (b) positive and negative attitudes toward person-centered planning. For every item, the participant was required to rate their response using a 5-point Likert scale regarding their level of agreement (1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree).

Two versions of the SSEPCP were developed for use in this study. An English version and Korean version were developed to compare secondary educators' perceptions of person-centered planning between the US and Korea. The English SSEPCP was developed first and then translated into Korean. The English SSEPCP was posted online and the Korean SSEPCP was distributed both online and in paper. Both versions of SSEPCP are provided in Appendix A and B.

Data Collection

The data was collected using two methods: an online survey using SurveyMonkey and paper copies of the survey that were mailed. For educators in the USA, an online survey was used. Both the online and paper versions were used in Korea. The online survey was linked to the SurveyMonkey website (<http://www.surveymonkey.com>) and included a statement letter explaining the purpose and significance of the study and the consent to participate, as well as a link to the SSEPCP survey. Packets of the paper version of the survey were mailed to Korean participants and included a letter explaining the purpose and significance of the study, a consent to participate form to be signed and returned, the SSEPCP survey, and a self-addressed stamped envelope. Approximately 7 days after the first mailing, a reminder was sent to those individuals who had not yet responded.

In the US, 46 educators agreed to participate in the study. Most participants were enrolled in special education graduate programs at a Midwestern university. Instructors of the three classes posted a link to the online SSEPCP survey and offered extra credit for participating in the survey. Additional participants were secondary special educators working

at junior high or high schools in a Midwestern state. Overall response rate for the US educators was 46 out of 58 possible participants (79%). However, not every participant responded to all questions. Differential rates of responding will be reported in the results section. Overall, a total of 38 out of 46 (83%) participants completed the entire survey.

In Korea, 70 educators agreed to participate in the study. All participants were secondary special educators who work at middle or high schools in Seoul, Busan, Ahndong, and Suwon. The SSEPCP survey forms were mailed on March 23, 2010 to 50 secondary educators. Participants completed the consent form and the SSEPCP. Forty-five educators (90%) completed the survey. The online version of SSEPCP was emailed on March 19, 2010 to 30 secondary educators. Participants visited the linked website to complete the survey. Seventeen educators (57%) completed the survey. The survey took 20 minutes. Overall response rate was 70 out of 80 possible participants (88%). Not every participant responded to all questions, therefore, differential rates of responding will be reported in the Result section. Overall, a total of 61 out of 70 participants (87 %) completed the entire survey.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics were conducted for respondents' demographic information, the level of implementation of person-centered planning, and the level of agreements of knowledge of and attitudes toward person-centered planning for US and Korean educators group. Through the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), the data were divided into two groups based on nationality (i.e., US educators and Korea educators) and implementation level (i.e., the group who had implemented person-centered planning and the group who had not implemented person-centered planning). In addition, the level of agreement of the dependent variables, overall knowledge on person-centered planning and overall attitude of person-centered planning, were computed. A one-way ANOVA was conducted to examine differences between the mean score of knowledge of person-centered

planning and the mean score of attitudes toward person-centered planning between the US and Korea. In addition, a one-way ANOVA was employed to determine differences the mean score of knowledge of and attitude toward person-centered planning according to implementation levels of person-centered planning. Then, one-way ANOVA was conducted to examine significant differences between the number of person-centered planning meetings implemented and the mean score across agreement levels of knowledge and attitude toward person-centered planning. In addition, correlation coefficients were computed to determine the relationship between two variables: (a) overall knowledge of person-centered planning, and (b) overall attitudes toward person-centered planning. Last, two-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted to determine significant differences among three variables: nationality, implementation levels of person-centered planning, and the mean score of knowledge of person-centered planning, and the mean score of attitudes toward person-centered planning.

Reliability of the Survey

Reliability analyses were conducted on the *Secondary Special Educators Person-Centered Planning Survey* (SSEPCP) and coefficient alpha were computed. The overall estimate of reliability for all 23 items included in the survey produced a .85 coefficient alpha. The internal consistency reliability for the two subscales were: Knowledge of Person-Centered Planning (Chronbach's alpha = .90); and Attitudes toward Person-Centered Planning (Chronbach's alpha = .66), while the reliability alpha for Attitudes toward Person-Centered Planning subscale was lower than generally acceptable range of values (Nunnally, 1978). However, the reliability coefficient is still satisfactory for determining differences between groups (Rudner & Schafer, 2002). The low reliability for the Attitudes toward Person-Centered Planning subscale may have been attributed to small test items, sample size, ambiguous questions, or respondent error to which coefficient alpha is sensitive (Jacobs,

1991). Moreover, the survey was developed by the researcher only for this study. In sum, these estimates indicated high overall reliability for the SSEPCP just below average ($r = .66$) to high ($r = .90$) internal consistency for the two subscales (Green & Salkind, 2008).

Chapter IV: Results

A total of 112 out of 138 educators participated in the survey with 99 valid surveys completed, yielding a total response rate of 85%. Findings are organized into three categories: (a) demographic data; (b) descriptive analysis of domains; and (c) research questions. The first section describes the demographic information. The second section reports descriptive analysis with percentage, means, and standard deviations for all domains. In last, the results of the research questions are reported.

Demographic Data for US Educators

Forty-six US educators agreed to participate in the survey and 38 (83%) completed the entire survey.

Types of school setting. Participants were asked to describe the school settings where they served students with disabilities. The options were: (a) special school; (b) self-contained special education classroom; (c) resource room; (d) home teaching; and (d) other. Forty-one educators answered this question and 4 skipped the question. Twenty-two percent (22%) of educators reported serving students with disabilities in resource rooms and 17 % in self-contained special education classrooms. The smallest group (5%) worked in special schools. Fifty-six percent (56%) of the educators reported other settings, such as transition coordinator (See Table 3).

Types of students' disability categories. Participants were asked to describe the disability categories of students with whom they primarily taught. The options were: (a) learning disability; (b) emotional disability; (c) mental retardation; (d) multiple disabilities; and (e) other. Forty educators answered this question. A little over one-third (35%) of all educators served students with learning disabilities and 33% served students with multiple disabilities. Thirteen percent (13%) of the educators worked with students with mental retardation. Only 3% of educators taught students who had emotional disabilities. Eighteen

percent (18%) of educators reported other categories such as autism spectrum disorder (See Table 3).

Grade levels. Participants were asked to report their current teaching grade level. The options were: (a) junior high or middle school level; (b) high school level; and (c) other. Forty educators answered this question. Sixty-five percent (65%) of educators were working at the high school level, while only 10% were working at junior high or middle school level. Twenty-five percent (25%) of educators reported other grade levels of teaching such as transition coordinator center (See Table 3).

Years teaching. Participant reported their total year of teaching. Forty educators answered this question. The years of teaching ranged from one year to more than 21 years. Thirty percent (30%) of the educators had been teaching for one to five years. One-fourth (25%) of the educators had been working between 6 to 10 years, 18% reported 11 to 15 years, and 18% more than 21 years. Only 10% of the educators had been teaching between 16 to 20 years.

Transition courses. Participants reported transition-specific courses that they had taken. This question included college level courses specific to transition services for students with disabilities. Forty educators answered this question. Twenty-eight percent (28%) of educators had taken more than 4 transition-specific courses. Eighteen percent (18%) of educators had enrolled in one course, 13% had completed 2 courses, and 10% had completed 3 courses. Only 5 % of educators have not taken any transition-specific courses (See Table 3).

Transition workshops. Participants reported total number of transition workshops in which they had participated. Workshops included in-service trainings, conference attendance, or other training specific to transition. Half of the educators (50%) reported attending more than 5 workshops. One-fifth (20%) of educators had never taken a transition workshop. Among the rest of the educators, 13% had completed 4 workshops, 8% had taken

1 workshop, and 8% had 2 workshops (See Table 3).

Person-centered planning training. Participants reported whether they had received any training related to person-centered planning. Forty educators answered this question. Among these participants, 26 educators (65%) responded that they had training on person-centered planning, while 14 educators (35%) responded that they had no experience with training in person-centered planning. Among the 26 educators who had training on person-centered planning, 9 (35%) had 4 to 6 hours of training and 7 (27%) had more than 10 hours of training. Six educators (23%) had between 1 to 3 hours of training, while 4 (15%) had 7 to 9 hours of training (See Table 3).

Demographic Data for Korea Educators

Seventy educators agreed to participate in the survey and 61 (87%) completed the entire survey.

Types of school setting. Participants were asked to report the school setting where they served students with disabilities. Sixty-seven educators answered this question. A majority (85%) of educators served students with disabilities in special schools, while 8% worked in resource rooms. The smallest group (2%) reported teaching in home teaching settings. Only 6% of educators reported other settings, all of whom reported being a transition coordinator (See Table 3).

Types of students' disability categories. Participants were asked to report the disability categories of students with whom they primarily taught. Sixty-seven educators answered this question. A majority (66%) of the educators served students with mental retardation, with 22% reporting they served students with multiple disabilities. Twelve percent (12%) of the educators reported other categories such as physical disabilities (See Table 3).

Grade levels. Participants were asked to describe their current teaching grade level.

Sixty-six educators answered this question. A little over half (52%) of educators worked in middle schools, while 26% taught students at the high school levels. Twenty-three percent (23%) of educators reported other grade levels of teaching including post-school program (See Table 3).

Years teaching. Participant reported their total years of teaching. The years of teaching ranged from one year to more than 21 years. A little over half (53%) of educators had been teaching for one to five years. Twenty-one percent (21%) had been working for 6 to 10 years. Eleven percent (11%) of the educators had worked between 16 to 21 years, and only 9% reported more than 21 years.

Transition courses. Participants reported their total number of transition-specific courses that they had taken. These included college-level courses specific to transition services for students with disabilities. Thirty percent (30%) of educators had taken one course, and 24% of the educator reported taking no transition-specific courses. Eighteen percent (18%) of the educators had taken 2 courses, with 12% enrolled in 3 courses. Only 5% of the educators had completed 4 courses. There were 11% of the respondents who took more than 5 courses (See Table 3).

Transition workshops. Participants reported total number of transition workshops they have taken. Workshops included in-service trainings, conference attendance, or other trainings specific to transition. Thirty percent (30%) of educators had attended a transition workshop at least one time. Twenty-six (26%) of educators had never taken a transition workshop. Eighteen percent (18%) of the educators had completed 2 workshops, and 12% at least 3 workshops. Only 2% of the educators had completed took 4 transition workshops, and 12% reported more than 5 (See Table 3).

Person-centered planning training. Participants reported whether they had any training in person-centered planning. Sixty-six educators answered this question, and 4

skipped the question. Among participants, 53 educators (80%) responded that they did not have training in person-centered planning, with only 13 educators (20%) responding they had completed training in person-centered planning. Among the 13 educators who had training in person-centered planning, 7 (54%) had 1 to 3 hours of training. Three educators (23%) had completed between 4 to 6 hours of training, and 3 (23%) more than 10 hours of training.

Level of Implementation of Person-centered Planning Domain

Participants were asked to report whether they had facilitated any person-centered planning meeting. Thirty-one educators out of 102 (30%) had facilitated person-centered planning meeting. Among the 31 educators who had implemented person-centered planning with their students with disabilities, 24 educators (77%) were from US, while only 7 educators (23%) were from Korea. There were substantially more educators who had not facilitated a person-centered planning, 71 educators out of 102 (70%). Among the 71 educators who had never facilitated a person-centered planning, 54 educators (76%) were from Korea, while 17 educators (24%) were from the US.

Research Question 1: What Is the Perception of Person-Centered Planning of Secondary Special Educators in Korea?

Educators in Korea were asked to rate their level of agreement about their knowledge of person-centered planning using a 5-point Likert-scale (1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neutral, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree). The knowledge score consisted of 8 items on the survey. The mean rating for Korean educators' knowledge of person-centered planning was just below overall agreement with the knowledge items ($M = 3.82$, $SD = 0.40$). Among the knowledge items, Korea educators reported their highest agreement with Question #2: "Person-centered planning focuses on the student's strengths, needs, and dreams more than other types of assessments ($M = 4.16$, $SD = 0.57$)." They reported lowest agreement level with Question #5: "The student has more control over the planning process (e.g., inviting

people to the meeting, leading the meeting, contributing to the goal setting) ($M = 3.15$, $SD = 0.96$).”

Educators were asked to rate their level of agreement with attitudes toward person-centered planning across 15 items on the survey. The mean rating for their attitudes toward person-centered planning was neutral ($M = 3.00$, $SD = 0.26$). Among the attitude items toward person-centered planning, Korea educators reported highest agreement with Question #20: “Person-centered planning helps me to make the IEPs better ($M = 4.05$, $SD = 0.53$).” The lowest agreement level was Question #14: “Getting people together in one place at a certain time to hold person-centered planning is difficult for me ($M = 1.80$, $SD = 0.60$).” and Question #16: “Lack of participation can make it difficult to implement person-centered planning meeting ($M = 1.80$, $SD = 0.63$).” The results of the analyses are presented in Table 4.

Research Question 2: What Is the Perception of Person-Centered Planning of Secondary Special Educators in the US?

Educators in the US were asked to respond their level of agreement about their knowledge of person-centered planning using a 5-point Likert-scale (1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neutral, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree). The knowledge score consisted of 8 items on the survey. US Educators reported that they agreed in terms of overall knowledge of person-centered planning ($M = 4.03$, $SD = 0.91$). Among the knowledge items, US educators reported the highest agreement level with Question #2: “Person-centered planning focuses on the student’s strengths, needs, and dreams more than other types of assessments ($M = 4.30$, $SD = 0.85$).” However, educators reported lowest agreement with Question #1: “Person-centered planning is flexible and informal ($M = 3.63$, $SD = 1.10$).”

Educators were asked to rate their level of agreement with attitudes toward person-centered planning across 15 items on the survey. They reported more neutral attitudes toward person-centered planning ($M = 3.28$, $SD = 0.45$). Among items related to the attitudes toward

person-centered planning, US educators reported highest agreement with Question #20: “Person-centered planning helps me to make the IEPs better (M = 4.00, SD = 1.15).” The lowest agreement level was Question #16: “Lack of participation can make it difficult to implement person-centered planning meeting (M = 2.21, SD = 0.86).” The results of the analyses are presented in Table 4.

Research Question 3: What Are Differences in Educators’ Knowledge of and Attitude Toward Person-Centered Planning Between the US and Korea?

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to evaluate the differences the mean scores for agreement levels of knowledge of person-centered planning between the US and Korea. The independent variable, the nationality, included two levels: the US educators and Korean educators. The dependent variable was the agreement levels of knowledge of person-centered planning. The results revealed that there were no significant differences between the US and Korean educators in terms of overall knowledge of person-centered planning ($F [1, 98] = 2.41, p = .12$). The results of the analyses are presented in Table 5.

However, among individual items, it was interesting to note that there was a difference between US educators and Korean educators with Question #5: “The student has more control over the planning process (e.g., inviting people to the meeting, leading the meeting, contributing to the goal setting).” Most US educators (75%) strongly agreed or agreed with this statement, while 41% Korean educators agreed. However, 28% Korean educators strongly disagreed or disagreed and 7% US educators strongly disagreed. Both US and Korean educators reported strongly agreed or agreed with the Question #6: “Through person-centered planning, various points of view about the student’s future life can be gathered from different people (88% for US educators and 87% for Korean educators) (See Table 6).”

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to determine if there were significant differences between nationality (i.e., US and Korea) and the mean scores for agreement levels of attitudes toward person-centered planning. The independent variable, the nationality, included two levels: US educators and Korean educators. The dependent variable was the agreement levels of attitudes toward person-centered planning. There were significant difference attitudes toward person-centered planning between US educators and Korean educators ($F [1, 98] = 5.37, p < .05$) (See Table 5). The US educators had more positive attitudes toward person-centered planning than Korean educators ($M = 3.28, SD = .45$ vs. $M = 3.00, SD = .26$).

Among individual items, it was interesting to note that there were huge differences between US educators and Korean educators with the Question # 10, 14, and 15. With the statement # 10 “Person-centered planning is too much extra work for me”, 61% Korean educators and only 5% US educators strongly agreed or agreed. However, 47% US educators and only 2% Korean educators strongly disagreed or disagreed. Most Korean educators (91%) strongly agreed or agreed with the statement # 14 “Getting people together in one place at a certain time to hold person-centered planning is difficult for me”, and 40% US educators agreed. Twenty-eight percent US educators strongly disagreed or disagreed with this statement, while no Korean educators disagreed. With the Question # 15 “Person-centered planning could replace the IEP meeting”, 64 % US educators strongly agreed or agreed, while 28% Korean educators agreed. However, 54% US educators strongly disagreed or disagreed with this statement and 10% Korean educators disagreed (See Table 6).

Research Question 4: Is There a Correlation Between Educators’ Knowledge of Person-Centered Planning and Attitudes toward Person-Centered Planning?

Correlation coefficients were computed among the two variables; knowledge of person-centered planning and attitude toward person-centered planning. The results of the analyses are presented in Table 7. The correlation between knowledge of person-centered

planning and attitudes toward person-centered planning was statistically significant at the 0.01 level, $r [102] = .65, p < .01$. The correlation coefficient implies that there is a positive correlation between two variables. This implies that educators who had more knowledge about person-centered planning were more likely to possess more attitudes toward person-centered planning, and vice versa. In addition, there was a strong positive correlation within the US educators' group ($r [41] = .84, p < .01$). However, no significant correlation was found within Korean educators' group ($r [59] = .13, p = .30$). These results indicated an overall positive relationship between knowledge of and attitudes toward person-centered planning for only the US educators' group.

Research Question 5: What are Differences in Educators' Knowledge of and Attitudes Toward Person-Centered Planning Based on Educators' Implementation Levels of Person-Centered Planning?

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to determine if there were differences between implementation levels of person-centered planning and the mean score of knowledge of person-centered planning. The independent variable included two groups: the group who had implemented person-centered planning and the group who had not implemented person-centered planning. The dependent variable was the agreement levels of knowledge of person-centered planning. The results of the analyses are presented in Table 8. There was no significant difference between implementation levels of person-centered planning and overall knowledge of person-centered planning at the 0.05 level ($F [1, 98] = .36, p = .55$).

In addition, one-way ANOVA was computed to identify whether there were differences between implementation levels of person-centered planning and the mean score of attitudes toward person-centered planning. The independent variable included two groups: the group who had implemented person-centered planning and the group who had not implemented person-centered planning. The dependent variable was the agreement levels of

attitudes toward person-centered planning. The results of the analyses are presented in Table 8. There was no significant difference between implementation levels of person-centered planning and overall attitudes toward person-centered planning at the 0.05 level ($F [1, 98] = 2.22, p = .14$).

Research Question 6: What Are Differences in Implementing Person-Centered Planning Based on Knowledge of and Attitudes toward Person-Centered Planning between the US and Korean Educators?

Two-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted to determine the differences among three variables: nationality (i.e., US educators and Korean educators), implementation levels of person-centered planning (i.e., the group who had implemented person-centered planning and the group who had not implemented person-centered planning), and perceptions of person-centered planning (i.e., the score of knowledge of person-centered planning and the score of attitudes toward person-centered planning). The results of the analyses are presented in Table 8. There were no significant differences among three variables nationality, implementation levels of person-centered planning, and perceptions of person-centered planning at the 0.05 level ($F [1, 98] = 3.29, p = .07$; $F [1, 98] = .01, p = .92$).

Chapter V: Discussion

This study investigated knowledge of and attitudes toward person-centered planning (PCP) of secondary special educators in the US and Korea. In addition, this study identified the relationship between current status of implementing person-centered planning and knowledge of and attitudes toward person-centered planning between two countries. The results concluded with implications of a person-centered planning workshop program for secondary special education teachers. This chapter provided the summary of this research as well as possible limitations and implications for future research are discussed.

Summary of Results

Thirty-eight US educators and 61 Korean educators completed the *Secondary Special Educators Person-Centered Planning Survey (SSEPCP)*. There were differences in demographic information of the entire participants. Most Korean educators (85%) worked at a special school which is a segregated educational environment, while 22% of US educators worked in a resource room which is a more inclusive environment. Fifty-two percent Korean educators were working at the junior high school level and 65% of US educators were working at the high school level. Korean educators mostly taught students with mental disabilities (66%), while US educators taught students with learning disabilities (35%). It is expected that this is related to participants' working environments. In other words, most Korean participants worked at the special schools which served students with mental disabilities and most US participants worked at the resource room that served students with learning disabilities.

With the statement of taking transition related courses at the college level, the US educators took more courses than Korean educators. The majority of US educators (51%) took more than 2 courses, while 35% of Korean educators took. The same result was found with the statement of taking transition related workshop for teachers. The US educators took

more workshops than Korean educators. Seventy-two percent of US educators took more than 2 workshops, while 44% of Korean educators took. In terms of taking person-centered planning training, 65% of US educators had experience with taking person-centered planning training, while only 20% of Korean educators had training related to person-centered planning. However, only 30% of the entire respondents had facilitated person-centered planning meeting. Among these educators who had implemented person-centered planning, 77% were US educators and 23% were Korean educators. In sum, the US educators were more familiar with facilitating person-centered planning in their educational settings than Korean educators.

The overall attitudes toward person-centered planning between the US and Korean educators groups, there were significant differences ($F [1, 98] = 5.37, p < .05$). In other words, there were different attitudes toward person-centered planning between the US group and the Korean group. US educators have more positive attitudes toward person-centered planning than Korean educators ($M = 3.28, SD = .45$ vs. $M = 3.00, SD = .26$). However, no significant differences were found in overall knowledge of person-centered planning between US educators and Korean educators ($F [1, 98] = 2.41, p = .12$).

There was sufficient evidence to support the claim that there is a positive correlation between knowledge of person-centered planning and attitudes toward person-centered planning ($r [102] = .65, p < .01$). As educators are more knowledgeable about person-centered planning, they will have more positive attitudes toward person-centered planning, and vice versa. These positive correlations between knowledge and attitudes of person-centered planning are consistent with Flannery and colleagues' (2000) findings, which was reported about improved perceptions toward person-centered planning process of educators and parents after they took the workshop related to person-centered planning training. In this study, however, a strong positive correlation between knowledge and attitudes of person-

centered planning was found only in the US educators group ($r [41] = .84, p < .01$). Therefore, there is a need for future study that investigates the effectiveness of workshop related to person-centered planning for secondary special educators, especially for Korean educators.

Lastly, there was not sufficient evidence to support the claim that as educators have more knowledge and positive attitudes toward person-centered planning, they would implement person-centered planning frequently ($F [1, 98] = .36, p = .55; F [1, 98] = 2.22, p = .14$). There were no relationships between educators' knowledge of and attitudes toward person-centered planning based on their implementation of person-centered planning. In addition, there were no relationships among nationality groups, implementation levels of person-centered planning, and educators' perceptions ($F [1, 98] = 3.29, p = .07; F [1, 98] = .01, p = .92$). These results may have been affected by small number of educators group who had facilitated person-centered planning in their educational settings. Therefore, future study is needed to determine relationship between educators' experience about person-centered planning and their perceptions.

Limitations

In this study, there were several limitations that impacted to generalization of the findings. These limitations were related to the sample size, sampling method, the characteristic of self-reporting method, and reliability of the survey.

The first limitation of this study was the small number of respondents involved. Thirty-eight US educators and 61 Korean educators participated in the survey. The number of respondents was not enough to represent the general population of educators within the US and Korea. In other words, it makes difficult to generalize the findings of this study. Especially, the number of educators who had facilitated person-centered planning in their educational settings was small. This may limit the results of this study. Therefore, in order to generalize the results, a larger sample size that will represent the entire population of

educators is needed for this study.

Second, convenient sampling method that was used for this study had limitation in generalization of the findings. The participants who were selected through convenient sampling were not representative of population of educators in the US and Korea. For example, for US educators group, most of them had enrolled in transition-related graduate programs at a Midwestern university. This means that they were highly educated group of the entire educators about person-centered planning. For the Korean educators group, most of the respondents worked in special education schools which mostly person-centered planning approach was not facilitated. Therefore, in order to avoid possible limited results because of convenient sampling, a random sampling is needed for future research (Triola, 2010).

Third limitation of this study was related to respondents' self-reporting of the survey items. Educators self-reported their knowledge and attitudes of person-centered planning. There are possibilities that respondent's bias impacted to the results of this study, in that respondents over-rated their responses. With the items related to attitudes toward person-centered planning, the researcher controlled for respondent's bias by reversing some items. However, the items related to knowledge of person-centered planning, a more rigorous approach would have been to create items that respondents choose correct answers of knowledge of person-centered planning. This will help to get better understanding of respondents' true knowledge of person-centered planning.

Last limitation was about the reliability of the survey. The overall reliability of the survey was satisfactory to determine differences between groups (Chronbach's alpha = .85 for all items; Chronbach's alpha = .90 for Knowledge of Person-Centered Planning subscale; Chronbach's alpha = .66 for Attitudes toward Person-Centered Planning subscale). However, the reliability of Attitudes subscales was lower than generally acceptable reliability range. It is expected that this is because the researcher developed the survey only for the purpose of

this study. Small items of the survey, small sample size, ambiguous items, or respondents' error may limit the reliability coefficient (Jacobs, 1991). At first, the survey was developed by English version then the survey was translated into Korean. Translation errors may limit the reliability of the survey. In addition, the question # 10 was identified as an ambiguous item though factor analysis of entire items. Thus, there is a need to improve the survey items more reliable for future study.

Future Research

Based on the findings of this research, several implications for future research are recommended. First of all, additional study is needed to investigate why gap of attitudes toward person-centered planning existed between US educators and Korean educators. The finding only indicated that there was difference attitudes toward person-centered planning between two countries (i.e., the US and Korea). Then, which factors influence to different attitudes toward person-centered planning? Bui and Turnbull (2003) described the conflicting factors of person-centered planning which made difficult to implement for Asian families: hierarchical family system; family cohesion; deference to professional's knowledge; low expectations about independent life; and being reluctant to seeking help. Kim and Morningstar (2005) also mentioned barriers of transition planning as negative professional attitudes, insensitivity on cultural diversity and contextual barriers. In this study, it is assumed that US educators have more positive attitudes toward person-centered planning because they have better relationship with families which makes more conducive to holding person-centered planning than Korean educators. Therefore, future research should address which factor makes attitude differences toward person-centered planning between different countries.

Several researchers suggested that person-centered planning can be used in order to support culturally diverse individuals with disabilities and their families during the transition

period from school to the community (Blue-Banning et al., 2000; Callicott, 2003; Trainor, 2007). Bui and Turnbull (2003) suggested modified person-centered planning approaches to match different cultural beliefs, such as being sensitive to family's cultural beliefs, arranging time and supports for convenience, and paying attention to any non-verbal cues. From this research, there were different attitudes toward person-centered planning between the US and Korea. The difference did not indicate the cultural differences about person-centered planning. However, future research can be conducted to investigate the relationship of cultural factors within person-centered planning process. This research will lead another study that investigates whether modified person-centered planning approaches effectively help cultural diversity groups.

In this sense, designing a workshop about training person-centered planning for Korean educators is recommended for future research. A workshop related to train person-centered planning was effective in increasing knowledge and positive attitudes of person-centered planning (Flannery et al., 2000). This study found that Korean educators had facilitated less than US educators. Korean educators had less positive attitudes toward person-centered planning compared to US educators. Importantly, the finding implies that a person who is more knowledgeable about person-centered planning will likely have positive attitudes toward person-centered planning. Therefore, the workshop about person-centered planning for Korean educators may impact to their improved attitudes toward person-centered planning and their implementation levels of person-centered planning in their educational settings. There is a need to investigate knowledge and attitude differences about person-centered planning by comparing pre and post responses through a workshop.

Lastly, future research is needed to address whether person-centered planning is an effective transition planning method in order to accomplish students' transition goals successfully. There were several literature review about person-centered planning, while few

studies that investigated the outcomes of person-centered planning (Menchetti & Garcia, 2003; Reid et al., 1999). As O'Brien (2002) viewed person-centered planning with possibility of social change, there is a need for future study to support sufficient evidence of using person-centered planning by investigating the effectiveness of person-centered planning for youth with disabilities.

References

- Bae, S. J. & Clark, G. M. (2004). Trends and issues in transition assessment in Korea. *The Journal of Special Education: Theory and Practice*, 5(3), 265-284.
- Blue-Banning, M. J., Turnbull, A. P., & Pereira, L. (2000). Group action planning as a support strategy for Hispanic families: Parent and professional perspectives. *Mental Retardation*, 38(3), 262-275.
- Bui Y. N., & Turnbull, A. (2003). East meets west: Analysis of person-centered planning in the context of Asian American values. *Education and Training in Developmental Disabilities*, 38(1), 18-31.
- Butterworth, J., Hagner, D., Heikkinen, B., Faris, S., DeMello, S., & McDonough, K. (1993). *Whole Life Planning: A guide for organizers and facilitators*. Retrieved from ERIC database (ED411616)
- Callicott, K. J. (2003). Culturally sensitive collaboration within person-centered planning, *Focus on Autism and Other Developmental Disabilities*, 18(1), 60-68.
- Cho, E. Y. (2001). *A study on assessment strategies for Individualized Transition Planning (ITP) of students with disabilities* (Unpublished master's thesis). Taegu University, Taegu, Korea.
- Employment and Disability Institute. (n.d.). In *Person-centered planning education site*. Retrieved from <http://www.ilr.cornell.edu/edi/pcp/index.html>
- Everson, J. (1996). Using person-centered planning concepts to enhance school-to-adult life transition planning. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*, 6, 7-13.
- Flannery, K.B., Newton, S., Horner, R.H., Slovic, R., Blumberg, R., & Ard, W.R. (2000). The impact of person-centered planning on the content and organization of individual supports. *Career Development for Exceptional Individuals*, 28, 123-137
- Green, S. B. & Salkind, N. J. (2008). *Using SPSS for Windows and Macintosh: Analyzing and*

- understanding data*. New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Hagner, D., Helm, D., & Butterworth, J. (1996). This is your meeting: A qualitative study of person-centered planning. *Mental Retardation*, 34, 159-171.
- Houlburn, S., Jacobson, J. W., Vietze, P. M., Schwartz, A. A., & Sersen, E. (2000). Quantifying the process and outcomes of person-centered planning. *American Journal on Mental Retardation*, 105(5), 402-416.
- Holburn, S. (2002). How science can evaluate and enhance person-centered planning. *Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities*, 27(4), 250-260.
- Holburn, S. & Cea, C. D. (2007). Excessive positivism in person-centered planning. *Research & Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities*, 32(3), 167-172.
- Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 20 U. S. C. §1414 (2004)
- Jacobs, L. C. (1991). *Test reliability*. Retrieved from http://www.indiana.edu/~best/test_reliability.shtml.
- Keyes, M. W., & Owens-Johnson, L. (2003). Developing person-centered IEPs. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, 38(3), 145-152.
- Kincaid, D., & Fox, L. (2002). Person-centered planning and positive behavior support. In S. Holburn & V. M. Vietze (Eds.), *Person-centered planning: Research, practice, and future directions* (pp. 29-49). Baltimore: Brookes.
- Kim, J. H. (2006). A review of literature study on the transition assessment for students with developmental disabilities in the transition perspective. *Journal of Mental Retardation*, 8(3), 55-77.
- Kim, K. H., & Turnbull, A. (2004). Transition to adulthood for students with severe intellectual disabilities: shifting toward person-family interdependent planning. *Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities*, 29(1), 53-57.
- Kim, K. H. & Morningstar, M. E. (2005). Transition planning involving culturally and

- linguistically diverse families. *Career Development for Exceptional Individuals*, 28(2), 92-103.
- Kohler, P. D. & Field, S. (2003). Transition-focused education: Foundation for the future. *The Journal of Special Education*, 37(3), 174-183.
- Korea Department of Education and Human Resource. *A research on the statue and needs of futue direction and job education for special education institutes*. (2008). Seoul: Author. Retrieved March 2010 from <http://www.kise.go.kr/html>
- Magito-McLaughlin, D., Spinosa, T. R., & Marsalis, M. D. (2002). Overcoming the barriers: Moving toward a service model that is conducive to person-centered planning. In S. Holburn & V. M. Vietze (Eds.), *Person-centered planning: Research, practice, and future directions* (pp. 127-150). Baltimore: Brookes.
- Menchetti, B. M. & Garcia, L. A. (2003). Personal and employment outcomes of person-centered career planning. *Education and Training in Developmental Disabilities*, 38(2), 145-156.
- Michaels, C. A. & Ferrara, D. L. (2005). Promoting post-school success for all: The role of collaboration in person-centered transition planning. *Journal of Educational & Psychological Consultation*, 16(4), 287-313.
- Miner, C. A. & Bates, P. E. (1997). The effect of person-centered planning activities on the IEP / Transition planning process. *Education and Training in Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities*, 32(2), 105-112.
- Morton Pengra, L. (2000). *Your values, my values: Multicultural services in developmental disabilities*. Baltimore: Brookes.
- Mount, B. (1987). *Personal futures planning: Finding directions for change* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Georgia, Ann Arbor, MI: UMI Dissertation Information Service.

- Newman, L., Wagner, M., Cameto, R., & Knokey, A.-M. (2009). *The Post-High School Outcomes of Youth with Disabilities up to 4 Years After High School: A Report of Findings from the National Longitudinal Transition Study-2 (NLTS2)* (NCSE 2009-3017). Menlo Park, CA: SRI International. Retrieved from http://www.nlts2.org/reports/2009_04/nlts2_report_2009_04_complete.pdf.
- Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- O'Brien, C.L., & O'Brien, J. (2002). The origins of person-centered planning: A community of practice perspective. In S. Holburn & V. M. Vietze (Eds.), *Person-centered planning: Research, practice, and future directions* (pp. 3-27). Baltimore: Brookes.
- O'Brien, J. (2002). Person-centered planning as a contributing factor in organizational and social change, *Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities*, 27(4), 261-264.
- Park, J. S. & Cho, I. S. (2006). The student on level of implementation of transition education in special schools. *Korean Journal of Special Education*, 41(1), 133-156.
- Park, S. W. & Kim, C. H. (2003). The comparison to perception level of parents and teachers about transition plan and self-determination of mentally retarded student. *Journal of Special Education*, 10(1), 169-192.
- Pearpoint, J., O'Brien, J., & Forest, M. (1993). *PATH (Planning Alternative Tomorrows with Hope): A workbook for planning positive futures*. Toronto: Inclusion Press.
- Person-centered planning: A tool for transition. (2004, February). *Parent Brief*. Minnesota: PACER Center.
- Rasheed, S. A., Fore III, C., & Miller, S. (2006). Person-centered planning: Practices, promises, and provisos. *The Journal for Vocational Special Needs Education*, 28(3), 47-59.
- Reid, D. H., Everson, J. M., & Green, C. W. (1999). A systematic evaluation of preferences

- identified through person-centered planning for people with profound multiple disabilities. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 32, 467-477.
- Rudner, L. M. & Schafer, W. D. (2002). *What teachers need to know about assessment*. Retrieved from <http://echo.edres.org:8080/nea/teachers.pdf>
- Sanderson, H. (2002). A plan is not enough: Exploring the development of person-centered teams. In S. Holburn & V. M. Vietze (Eds.), *Person-centered planning: Research, practice, and future directions* (pp. 97-126). Baltimore: Brookes.
- Salkind, N. J. (2009). *Exploring research*. New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Scott, P. (2007). Rallying relationships: The role of positive visions and possible actions in person-centered planning. *Research & Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities*, 32(3), 181-183.
- Seo, H. M. (2007). *Korean secondary special education teachers' perceptions of transition competences* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Kansas, Kansas, USA.
- Smull, M., Sanderson, H., & Harrison, S. (1996). *Reviewing essential lifestyle plans: Criteria for best plans*. College Park: University of Maryland, Center Services Development.
- Stlington, P. L., & Clark, G. M. (2006). *Transition education and services for students with disabilities* (4th ed.). New York: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Trainor, A. A. (2007). Person-centered planning in two culturally distinct communities: Responding to divergent needs and preferences. *Career Development for Exceptional Individuals*, 30(2), 80-91.
- Triola, M. F. (2010). *Elementary Statistics* (11th ed.). New Jersey: Pearson Addison-Wesley.
- Turnbull, A. P., & Turnbull, H. R. (1996). Group Action Planning as a strategy for providing comprehensive family support. In L. K. Koegel, R. L. Koegel, & G. Dunlap (Eds.), *Positive behavioral support: Including people with difficult behavior in the community* (pp. 99-114). Baltimore: Brookes.

- Turnbull, A. P., Turnbull, H. R., & Blue-Banning, M. J. (1994). Enhancing inclusion of infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families: A theoretical and programmatic analysis. *Infants and Young Children, 7*(2), 1-14.
- Vandercook, T., York, J., & Forest, M. (1989). The McGill action planning system (MAPS): A strategy for building the vision. *Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 14*, 205-215.
- Wehmeyer, M. L. (2002). The confluence of person-centered planning and self-determination. In S. Holburn & V. M. Vietze (Eds.), *Person-centered planning: Research, practice, and future directions* (pp. 51-69). Baltimore: Brookes.
- Weir. (2004). Person-centered and collaborative supports for college success. *Education and Training in Developmental Disabilities, 29*(1), 67-73.
- Whitney-Thomas, J., Shaw, D., Honey, K. & Butterworth, J. (1998). Building a future: A study of student participation in person-centered planning. *The Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 23*(2), 119-133.
- Yoon, T. S. & Yoo, A. (2008). A study on transition education of secondary special education classes and its improvement in Chungnam province. *The Journal of Special Education: Theory and Practice, 9*(4), 17-41.

Table 1

Examples of Person-centered Planning

Making Action Plans (MAPs)	Personal Futures Planning
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is a MAP? 2. What is the individual’s history? 3. Who is the individual? 4. What are the dreams? 5. What are the nightmares? 6. What are the individual strengths and talents? 7. What does the individual need now? 8. What would an ideal school day look like? 	<p>Task 1: Getting to know people (tool: the relationship map)</p> <p>Task 2: Finding capacities in people (tool: the personal profile)</p> <p>Task 3: Finding capacities in community life (tool: the community building map)</p> <p>Task 4: Creating a vision for the future (tool: the futures map)</p> <p>Task 5: Supporting people over time to take action and try new things (tool: follow along meetings and action plans)</p> <p>Task 6: ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE: Constructive system supports (tool: designing platforms for change)</p>
Planning Alternative Tomorrow with Hope (PATH)	Essential Lifestyles Planning
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify the “North Star” 2. Identify the “Goal” 3. Look at life “Now” 4. Identify differences between “Now” and “Goal” 5. Identify steps to move person from “Now” to “Goal” 6. Identify “First step” 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What are your “non-negotiable”? 2. What are your “strong preferences”? 3. What are your “highly desirables”? 4. People who know and care about me say... 5. To be successful in supporting me, we must... 6. My reputation is... 7. If this is going to happen, we must...
The Whole Life Planning	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Organize the planning process 2. Create a personal profile 3. Build a vision 4. Action planning 5. Support networks and plans 	

Note. From Keyes & Owen-Johnson, 2003; Rasheed, Fore III, & Miller, 2006; Employment and Disability Institute, n.d.

Table 2

Types of Person-Centered Planning

	Personal Future Planning	McGill Action Planning	Essential Lifestyle Planning	Group Action Planning	Whole Life Planning	Promoting Alternative Tomorrows with Hope
Family, friends, community, etc., participate in meetings	X	X	X	X	X	X
Community of social focus	X	X	X	X	X	X
Student or school focus	X	X		X		
Adult focus	X		X			
Personal empowerment	X	X	X	X	X	X
Directed by focus person	X	X	X	X	X	X
Focus on strengths of person	X	X	X	X	X	X
Long-term support	X	X	X	X	X	X
Ongoing problem solving process	X	X	X	X	X	X

Note: Adapted from “Person-centered planning: Practices, promises, and provisos”, by Rasheed, S. A., Fore III, C., & Miller, S., 2006, *The Journal for Vocational Special Needs Education*, 28(3), 47-59.

Table 3

Demographic Data of the Respondents (Frequency Data in Parentheses)

Demographic Data	US		Korea	
Types of School				
Special school	4.9%	(2)	85.1%	(57)
Self-contained special education classroom	17.1%	(7)	0.0%	(0)
Resource room	22.0%	(9)	7.5%	(5)
Home teaching	0.0%	(0)	1.5%	(1)
Other	56.1%	(23)	6.0%	(4)
Transition coordinator	19.5%	(8)	6.0%	(4)
Public high school	19.5%	(8)	0.0%	(0)
State educational consultant	4.9%	(2)	0.0%	(0)
Title I Reading teacher	2.4%	(1)	0.0%	(0)
Early childhood teacher	2.4%	(1)	0.0%	(0)
Student teaching	2.4%	(1)	0.0%	(0)
Administrator	2.4%	(1)	0.0%	(0)
Instructional level courses	2.4%	(1)	0.0%	(0)
Total	100%	(41)	100%	(67)
Disability Category Taught				
Learning disability	35.0%	(14)	0.0%	(0)
Emotional disability	2.5%	(1)	0.0%	(0)
Mental retardation	12.5%	(5)	65.7%	(44)
Multiple disability	32.5%	(13)	22.4%	(15)
Other	17.5%	(7)	11.9%	(8)

All disability	10.0%	(4)	4.5%	(3)
Autism spectrum disorder	5.0%	(2)	1.5%	(1)
Visual impairment	2.5%	(1)	0.0%	(0)
Physical disability	0.0%	(0)	6.0%	(4)
Total	100%	(40)	100%	(67)

Grade levels

Junior high or middle school level	10.0%	(4)	51.5%	(34)
High school level	65.0%	(26)	25.8%	(17)
Other	25.0%	(10)	22.7%	(15)
Early childhood	10.0%	(4)	0.0%	(0)
Elementary	7.5%	(3)	0.0%	(0)
Both	7.5%	(3)	10.6%	(7)
Post-school program	0.0%	(0)	7.6%	(5)
Transition coordination center	0.0%	(0)	4.5%	(3)
Total	100%	(40)	100%	(66)

Years teaching

1-5 years	30.0%	(12)	53.0%	(35)
6-10 years	25.0%	(10)	21.2%	(14)
11-15 years	17.5%	(7)	6.1%	(4)
16-20 years	10.0%	(4)	10.6%	(7)
21 + years	17.5%	(7)	9.1%	(6)
Total	100%	(40)	100%	(66)

Transition courses total

0 course	5.0%	(2)	24.2%	(16)
----------	------	-----	-------	------

1 course	17.5%	(7)	30.3%	(20)
2 courses	12.5%	(5)	18.2%	(12)
3 courses	10.0%	(4)	12.1%	(8)
4 courses	27.5%	(11)	4.5%	(3)
5+ courses	27.5%	(11)	10.6%	(7)
Total	100%	(40)	100%	(66)

Transition workshops total

0 workshop	20.0%	(8)	25.8%	(17)
1 workshop	7.5%	(3)	30.3%	(20)
2 workshops	7.5%	(3)	18.2%	(12)
3 workshops	2.5%	(1)	12.1%	(8)
4 workshops	12.5%	(5)	1.5%	(1)
5+ workshops	50.0%	(20)	12.1%	(8)
Total	100%	(40)	100%	(66)

Person-centered planning training

Yes	65.0%	(26)	19.7%	(13)
No	35.0%	(14)	80.3%	(53)
1-3 hours	23.1%	(6)	53.8%	(7)
4-6 hours	34.6%	(9)	23.1%	(3)
7-9 hours	15.4%	(4)	0.0%	(0)
10+ hours	26.9%	(7)	23.1%	(3)
Total	100%	(40)	100%	(66)

Table 4

Means and Standard Deviations of 23 Survey Items

	US		Korea		Total	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Knowledge of person-centered planning						
1. Person-centered planning is flexible and informal.	3.64	1.10	3.32	0.95	3.45	1.02
2. Person-centered planning focuses on the student's strengths, needs, and dreams more than other types of assessments.	4.30	0.85	4.16	0.57	4.21	0.70
3. Many people who are close to the student and have different backgrounds participate in person-centered planning meeting.	4.00	0.99	3.81	0.69	3.89	0.83
4. Person-centered planning increases the student and family's involvement in educational decisions and transition planning.	4.18	0.10	4.05	0.68	4.10	0.82
5. The student has more control over the planning process (e.g., inviting people to the meeting, leading the meeting, contributing to the goal setting).	3.93	1.08	3.15	0.96	3.47	1.08
6. Through person-centered planning, various points of view about the student's future life can be gathered from different people.	4.09	1.04	3.98	0.50	4.03	0.77
7. Through person-centered planning, the family shares information about their son/daughter.	4.09	1.09	4.10	0.60	4.10	0.83
8. Person-centered planning helps people to develop shared action plan for the student's future life.	4.21	1.10	3.97	0.61	4.07	0.85
Total Knowledge Score	4.04	0.91	3.82	0.41	3.91	0.66

	US		Korea		Total	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Attitude of person-centered planning						
9. I can easily implement person-centered planning in my class.	3.28	1.03	3.00	0.66	3.12	0.84
*10. Person-centered planning is too much extra work for me.	3.56	0.77	2.25	0.75	2.79	0.99
11. I can easily collaborate with the family and other people through person-centered planning.	3.47	1.01	3.34	0.70	3.39	0.84
*12. Person-centered planning requires a lot of time.	2.49	0.94	1.84	0.64	2.11	0.84
13. Person-centered planning is good to do before IEP meetings.	4.07	1.08	3.64	0.88	3.82	0.98
*14. Getting people together in one place at a certain time to hold person-centered planning is difficult for me.	2.95	1.02	1.80	0.60	2.28	0.98
15. Person-centered planning could replace the IEP meeting.	2.74	1.27	3.67	0.83	3.29	1.13
*16. Lack of participation can make it difficult to implement person-centered planning meeting.	2.21	0.86	1.80	0.63	1.97	0.76
17. Using person-centered planning is an effective way to communicate with the family and other people.	3.93	1.06	3.75	0.67	3.83	0.85
*18. Person-centered planning can put people into a vulnerable situation when talking about a family's personal life.	2.60	1.00	2.67	0.87	2.64	0.92
19. Person-centered planning helps me to plan the student's future goals.	3.98	1.10	3.97	0.48	3.97	0.79
20. Person-centered planning helps make the IEPs better.	4.00	1.15	4.05	0.53	4.03	0.84
21. The families I work with would be comfortable participating in person-centered planning meeting.	3.47	0.96	2.87	0.62	3.12	0.83

22. The families I work with feel comfortable sharing their knowledge, feelings, and dreams (future plan) about their son/daughter.	3.40	1.05	3.23	0.69	3.30	0.86
23. The families I work with want their son/daughter to lead the person-centered planning meeting.	3.09	0.97	3.21	0.76	3.16	0.85
Total Attitudes Score	3.28	0.45	3.01	0.27	3.12	0.38

Note. 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neutral, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree
*Scoring was reversed for these items.

Table 5

Means and Standard Deviations on the Dependent Variables for the Groups

Variables		M	SD	95% CI		<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>
				LL	UL		
Knowledge of PCP	US	4.04	0.91	3.80	4.21	1	2.412
	KOR	3.82	0.41	3.49	4.00		
Attitudes toward PCP	US	3.28	0.45	3.16	3.38	1	5.373*
	KOR	3.01	0.27	2.92	3.20		

Note. CI = Confidence Interval; LL = Lower Limit; UL = Upper Limit

* $p < .05$

Table 6

Frequency and Percent of 23 Survey Items

	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly Agree	
	US	KOR	US	KOR	US	KOR	US	KOR	US	KOR
Knowledge of Person-Centered Planning										
1. Person-centered planning is flexible and informal.	1 (2.3%)	2 (3.2%)	8 (18.2%)	11 (17.5%)	7 (15.9%)	19 (30.2%)	18 (40.9%)	27 (42.9%)	10 (22.7%)	4 (6.3%)
2. Person-centered planning focuses on the student's strengths, needs, and dreams more than other types of assessments.	1 (2.3%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	5 (11.4%)	6 (9.5%)	17 (38.6%)	41 (65.1%)	21 (47.7%)	16 (25.4%)
3. Many people who are close to the student and have different backgrounds participate in person-centered planning meeting.	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.9%)	2 (3.2%)	4 (3.7%)	16 (25.4%)	25 (23.4%)	37 (58.7%)	53 (49.5%)	8 (12.7%)	24 (22.4%)
4. Person-centered planning increases the student and family's involvement in educational decisions and transition planning.	1 (2.3%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (4.5%)	1 (1.6%)	6 (13.6%)	10 (15.9%)	14 (31.8%)	37 (58.7%)	21 (47.7%)	15 (23.8%)
5. The student has more control over the planning process (e.g., inviting people to the meeting, leading the meeting, contributing to the goal setting).	3 (7.0%)	2 (3.3%)	0 (0.0%)	15 (24.6%)	8 (18.6%)	19 (31.1%)	18 (41.9%)	22 (36.1%)	14 (32.6%)	3 (4.9%)
6. Through person-centered planning, various points of view about the student's future life can be gathered from different people.	3 (7.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (7.0%)	8 (13.1%)	21 (48.8%)	46 (75.4%)	16 (37.2%)	7 (11.5%)
7. Through person-centered planning, the family shares information about their son/daughter.	3 (7.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	5 (11.6%)	8 (13.1%)	17 (39.5%)	39 (63.9%)	18 (41.9%)	14 (23.0%)
8. Person-centered planning helps people to develop shared action plan for the student's future life.	3 (7.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (9.3%)	12 (19.7%)	14 (32.6%)	39 (63.9%)	22 (51.2%)	10 (16.4%)
Attitudes toward Person-Centered Planning										
9. I can easily implement person-centered planning in my class.	3 (7.0%)	1 (1.6%)	6 (14.0%)	10 (16.4%)	13 (30.2%)	38 (62.3%)	18 (41.9%)	12 (19.7%)	3 (7.0%)	0 (0.0%)
*10. Person-centered planning is too much extra work for me.										
11. I can easily collaborate with the family and other people through person-centered planning.	3 (7.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (7.0%)	7 (11.5%)	12 (27.9%)	27 (44.3%)	21 (48.8%)	26 (42.6%)	4 (9.3%)	1 (1.6%)
*12. Person-centered planning requires a lot of time.	2 (4.7%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (4.7%)	0 (0.0%)	16 (37.2%)	8 (13.1%)	18 (41.9%)	35 (57.4%)	5 (11.6%)	18 (29.5%)
13. Person-centered planning is	3	1	1	5	2	17	21	30	16	8

good to do before IEP meetings.	(7.0%)	(1.6%)	(2.3%)	(8.2%)	(4.7%)	(27.9%)	(48.8%)	(49.2%)	(37.2%)	(13.1%)
*14. Getting people together in one place at a certain time to hold person-centered planning is difficult for me.	4 (9.3%)	0 (0.0%)	8 (18.6%)	0 (0.0%)	14 (32.6%)	6 (9.8%)	16 (37.2%)	37 (60.7%)	1 (2.3%)	18 (29.5%)
15. Person-centered planning could replace the IEP meeting.	6 (14.0%)	0 (0.0%)	17 (39.5%)	6 (9.8%)	8 (18.6%)	16 (26.2%)	6 (14.0%)	31 (50.8%)	6 (14.0%)	8 (13.1%)
*16. Lack of participation can make it difficult to implement person-centered planning meeting.	2 (4.7%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.3%)	0 (0.0%)	6 (14.0%)	7 (11.5%)	29 (67.4%)	35 (57.4%)	5 (11.6%)	19 (31.1%)
17. Using person-centered planning is an effective way to communicate with the family and other people.	3 (7.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (3.3%)	7 (16.3%)	17 (27.9%)	20 (46.5%)	36 (59.0%)	13 (30.2%)	6 (9.8%)
*18. Person-centered planning can put people into a vulnerable situation when talking about a family's personal life.	2 (4.7%)	2 (3.3%)	6 (14.0%)	8 (13.1%)	12 (27.9%)	21 (34.4%)	19 (44.1%)	28 (45.9%)	4 (9.3%)	2 (3.3%)
19. Person-centered planning helps me to plan the student's future goals.	3 (7.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	8 (18.6%)	8 (13.1%)	16 (37.2%)	47 (77.0%)	16 (37.2%)	6 (9.8%)
20. Person-centered planning helps make the IEPs better.	3 (7.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	10 (23.3%)	7 (11.5%)	11 (25.6%)	44 (72.1%)	19 (44.2%)	10 (16.4%)
21. The families I work with would be comfortable participating in person-centered planning meeting.	3 (7.0%)	1 (1.6%)	1 (2.3%)	13 (21.3%)	16 (37.2%)	40 (65.6%)	19 (44.2%)	7 (11.5%)	4 (9.3%)	0 (0.0%)
22. The families I work with feel comfortable sharing their knowledge, feelings, and dreams (future plan) about their son/daughter.	3 (7.0%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (9.3%)	8 (13.1%)	14 (32.6%)	32 (52.5%)	17 (39.5%)	20 (32.8%)	5 (11.6%)	1 (1.6%)
23. The families I work with want their son/daughter to lead the person-centered planning meeting.	3 (7.0%)	0 (0.0%)	6 (14.0%)	9 (14.8%)	21 (48.8%)	33 (54.1%)	10 (23.3%)	16 (26.2%)	3 (7.0%)	3 (4.9%)

*Scoring was reversed for these items.

Table 7

Correlations among the Knowledge Items and Attitudes Items

Variable	All (<i>N</i> = 104)		US (<i>N</i> = 43)		KOR (<i>N</i> = 61)	
	1	2	1	2	1	2
1. Knowledge of PCP	1.00		1.00		1.00	
2. Attitude toward PCP	.65*	1.00	.84*	1.00	.13	1.00
<i>M</i>	3.91	3.12	4.05	.90	3.81	.40
<i>SD</i>	.67	.37	3.28	.44	3.01	.27

Table 8

MANOVA results on the Dependent Variables for the Groups

Variable		Sum Square	df	Mean Square	F	p
Nationality	Knowledge PCP	1.020	1	1.020	2.412	.124
	Attitudes PCP	.666	1	.666	5.373	< .05
Implementation	Knowledge PCP	.152	1	.152	.360	.550
	Attitudes PCP	.276	1	.276	2.223	.139
Nationality* Implementation	Knowledge PCP	1.392	1	1.392	3.291	.073
	Attitudes PCP	.001	1	.001	.010	.922
Error	Knowledge PCP	41.445	98	.423		
	Attitudes PCP	12.154	98	.124		
Total	Knowledge PCP	1602.297	102			
	Attitudes PCP	1005.284	102			

Appendix A

Secondary Special Educators Person-Centered Planning Survey (SSEPCP)

This survey is intended collect information about your perceptions of Person-Centered Planning (PCP), but not to evaluate your knowledge as a teacher. This is for research purpose only, and will be kept completely confidential. Thank you for your cooperation by completing and returning this survey.

Part I. Demographic Information

Please complete the following demographic information. Check the boxes that apply to your current professional role.

1. In what type of school do you teach? (Mark only 1 answer)
 Special School Self-Contained Special Education Classroom
 Resource Room Home Teaching Other: _____
2. What students do you primarily teach? (Mark only 1 answer)
 Learning Disability Emotional Disability
 Mental Retardation Multiple Disability Others: _____
3. What grade level of students with disabilities do you primarily teach? (Mark 1 answer)
 Junior High or Middle School Level High School Level
 Others (please specify): _____
4. How many total years have you been teaching? (Mark 1 answer)
 1-5 6-10 11-15 16-20 20+ years
5. How many transition-specific educational courses have you taken (college level coursework in transition)? (Mark 1 answer)
 0 1 2 3 4 5+ courses
6. Have you had training in Person-Centered Planning (PCP)? Yes No
If yes, how many hours of training? 1-3 4-6 7-9 10+

Part II. Implementation of Person-Centered Planning (PCP)

Please complete the following questions. Check the boxes that apply to your experiences related to implementing Person-Centered Planning (PCP).

1. Have you ever facilitated a person-centered planning meeting? Yes No
If yes, how many have you done?
 1-2 3-4 5-6 7-8 9-10 10+
If yes, what was your impression of the person-centered planning meeting?
 Negative experience
 Somewhat negative experience
 Neither positive nor negative
 Somewhat positive experience
 Very positive experience

Why? _____

2. Were the student and family active participants in the person-centered planning meetings? Yes No

If yes, How active was their participation?

- Very low participation
 Somewhat low participation
 Not low but not high participation
 Somewhat high participation
 Very high participation

Why? _____

Part III. Perceptions of Person-Centered Planning (PCP)

*This part consists of 23 questions that apply to your thoughts about Person-Centered Planning (PCP) in 2 domains. Please complete the following questions by circling your level of agreement.

Knowledge of Person-Centered Planning (PCP) (Mark your level of agreement)					
Questions	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. Person-centered planning is flexible and informal.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Person-centered planning focuses on the student's strengths, needs, and dreams more than other types of assessments.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Many people who are close to the student and have different backgrounds participate in person-centered planning meeting.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Person-centered planning increases the student and family's involvement in educational decisions and transition planning.	1	2	3	4	5
5. The student has more control over the planning process (e.g., inviting people to the meeting, leading the meeting, contributing to the goal setting).	1	2	3	4	5
6. Through person-centered planning, various points of view about the student's future life can be gathered from different people.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Through person-centered planning, the family shares information about their son/daughter.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Person-centered planning helps people to develop shared action plan for the student's future life.	1	2	3	4	5
Perceptions of Person-Centered Planning (PCP) (Mark your level of agreement)					
Questions	Strongly	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly

	Disagree				Agree
9. I can easily implement person-centered planning in my class.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Person-centered planning is too much extra work for me.	1	2	3	4	5
11. I can easily collaborate with the family and other people through person-centered planning	1	2	3	4	5
12. Person-centered planning requires a lot of time.	1	2	3	4	5
13. Person-centered planning is good to do before IEP meetings.	1	2	3	4	5
14. Getting people together in one place at a certain time to hold person-centered planning is difficult for me.	1	2	3	4	5
15. Person-centered planning could replace the IEP meeting.	1	2	3	4	5
16. Lack of participation can make it difficult to implement person-centered planning meeting.	1	2	3	4	5
17. Using person-centered planning is an effective way to communicate with the family and other people.	1	2	3	4	5
18. Person-centered planning can put people into a vulnerable situation when talking about a family's personal life.	1	2	3	4	5
19. Person-centered planning helps me to plan the student's future goals.	1	2	3	4	5
20. Person-centered planning helps make the IEPs better.	1	2	3	4	5
21. The families I work with would be comfortable participating in person-centered planning meeting.	1	2	3	4	5
22. The families I work with feel comfortable sharing their knowledge, feelings, and dreams (future plan) about their son/daughter.	1	2	3	4	5
23. The families I work with want their son/daughter to lead the person-centered planning meeting.	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix B

설문조사 참여 동의서 (제출용)

개인 중심 계획(Person-Centered Planning: PCP)에 대한 한국과 미국 중등 특수교사의 인식 수준의 비교

캔자스 대학(University of Kansas)의 특수교육과(Department of Special Education)에서는 연구 참여자들에게 대한 권리를 보호하고 있습니다. 귀하께서 본 설문조사 참여 여부에 대한 결정을 할 수 있도록 다음과 같은 정보를 알려드립니다.

본 연구의 목적은 개인 중심 계획(Person-Centered Planning: PCP)에 대한 한국과 미국 중등 특수교사의 인식 수준을 비교하고자 함에 있습니다. 또한, 본 연구는 한국과 미국에서의 개인 중심 계획의 현재 실행 수준과 인식 수준의 관련성을 파악하여, 그 결과를 비교하고자 합니다. 연구를 위해 개인 중심 계획에 대한 중등 특수교사의 인식 수준 측정 설문 조사가 사용될 것입니다. 이 설문 조사는 개인 중심 계획에 대한 인식 수준과 실행 수준을 측정하기 위하여 개발되었으며, 영어와 한국어 버전이 있습니다. 23개의 질문 문항으로 구성되어 있으며, 5점 라이커트 척도로 측정이 됩니다.

이 설문 조사는 장애를 가진 청소년들의 전환교육과 관련된 개인 중심 계획에 대한 한국과 미국의 중등 특수교사의 인식 수준에 대한 이해를 도우며, 교육 현장에서 개인 중심 계획을 보다 효과적으로 실행 및 적용하는데 도움이 될 수 있는 기초 자료로서 활용될 것입니다.

본 연구는 약 10분 정도 소요됩니다. 귀하의 개인적인 정보는 비밀 유지가 될 것이며, 이 설문조사의 결과는 연구 목적 이외의 용도로는 사용되지 않을 것임을 약속 드립니다.

귀하께서는 본 참여 동의서에 의무적으로 서명하실 필요는 없으시며, 설문 참여 거부로 인하여 캔자스 대학으로부터 귀하가 받고 계시거나, 앞으로 받으실 수 있는 어떠한 서비스에 대해서도 불이익이 없으실 것을 약속 드립니다. 그러나 귀하께서 서명하지 않으시면, 본 연구에 참여하실 수 없습니다.

귀하께서는 언제든지 이 설문 조사에 의한 연구 참여를 철회하실 수 있습니다. 또한 언제든지 귀하로부터 수집된 정보에 대한 사용 허가를 취소하실 수 있습니다. 이러한 경우 본 동의에 대한 취소 요구를 이현주 앞으로, 1804 Tennessee #3, Lawrence, KS 66044, U.S.A.으로 취소서신을 보내야 합니다.

보관용 동의서는 귀하께서 보관하시고 설문지에 첨부된 동의서는 설문지와 함께 제출해 주시면 감사하겠습니다. 설문조사 과정에 질문이 있으시면 이 동의서 하단에 표시된 연구자에게 직접 연락을 주십시오.

마지막으로 소중한 시간을 내어 주신 데 대해 진심으로 감사 드리며, 이 설문조사에 참여해 주셔서 다시 한 번 감사 드립니다.

캔자스 주립대학
특수교육 대학원
이현주

본인은 이 동의서 내용을 숙독하였고 이해하였습니다. 설문조사에 대한 질문사항들과 연구를 위하여 본인의 정보가 어떻게 사용되고 공개되는지에 대해 질문 할 수 있는 기회를 가졌으며, 적절한 답을 얻었습니다. 만약 연구 참여자로서 본인의 권리에 대해 부수적인 질문이 생길 경우에는 다음 전화 혹은 주소로 연락할 것입니다.

전화번호: (785) 864-7429 or (785) 864-7385

주소: the Human Subjects Committee Lawrence Campus (HSCL), University of Kansas, 2385 Irving Hill Road, Lawrence, Kansas 66045-7563, U.S.A.

이메일주소: mdenning@ku.edu.

본인은 연구 참여자로서 이 연구에 참여하는데 동의합니다. 또한 앞서 언급된 바와 같이 이 연구에서 연구의 목적으로 본인의 정보가 이용되거나 공개되는데 동의합니다. 본인의 서명으로써 본인이 18세 이상이라는 것과 동의서에 복사본을 받았다는 사실을 보증합니다.

참여자 성명

작성 날짜

서명

연구자 연락 정보

Hyun Joo Lee 이현주
Principal Investigator
University of Kansas
Department of Special Education
521 J R Pearson Hall
1122 W. Campus Road
Lawrence, KS 66045
785 424 3664
zoo0111@ku.edu

Mary E. Morningstar
Faculty Supervisor
University of Kansas
Department of Special Education
521 J R Pearson Hall
1122 W. Campus Road
Lawrence, KS 66045
785 864 0682
mmorningstar@ku.edu

개인 중심 계획 (Person-Centered Planning: PCP) 에 대한 중등 특수교사의 인식 수준 설문지

이 설문 조사의 목적은 개인 중심 계획(Person-Centered Planning: PCP)에 대한 중등 특수교사의 인식 수준에 관한 정보를 얻기 위함입니다. 따라서 이 설문지는 중등 특수교사의 능력을 평가하기 위해 제작된 것이 아니며, 교사 자신의 개인 중심 계획에 대한 인식 정도에 관한 정보만을 수집하기 위해서 작성되었습니다. 설문 조사를 통해 습득된 정보는 연구 목적으로만 사용될 것이며, 본 설문 조사를 참여해주신 분들의 모든 개인적인 정보는 비밀 유지가 될 것임을 알려드립니다. 설문 조사에 참여하여 주셔서 감사합니다.

Part I. 기초 정보

아래의 질문을 천천히 읽으신 후, 해당 사항에 표시 (√ 혹은 ○)하여 주시기 바랍니다.

1. 선생님께서 현재 근무하고 계시는 특수교육 환경을 표시해 주시기 바랍니다.
 - 특수학교
 - 전일제 특수학급 (일반학교 내에 소재하는 특수학급)
 - 시간제 특수학급 (일반학교 내에 소재하는 특수학급)
 - 재택학급 (순회교사)
 - 기타 (자세히 기술해 주시기 바랍니다): _____
2. 현재 선생님께서 가르치는 학생들의 주 장애영역을 표시해 주시기 바랍니다(1가지).
 - 학습장애
 - 정서/행동장애
 - 정신지체
 - 복합장애
 - 기타 (자세히 기술해 주시기 바랍니다): _____
3. 현재 선생님께서 근무하고 계시는 교육기관을 표시해 주시기 바랍니다.
 - 중학교
 - 고등학교
 - 기타 (자세히 기술해 주시기 바랍니다): _____
4. 선생님의 교직 경력을 표시해 주시기 바랍니다.
 - 1-5년 6-10년 11-15년 16-20년 21년 이상
5. 선생님께서는 대학 또는 대학원 과정에 개설된 '전환 교육' 관련 과목을 몇 과목 이수하셨습니까? [대학에서 학점으로 인정되는 학기 단위로 편성된 과목을 말함]
 - 0과목 1과목 2과목 3과목 4과목 5과목 이상
6. 선생님께서는 '전환 교육'과 관련된 워크샵에 몇 회 참여하셨습니까? [교사 연수, 워크샵, 학회 참석 등 전환교육과 관련된 교육활동을 모두 포함]
 - 0 회 1 회 2 회 3 회 4 회 5 회 이상
7. 선생님께서는 개인 중심 계획(Person-Centered Planning: PCP)과 관련된 과목 혹은 연수를 이수하신 적이 있습니까? [정의: 개인 중심 계획(Person-Centered Planning: PCP)은 개개 장애인의

감정, 기호, 환경, 어려움 및 미래에 대한 희망에 기반한 미래를 설계하고자 하는 일련의 개별화된 전환 계획이다(배성직 & Clark, G., 2004, p. 278.)

- 예 (7-1 번으로 이동하여 주십시오)
- 아니오 (Part II으로 이동하여 주십시오)

7-1. 개인 중심 계획과 관련된 과목 혹은 연수를 몇 시간을 이수하셨습니다?

- 1-3시간
- 4-6시간
- 7-9시간
- 10시간 이상

Part II. 개인 중심 계획의 실행 및 적용

아래의 질문을 천천히 읽으신 후, 교육 현장에서 개인 중심 계획(Person-Centered Planning: PCP)의 실행 및 적용과 관련된 선생님의 경험 여부에 해당되는 사항에 표시 (√ 혹은 ○)하여 주시기 바랍니다.

1. 개인 중심 계획 미팅을 가져본 적이 있습니까?

- 예 (1-1 으로 이동하여 주십시오)
- 아니오 (2 번으로 이동하여 주십시오)

1-1. 개인 중심 계획 미팅을 몇 회 실행하셨습니다?

- 1-2 회
- 3-4 회
- 5-6 회
- 7-8 회
- 9-10 회
- 11 회 이상

1-2. 개인 중심 계획 미팅을 한 후의 느낌을 표시해 주시기 바랍니다.

- 매우 부정적인 경험이었다
- 다소 부정적인 경험이었다
- 부정적이지도 긍정적이지도 않았다
- 다소 긍정적인 경험이었다
- 매우 긍정적인 경험이었다

1-3. 그 이유에 관하여 기술하여 주시기 바랍니다: _____

2. 개인 중심 계획을 실행 및 적용하였을 때, 학생과 가족이 참여하셨습니다?

- 예 (2-1으로 이동하여 주십시오)
- 아니오 (Part III으로 이동하여 주십시오)

2-1. 학생과 가족의 참여 정도는 어떠하셨습니다?

- 매우 낮은 참여도
- 다소 낮은 참여도
- 낮지도 높지도 않은 참여도
- 다소 높은 참여도
- 매우 높은 참여도

2-2. 이유에 관하여 기술하여 주시기 바랍니다: _____

Part III. 개인 중심 계획에 대한 인식 정도

다음은 개인 중심 계획(Person-Centered Planning: PCP)에 대하여 인식하는 정도에 관한 23개의 질문 항목으로 구성 되어 있습니다. 아래의 질문을 천천히 읽으신 후, 각 질문에 동의하시는 정도에 따라 해당되는 항목 혹은 숫자에 표시 (√ 혹은 ○)하여 주시기 바랍니다.

질문 항목	매우 동의 하지 않음	동의 하지 않음	중립	동의 함	매우 동의 함
1. 개인 중심 계획은 유동적이고 비형식적이다.	1	2	3	4	5
2. 개인 중심 계획은 다른 평가 형식에 비해 학생의 강점, 요구, 장래희망에 더 많은 초점을 두고 있다.	1	2	3	4	5
3. 개인 중심 계획 미팅에 참여하는 많은 사람들은 학생과 친밀하고 서로 다양한 배경 지식을 가지고 있다.	1	2	3	4	5
4. 개인 중심 계획은 학생의 현재 교육 및 전환 계획에 대한 결정에 있어서 학생 당사자와 가족의 참여를 증진시킨다.	1	2	3	4	5
5. 개인 중심 계획을 하는 과정 중에 학생은 주도적인 역할을 이행한다 (즉, 미팅에 사람들을 초대하기, 미팅을 인도하기, 목표 수립에 기여하기).	1	2	3	4	5
6. 개인 중심 계획으로 인해 여러 사람들로부터 학생의 미래에 대한 다양한 관점을 들어볼 수 있다.	1	2	3	4	5
7. 개인 중심 계획을 통해서 가족 구성원은 자녀에 대한 정보를 서로 나눌 수 있다.	1	2	3	4	5
8. 개인 중심 계획은 학생의 장래 생활에 대해 모두가 공유하는 구체적인 교육 계획을 짜도록 도와준다.	1	2	3	4	5
9. 나는 나의 학생들을 대상으로 개인 중심 계획을 쉽게 적용 및 실행하여 볼 수 있다.	1	2	3	4	5
10. 개인 중심 계획은 추가적인 업무를 지나치게 많이 요구한다.	1	2	3	4	5

11. 나는 개인 중심 계획을 통해서 학생의 가족 및 다른 전문가들과 쉽게 협력할 수 있다.	1	2	3	4	5
12. 개인 중심 계획은 준비하고 실행하는 데에 많은 시간이 요구된다.	1	2	3	4	5
13. 개인 중심 계획은 개별화 교육 계획 (IEP) 미팅을 하기 전에 실행하는 것이 효과적이라고 생각한다.	1	2	3	4	5
14. 나는 여러 사람들을 개인 중심 계획 미팅을 위해서 같은 시각, 한 장소에 모이도록 하는 것이 어렵다고 느낀다.	1	2	3	4	5
15. 개인 중심 계획은 개별화 교육 계획 (IEP) 미팅을 대체할 수 있다고 생각한다.	1	2	3	4	5
16. 사람들의 낮은 참여도가 개인 중심 계획을 어렵게 만들 수 있다.	1	2	3	4	5
17. 개인 중심 계획의 사용은 가족과 다른 여러 전문가들이 효과적으로 대화할 수 있는 방법이라고 생각한다.	1	2	3	4	5
18. 개인 중심 계획은 가족의 사적인 생활을 이야기하게 함으로써, 그들은 예민한 상황에 놓이게 할 수 있다.	1	2	3	4	5
19. 개인 중심 계획은 학생의 장래 목표 수립에 도움을 준다.	1	2	3	4	5
20. 개인 중심 계획은 개별화 교육 계획 (IEP)을 작성하는 데에 도움을 준다.	1	2	3	4	5
21. 나와 일하는 가족들은 개인 중심 계획에 참여하는 것을 편하게 받아들였다.	1	2	3	4	5
22. 나와 일하는 가족들은 그들의 자녀에 대한 정보, 느낌, 장래 계획을 잘 공유하였다.	1	2	3	4	5
23. 나와 일하는 가족들은 그들의 자녀가 개인 중심 계획 미팅을 주도하여 나가기를 바랐다.	1	2	3	4	5

*설문 조사가 끝이 났습니다. 설문지에 응하여 주셔서 감사합니다!