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The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between the implementation level of comprehensive school counseling programs at internship sites and school counseling interns’ self-efficacy. Other variables were also examined in combination with school counseling program implementation including, prior teaching experience, prior mental health experience, age, and prior professional K12 experience.

A total of 61 school counseling interns from CACREP school counseling programs who were in their last semester of internship were included in the final analysis. These subjects completed two instruments, the School Counseling Program Implementation Survey, which measured program implementation, and the School Counseling Self-Efficacy Scale, which measured school counselor self-efficacy.

The data were analyzed using correlation analysis and multiple linear regressions. With the removal of outliers, school counseling programming as measured by the SCPIS correlated to school counseling interns’ self-efficacy. Regression analyses revealed that the SCPIS and the demographic factors differentially predicted school counseling interns’ self-efficacy. The results are discussed in detail herein. Implications of the findings along with the limitations of the study are presented. Recommendations for future research are also described.
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to the participants of this study, the future practitioners—Thank you! I would like to thank Dr. Steve Rainey, for his steady hand and mentorship, and for agreeing to chair my dissertation. I would like to thank Dr. Betsy Page, for her guidance and help. I would like to thank Dr. Kokinova, for teaching me the importance of quantitative statistics and agreeing to oversee the data and analytics of this study.

I would also like to express thanks to Dr. Maiko Xiong, a fellow school counseling practitioner and true friend. Lastly, to my family, and wife, Bridget, thank you for your support and helping me see this to the finish.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACKNOWLEDGMENTS</td>
<td>iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF FIGURES</td>
<td>viii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF TABLES</td>
<td>ix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHAPTER</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE REVIEW</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose and Rationale</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitions</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of the Literature</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The History of Guidance</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Parsons</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesse Davis</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradigm shift</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogerian influence on school counseling</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The establishment of the American School Counseling Association</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The launching of Sputnik and the National Defense Act</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The accountability age of K–12 education</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Child Left Behind and mandated assessment</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comprehensive Guidance Programs</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Trust Initiative</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role identity</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American School Counseling Association Standards (1997)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American School Counseling Association National Model</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conceptualization of American School Counseling Association</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Model</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management systems</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery systems</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability systems</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mindset and behavior standards</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research on American School Counseling Association National Model</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Counselor Training</strong></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council for the Accreditation of Counselors and related educational programs</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative outcome research on council for counselor education and related programs</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensure</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internship phase of school counseling in CACREP</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School counseling supervision</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American School Counseling Association influence on school counseling supervision</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research on self-efficacy</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy as a measurement for school counseling</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary and limitations of current literature</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. METHODOLOGY</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age, Gender, Prior Teaching, and Prior Mental Health Experience</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing the Conceptual Foundations of the Study</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of Council of Accreditation and Related Educational Programs With School Counseling Programs</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment of Participants</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruments</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparatory step of validity for School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validity study two of School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validity study three of School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validity study four of School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Counselor Program Implementation Survey</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographic data</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analyses</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operationalizing Instruments</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. RESULTS</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistical Results</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results for Hypothesis One</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results for Hypothesis Two</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow up hypothesis</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow up research question</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results for Hypothesis Three</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Results</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. DISCUSSION</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Results</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Question 1</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## LIST OF FIGURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. History of school counseling</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ASCA National Model Diamond Graphic</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Scatterplot Matrix Linearity</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Residual Scatterplot of homoscedasticity</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Percentage of participants in the four categories</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Demographic Information of Participants ($N = 61$)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Eigenvalues of School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Correlations, Means and Standard Deviations for SCPIIS and SCSES ($N = 61$)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations for SCPIIS and SCSES ($N = 58$)</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Collinearity Statistics of Independent Variables ($N = 61$)</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Results of Multiple Regression Predicting School Counseling Intern’s Self-Efficacy From Subscales of the SCPIIS Including Program Orientation, Counseling Services, Technology and Demographic Variables of Age and Prior Teaching Experience ($N = 61$)</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Results of Multiple Regression Predicting School Counseling Intern’s Self-Efficacy From Subscales of the SCPIIS Including Program Orientation, Counseling Services, Technology and Demographic Variables of Age and Prior Teaching Experience Without Outliers ($N = 58$)</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Results of Multiple Regression Predicting School Counseling Intern’s Self-Efficacy From Subscale Scores of Technology, Counseling Services, Program Orientation and Demographic Variable of Prior Mental Health Services Experience ($N = 61$)</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Results of Multiple Regression Predicting School Counseling Intern’s Self-Efficacy From Subscale Scores of Technology, Counseling Services, Program Orientation and Demographic Variable of Prior Mental Health Services Experience Without Outliers ($N = 58$)</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Results of Multiple Regression Predicting School Counseling Intern’s Self-Efficacy From SCPIIS and Demographic Variable of Prior Mental Health Services Experience ($N = 61$)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Results of Multiple Regression Predicting School Counseling Intern’s Self-Efficacy From SCPIIS and Demographic Variable of Prior Mental Health Services Experience Without Outliers ($N = 58$)</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. Results of Multiple Regression Predicting School Counseling Intern’s Self-Efficacy From Scores on the SCPIS, Demographic Variables Including Age and Prior Teaching Experience (N = 61) ........................................72

13. Results of Multiple Regression Predicting School Counseling Intern’s Self-Efficacy From Scores on the SCPIS, Demographic Variables Including Age and Prior Teaching Experience (N = 58) ........................................72

14. Results of Multiple Regression Predicting School Counseling Intern’s Self-Efficacy From Scores on the SCPIS, Demographic Variables Including Age and Prior K12 Experience (N = 61) ........................................73

15. Results of Multiple Regression Predicting School Counseling Intern’s Self-Efficacy From Scores on the SCPIS, Demographic Variables Including Age and Prior K12 Experience with the Removal of Outliers (N = 58) ..................................................................................74

16. Descriptive Statistics for the SCPIS (N = 61) ...............................................................................75
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE REVIEW

School counseling has a rich history, starting back to the beginning of the 20th century, when Frank Parsons instituted vocational counseling within the schools of Boston. Over the course of the past 100 years, school counseling has evolved into a profession that encompasses many aspects of the K–12 school, including academics, social, mental health, and vocation. This evolution has led to the development of the comprehensive school counseling program. Outcomes validating comprehensive school counseling programs in relation to student achievement and safety have been well documented (Gysbers, 2004; Lapan, Gysbers, & Petroski, 2001; Sink & Stroh, 2003). The importance of implementing comprehensive programs has been supported by research, and though taught in Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programming (CACREP) programs, comprehensive programs have not been widely found in practice (Studer & Oberman, 2006). School counselors who are trained in CACREP programs include instructional standards that include aspects of comprehensive school counseling programming (CACREP, 2009). Though CACREP provides specifications for internship clock hours and supervision, it places no requirements for on-site placement in relation to comprehensive counseling programming (CACREP, 2009). Studies have been conducted which examine the clinical preparation and activities of school counselors (Akos & Scarborough, 2004; Stickel & Callaway, 2006; Woodside, Ziegler, & Paulus, 2009). Other studies have examined the supervisory activities of supervisors who report working in an ASCA comprehensive program versus
a traditional program (Studer & Oberman, 2006). Yet few studies have investigated factors that impact internship outcomes (Crespi & Dube, 2005; Stickel, 1995). The investigation of comprehensive programs at the internship site is warranted to determine the impact it has on training outcomes of future school counselors. Self-efficacy was used to measure training outcomes.

Self-efficacy has been examined in multiple environments of counseling and teaching (Bandura, 1986, 1995; Bodenhorn, Wolfe, & Airen, 2010; Larson & Daniels, 1998; Jaafar, Mohamed, Bakar, & Tarmizi, 2009). Research examining self-efficacy has found that counselors with higher levels of counseling self-efficacy perform better as rated by supervisors (Larson & Daniels, 1998). In one study a statistically significant correlation was found between counseling self-efficacy and counselor performance in counseling interns (Jaafar et al., 2009). School counselors who have the ability to set goals, have strong commitment, have high measures of resiliency, and are motivated will be more successful in practice (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005; Larson & Daniels, 1998). Self-efficacy is defined as beliefs about one’s own ability to perform a given behavior (Bandura, 1986). The School Counselor Self-Efficacy scale was developed to measure this behavior within the school counseling profession (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005).

**Purpose and Rationale**

The purpose of the present study was to investigate ASCA Comprehensive Programing at the internship phase of school counselor training and the relationship it may have to an intern’s self-efficacy. Literature reveals that ASCA comprehensive programs are effective in reducing school discipline reports and contributing to academic
gains (Gysbers, 2004; Lapan et al., 2001; Sink & Stroh, 2003). CACREP programs include standards that cover ASCA programs. CACREP requires a 600 hour internship but does not require students to complete internships at sites that utilize ASCA programs (CACREP, 2009). This research builds upon previous research of school counseling internship sites, where supervision and internship experiences were varied and learning outcomes were diverse (Akos & Scarborough, 2004). This study investigates the relationship between variables of ASCA National Model Programing at the internship phase of training and self-efficacy of school counselor students.

**Definitions**

The beginning of the review of literature lists several definitions of concepts and terms that are found in the scholarship of K–12 education, school counseling and self-efficacy. The following terms provide definitions to facilitate understanding of the review of literature.

*American School Counseling Association (ASCA)* is the national professional association that lobbies and establishes national policy platforms for school counseling issues. It advocates on behalf of professional school counselors and counselor educators (ASCA, 2012).

*ASCA competencies* were developed in 2007 that delineate what specifically school counselors should know and be able to do. The ASCA Competencies are composed of 5 domains (program, management, delivery, foundations, and accountability), under which there are three categories, followed with the individual indicators. There are 216 total indicators in the ASCA competencies (ASCA, 2007).
American School Counseling Associations National Model is a framework outlining how school counselors should implement their professional services to reach all students (ASCA, 2003, 2005, 2012).

Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) accredits master’s and doctoral degree programs in counseling and its specialties that are offered by colleges and universities in the United States (CACREP, 2009).

Comprehensive Guidance Counseling Program is a guidance program that relies on results-based systems. This program outlines the primary roles and functions of professional school counselors. The program outlines the promotion of students’ academic, career, and personal-social developmental competencies (Gysbers, 2001).

Internship is the culminating practicing experience of school counselor students. This is where students practice the theory in a K–12 field placement with direct supervision from a certified school counselor. CACREP requires a 600 hour internship, at a K–12 school with an on site supervising school counselor (CACREP, 2009).

Supervising School Counselor. The site supervisor is the onsite field supervisor responsible for the supervision of the intern’s field experience within the context of the setting. CACREP specifies that site supervisors must have a minimum of a master’s degree in counseling with appropriate certifications and licenses, have practiced for two years, and have relevant training counseling supervision (CACREP, 2009).
No Child Left Behind (NCLB) is the federal legislation associated with the new era of accountability. It requires all states assess and measure student learning in math and reading. It also requires reporting of student learning (NCLB, 2001).

Practicum refers to the field experience prior to internship, in which school counselor students begin the practitioner phase of their degree requirements. This includes at least 40 hours of direct contact with students in the form of individual, group, and classroom guidance instruction. In total, CACREP requires 100 clock hours (CACREP, 2009).

Recognized ASCA Model Programs (RAMP) refers to programs that have proven to fully implement the ASCA National Model (ASCA, 2012).

Role identity refers to a school counselor’s ability to define who he or she is and what his or her professional scope of practice is (Remley & Herlihy, 2001).

Self-efficacy refers to the belief in one’s ability to successfully perform a given behavior (Bandura, 1994).

Traditional School Counseling Models are remedial-reactive approaches that emphasize counselor services or functions rather than emphasizing student competencies and outcomes (Studer & Oberman, 2006).

Vertical integration refers to the integration of standards and competencies between grade levels and buildings (Marzano, Welch, Adams, Brown, & Welch, 2008).

Review of the Literature

The profession of school counseling in the United States has a rich history. This section highlights the evolution of school counseling and the development of
comprehensive school counseling programs. The review includes: (a) the early history of school counseling, the leading early advocates and the shift from vocation to individual and comprehensive counseling services; (b) the development and progression of comprehensive counseling programs; (c) school counselor training; and (d) the development and use of self-efficacy. Finally the review concludes with the limitations of current research supporting the need for exploration.

The History of Guidance

School counseling can trace its roots to the early 1900s. As the evolution of American public schools was transpiring, the economic transition from agrarian society to an industrial nation was also occurring (Gysbers, 2001). As more of the population entered into the workforce, more of America’s youth were acquiring a public education. By 1910, over 30 states had compulsory education laws on record, which led to 72% of American children being enrolled in public schools (Snyder, 1993). Providing direction and guidance to students regarding post education opportunities led to the development of vocational training for educators. School counseling started as a movement led by early advocates for vocational and educational guidance within the schools. The scope of the profession broadened with attention to mental hygiene and evolved over the geopolitical influences of the space race emerging into the comprehensive developmental programing of the national model that it is today. See Figure 1.
Frank Parsons. Vocational Guidance is attributed to Frank Parsons and his work in the Boston public schools. Parsons was an early publisher on vocational education, writing *Choosing a Vocation* (1909), one of the first publications directed towards youth and vocational education. It was through this focus on vocational guidance that counseling became identified as a discipline separate from social work (Savickas, 2011). Parson’s work in vocational guidance greatly influenced the early form of guidance, which was integrated into the Boston city schools. By 1910, the superintendent of the Boston city schools had implemented vocational guidance within the schools. Teachers volunteered to assume the role of a vocational counselor in addition to their assigned teaching load. The teachers were trained by the Boston Vocational Bureau, an organization founded by Parsons, in a course designed specifically for the implementation of vocational counseling services within the schools (Savickas, 2011). Though Parsons had originally been appointed to lead and develop the first course to train vocational counselors, his untimely death in 1908 catapulted Meyer Bloomfield to the forefront of developing and instituting the first counselor education course work in
vocation (Hershenson, 2006; Savickas, 2011). Bloomfield would continue the work of Parsons, and advocated and advanced the vocational movement within Boston over the preceding years.

**Jesse Davis.** While Parsons’ movement was transpiring in Boston, Jesse Davis was conducing his own vocational programing in the schools of Detroit, Michigan (Pope, 2009). Davis, a high school history and math teacher, and later principal, foresaw the need for guidance and vocational counseling as a result of his own career uncertainty (Pope, 2009). Davis, through his role as a teacher and principal, started to identify the areas, skills, and domains that the position of a school counselor would cover (Davis, 1956). In 1912, Davis was appointed vocational guidance director of the city of Grand Rapids, and in 1914 he published his book, which outlined implementation of vocational instruction (Davis, 1914). It was through this publication and his election as president of The National Association of Vocational Guidance in 1914, that he started traveling the country to draw attention to the need for vocational and moral guidance as an element within the public school system (Pope, 2009). Davis used his own experience as an educator to speak to the need for guidance within the school. Specifically he outlined the guidance program he developed while principal of Grand Rapids Central High School. He developed and implemented a systematic guidance program with vertical integration between grade levels. He utilized English classes on Friday to have students develop and write on topics such as ambition, vocation, character building, friends, and family. It was through this work, that Davis became known as the first school counselor (Pope, 2009).
The simultaneous movements of Parsons and Davis established a foothold for counseling through teacher directed exercises that included a list of duties related to vocational counseling. In essence, the first form of school guidance was an extracurricular duty performed by a teacher with little or no formal training with a major focus on vocation. By the 1920s, states started to formalize the position of counselors within the schools, with New York being the first to require certification for guidance workers, and the first state to have full time personnel (Erford, 2011).

**Paradigm shift.** A paradigm shift in guidance would occur starting in the early 1920s. The emphasis on guidance for vocation shifted to guidance for education (Gysbers, 2001). This paradigm shift was thought to occur for several reasons, including the progressive movement, child worker reforms, attention to mental hygiene, economic transitions within the population, and the humanistic movement (Gysbers, 2001). The combination of these factors led to the inclusion of the clinical aspect of guidance, and personal counseling began to influence the guidance movement. Psychotherapy and the tenets of its theories were gaining traction and the influence was notable within the field (Gysbers, 2001). While early psychotherapy theory draws upon European luminaries such as Freud, Adler, and Frankl, it was Carl Rogers’ work in child development and the person-centered approach that helped to shape the interpersonal counseling element within school counseling (Feingold, 1991).

**Rogarian influence on school counseling.** After World War II, returning veterans saturated both the work force and the rosters of education. The returning veterans were not prepared to be told what to do with their lives by a counselor (Wright,
This transitional period paved the way for a paradigm shift in counseling theory and practice. After Carl Rogers completed his degree from Columbia, he dealt directly with treating problem children; children referred to his practice through the courts. Rogers felt that his psychological training did little to impact his practice with children, and thus developed the non-directive, person centered approach towards client change (Rogers, 1961). Through the non-directive approach, the counselor does not fix the problem, but rather helps the child or client identify his or her inner strengths to move towards solutions (Wright, 2012). The emergence of humanistic counseling and the person-centered approach replaced the practices of Freud associated with the clinical mental hygiene movement. This interpersonal counseling combined to influence guidance counselors in their vocational work with students as the profession emerged into the latter half of the 20th century (Gysbers, 2001).

**The establishment of the American School Counseling Association.** By the middle of the 20th century, school counseling had achieved professional status with the establishment of the American School Counselor Association in 1952. Following this, the profession published its first peer reviewed journal, *The School Counselor*, a publication of ASCA (Bauman et al., 2003). The school counseling association provided a forum for professional dialogue and a sense of identity for the emerging profession. Yet global events of the 1950s would firmly cement school counseling as an establishment within the context of K–12 education.

**The launching of Sputnik and the National Defense Act.** In the early part of the 20th century school counseling development was attributed to individuals, but as the
century progressed, political movements would catapult funding and direction to the profession. As the industrial revolution shaped the American School system, so did the geopolitical events of the Cold War. In 1956, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) launched the first satellite into orbit, triggering the space race. As part of the plan to close the technology gap between the United States and the USSR, the National Defense Education Act was passed in 1958, with the intent to increase the number of students entering into the science and math fields. This legislation poured funding into public schooling, providing funding for dramatically more counselors within the school systems (Gysbers, 2001). These new counselors were to provide early identification and academic counseling to students who showed aptitude in the science and math fields (Feingold, 1991). As a result of counselors identifying specific content ability, the component of academic counseling integrated into the counselor’s scope of practice.

The accountability age of K–12 education. Trends in education are largely reflected by reform and legislation. In much the same way that the geopolitical influences of the cold war impacted educational policy in the 1950s and 1960s, so did the reform movement of the 1980s (Perkins, Oeschler, & Ballard, 2010). In the early 1980s the U.S. Department of Education’s National Commission on Excellence in Education conducted an 18 month study that contributed to the assertion that American schools were failing. The resulting report titled, A Nation at Risk (U.S. National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983), sparked a wave of local and state reform efforts that focused on measurable standards of education (Dimmitt, Carey, & Hatch, 2007).
No Child Left Behind and mandated assessment. This movement towards measuring student growth has led to what has been termed standards based education and the accountability age (Dimmitt et al., 2007). This movement culminated in the federal legislation of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB, 2001), which provided broad federal power and direction into the management of public education.

This legislation directed the states to test students in reading and math for all students between the third and eighth grades, and once again in 10th or 11th grade (Wright, 2012). The results of this testing would become public, reflecting a school’s performance, based on testing indicators of students’ performance (Dimmitt et al., 2007). The accountability age of education continued under President Barack Obama. The Obama administration’s plan “Race to the Top” provided federal funds to schools that adopted a strong set of national educational achievement standards and educational reforms. This model continues the method of high stakes testing that has been a pillar of educational reform (Wright, 2012).

Comprehensive Guidance Programs

Though the first systematic counseling services are attributed to Jesse Davis (Pope, 2009), the broadening of the counseling focus to include and combine elements of career, academic, and social services for all students can be traced to the late 1960s when Norman Gysbers began his work on the design of comprehensive school counseling and guidance programs in Missouri (Brown & Trusty, 2005). This framework developed from the need to organize and apply identity to the school counseling profession. The culmination of the mental hygiene movement along with the vocation and testing
movement and academic pressures found school counselors searching for an identity. As a result, school counselors were often seen as peripheral personnel within the school system. It was at this point that Gysbers started to advocate for an organizational structure that could focus on domains of delivery for all students (Hatch, 2008). A cornerstone of comprehensive guidance programs is the element of a developmental approach (Gysbers & Henderson, 1997). The developmental approach focuses on results and is organized to included competencies that apply the services of social, academic, and career as age appropriate intervention and instruction. The developmental model views the resources of the school counselor as: human, financial, and political, and provides a framework for the school counselor to apply these resources (Gysbers & Henderson, 2000). Through the advocacy of state and national leaders, comprehensive school counseling programs integrated into the landscape of American public education (Gysbers, 2001). By 1998, research indicated that 43 states had implemented state curriculum related to comprehensive school counseling models in some form (Sink & MacDonald, 1998).

**Education Trust Initiative.** School counseling often mirrors trends in education (Perkins et al., 2010). The heightened focus on accountability resulting from the reform movement impacted school counseling in several ways, including the training and evaluation of duties and responsibilities school counselors practice (Dimmitt et al., 2007). In 1996, the Education Trust initiated a series of focus groups investigating the roles of school counselors. It was through these focus groups that both problems and solutions within school counseling and counseling education programs were identified
(Zagelbaum, Kruczek, Alexander, & Crethar, 2014). Some of the problems identified included the way school counselors were trained, and that students were not being adequately prepared by universities to enter into practice (Perkins et al., 2010). As part of the solution, in 1997, the DeWitt Wallace Fund provided grants to several universities to improve the training of school counselors, and the Education Trust Transforming School Counselor Initiative was established (Perkins et al., 2010). The initiatives of this committee led to a renewed focus on academic achievement for all students with an emphasis on closing achievement gaps. While the Education Trust Initiative was established, the American School Counseling Association was also developing a renewed focus.

**Role identity.** With the renewed focus on academic achievement for all students coming to the forefront, the role of school counselors evolved. School counselors historically were seen as the professional within the building that administered assessments, handled mental health concerns, and oversaw scheduling. This shifted and school counselors took a more sophisticated role of providing mental health prevention and reactive services and more importantly, providing academic intervention and enrichment services while abandoning the traditional duties of scheduling and transcript work (Perkins et al., 2010). As the role of school counselors has evolved, with the increased focus on academic support and advocacy and a diminishing spotlight on direct services, confusion and professional identity have surfaced as issues for school counselors (Kozlowski, 2010).
American School Counseling Association Standards (1997). As the Education Trust Initiative was focusing on academic achievement, ASCA was also developing organizational initiatives with a focus on student achievement. As a result of a renewed focus on academic achievement for all students, ASCA crafted national standards that specify what students learn by being instructed in a comprehensive school counseling program (Gysbers, 2001). In 1997, the first set of school counseling standards were published by ASCA, *Sharing the Vision: The National Standards for School Counseling Programs*. These standards established the school counseling program as an integral component of school, identifying the attitudes, knowledge, and skills that all students should acquire as a result of the K–12 school counseling program (Campbell & Dahir, 1997). These standards were based on three interrelated areas of student development: academic, career, and personal/social. The standards for academic development guided the school counseling program to develop and implement interventions and activities to maximize student learning. The standards for career development guided the school counseling program in developing skills and attitudes to enable students to make a transition from school to work. The standards for personal/social guided the school counseling program to deliver activities to enable student mastery of strong interpersonal, safety, and communication skills (Campbell & Dahir, 1997).

American School Counseling Association National Model. In 2001, the American School Counseling Association’s governing board commissioned a committee to develop a national model of school counseling, which was considered the next logical step from the progression of the National Standards (ASCA, 2003). The committee
consisted of national leaders in the school counseling profession. This led to the publication of the *ASCA National Mode: A Framework for School Counseling Programs*. The national model, built upon the work of Norman Gysbers, utilized a developmental approach and provided the framework for implementation and delivery (ASCA, 2003). The national model also addressed the problems identified by the Education Trust Committee (Zagelbaum et al., 2014). The national model provided practitioners with a standardized approach to the creation and implementation of a comprehensive school counseling program. In doing so, the national model eliminated the ambiguity of outdated models and provided clarity to the role and importance of the school counselor within the K–12 educational environment (Payne, 2011). The ASCA model created an identity for school counselors as consultant, mental health expert, and facilitator of prevention services (Rayle & Adams, 2008).

**Conceptualization of American School Counseling Association National Model.** School counselors work within the framework of four systems, which include: (a) foundation, (b) management, (c) delivery, and (d) accountability (ASCA, 2003). These four systems are interacting with each other, each system is assigned specific functions, which are described below. The four systems of the model are shown graphically in Figure 2.
Figure 2. ASCA National Model Diamond Graphic

Foundation. The foundation of the model describes the philosophies, program goals, values, and core beliefs that direct a school counseling program. The foundation includes the program’s mission statement, which incorporates the goals and values and provides a foundation for the program. The foundation utilizes ASCA student standards, ASCA school counselor competency standards, and ethical standards for school counselors. These standards provide a blueprint to which the program strives and by which it will be evaluated (ASCA, 2012).

Management systems. The management systems are the methods and processes school counselors use to manage a school counseling program. These systems include
assessment of time in direct and indirect services, developing agreements with the principal regarding the goals and vision of the program, and developing a calendar to coordinate the delivery of services. The management system also provides the blueprint for the parent advisory council. These processes help school counselors effectively manage their time and provide a forum of communication with other staff, parents, and administrators.

*Delivery systems.* The delivery system is the methods that school counselors use to provide services to students. The model identifies two types of delivery: direct and indirect services. Direct services are in-person interactions between the school counselor and students. These services are delivered through individual student planning, responsive services, and classroom guidance. Indirect student services are the services provided for the students as a result of a school counselor’s interactions with others, such as a consultation with teachers or administrators. The national model specifies that 80% of a counselor’s time will be spent in the delivery of services (ASCA, 2012).

*Accountability systems.* The accountability system stresses the use of data to determine whether the goals of the program were reached. It provides the tools school counselors need to answer the question, “How are students different as a result of the school counseling program?” The accountability system provides the tools, such as needs assessments, school data profile analysis, and test scores, to both drive and measure the school counseling program (ASCA, 2012).

*Mindset and behavior standards.* The evolution of the ASCA Standards continues with the introduction of the American School Counseling Associations
Mindsets and Behaviors Standards (ASCA, 2014). ASCA has referred to these standards as the “next generation” of standards, as these standards identify and prioritize the specific attitudes, knowledge, and skills students should be able to demonstrate as a result of a school counseling program (ASCA, 2014). There are 35 standards, which can be applied to any of the three existing domains. The school counselor selects a domain based on the needs of the school, classroom, group, or individual. These standards are intended to demonstrate a new era of accountability and provide evidence for how students are different as a result of a school counseling program. As these are new standards, research on practical implications is limited.

**Research on American School Counseling Association National Model.** With the continued advocacy for accountability within the K–12 educational landscape, the focus on data-driven programming and intervention that is supported by the ASCA National Model is a primary driver for its continued implementation (Young & Kafflenberger, 2011). As the ASCA model has sustained itself for the past decade, researchers have investigated both its implementation and outcomes related to schools that have practiced aspects of it. This section reviews research related to program implementation and outcomes associated with the use of the ASCA National Model.

Research has focused on the implementation of the ASCA National model (Studer & Oberman, 2006). Studer and Oberman investigated several questions including: (a) are there differences between supervisory activities in a traditional program compared to an ASCA program; (b) are there differences in the number of years school counselors practice and the implementation of an ASCA model program; and (c) do administrators
understand the role of school counselors better in a traditional program versus an ASCA Model Program? The participants for these research questions were practicing school counselors who were members of the ASCA Southern region. These participants were selected through a systematic sample ($N = 73$), where every $10^{th}$ person on the ASCA list was selected, resulting in a return rate of $37\%$ (Studer & Oberman, 2006). The authors noted that the return rate was lower than desired, but relayed that this still exceeded the $23\%$ that normally is found in psychology and education journals (Studer & Oberman, 2006). The authors also noted the small sample size as a limitation of the study.

The first question explored differences between supervisory activities provided to trainees working in traditional school counseling programs in comparison with the activities provided to trainees working in developmental programs. The comparisons were based on supervisor self-report of the type of program they have. The researchers found a chi-square test revealed no significant differences in supervisory activities among trainees who received supervision following the components of the ASCA National Model compared to those trainees supervised in a traditional school counselor program, $\chi^2(4, N = 73) = 9.460, p = .06$ (Studer & Oberman, 2006). These activities included measures of the supervisory relationship, corrective feedback and micro-skills of counseling.

The second question explored potential differences in the number of years between school counselors and the use of an ASCA program. The study revealed that there were no significant differences between years of experience as a school counselor and the use of a comprehensive, developmental program $-\chi^2(2, N = 73) = .967, p = .61$. 
However, the study found that individuals who have been school counselors for 6 or less years were significantly more likely to have had a course in the ASCA National Model than were school counselors in the field for 7 or more years, χ²(1, N = 73) = 4.401, p = .04. A supplemental result revealed that implementing a school counseling program often takes an average of six years (Studer & Oberman, 2006).

The third question the researchers (Studer & Oberman, 2006) explored was how well school principals understood the role of the school counselor between American School Counseling Associations National Model and traditional programs. Traditional school counseling programs were described as programs where school counselors acted in a reactive capacity to students’ emotional and social needs, and where school counselors take on roles of scheduling and testing duties. The researchers found that school principals understood the role of the school counselor better in traditional programs. The researchers found that participants who reported having a developmental program believed that the principal was less likely to understand their role as a school counselor. The researchers also found that those working in a traditional school counseling program reported that the principal had a better understanding of their role within the school system. The researchers used a Tukey test, which yielded significant differences (p = .05; Studer & Oberman, 2006).

While the above research focused on program implementation and supervision, other research has focused on different aspects of the National Model. Baggerly and Osborn (2006) investigated correlates and predictors of school counselors’ career satisfaction and commitment in relation to the American School Counselor Associations
national model. Utilizing a regression analysis of 1,280 Florida counselors’ survey responses, they found a significant correlation ($p < .01$) between satisfaction and appropriate duties ($r = .14$), inappropriate duties ($r = -.185$), supervision by a district counselor ($r = .10$), supervision by a peer ($r = .09$), and stress ($r = -.30$). They found that school counselors who more frequently implemented aspects of the ASCA National Model were more likely to be satisfied and committed in their careers compared to peers who performed traditional guidance duties (Baggerly & Osborn, 2006).

Research has also focused on student outcomes in relation to program implementation. Studies of more fully implemented comprehensive school counseling programs have demonstrated both positive achievement and environmental outcomes (Carey & Dimmitt, 2012; Lapan et al., 2001; Wilkerson, Perusse, & Hughes, 2013). Lapan et al. (2001) conducted research of comprehensive guidance programs between 1992 and 1996. They acquired data on seventh grade students in Missouri schools with comprehensive programs ($N = 22,601$). They utilized the Missouri School Improvement Plan Questionnaire (MSIPQ) to collect data on both student and teacher perceptions of school safety and academic beliefs. This questionnaire was administered by the Missouri State Department of Education. After controlling for between school differences in socio-economic systems, and enrollment size, the researchers found that more fully implemented school counseling programs significantly predicted student perceptions of being safer in their schools ($t = 3.23, p < .01$). The researchers also found that more fully implemented counseling programs significantly predicted better relationships between students and teachers ($t = 2.61, p < .05$), predicted greater satisfaction with students’
perceptions of the education they were receiving in their schools ($t = 5.14, p < 001$), and students’ perceptions that education was relevant and important to their future ($t = 2.63, p < .05$; Lapan et al., 2001).

Wilkerson et al. (2013) investigated student achievement in correlation to more fully implemented school counseling programs as defined by the American School Counseling Association’s Recognized ASCA Model Program (RAMP) recognition. The researchers identified K–12 schools in Indiana that had RAMP recognition to serve as the experimental group ($n = 75$). The researchers then identified traditional school counseling schools from Indiana and randomly selected several to create the control group ($n = 226$). The researchers used the Indiana Statewide Testing for Educational Progress Plus (ISTEP+) and the Graduation Qualifying Examinations (GQEs). The ISTEP+ is a set of criterion-referenced tests administered annually to Indiana students in grades 3–8 and grade 10.

Using an ANOVA, the researchers (Wilkerson et al., 2013) examined the differences between the ASCA schools and traditional schools. The researchers used two dependent variables (English and Math scores from the ISTEP+) and six distinct groups: elementary, middle, and secondary RAMP schools; and elementary, middle, and secondary control schools. In this instance, the authors identified significant between-subject effects among the six different groups on both the English Language Arts (ELA) and Math outcome variables: English Language Arts proficiency rates ($F(5,295) = 3.60, p \leq .004$); Math Proficiency Rates ($F(5,295) = 7.31, p \leq .000$). Medium effect sizes for both the ELA outcome ($\eta^2 = .06$) and the Math outcome ($\eta^2 = .11$) were
detected and observed power was adequate (ELA = .922; Math = .999). The researchers then conducted a post hoc analysis using Duncan’s multiple range test to determine the nature of the differences between the groups. The researchers’ analysis suggested that school-wide proficiency rates in ELA and Math were significantly higher in RAMP elementary schools (ELA = 78.2%; Math = 80.0%) when compared with their elementary control schools (ELA = 72.1%; Math = 73.6%; Wilkerson et al., 2013).

Carey and Dimmitt (2012) have demonstrated that school counselors who follow the ASCA National Model increased the percentage of students taking the ACT and increased students’ math and reading scores on state mandated tests. The researchers in conjunction with the Utah State Office of Education sent principals and guidance directors of every public high school in Utah a request to participate in important outcome research examining if more fully implemented school counseling programs and school counselor activities are associated with stronger positive student outcomes. A total of 161 school counselors completed at least part of the survey.

The survey used for this study consisted of a total of 52 questions with items composed from three sources: the School Counseling Program Implementation Survey (SCPIS; Elsner & Carey, 2005), items used in previous district- and state-level evaluations, and items specific to the state of Utah that were created in consultation with personnel at the USOE. Outcome and demographic data were obtained from a total of 280 schools in Utah. This outcome data included ACT information and statewide assessments.
Carey and Harrington (2010) and Carey and Dimmitt (2012) have found several significant correlations between more fully implemented school counseling programs as measured by the School Counseling Program Implementation Survey and student outcome data. More fully implemented school counseling programs correlated with more students taking the ACT \((r = .437, p < .001)\), and students that were proficient in reading \((r = .301, p = .013)\) and math \((r = .263, p = .030)\).

Sink, Akos, Turnbull, and Mvududu (2008) conducted a study of middle schools in the state of Washington and found that schools which had more fully implemented programs across a time span of five or more years had students significantly outscore students from buildings that did not have comprehensive guidance programs on state assessments. These researchers randomly identified sixth- through eighth-grade configured middle schools \((n = 146)\) using the Washington Education Directory. The researchers then divided these schools into a research and comparison group based on the schools’ use of a comprehensive guidance and counseling program.

To measure whether schools were utilizing a comprehensive guidance program, the researchers (Sink et al., 2008) utilized The Comprehensive Guidance & Counseling Programs and Student Success in Washington State Middle Schools Survey (Sink & Stroh, 2003), which were completed by the middle school counselors \((n = 146)\). The researchers utilized the results of this instrument to develop research and comparison groups, with the research group identified as students being educated in a comprehensive school counseling program \((n = 31,010, 51\%)\) and the comparison group identified as students being educated in a school with a traditional school counseling program \((n =\)
29,321, 48.6%). The researchers found that the groups were similar in their composition of gender, ethnicity, and socio-economic status.

To measure academic achievement of students the researchers (Sink et al., 2008) used both the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills and the Washington Assessment of Student Learning. The authors cited both of these measures as having published psychometric properties. The researchers used a series of MANCOVAs to analyze the data that were collected. The researchers found in the sixth grade level, using the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills, group effects that were significant in comprehensive school counseling programs over non-comprehensive school counseling program schools for language (F[1, 20,745] = 3.73, p < .05, = .00, d = .08), math (F[1, 20,745] = 10.91, p = -.001, 7r2 = .00, d = .08), and core total (F[1, 20,745] = 5.23, p = .02, q2p = .00, d = .08; Sink et al., 2008).

Research continues to explore and expand upon the effects and outcomes of school counseling programs. The results presented in the literature of this study provide a baseline for the use of comprehensive school counseling programs.

**School Counselor Training**

School counselor training has evolved as the profession has evolved. Early training was conducted through professional seminars geared towards teachers with a focus on vocational training (Savickas, 2011). The passage of the National Defense Act in 1958 and the Education Professions Development Act of 1967 infused funding for the implementation of high school counselors and created a demand for counselor educators and counselor education programs (Lloyd, Feit, & Nelson, 2010). The development of counseling as its own profession with the infusion of funding and demand created a
situation where counseling struggled for identity. This consequently created ambiguous training standards for counselor education programs (Adkison-Bradley, 2013). The need for uniform training standards in order to create a professional identity had been transpiring in the different divisions of the American Guidance and Personal Association since the 1960s (Bobby, 2013). As a result, in 1981 The Council for the Accreditation of Counselor and Related Programing (CACREP) was created to accredit master’s and doctoral level counseling programs (Adkison-Bradley, 2013). With the establishment of CACREP, the first set of standards was adopted.

**Council for the Accreditation of Counselors and related educational programs.** The Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES) created the first set of standards that were adopted by CACREP. These standards were broad in scope and were written so that future specialty areas would be included within revisions (Bobby, 2013). In 1984 school counseling was included as a specialty area, and the American School Counseling Association had requested to be included within the school counseling specialty area (Bobby, 2013). The current CACREP Standards for School Counseling include eight domains: foundations, counseling, diversity, assessment, research, academic, collaboration, and leadership. Within these eight domains are 77 indicators (CACREP, 2009). In addition, CACREP specifies that students must complete both a 100 hour onsite field experience with 40 hours of direct contact called practicum, and then complete a 600 hour practitioner based field experience called internship (CACREP, 2009). The current database for CACREP presents 240 CACREP school counseling programs in the United States (CACREP, 2014).
Quantitative outcome research on council for counselor education and related programs. With so many school counseling programs holding CACREP accreditation, there has been a focus on research outcomes related to students who hold graduate degrees from CACREP institutions. Research on CACREP programs has investigated the impact CACREP standards have in relationship to school counselor professionalism (Milsom & Akos, 2005).

Milsom and Akos (2005) used archival data from 1994 to 2003 to examine the CACREP’s association with professionalism of school counselor educators. The authors defined indicators of professionalism to include contributions to journal publications, conference presentations, leadership in professional organizations, and pursuit of counseling credentials. The authors examined professionalism by obtaining and analyzing school counseling peer reviewed published articles from 1994–2003. The authors found that the archival data revealed 644 publications in the area of school counseling written by 1,246 authors of which 578 were counselor educators. In evaluation of the presentations, the authors found a total of 2,335 conference presentations from ASCA and ACES with 4,033 presenters, of which 1,126 were identified as counselor educators.

Milsom and Akos (2005) conducted a chi-square analysis to examine the relationship between CACREP accreditation and professional contributions (journal publications and conference presentations) of school counselor educators. The analysis revealed a significant relationship between the two variables, \( \chi^2 (1, n = 1,704) = 8.189, p = .004 \) (Milsom & Akos, 2005).
It has also been found using archived data from 1994 to 2003, that CACREP graduates have passed the National Counselor Exam at higher rates than students from non-CACREP programs (Milsom & Akos, 2007). Milsom and Akos used archival data from 1995 to 2003 of students from both CACREP and non-CACREP programs that took the National Counselor Examination. This resulted in a total of 15,392 graduate students from CACREP-accredited programs and 3,910 students from non-accredited programs (N = 19,302). The authors then used a t-test to calculate and examine differences in mean scores on the NCE between graduate students from CACREP-accredited and non-accredited programs. The results revealed significant differences at p < .001, t(19,300) = 15.395 (Milsom & Akos, 2007). Other studies have resulted in similar findings. Adams (2006) used an ANOVA to examine the National Counselor Examination’s (NCE) ability over a five-year period to show differences between CACREP and non-CACREP scores. Participants were randomly selected from the NBCC database of test takers from states that required the NCE for state licensure. A second set of restrictions included that the participants must have been first time test takers in the last semester of a master’s program in counseling. Adams used the NBCC and the CACREP directory to assign the students data to either a CACREP program or non-CACREP program.

Adams (2006) then conducted an ANOVA and found that there was a significant difference in the actual NCE scores between groups, suggesting that NCE scores are dependent on accreditation status and the CACEP test takers do score significantly higher
than non-accredited test takers at the $p < .01$ with sample 1 [$F(1)= 24.806, p = .00, N = 977$] compared to sample 2 [$F(1)= 28.183, p = .00, N = 959$] (Adams, 2006).

The studies listed above demonstrate CACREP standards provide positive academic and professional outcomes for students whom attend an accredited program (Adams, 2006; Milsom & Akos, 2005, 2007). For students who specialize in school counseling, one of the defining elements within the CACREP standards is the emphasis placed on the internship phase. The internship has been defined as the theory to practice component phase of counselor education (Hamlet & Burns, 2013). Though different states have different requirements for the internship hours and experience in order to gain licensure, all CACREP programs require the completion of 600 hours on site, with 240 hours to be accumulated in direct service (CACREP, 2009). In addition, one hour of individual supervision with the site supervisor and one and a half hours of group supervision with university supervisor is required weekly (CACREP, 2009).

**Licensure.** Though CACREP is viewed as an advantage to school counseling graduates in seeking employment (McGlothlin & Guillot Miller, 2008), it is not necessary to graduate from a CACREP program to gain certification for practice. Certification has been identified as the guidelines an individual must follow as established by the state legislature in order to confirm credentials to practice (Milsom & Akos, 2007). All 50 states have either licensure or certification standards for the credentialing of practice as a school counselor (Wright, 2012). In addition, all 50 states require some form of graduate training, and most also require passage of a certification exam such as the Praxis II in School Counseling (Wright, 2012).
**Internship phase of school counseling in CACREP.** Though all 50 states have licensure requirements in relation to certification, pathways and specific requirements towards internships may be different. In Ohio, all school counseling students must complete a 600 hour internship, whereas in Massachusetts a 450 hour field experience is required (ASCA State Certification Requirements, 2014). While states retain autonomy of licensure requirements, CACREP requires a 600 hour field placement for internship. The CACREP requirements often exceed state requirements, but do so in order to provide graduates with licensure portability (Mascari & Webber, 2013).

CACREP has specific requirements regarding hours and supervisor qualifications for students in the internship phase, but does not provide specific activities that should be completed. Research has shown that school counseling interns are not always conducting activities that reconcile with the roles identified by the ASCA National Model (Leuwerke, Bruinekool, & Lane, 2008). Research conducted by Akos and Scarborough (2004) found wide ranging discrepancy between internship sites, and that students often engage in activities that are far different from others within an internship class. They further concluded that internship classes had few specified activities in which interns were to engage.

**School counseling supervision.** Though CACREP has specific requirements regarding school counseling site supervision, the rigor of these requirements for school counseling supervisors is far less than for clinical mental health supervisors, where state licensure boards require specific credentials for supervision. CACREP specifies that school counselor site supervisors should have a minimum of two years of professional
experience, and should have relevant training in counseling supervision (CACREP, 2009). Though CACREP provides specifications for relevant training in supervision, it is not defined and can be left to the interpretation of the university program. Further, the ASCA National Model did not address supervision until the most recent publication in 2012. Because supervisory credentials are not mandated for site supervision, many school counseling interns find that they are placed at internship sites where the ASCA model has not been implemented and their site supervisor has little or no familiarity with it (Murphy & Kaffenberger, 2007). It has been asserted that trainees who have been instructed in the value and importance of a comprehensive developmental school counseling program will fail to apply these concepts if they are not reinforced and practiced during supervision (Oberman & Studer, 2012).

**American School Counseling Association influence on school counseling supervision.** Though the ASCA model provides little direction regarding supervision of interns, research has been conducted on supervision at sites that have implemented the ASCA National Model. Studer and Oberman (2006) investigated the types of supervisory activities provided to school counselor trainees. Studer and Oberman developed *The School Counselor Supervision Questionnaire* and piloted it with practicing professional school counselors throughout the nation. The researchers used systematic sampling to recruit 73 practicing school counselors from the Southern region who were members of the ASCA.

The researchers (Studer & Oberman, 2006) utilized a chi-square test and found no significant differences in supervisory activities among trainees who received supervision
following the components of the ASCA National Model compared to those trainees supervised in a traditional school counselor program ($\chi^2(4, n = 73) = 9.460, p = .06$). This research demonstrated that the supervisory activities such as corrective feedback and micro-skills of counseling were not different between sites. Yet, this research did not answer questions regarding school counseling intern activities.

Literature reveals that there is inconsistency between the theory and standards in which students are instructed, specifically as it relates to the ASCA national model. Gibson, Dooley, Kelchner, Moss, and Vacchio (2012) conducted a thorough review of literature on school counselor identity in relation to training and the ASCA model. They found that differences often occur between what is instructed in counselor education through the ASCA model and what occurs in practice. These authors cited ASCA’s directive on leadership, and cited research by Mason and McMahon (2009) that revealed both educators and school counselors do not view themselves as leaders within a school without taking on administrative duties (Gibson et al., 2012).

Akos and Scarborough (2004) investigated the differences in internships by evaluation of counselor education internship syllabi. The authors obtained internship syllabi of 59 school counseling programs. Of these, 71% were CACREP. The researchers developed 10 categories to guide exploration and comparisons. The 10 categories included: (a) objectives, (b) content areas, (c) required textbooks, (d) supplemental resources, (e) method of instruction, (f) course assignments, (g) grading criteria, (h) on site requirements, (i) supervision, and (j) audiotaping/videotaping
requirements. These included CACREP categories in addition to author developed categories.

A qualitative analysis revealed wide diversity in content regarding supervision and student assignments. In particular, on site requirements had wide degrees of disparity: 133 meaning units emerged from the on-site requirements; 25% of syllabi required large group counseling, 20% required record keeping activities, and 8% required career activities. The authors (Akos & Scarborough, 2004) noted that data from this study illustrated that many school counseling programs do not specify any or only a limited number of required on-site counseling activities. Akos and Scarborough concluded that wide diversity continues to exist regarding expectations for students in the school counseling internship phase of the program (Akos & Scarborough, 2004).

CACREP prioritizes its standards so that professional identity of graduates is focused as counselors first and specialty areas as secondary (Bobby, 2013). Yet, as Bobby concluded, this is in direct contradiction to the ASCA position statement which identified: “The Role of the Professional School Counselor . . . professional school counselors are certified/licensed educators with a minimum of a master’s degree in school counseling” (ASCA, 2009). This role confusion and incongruence within the school counseling internship phase may impact emerging professionals’ abilities to assume responsibilities and perform as school counselors upon graduation.

Stickel (1995) has asserted that continued research is needed to determine which aspects of internships provide quality experiences for students. While supervisory activities reveal no significant differences between sites that implement the ASCA
national model and sites that follow traditional school counseling, the review of literature
has found limited studies that focus on outcome data of school counseling students that
complete their internship at ASCA model sites (Studer & Oberman, 2006). The literature
does have limitations, including small sample sizes, few replication studies, and small R²
values.

This study focuses on outcome data of school counseling students that complete their internship at ASCA sites. The outcome measure that was utilized for this study was the School Counselor Self Efficacy Scale (SCSE; Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005). Because the dependent variable of self-efficacy was utilized, it was important to provide background and scholarship on the construct of social learning and self-efficacy.

**Development of Self-Efficacy**

Counselor self-efficacy is a construct of social cognitive theory (Larson & Daniels, 1998). Social cognitive theory and self-efficacy is associated with Albert Bandura, a psychologist, educator, and prolific writer on both social learning and self-efficacy (Bandura, 1986, 1997). A notable inclusion to his body of work on self-efficacy is the publication of *Self-Efficacy: The Exercise of Control* (Bandura, 1997). A concept of social cognitive theory is that people exercise personal agency through the symbolic capacity of forethought (Larson & Daniels, 1998). Bandura (1997) has defined self-efficacy as the “beliefs in one’s capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments” (p. 3). Bandura has further defined that self-efficacy beliefs influence how people feel, think, motivate themselves, and behave (Bandura, 1993). Self-efficacy is considered a cognitive process related to the way
people act. Bandura (1993) postulated that people’s beliefs in their efficacy shape their vision and influence the types of anticipatory scenarios they construct in the cognitive process. Those with high self-efficacy envision successful scenarios and create and identify the supports and positive structures within their control. Those with low self-efficacy rehearse failure and perseverate on the myriad of variables that could possibly go wrong (Bandura, 1993).

**Research on self-efficacy.** Research has supported Bandura’s theory on self-efficacy and is cited within his works (Bandura, 1986, 1993, 1997). A study conducted by Collins (1982) reinforced Bandura’s thoughts on anticipatory scenarios. Students were selected at three different levels of mathematical ability: low, medium, and high. The researcher then found students within each of these ability groups with varying degrees of self-efficacy regarding their math abilities. The researcher found that positive attitudes towards math were better predicted by self-efficacy than by ability (Collins, 1982). Self-efficacy has also been found to be an important part of successful counseling (Jaafar et al., 2009; Larson & Daniels, 1998). Larson and Daniels conducted a thorough review of the scholarship on self-efficacy in relation to counseling. This review found 32 studies on counselor self-efficacy, of which 47% were published studies ($n = 15$). Within this review of scholarship, a study investigated self-efficacy in relationship to counselor outcomes (Larson et al., 1992).

Larson et al. (1992) conducted a study validating the Counseling Self-Estimate Inventory (COSE). They sought to provide initial criterion validity estimates by conducting a multiple-regression analysis to ascertain whether counseling self-efficacy
was a predictor of counseling micro skills performed by pre-practicum students. The participants were graduate students enrolled in a graduate level pre practicum course at a large Midwestern university ($n = 26$). The participants completed the Counseling Self-Estimate, which was used as the predictor variable. The participants then conducted a 15-minute mock counseling session. A behavior rating form consisting of 18 seven-point Likert items was developed for this study, in which raters indicated the degree to which the participants gave counseling micro-skill responses. The researchers found that the Counseling Self-Estimate Inventory was a significant predictor of the Behavioral Rating Form ($\beta = .69, p = .01$; Larson et al, 1992). The authors cautioned that a limitation of this study was the small sample size.

The review of self-efficacy research conducted by Larson and Daniels (1998) evaluated a counselor outcome in relation to self-efficacy as determined by human raters (Larson et al., 1992). In addition, there has been a study investigating self-efficacy in relationship to counselor outcomes as determined by the Counselor Performance Inventory (Jaafar et al., 2009). The Counselor Performance Inventory is a 41-question inventory that was filled out by the participants. The inventory was found to have sound psychometric properties with overall internal consistency of $\alpha = .93$. The study randomly selected 100 participants in their final stages of training. The study found a significant relationship was found between counseling self-efficacy and counselor performance, $r = .312, p < .05$. The Bivariate Linear Regression analysis showed that the counseling self-efficacy was the significant predictor towards counselor performance, $R^2 = .098$, $F(1,98) = 10.589, p < .05$ (Jaafar et al., 2009).
Self-efficacy as a measurement for school counseling. Self-efficacy scales were developed by Bandura (1977) to measure perceived academic self-efficacy. Since that time, several self-efficacy scales had been developed for use in counselor education (Larson & Daniels, 1998). Bodenhorn and Skaggs (2005) relayed that the most commonly used self-efficacy scales used in counseling are for individual and career counseling. Prior to the development of The School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale (Bodenhorn, 2001), there was only one self-efficacy assessment that had a school counselor focus (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005). This instrument, the Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale (Sutton & Fall, 1995), was adapted from a teacher scale, and was used in one study of school counselors, but never reported any psychometric properties (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005). As few instruments had been developed that had a primary focus on school counseling, the research on self-efficacy in relation to school counseling has been limited (Bodenhorn, 2001; Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005). As a result of the scant literature and research regarding school counselor self-efficacy, The School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale was created (Bodenhorn, 2001). This scale measures school counselors’ confidence in their abilities by providing information on school counselors’ beliefs about their ability to perform the duties outlined in the ASCA National Model.

Since the development of The School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale, there has been a small increase in research regarding school counselor self-efficacy (Bodenhorn et al., 2010; Holcomb, Gonzalez, & Johnston, 2009; Owens, Bodenhorn, & Bryant, 2010). These studies have examined school counselor self-efficacy in relation to multicultural competence, data use, and achievement gap.
Owens et al. (2010) investigated the relationship between school counselor self-efficacy and perceived multicultural competence self-efficacy of school counselors. Participants were randomly selected from a national membership roster of the American School Counselor Association ($n = 157$). The participants completed the multicultural competency scale (MCCTS-r; Holcomb-McCoy & Day-Vines, 2004) and a school counselor self-efficacy scale (SCSE; Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005). The MCCTS-R has three subscales: multicultural terminology, multicultural knowledge, and multicultural awareness. A regression analysis was conducted for the prediction of the three multicultural competence scales by five School Counselor Self Efficacy Scales (personal and social, leadership and assessment, career and academic, collaboration, and cultural acceptance). The cultural acceptance scale of The School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale was a statistically significant predictor of all three multicultural competencies (terminology, knowledge, and awareness, ($F(3,118)=10.64, p < .01$; Owens et al., 2010).

Holcomb et al. (2009) investigated school counselor self-efficacy as a predictor for data usage. School counselors in two large metropolitan districts in Maryland and Virginia and randomly selected school counselors from ASCA were recruited for participation ($n = 130$). The researchers developed the School Counselor Attribute and Data Use Survey (SCADUS), a 52-item survey which measured school counselor frequency and use of data. School counselor self-efficacy was measured using the adapted Bandura Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale. The original scale was a 30-item scale developed by Bandura. The researchers replaced “teacher” with “school counselor” and eliminated 20 items that were not relevant to school counseling. Sample items from this
included: “To what extent can you assist students with career and college decisions?” A forward multiple regression produced a model that best predicted school counselor self-efficacy. The findings suggest that school counselor self-efficacy is a predictor of data usage ($\beta = .47, p = .05$). This study accounted for 25% variance in data usage among school counselors (Holcomb et al., 2009). This study was limited by regionalized samples and minimal psychometric data on the instruments.

Bodenhorn et al. (2010) investigated: (a) the relationships between school counselor self-efficacy and school counselors perception of achievement gap status and equity in the school, and (b) the relationships between school counselor self-efficacy and the school counseling program approach utilized. A total of 1,600 school counselors from ASCA were randomly invited to participate in the study ($n = 860$) with a response rate of 54%. Surveys including The School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale, questions regarding the school counseling program, demographics, and student achievement gap information were sent to the participants. Bodenhorn et al. found the relationship between school counselor self-efficacy and the perception of equity produced statistically significant results ($F=104.70, p < .001, R^2 = .11$). Bodenhorn et al. also found that school counselors with high self-efficacy scores were considerably more likely to utilize the ASCA National Model and those with lower self-efficacy scores indicated no choice for the type of program being used; ASCA model group $\chi^2 (1), =21.89, p \leq .000$(Bodenhorn et al., 2010).

Summary and limitations of current literature. A thorough review of the scholarship on self-efficacy revealed no studies in relation to counselor training and
internship sites that have implemented the ASCA National Model. Bodenhorn (2001) has emphasized that understanding school counselors’ self-efficacy is paramount to understanding their confidence in their ability to carry out the duties outlined by the ASCA National Model. Present literature reveals that Comprehensive Counseling Programs have been proven to be effective in reducing school discipline reports and contributing to academic gains (Gysbers, 2004; Lapan et al., 2001; Sink & Stroh, 2003). The review of research found few studies focusing on outcome data of counselors in training at ASCA Model sites. Calls for continued research to determine what aspects of internships provide quality experiences for students have been made (Stickel, 1995). While supervisory activities reveal no significant differences between sites that implement that ASCA national model and sites that follow traditional school counseling, the review of literature has found limited studies that focus on outcome data of school counseling students that complete their internship at ASCA Model sites (Studer & Oberman, 2006). As self-efficacy has been found to be correlated to counselor performance, the literature supports the investigation of internship sites in relation to counselors in training self-efficacy (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005).

The purpose of the present study is to investigate ASCA Comprehensive Programing at the internship phase of school counselor training and the relationship it may have to an intern’s self-efficacy. This study investigates the relationship between variables of ASCA National Model Programing at the internship phase of training and self-efficacy of school counselor students.

The research questions are as follows:
1. What is the relationship between scores of ASCA program implementation as measured by the School Counseling Program Implementation Survey (SCPIS; Elsner & Carey, 2005) and school counseling intern’s self-efficacy as measured by The School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale (SCSES; Bodenhorn, 2001)?

2. Which of these combined variables predict the variance in a student’s self-efficacy upon completion of the internship: Programmatic orientation, school counselors use of software to manage data, school counseling services, prior professional K–12 experience, prior teaching experience, prior clinical mental experience?

3. What percentage of school counseling interns are placed at more fully implemented ASCA sites?
CHAPTER II
METHODOLOGY

This study examines the relationship between ASCA program implementation at the internship site and the self-efficacy of school counselors in-training. The research questions that guided this study include:

1. What is the relationship between scores of ASCA program implementation as measured by the School Counseling Program Implementation Survey (SCPIS; Elsner & Carey, 2005) and school counseling intern’s self-efficacy as measured by The School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale (SCSES; Bodenhorn, 2001)?

2. Which of these factors predict the variance in a student’s self-efficacy upon completion of the internship: Programmatic orientation, school counselors’ use of software to manage data, school counseling services, prior professional K–12 experience, prior teaching experience, prior clinical mental experience?

3. What percentage of school counseling interns are placed at more fully implemented ASCA sites?

Participants

School counseling students at the internship phase of their program were recruited from accredited counselor education programs at universities in Ohio. The researcher was approved for data collection from the Kent State IRB on April 13, 2015. Recruitment emails were sent (See Appendix B) to the directors or department chairs of the following universities from the approved list (See Appendix C; Bowling Green,
Cleveland State, The University of Akron, Kent State University, The University of Pennsylvania Indiana, John Carroll University, Youngstown State University, Walsh University, and Malone University). The researcher traveled to each internship class individually to sample the population. Complete information for the collection of data is found in the methodology section. The researcher collected data at the following Universities: The University of Akron (one class), Kent State University (two classes), Youngstown State University (one class), John Carroll University (two classes), and Malone University (two classes) for a total of eight classes. The population of participants was in the final two weeks of their internship experience. The classes ranged from 6 students per class to over 15 students in a class. The researcher did not collect data on the total number of students per class, but just students that volunteered to participate in the research. In all classes, the majority of students volunteered to participate in the research.

A total of 65 individuals started the survey. All participants answered yes to the informed consent. Of the initial 65, 4 individuals left answers incomplete on one of the instruments used to collect data. According to Lomax (2007), a common way to handle missing data is to drop the individuals from the sample. Thus, 61 participants were left for the analysis and became the researcher’s sample.

**Age, Gender, Prior Teaching, and Prior Mental Health Experience**

This sample included 51 (83%) female and 10 (16%) male individuals. Ages of participants in the sample were collected into four categories: (a) 22–25 (n = 21; 34%), (b) 26–31 (n = 29; 47), (c) 32–37 (n = 5; 8%), (d) ≤37 (n = 6; 9%). Within the sample,
24 individuals (39%) reported have teaching experience, and 8 individuals (13%) reported having mental health experience. Information can be found on the participants’ demographics in Table 1.

Table 1

*Demographic Information of Participants (N = 61)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>83.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-37</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37&lt;</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prior Teaching</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>60.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prior Mental Health</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>86.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prior K12</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>70.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Procedures**

The following paragraphs provide information on the procedures used in this study including preparing the conceptual foundations of the study, identification of the Council of Accreditation and related educational programs with school counseling programs, and recruitment of the participants.
Preparing the Conceptual Foundations of the Study

The initial research procedures involved the researcher analyzing the 2009 CACREP standards in comparison to the ASCA School Counselor Competencies (2012). The ASCA School Counselor Competencies were developed in 2007. At that time, a group of school counselors, district supervisors, and counselor educators from across the country met to ensure that future school counselors were trained to design and implement comprehensive school counseling programs. From this group, it was determined that a core set of school counselor competencies should be created. ASCA created a task force that formed the school counselor competencies that supported the ASCA National Model. These competencies cover the areas of knowledge, skills, abilities, and attitudes (ASCA, 2012).

As the American School Counselor Association does not accredit school counselor education programs, the researcher felt it necessary to determine the number of standards and indicators of the ASCA School Counselor Competencies that reconciled with CACREP 2009 school counseling standards. The two documents that outline what counselors should do both compare and contrast in complexity and depth. It was found that the CACREP standards have more domains (9) and substantially fewer indicators in the school counseling domain (69) compared to the American School Counseling Associations Competencies with (5) domains and (216) indicators. The CACREP standards present as a broader document. The ASCA competencies for school counselors have few domains, but have more indicators and are more explicit about needed competencies. The researcher found that the majority of ASCA indicators are either not
found or not specific in language or context within CACREP. In qualifying an indicator
not being found in CACREP, both specific language and meaning could not be found in
CACREP. An example of indicators not found in CACREP included any indicators that
relate to administration as a stakeholder. The CACREP document also lacked contractual
agreements between the school counselor and administration. An example includes the
ASCA indicator III-B-1b: “Negotiates a management plan for the comprehensive school
counseling program with the administrator.”

Loosely found indicators were identified when CACREP was missing parts or
specific language, but could be broadly interrupted to cover the majority of the indicator.
An example of this includes III-B-2, “Establishes and convenes an advisory council for
the comprehensive school counseling program,” cross-referenced to CACREPS’ “O.5:
Understands the school counselor’s role in student assistance programs, school
leadership, curriculum, and advisory meetings.” CACREP does not specify the
establishment of an advisory meeting for the purpose of developing a comprehensive
guidance program. It does mention that it should be done in part with other aspects of a
school counselor’s position. It is loose and not as direct as ASCA.

The end result of this work established a need to evaluate components of the
ASCA comprehensive program for interns because accrediting a program as CACREP
does not certify the program as an ASCA comprehensive program. Though school
counselor students may be instructed in varying aspects of ASCA competencies,
CACREP only addresses 92 of the 216 competencies.
Identification of Council of Accreditation and Related Educational Programs With School Counseling Programs

The researcher identified several possible CACREP school counseling programs from the database maintained on the website of CACREP. (See Appendix A.) An initial email was sent to program directors or department chairs of the following identified programs explaining the study and seeking permission to contact faculty teaching internship classes in order to facilitate recruitment of participants (The University of Akron, Kent State University, Malone University, Cleveland State University, John Carroll University, Walsh University, Youngstown State University, Bowling Green State University, Indiana University of Pennsylvania; See Appendix C for email). A copy of the IRB approval was also enclosed along with the informed consent (See Appendix B). The researcher received responses from all but one of the universities contacted.

Recruitment of Participants

Upon permission from the universities’ program directors or department chairs, the researcher contacted the internship instructor to attain permission and information to attend an internship class to present the research and recruit participants. The researcher selected the following universities based upon location and number of participants to most effectively and efficiently collect participants. These programs included: The University of Akron, Kent State University, Youngstown State University, Malone University, and John Carroll University. The researcher contacted Bowling Green State University and Walsh University, but did not recruit either due to the semester ending
early or low class numbers in the internship classes. The researcher coordinated times with the respective internship instructor and attended the classes on site to present the research and seek recruitment between April 17, and June 6, 2015. The researcher read from a script explaining the purpose and rationale for the study (See Appendix D). The researcher reviewed the intent to participate form, the School Counseling Self-Efficacy Scale (Bodenhorn, 2001; See Appendix E), the School Counseling Program Implementation Instrument (Elsner & Carey, 2005; See Appendix F), and the demographic questionnaire (See Appendix G). The researcher then passed out the aforementioned forms. All individuals were informed that they could choose to participate in a lottery drawing for a prize of a $50.00 gift card by submitting their names to the researcher after completing the surveys. All members of the classes were informed that they could still participate in the drawing whether they consented to the study or not. The committee members supervised the drawing at the end of the research.

**Instruments**

The following paragraphs provide information on the validity and reliability of the instruments used in this study. These instruments include the School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale and the School Counselor Program Implementation Survey.

**The School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale**

The School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale (SCSE; Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005) was constructed out of the need to measure school counselors’ self-efficacy, covering the myriad of responsibilities and areas defined in the new age of comprehensive counseling programming (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005). The original instrument was developed by
Bodenhorn from the National Standards for School Counseling, the school counseling program standards from the Council of Accreditation and Related Programming Standards 2001 publication, and from self-efficacy counseling scales, such as the Career Counseling Self-Efficacy Scale (O’Brien, Heppner, Flores, & Bikos, 1997). This instrument was tested in four different studies to validate psychometric properties.

**Preparatory step of validity for School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale.** The preparatory step included expert analysis of items to ensure content validity, that is, what items best suited a school counselor self-efficacy scale. The initial scale of 44 items was reviewed by school counseling experts. Bodenhorn and Skaggs (2005) identified that the panel of experts was composed of five national experts whom held offices within the professional organizations of ASCA, Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES), and CACREP. The author followed guidelines of panel review as set forth by O’Brien et al. (1997) in the development of his Career Self-Efficacy Scale.

**Validity study two of School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale.** Study two was an item analysis from practicing school counselors. The authors gathered data from a national school counseling conference utilizing the School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale and a demographic survey (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005). Data collected from respondents who did not report being a practicing school counselor were omitted. In total, 582 individuals were contacted and 226 identified as being usable. The authors compared studies from professional journals with large samples sizes to determine the representativeness of their sample of participants. These studies included Coll and Freeman’s (1997) study on role conflict among elementary counselors. This study
reported $N = 1,510$ with an average of 9 years of counseling experience. Utilizing comparison studies, the authors determined that their sample of $N = 226$ was demographically representative of school counselors. The authors used this data to conduct reliability using SPSS (version 12.0), and found internal consistency with $\alpha = .95$.

**Validity study three of School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale.** Study three was conducted to examine construct validity of the SCSES by correlation with four other preexisting psychometrically sound instruments. These instruments included the *Counseling Self-Estimate Inventory* (COSE; Larson et al., 1992), *The Social Desirability Scale* (SDS; Crowne & Marlowe, 1960), *The State-Trait Anxiety Inventory* (STAI; Spielberger, Gorsuch, Lushene, Vagg, & Jacobs, 1983), and *The Tennessee Self-Concept Scale, second edition* (TSCS:2; Fitts & Warren, 1996). The following information describes the psychometric properties of these instruments that were used to correlate with the *School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale*.

The Counseling Self-Estimate Inventory is a 37-item scale with subscales of micro-skills, process, and understanding the impact of values. It was reported to have adequate reliability using test-retest measurement ($\alpha = .87$ reported across three week intervals). Validity was determined by positive correlations of counselor performance as measured by a behavioral rating scale (Larson et al., 1992). In addition, Bodenhorn and Skaggs (2005) reported that the Counseling Self-Estimate Inventory has been used in 43% of the studies on counseling self-efficacy since its development.
The Social Desirability Scale is a 33-item instrument that respondents answer in a true/false format. The SDS measures one’s attempt to describe oneself in favorable terms as a way to achieve approval from others. Because self-efficacy scales ask people to report a confidence level that leaves little to no doubt about which direction is socially desirable, it is important to verify that respondents are not just answering the inventory questions in the socially desirable way. The Social Desirability Scale has adequate levels of test-retest reliability (α = .89 across one month; Beretvas, Meyers, & Leite, 2002). The Social Desirability Scale is a widely used instrument, having been listed in over a 1,000 research articles or dissertations (Beretvas et al., 2002). It has been found to have met the thresholds of acceptable validity in a number of different samples by Confirmatory factor analyses (Loo & Thorpe, 2000.)

The State Trait Anxiety Inventory developed by Spielberger et al. (1983) is a 40-item instrument used to measure anxiety. The authors (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005) reported that according to self-efficacy theory, people that report strong self-efficacy have reduced anxiety and avoidant behaviors. This instrument was used to validate negative correlations with positive measures of self-efficacy. Test-retest reliability coefficients have ranged from (α = .65) to (α = .75) over a 2-month interval (Spielberger et al., 1983). Validity studies were conducted by correlating other anxiety instruments (State-Trait Inventory for Cognitive and Somatic Anxiety and the Depression Anxiety Stress Scale) with the State Trait Anxiety Inventory. Both the State-Trait Inventory for Cognitive and Somatic Anxiety and the Depression Anxiety Stress Scale evidenced
strong correlations with the State Trait Anxiety Inventory \( (r > .57; \text{Grös, Antony, Simms,} \& \text{McCabe, 2007}) \).

The Tennessee Self Concept Scale:2 is an 82 item measure of self-confidence. The Tennessee Self Concept Scale has adequate levels of test-retest reliability \( (\alpha = .82 \text{ reported across a two week period; Fitts & Warren, 1996}) \). Fitts and Warren examined construct validity using a principal components analysis. The results of a two-factor extraction highlighted the use of positively and negatively worded items. Their two-factor extraction accounted for 28.7% of the variance.

The participants for study three were masters students enrolled in the internship phase of their school counseling program \( (n = 116) \) with a response rate of 36%. Two of these correlations were expected to have positive correlations to validate the School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale. The Counseling Self Estimate Inventory (Larson et al., 1992; \( r = .41, n = 28, p < .05 \)), and the Social Desirability Scale (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960; \( r = .30, n = 25 \)). The SCSES was also correlated against the State Trait Anxiety Inventory (1983), an inventory that measures State anxiety and Trait anxiety in which a negative correlation was expected with the results reporting \( (r = -.41, r = -.31, n = 38; p < .05) \).

**Validity study four of School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale.** Study four was conducted using a principal components analysis with an oblique rotation, in which all of the data were combined from both the practitioner sample and the school interns’ sample \( (n = 342) \). Eight eigenvalues greater than 1.0 emerged that accounted for 63% of the total variance, as seen in Table 2 (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005).
Table 2

Eigenvalues of School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eigenvalues</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of total variance</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bodenhorn and Skaggs (2005) then utilized a scree-test, and found natural breaks occurred after components one, two, five, and eight. The researchers then examined through an oblique rotation solutions involving one through eight of the components. From this, five subscales emerged: Personal and Social Development (12 items), Leadership and Assessment (9 items), Career and Academic Development (7 items), Collaboration (11 items), and Cultural Acceptance (4 items). Four of the five subscales correlated positively with each other, with the correlations ranging from $r = .27$ to $r = .43$. Career and Academic Development had a negative correlation with the other components, with correlations ranging from $r = -.28$ to $r = -.41$ (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005).

During the validation studies, the SCSE demonstrated internal consistency with a coefficient alpha of ($\alpha = .95$; Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005). Other researchers have utilized the SCSE and have found strong reliability, with a coefficient alpha of ($\alpha = .97$; Bodenhorn et al., 2010).
School Counselor Program Implementation Survey. The School Counseling Program Implementation Survey (SCPIS; Elsner & Carey, 2005) was developed at the University of Massachusetts to both facilitate research and provide an instrument for practitioners to identify what aspects of an ASCA program were in place or missing (Clemens, Carey, & Harrington, 2010). The instrument originated as a 25-item questionnaire developed from extensive review of literature that identified the ASCA National Model and related comprehensive developmental school counseling programs (Clemens et al., 2010). These items were then reviewed by a panel of expert practicing counseling directors familiar with the ASCA National Model for validity. The feedback from this panel led to the revision of wording on several questions. A principal axis factor method with oblique rotation analysis was conducted on 20 retained questions from the original instrument. Participants were practicing school counselors ($n = 341$). The decision to retain factors was guided by the scree plot, considering Eigenvalues, and balancing parsimony and plausibility (Clemens et al., 2010). The researchers found that the initial loading produced four factors with values greater than 1.

The three factor and two factor model utilizing 17 items was found to be most appropriate (Clemens et al., 2010). The researchers found that advantages of the three factor model would allow for future researchers to more precisely capture aspects of the ASCA National Model program implementation. The three factors of this model were: programmatic orientation, school counseling services, and software to manage and use data for students. Cronbach’s Alpha for the 17 items in the analysis of the three factor model was reported at $\alpha = .83$. All factors met the criteria for a stable subscale, which is
a minimum of three items that load at .5 or greater (Clemens et al., 2010). The three factor model accounted for 54% of the variance. Correlations among the factors were moderate ($r = .35$ factors 1 and 2, $r = .45$ factors 1 and 3, $r = .36$ factors 2 and 3). However, it should be noted that no confirmatory factor analysis was conducted nor were reliability data gathered. The researchers acknowledged that though the variance may be considered a psychometric limitation, it should be considered in the context of measures relating to school counseling programs. Specifically the researchers compared the School Counseling Activity Rating Scale (SCARS) psychometrics to SCPIS. The SCARS factor analysis accounted for 47% of the variance. The authors contended that the amount of the variance explained by the SCARS is comparable the SCPIS, and initial steps indicate preliminary evidence of psychometric suitability (Clemens et al., 2010).

**Demographic data.** Demographic information was collected from all participants. These descriptors included gender, age, prior teaching experience, prior clinical mental health experience, prior K12 professional experience, undergraduate GPA, undergraduate field of study, and graduate GPA.

**Data Analyses**

The data collected were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS; Leech, Barrett, & Morgan, 2008) to answer the following research questions.

Research Question 1: What is the relationship between scores of ASCA program implementation as measured by the School Counseling Program Implementation Survey (SCPIS; Elsner & Carey, 2005) and school counseling intern’s self-efficacy as measured
by The School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale (SCSES; Bodenhorn, 2001)? Correlation analysis was utilized to explore this relationship.

Research Question 2: Which of these combined variables predict the variance in a student’s self-efficacy upon completion of the internship: Programmatic orientation, school counselors use of software to manage data, school counseling services, prior professional K–12 experience, prior teaching experience, prior clinical mental experience?

Research Question 3: What percentage of school counseling interns are placed at more fully implemented ASCA sites? Measures of central tendency were utilized to answer this question.

Both descriptive data analysis and frequencies of and measures of central tendencies were calculated to analyze the demographic information collected. Multiple linear regression analyses were conducted to examine the relationship between the predictor variables of the components of the ASCA National Model as identified in the SCPIS Programmatic orientation, school counselors use of software to manage data, school counseling services and the criterion variable (school counselor interns’ self-efficacy). Linear regression was the appropriate procedure to test the main assumptions against the collection of data. The findings were considered significant at a $p$-value of .05 or better.

Operationalizing Instruments

Regression and correlation was the appropriate statistical analysis to address the first two research questions. This statistical method allows for two or more predictor
variables to be used to predict a criterion variable (Lomax, 2007). Using this methodology allowed for the examination of whether school counseling interns’ self-efficacy was significantly associated with the implementation of the ASCA Model at school counseling sites and several other variables including prior teaching experience (0 = no, 1 = yes), factors of the school counseling program implementation survey including use of technology, program orientation, and counseling services. Dummy coding was used for teaching experience (0 = no, 1 = yes). In order to utilize categorical variables within a regression model, converting categorical variables to continuous variables allows for studying the effect of each (Lomax, 2007). Percentage calculations were used to address the third research question.

The dependent variable, or scores on the School Counselor Self Efficacy Scale, was calculated as a total score from 43 items. The scores ranged from 135 to 210. A score of 135 represented the lowest self-reported score on the SCSES. A score of 210 represented the highest reported score.

The SCPIS was calculated as a total score from 18 items. The scores ranged from 20 to 77. A score of 20 represented the lowest reported score and a score of 77 represented the highest reported score. In addition, three sub scores of the SCPIS were analyzed as independent variables: counseling services, program orientation, and technology. Counseling services was calculated as a total score from 4 items with the scores ranging from 5 to 20. Program orientation was calculated as a total score from seven items with scores ranging from 7 to 27. Technology was calculated as a total score from three items with scores ranging from 5 to 20.
CHAPTER III

RESULTS

This study investigated the relationship between ASCA program implementation at the internship site as measured by the School Counseling Program Implementation Survey (SCPIS; Elsner & Carey, 2005) and school counseling intern’s self-efficacy as measured by the School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale (SCSES; Bodenhorn, 2001). Quantitative multivariate correlational research methods were used to answer the following questions:

1. What is the relationship between scores of ASCA program implementation as measured by the School Counseling Program Implementation Survey (SCPIS; Elsner & Carey, 2005) and school counseling intern’s self-efficacy as measured by The School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale (SCSES; Bodenhorn, 2001)?

2. Which of these factors predict the variance in a student’s self-efficacy upon completion of the internship: Programmatic orientation, school counselors’ use of software to manage data, school counseling services, prior professional K–12 experience, prior teaching experience, prior clinical mental experience?

3. What percentage of school counseling interns are placed at more fully implemented ASCA sites?

Statistical Results

The previous chapter outlined the specific methodology and instrumentation for this study. This chapter provides details on the results of the data.
Results for Hypothesis One

Hypothesis one states: In the population, there will be a relationship between scores of ASCA program implementation as measured by the School Counseling Program Implementation Survey (SCPIS; Elsner & Carey, 2005) and school counseling intern’s self-efficacy as measured by the School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale (SCSES; Bodenhorn, 2001).

A Pearson’s correlation was computed to assess the relationship between scores of the SCPIS and SCSES, \( r(61) = .246, p = .056 \). The correlation between the degree of a more fully implemented ASCA Model program as measured by the SCPIS at the internship site correlated to school counselor interns’ self-efficacy was not statistically significant. The results of correlations can be found in Table 3. A Pearson’s correlation was computed to assess the relationship between scores of the SCPIS and SCSES with the removal of outliers.

Table 3

*Correlations, Means and Standard Deviations for SCPIS and SCSES (\( N = 61 \))*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>( M )</th>
<th>( SD )</th>
<th>( R )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCPIS</td>
<td>55.87</td>
<td>12.039</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCSES</td>
<td>183.39</td>
<td>15.812</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\*\( p < .05 \); \**\( p < .01 \)
The outlier process involved analyzing the data of the SCSES and the SCPIS and removing participants who had scores two standard deviations above or below the Means of both the SCSES and the SCPIS (see Table 4). The original sample \((N = 61)\) of the SCSES \((M = 183.39, SD = 15.812)\) had two participants that reported scores of 148 and 135. These two participants were removed from the sample set for having scores more than two standard deviations below the mean. An analysis was conducted of the SCPIS \((M = 55.87, SD = 12.03)\), and one score was found to be two standard deviations above the mean with a score of 20. This participant was removed from the sample. Of the three participants that were removed, only one variable (either the SCPIS or the SCSES) was identified as being outside two standard deviations for each participant that was removed.

Table 4

*Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations for SCPIS and SCSES (N = 58)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>(M)</th>
<th>(SD)</th>
<th>(R)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCPIS</td>
<td>56.74</td>
<td>11.07</td>
<td>.267*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCSES</td>
<td>184.66</td>
<td>14.018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\*\(p < .05; **p < .01\)

The outlier data set was computed using a Pearson correlation to assess the relationship between scores of the SCPIS and SCSES, \(r (58) = .267, p = .043\). The correlation between the degree of a more fully implemented ASCA Model program as
measured by the SCPIS at the internship site correlated to school counselor interns’ self-efficacy was statistically significant.

**Results for Hypothesis Two**

Hypothesis two states: In the population, the combination of the ASCA Model Programing as measured by the SCPIS subscales of technology, program orientation and counseling services and demographics of age, prior teaching experience, prior mental health experience will explain more than zero percent of the variability in scores of self-efficacy as measured by the School Counselor Self Efficacy Scale (SCSES).

**Follow up hypothesis.** In the population, the ASCA Model as measured by the SCPIS and demographics of age, prior teaching experience, prior K12 and prior mental health experience will explain more than zero percent of the variability in scores of self-efficacy as measured by the School Counselor Self Efficacy Scale (SCSES).

The assumptions of linearity and homoscedasticity were checked. The results can be found in Figure 3. The results of the scatter plot indicated that the independent variables were primarily linearly related to the dependent variable of school counseling self-efficacy, meeting this assumption.

The other assumptions of error were checked in the residual scatterplot, which indicated that the errors were normally distributed, the variances of the residuals were constant, and the residuals were generally uncorrelated with the linear combinations of predictors. The results of these assumptions are seen in Figure 4.
Figure 3. Scatterplot Matrix Linearity
Figure 4. Residual Scatterplot of homoscedasticity
Multicollinearity was also checked by analyzing the Tolerance and VIF values. These values were close to 1, and as a result did not significantly affect the regression model. Results can be found in Table 5.

Table 5

*Collinearity Statistics of Independent Variables (N = 61)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regression Model</th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
<th>VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.799</td>
<td>1.251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Teaching</td>
<td>.767</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Orientation</td>
<td>.565</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>.664</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling Services</td>
<td>.503</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Mental Health</td>
<td>.939</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher ran several models of a simultaneous multiple regression to determine the best linear combination of ASCA Model Programming as determined by the subscales of technology, program orientation and counseling services, age and prior teaching, and mental health experience for predicting school counselor intern’s self-efficacy and accounting for variance. The first model included independent variables of the subscales of technology, counseling services, and program orientation, age, and prior teaching experience. The dependent variable was the SCSES. The analysis of variance (ANOVA) results from the overall regression equation were not statistically significant, $F(5, 55) = 1.309, p = .274$. The model summary from the regression analysis
gives the $R$ (.326) and adjusted $R^2$ (.102). The model showed that the set of predictor variables accounted for 10% of the variance in the dependent variable of school counseling interns’ self-efficacy. The beta weight in the predictor variables was found to be both in the positive and negative direction. No predictors were significant. The results of the regression predicting school counseling interns’ self-efficacy from the independent variables from the first model can be found in Table 6.

Table 6

*Results of Multiple Regression Predicting School Counseling Intern’s Self-Efficacy From Subscales of the SCPIS Including Program Orientation, Counseling Services, Technology and Demographic Variables of Age and Prior Teaching Experience (N=61)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SEB</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$P$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>2.471</td>
<td>.262</td>
<td>.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Teaching</td>
<td>-2.05</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>-.064</td>
<td>.655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Orientation</td>
<td>.464</td>
<td>.529</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>.384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>.840</td>
<td>.654</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>.204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling Services</td>
<td>-.637</td>
<td>.826</td>
<td>-.137</td>
<td>.444</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. $R = .326; R^2 = .106; \text{adjusted } R^2 = .025; F(5, 55) = 1.309, p = .274*

The researcher conducted the same model removing the outliers of the SCSES and the SCPIS ($N = 58$). This model included the dependent variable of the SCSES and the independent variables of age, technology, counseling services, program orientation, and prior teaching experience. The model summary for this regression analysis showed that the analysis of variance (ANOVA) overall were not statistically significant,
F(5,52)=.574, p = .719. The model summary from the regression analysis gives the R (.221) and adjusted R² (0). The beta weights for this model varied in both the positive and negative directions and can be found in Table 7. No predictors were found to be significant.

Table 7

*Results of Multiple Regression Predicting School Counseling Intern’s Self-Efficacy From Subscales of the SCPIS Including Program Orientation, Counseling Services, Technology and Demographic Variables of Age and Prior Teaching Experience Without Outliers (N = 58)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SEB</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>.236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Teaching</td>
<td>-3.12</td>
<td>4.213</td>
<td>-.110</td>
<td>.684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Orientation</td>
<td>.386</td>
<td>.486</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>.432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>.422</td>
<td>.627</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling Services</td>
<td>-.317</td>
<td>.774</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.684</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* R = .221, R² = .0, F(5,52)=.574, p = .719

The researcher conducted the regression with the dependent variable of SCSES and the independent variables of age, prior mental health experience, program orientation, technology, and counseling services. The model summary for this regression analysis showed that the analysis of variance (ANOVA) overall were not statistically significant, F(4,56)=.756, p = .578. The model summary from the regression analysis gives the R (.222) and adjusted R² (0). The beta weights for this model varied in both the
positive and negative directions and can be found in Table 8. No predictors were significant.

Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SEB</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Orientation</td>
<td>.545</td>
<td>.536</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>.728</td>
<td>.666</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>.279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling Services</td>
<td>-.718</td>
<td>.850</td>
<td>-.155</td>
<td>.402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Mental Health Experience</td>
<td>-.846</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>.890</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. R = .222, R² = 0, F(4,56) = .756, p = .578

The researcher conducted a multiple regression of the same model without the outliers (N = 58). The dependent variable was the SCSES. The independent variables were program orientation, technology, counseling services, and prior mental health services. The model summary for this regression analysis showed that the analysis of variance (ANOVA) overall were not statistically significant, F(4,53) = .475, p = .754. The model summary from the regression analysis gives the R (.186) and adjusted R² (0). The beta weights for this model varied in both the positive and negative directions and can be found in Table 9. No predictors were significant.
Table 9

*Results of Multiple Regression Predicting School Counseling Intern’s Self-Efficacy From Subscale Scores of Technology, Counseling Services, Program Orientation and Demographic Variable of Prior Mental Health Services Experience Without Outliers (N = 58)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SEB</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Orientation</td>
<td>.401</td>
<td>.483</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>.413</td>
<td>.629</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling Services</td>
<td>-.336</td>
<td>.774</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Mental Health Experience</td>
<td>-4.353</td>
<td>5.789</td>
<td>-.102</td>
<td>.455</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* R = .186, R² = 0, F(4,53) = .475, p = .754

**Follow up research question.** The researcher conducted a regression with the dependent variable of SCSES and the independent variables of: SCPIS, age, and prior mental health experience. The model summary for this regression analysis showed that the analysis of variance (ANOVA) overall were not statistically significant, F(3,57) = 2.743, p = .051. The model summary from the regression analysis gives the R (.355) and adjusted R² (.08). The beta weights for this model varied in both the positive and negative directions and can be found in Table 10. Age (β = .257, P = .043) and the SCPIS (β = .272, P = .033) were significant predictors of self-efficacy.
Table 10

Results of Multiple Regression Predicting School Counseling Intern’s Self-Efficacy From SCPIS and Demographic Variable of Prior Mental Health Services Experience (N = 61)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SEB</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCPIS</td>
<td>.357</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>.272</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Mental Health Exp.</td>
<td>-.320</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.956</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. R = .355, R² = .08, F(3,57)=.743, p = .051

The researcher then conducted the regression after removing outliers from the SCPIS and the SCSES. The model summary for this regression analysis showed that the analysis of variance (ANOVA) overall were not statistically significant, F(3,54)=2.044, p = .11. The model summary from the regression analysis gives the R (.319) and adjusted R²=.052. The beta weights for this model varied in both the positive and negative directions and can be found in Table 11. Age (β = .277, P=.037) was a significant predictor of self-efficacy.

The researcher conducted a regression with the dependent variable of SCSES and the independent variables of: SCPIS, age, and prior teaching experience (N = 61). The model summary for this regression analysis showed that the analysis of variance (ANOVA) overall were statistically significant, F(3,57)=2.98, p = .039. The model summary from the regression analysis gives the R (.36) and adjusted R² (.09). This model demonstrated that the predictor variables accounted for 9% of the variance in
Table 11

*Results of Multiple Regression Predicting School Counseling Intern’s Self-Efficacy From SCPIS and Demographic Variable of Prior Mental Health Services Experience Without Outliers (N = 58)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SEB</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>2.146</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td>.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCPIS</td>
<td>.351</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>.305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Mental Health Exp.</td>
<td>-4.317</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>-.101</td>
<td>.440</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. R = .319, R² = .052, F(3,54)=2.04, p = .11*

school counseling interns’ self-efficacy as explained by this model. The beta weights for this model varied in both the positive and negative directions and can be found in Table 12. This model found that age (β = .307, p = .031), and the SCIPIS (β = .294, p = .024) were statistically significant and contributed to the model.

The researcher conducted a regression with the dependent variable of SCSES and the independent variables of: SCPIS, age, and prior teaching experience after removing the outliers of the SCPIS and the SCSES (N = 58). The model summary for this regression analysis showed that the analysis of variance (ANOVA) overall were not statistically significant, F(3,54)=2.361, p = .082. The model summary from the regression analysis gives the R (.341) and adjusted R² (.062). The beta weights for this model varied in both the positive and negative directions and can be found in Table 13. This model found that the SCIPIS (β = .309, p = .023) was statistically significant and contributed to the model.
Table 12

*Results of Multiple Regression Predicting School Counseling Intern’s Self-Efficacy From Scores on the SCPIS, Demographic Variables Including Age and Prior Teaching Experience (N = 61)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SEB</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>5.331</td>
<td>2.412</td>
<td>.307</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCPIS</td>
<td>.387</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>.294</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Teaching Experience</td>
<td>-3.562</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>-.111</td>
<td>.431</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. R = .368, R² = .090, F(3,57)=2.931, p = .039*

Table 13

*Results of Multiple Regression Predicting School Counseling Intern’s Self-Efficacy From Scores on the SCPIS, Demographic Variables Including Age and Prior Teaching Experience (N = 58)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SEB</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>3.381</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCPIS</td>
<td>.341</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>.309</td>
<td>.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Teaching Experience</td>
<td>-4.14</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>-.174</td>
<td>.230</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. R = .341, R² = .062, F(3,54)=2.361, p = .082*

The researcher conducted a regression with the dependent variable of SCSES and the independent variables of: SCPIS, age, and prior K12 experience (N = 61). The model summary for this regression analysis showed that the analysis of variance (ANOVA) overall were statistically significant, F(3,57) = 4.81, p = .005. The model summary from
the regression analysis gives the R (.449) and adjusted R² (.16). This model
demonstrated that the predictor variables accounted for 16% of the variance in school
counseling interns’ self-efficacy as explained by this model. The beta weights for this
model varied in both the positive and negative directions and can be found in Table 14.
This model found that age (β = .325, p = .010), the SCPIS (β = .295, p = .017) and K12
experience (β = -.287, p = .023) were statistically significant and contributed to the
model.

Table 14

Results of Multiple Regression Predicting School Counseling Intern’s Self-Efficacy From
Scores on the SCPIS, Demographic Variables Including Age and Prior K12 Experience
(N = 61)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SEB</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>.325</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCPIS</td>
<td>.387</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>.295</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior K12 Experience</td>
<td>-9.77</td>
<td>4.191</td>
<td>-2.87</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. R = .449, R² = .161, F(3,57) = 4.810, p = .005*

After removing the outliers for the SCPIS and the SCSES the researcher
conducted a regression with the dependent variable of SCSES and the independent
variables of: SCPIS, age, and prior K12 experience (N = 58). The model summary for
this regression analysis showed that the analysis of variance (ANOVA) overall were
statistically significant, F(3,54)=3.16, p = .032. The model summary from the regression
analysis gives the R (.387) and adjusted R² (.102). This model demonstrated that the
predictor variables accounted for 10% of the variance in school counseling interns’ self-efficacy as explained by this model. The beta weights for this model varied in both the positive and negative directions and can be found in Table 15. This model found that the SCPIS ($\beta = .298$, $p = .022$) was statistically significant and contributed to the model.

Table 15

Results of Multiple Regression Predicting School Counseling Intern’s Self-Efficacy From Scores on the SCPIS, Demographic Variables Including Age and Prior K12 Experience with the Removal of Outliers ($N = 58$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SEB</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$P$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>3.287</td>
<td>2.075</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCPIS</td>
<td>.377</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>.298</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior K12 Experience</td>
<td>-7.499</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>-.250</td>
<td>.061</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $R = .387$, $R^2 = .102$, $F(3,54) = 3.16$, $p = .032$

Results for Hypothesis Three

Hypothesis three states: In the population most students will be placed at school counseling sites with more fully implemented ASCA models.

The School Counseling Program Implementation Survey consisted of 18 items, with one item having three subscales. Each question had a Likert scale of 1–4, 1 = not present, 2 = development in progress, 3 = partially implemented, 4 = fully implemented. The total range for the survey was 20–80 points, with 80 points being the most fully implemented ASCA programing as measured by the SCPIS. The range from the data collected for this research was 20–77 (see Table 16). The researcher created quartiles
based on the Likert scale descriptors to measure implementation. Quartile one was total scores between 0–20 and was categorized as “not present.” Quartile two was total scores of 21–40 and was categorized as “Development in progress.” Quartile 3 was total scores between 41–60 and was categorized as “Partially implemented.” Quartile 4 was total scores of 60 or more and was categorized as “fully implemented.”

Table 16

*Descriptive Statistics for the SCPIS (N = 61)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCPIS</td>
<td>55.87</td>
<td>12.039</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling Services</td>
<td>14.74</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>15.33</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Orientation</td>
<td>16.75</td>
<td>5.068</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sample has 1 (1.5%) person placed in category 1, where the ASCA model was not present. Five participants (8%) were placed in category 2, where the ASCA model was a development in progress. Thirty-one participants (50.8%) were placed in an internship site that was category 3, where the ASCA model was partially implemented. Twenty-four participants (39%) were at a site that was category four and fully implemented. See Figure 5.
Summary of Results

This chapter outlined the findings from the quantitative analysis of the investigation of how scores on the School Counselor Program Implementation Scale measuring ASCA Model programing predict scores on the School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale among school counseling interns. The model found that participants who reported having a more fully implemented school counseling program at their internship site predicted higher self-efficacy among school counseling interns. In addition, when combining factors of age and prior mental health and teaching experience, the SCPIS was statistically significant in predicting school counseling interns’ self-efficacy, though this prediction should be taken into context considering the small $R^2$. 

Figure 5. Percentage of participants in the four categories.
The following chapter explores these findings in more detail, and relates them to existing literature and the benefits and limitations of a more fully implemented school counseling program. The limitations of this research are also presented. Last, implications and future direction for further research are explored.
CHAPTER IV
DISCUSSION

This study examined the relationship between the ASCA Model implemented at school counseling internship sites as measured by the SCPIS and school counseling interns’ self-efficacy. The purpose of this study was to provide practitioners, supervisors, and counselor educators a better understanding of how the ASCA model influences self-efficacy during school counselor training. The findings of this research are intended to contribute to the body of knowledge on the ASCA Model and the training and supervision of school counselors.

This chapter presents the summary of major findings for each research question, followed by a section that discusses the limitations. The findings from this research are reconciled with the current literature on the ASCA Model and its use in the training of school counselors during internship. Last, implications for practice and future directions of research are outlined.

Summary of Results

Research has been conducted that investigated school counselors’ self-efficacy in the prediction of the use of data (Holcomb et al., 2009). Literature also exists on school counselors’ self-efficacy in relation to the achievement gap (Bodenhorn et al., 2010). Yet, there is no research that has focused specifically on school counseling interns’ self-efficacy in relationship to the internship site or the ASCA Model. This study was among the first to examine the ASCA Model as a predictor of school counseling interns’ self-efficacy. The results of this study support the hypothesis that there is a small
relationship between interns’ self-efficacy and the level of implementation of the ASCA model. More specifically, the more fully implemented the ASCA model was at the internship site, the higher the level of the interns’ self-efficacy. Furthermore, when age and prior K–12 experience were combined, the regression produced a significant model that was predictive of school counselors’ self-efficacy and accounted for 10% of the variance. However, the subscales of the School Counseling Program Implementation Survey were not predictive of the school counseling interns’ self-efficacy. Despite the marginal evidence, the initial evidence does support a relationship between the SCPIS among interns at the internship site and their self-efficacy.

The data demonstrated that the majority of school counseling interns within the sample were placed at sites where the ASCA Model was either partially implemented (50%), or fully implemented (39%) as measured by the SCPIS. These findings suggest that most school counselors within the sample are using components of the ASCA model in their practice. Only 10% of school counselor interns responded that their sites either were developing into an ASCA site, or did not have any components of the ASCA model.

**Research Question 1**

Is there a relationship between scores of ASCA program implementation as measured by the School Counseling Program Implementation Survey (SCPIS; Elsner & Carey, 2005) and school counseling interns’ self-efficacy as measured by the School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale (SCSES; Bodenhorn, 2001)?

In this study, the School Counseling Program Implementation Scale correlated with the School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale when the researcher removed outlying
data points. The correlation was low, $r = .267$, but was statistically significant. A more robust sample may have yielded stronger results.

The correlation suggests that school counselors at sites with more fully implemented school counseling programs experienced higher self-efficacy. Though the ASCA Model has been examined in relation to K–12 student outcomes, the review of literature found no studies that examined correlation statistics regarding the SCPIS (Palmer & Erford, 2012; Payne, 2011). Further, few studies have examined school counselor interns’ self-efficacy, one of which used the SCSES correlated to the COSE in order to validate the SCSES (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005). As a result, this study had few comparisons, and the low correlation still suggests a relationship between ASCA programing at the internship site and counseling interns’ self-efficacy.

The participants involved in this study were educated in school counseling theory from CACREP schools. Though CACREP standards are broad regarding the implementation of training, it does specify that students should be trained in comprehensive school counseling programs. Students who were trained specifically in school counseling programing would have the ability to practice at a site that has a more fully implemented program, thus reinforcing their training and possibly explaining the relationship between self-efficacy of students and the implementation of comprehensive school counseling programs at the internship site.

Interns who were placed at sites that did not measure highly on the SCPIS may have had site supervisors who were more engaged in traditional duties outside those recommended by ASCA. These duties, as described by Gysbers (2004), include a
mixture of school counseling, administrative, and clerical duties. Oftentimes counselors will conduct such duties as coordinating the school testing program, testing for special education and gifted programs, being coordinator/manager of 504 files, and maintaining permanent records (Gysbers, Bragg, Lapan, & Pierce, 2014). These administrative and clerical duties are a contradiction to the training as described in the CACREP standards, which described the duties of school counselors (CACREP, 2009).

The weak correlation between the SCPIS and the SCSES may be explained by several factors. Though CACREP standards specify that comprehensive counseling programs be taught, this is a broad standard. Programs may take different approaches to teaching comprehensive counseling programs, and consequently measuring mastery. This study did not take into account the mastery of school counseling interns’ understanding of comprehensive school counseling programs. The cross-walking of CACREP standards to ASCA standards demonstrated large gaps in content. This, in addition to the multifaceted way programs approach instruction regarding school counseling programing, could be a contributor to weak and mixed results.

**Research Question 2**

Which of these combined variables predict the variance in a student’s self-efficacy upon completion of the internship: Programmatic orientation, school counselors use of software to manage data, school counseling services, prior professional K–12 experience, prior teaching experience, prior clinical mental experience? Follow up question: In the population, will the ASCA Model as measured by the SCPIS and demographics of age, prior teaching experience, prior K–12 and prior mental health
experience, explain more than zero percent of the variability in scores of self-efficacy as measured by the School Counselor Self Efficacy Scale (SCSES)?

The researcher conducted two different models of a multiple regression analysis, with different independent variable combinations to answer the first part of question 2. These included the sample size of \( n = 61 \). In addition, the researcher conducted the same models removing outlier data points as described in Chapter 3 \((n = 58)\). In total, four different models were analyzed. Of the four models, no significant results were reported. The independent subscales of technology to manage software, counseling services, and program orientation were not significant predictors of counseling interns’ self-efficacy. The combination of these subscales did not produce a model that significantly explained more than zero variance.

The results of the analysis suggest that a counseling intern’s site that scores high in program orientation, the use of software, and counseling services does not impact the training results of a school counselor as measured by self-efficacy. The results of the SCPIS subscales not demonstrating predictive powers of the SCSES contrasted the significant results of the SCPIS correlation with the SCSES. These subscales may not fully explain the SCPIS. The factor analysis that resulted in the three distinct subscales does not include several questions that are included in the total SCPIS score (Elsner & Carey, 2005). As a result, the combination of subscales in addition to the questions that complete the SCPIS combined to correlate with school counseling intern’s self-efficacy.

One potential reason for the non-significant results could be the subscales explain components of an ASCA model that are found more often at specific building levels.
Research has demonstrated that specific activities of interns associated with the ASCA Model are found at varying levels between the high school, middle school, and elementary levels (Leuwerke et al., 2008). An example of this study demonstrated that classroom guidance only contributed to 4% of the activities that high school interns conducted whereas it was 24% of the interns’ activities at the middle school level (Leuwerke et al., 2008). This study did not disaggregate data by building level. An unbalanced sample of building levels, that is data that consisted of interns placed mostly at high schools or conversely at elementary levels, may have impacted the subscale predictions. This may have contributed to the non-significant results.

Follow up question: In the population, the ASCA Model as measured by the SCPIS and demographics of age, prior teaching experience, prior K–12 and prior mental health experience will explain more than zero percent of the variability in scores of self-efficacy as measured by the School Counselor Self Efficacy Scale (SCSES).

In summary, the researcher conducted three different models using both the original sample $N = 61$, and the outlier removed sample, $N = 58$, for a total of six different analysis. The SCPIS was found to be a significant predictor in five of the six different analyses. Age was found to be a significant predictor in four of the six different analyses. In three different models, the analysis of variance (ANOVA) was found to be significant.

Variables that were not found to be significant in any of the runs included prior teaching experience and prior mental health experience. This contributes to and reinforces prior literature, which has found teaching experience has not significantly
impacted school counseling interns’ teaching skills, clinical skills, professional behavior, or ability to attain employment (Stein & DeBerard, 2010). The findings of previous literature regarding prior teaching experience has led several states to drop the requirement of teaching experience as a qualification for licensure. The results of this research did not conflict with those findings.

Age was found to be a significant predictor in all three of the models, and was found to be predictive in three of the models that included the full set of participants \((n = 61)\) and one model that included the outlier data set \((n = 58)\). This suggests that when school counseling interns were older, they reported higher levels of self-efficacy. These findings contrast findings of Mullen, Uwamahoro, Blount, and Lambie (2015), who tracked counseling students’ self-efficacy at three different intervals during graduate school. Using the Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale, Mullen et al. found no relationship between age and self-efficacy at different intervals of training, with the conclusion of the internship phase \((n = 178)\). This contrast in findings may be the result of an instrument that was not as focused on school counseling as the SCSES. Mullen et al. reported that the sample had three different counseling tracks of students (Clinical, Family, and School) of which 30% were school counselors. This was comparable to the present study’s sample of \(n = 61\). Mullen et al. did not report the results by track but rather presented the findings of the entire group. The present study isolated school counseling students and utilized a self-efficacy scale that was specific to school counseling. This may explain the significant findings found in the present study related to age. Age was considered a low to moderate predictor, with the highest predictor being \(\beta = .325\). A
more prescriptive method regarding the recording of age may have produced better results. Age was recorded categorically and translated into a continuous variable. This may have been a limitation to the results of age as a predictor.

The School Counseling Implementation Scale was found to be a significant predictor in all three of the models and was found to be significant in the three runs ($n = 61$) and two of the runs with the outliers removed ($n = 58$). This variable was found to be the most reoccurring significant predictor across all the variables and models. This suggests that for the sample, the SCPIS at the internship site is a predictor of school counseling interns’ self-efficacy. The SCPIS predictive beta values ranged from $\beta = .272$ to $\beta = .309$. The degree of SCPIS has been found to have a significant relationship to school counselor burnout (Camelford, 2014). Yet, the review of literature failed to find similar studies of program implementation in relation to any form of school counselor self-efficacy. Specifically, there have been no studies that have analyzed the level of programming at the internship site in relation to school counseling interns’ self-efficacy. The statistically significant findings of the SCPIS being predictive of counseling interns’ self-efficacy may be explained by the congruence or incongruence between training and practice. Research has demonstrated that counselor educators rely heavily on site supervisors during the practicum and internship process to complete the educational process (Akos & Scarborough, 2004). This can be problematic: although site supervisors may have heard about the ASCA National Model, their knowledge about it is often superficial (Murphy & Kaffenger, 2007). This, coupled with the fading voice of counselor educators as students’ transition into the field, perhaps creates incongruence for
students at sites that have less fully implemented models of counseling programs. Conversely, students who are placed at sites that have more fully implemented ASCA model would have the opportunity to practice the skills and utilize the knowledge attained during their education. This may explain both the relationship of the SCPIS and the SCSES across the several models.

The ANOVA was found to be significant in three of the six runs of data. The first model was significant when the independent variables were SCPIS, age, and prior teaching experience. This model explained 9% of the variance ($n = 61$), but was not significant when the outliers were removed. The small sample of data may have impacted the model and perhaps can explain the discrepancy of significance between the two sample sizes. Further, research has demonstrated that prior teaching experience has little bearing on school counselor training outcomes (Stein & DeBerard, 2010). The models of SCPIS, age and prior K–12 experience was significant in both the sample ($n = 61$) and the outlier ($n = 58$). These models explained 16% and 10% of the variance, respectively. Within both of these models, the SCPIS was a significant predictor of counseling interns’ self-efficacy. Within the run ($n = 61$), K–12 experience had an inverse relationship $\beta=-.287$.

Role identity is a possible explanation for the inverse relationship of K–12 experience within the significant model of SCPIS and age. It has been identified that role confusion has long been a problem within the school counseling profession (Kozlowski, 2010). Kozlowski found that integrating mental health services into the school setting while trying to maintain a counseling identity and meeting educational objectives has
resulted in confusion for school counselors. Counseling interns with prior K–12 experience may have underlying role confusion as a result of being in the K–12 environment without potentially having a mental health background. Conversely, the development of roles for counseling interns without K–12 experience may largely occur through counselor education programs. When these interns are placed at sites that match their education, the raise in self-efficacy may be a result.

Though the model was statistically significant at the pre-specified alpha level, it did not explain much of the variance. This may be the result of not identifying more significant variables that are associated with the SCPIS and self-efficacy, or this may be attributed to the small nature of the relationship. Within this study, little relevance was given to the supervision or the supervisory relationship at the internship site. School counselor supervision has the benefits of enhanced professional development, development of counseling skills, and provisions of professional support (Sutton & Page, 1994). Though these benefits exist, there are not specific training guidelines or requirements for school counselor supervisors. Prior research has determined that supervisory activities differ among school counseling sites that are traditional versus having an ASCA model program (Blakely, Underwood, & Rehfuss, 2009). The relationship, training, and activities of the supervisor may contribute to the overall model.

**Research Question 3**

In the population, most students will be placed at school counseling sites with more fully implemented ASCA models. The results of this study demonstrated that the majority of counseling intern students were placed at sites that had either partial or fully
implemented programs as measured by the SCPIS ($n = 61$). The findings of this study revealed that 50% of students were placed at sites that were partially implemented, and 40% of students were placed at sites that were fully implemented. The review of literature found that few studies have examined ASCA implementation; moreover, these studies varied in method of measurement and reporting.

Studer and Oberman (2006) found that only 26% of internship sites reported being an ASCA program ($n = 73$). Studer and Oberman used the School Counselor Supervision Questionnaire for their study. This instrument was developed by Studer and Oberman, and was piloted by practicing school counselors. The authors did not report psychometrics on the instrument. Given the publication date of 2006, this study was conducted prior to the development of the SCPIS. Though the ASCA model has remained in place since 2003, the method of measurement between the School Counselor Supervision Questionnaire and the SCPIS has not been correlated. Caution should be taken in comparing the results from the present study with the Studer and Oberman findings.

The second study that was found in the review of literature was a 2014 dissertation on school counselor burnout and the ASCA model (Camelford, 2014). This study evaluated secondary school sites who were members of ASCA using the SCPIS ($n = 494$). Camelford used the SCPIS, but used the two factor model of this instrument, which eliminated some questions found on the SCPIS. In addition, Camelford calculated her findings using the average mean of the respondents’ responses, as opposed to calculating frequencies. The authors of the SCPIS left some ambiguity in how the results
should be calculated, relaying only that higher scores are indicative of a more fully implemented program. The findings of the Camelford study revealed that the majority of secondary school counselors were either in the category of development in progress or partially implemented according to the two factors that were reported on: counseling services and program orientation (Camelford, 2014).

Acknowledging the limitations in comparing the previously mentioned studies, the growth of implementation of ASCA programing since the 2006 study may be explained by the advocacy of benefits for the implementation of ASCA model programing. The ASCA model was first published in 2003, and since its publication, new counselors, having been educated on its implementation through course work, have entered the profession.

Camelford’s study (2014) was focused exclusively on secondary school counselors, and this may in part explain some differences in results. The participants for this study were K–12; this suggests that ASCA programing may be more likely to occur across the K–12 spectrum. It should also be noted that in Camelford’s study, the SCPIS was completed by professional school counselors as opposed to counseling interns, which were used for this study. Several variables regarding the training of these counselors may have impacted their ability to accurately complete the SCPIS. These include: broad understanding of the ASCA model, training in ASCA model programing, whether their graduate degree was from a CACREP program, and years since graduation. More prescriptive research should be conducted to investigate the differences between the studies including replication studies.
Implications for School Counselor Training

The results from this study provide insight into the relationship between the level of ASCA Model implementation at the internship site and school counseling interns’ level of self-efficacy. These results offer the counseling community important information and highlight potential implications regarding the training of school counseling students.

The findings of the current study have several implications in the field of counselor education. First, this study suggests that the level of implementation of ASCA model programming at the internship site affects the level of self-efficacy of school counseling intern students. In addition, the level of ASCA programing at the internship site as measured by the SCPIS was found to predict school counseling students’ self-efficacy in the current sample. Though CACREP programs require instruction on ASCA programing, and provide specifications for internship clock hours and supervision, it places no requirements for on-site placement in relation to comprehensive counseling programming (CACREP, 2009). Studies have been conducted which examine the clinical preparation and activities of school counselors (Akos & Scarbrough, 2004; Stickel & Callaway, 2006; Woodside et al., 2009). Other studies have examined the supervisory activities of supervisors who report working in an ASCA comprehensive program versus a traditional program (Studer & Oberman, 2006).

This study revealed that the level of implementation of the SCPIS has a small relationship with counseling students’ self-efficacy. The degree to which the ASCA Model is implemented should be among the factors considered when evaluating
appropriateness of internship sites. These findings may direct students and counselor educators to consider sites that have implemented the ASCA National Model. The SCPIS may be considered useful when determining overall fit for placement of intern students. Though these findings should be taken in caution, they suggest that of the variables considered the overall score of the SCPIS is most predictive of school counseling students’ self-efficacy. This study also suggests that the isolated scores of the subscales are not predictive, but the sum of the whole does have some relationship with students’ self-efficacy. Therefore, school counseling students should look for sites that score higher on the total score of the SCPIS. This reinforces the pedagogical practice of providing opportunity to utilize content skills gained in classroom instruction within the internship.

The findings of this study suggest that program implementation has increased since the ASCA National Model was first published in 2003. A few studies have analyzed the level of implementation of the ASCA National Model (Camelford, 2014; Studer & Oberman, 2006). The findings from this study suggest that the level of implementation is increasing over time. This may be the result of increased awareness of the ACSA National Model, and newly trained professionals entering into the field.

Limitations

The findings of this study should be taken with caution in consideration of the following limitations. The sample of $n = 61$ and the sample in which the outliers were removed ($n = 58$), though meeting the statistical threshold of $n = 48$ by the priori analysis, could have been strengthened by having additional participants. As a result,
caution should be taken in making generalizations of these findings. In addition, the participants were recruited from universities regionalized in Northeast Ohio. A broader geographical sample would also have strengthened the results.

As a result of the small sample, the researcher utilized an outlier process, and ran the analysis for the models with two sample sets ($n = 61$ and $n = 58$). Oftentimes these sample sets had inconsistent results. This may have been the result of a small sample size.

The findings of the models only produced a maximum variance of 16%. Though these findings were significant, they accounted for only a small percentage of the total variance. The instruments used for this study, though having met the thresholds of psychometrics to be used in previous published studies, had some limitations. Notably, the SCPIS variance was reported at 54%. The authors of the SCPIS noted that the School Counseling Activity Rating Scale (SCARS) psychometrics, another published instrument had comparable psychometrics. The SCARS factor analysis accounted for 47% of the variance. The authors contended that the amount of the variance explained by the SCARS is comparable the SCPIS, and initial steps indicate preliminary evidence of psychometric suitability (Clemens et al., 2010).

Though age was found to be a significant predictor, the recording of age on the demographic should be considered. This was recorded in categories, and converted to a continuous variable for the analytics. A recording of the precise age may have yielded different results.
This study found a majority of sites had implemented the ASCA National Model as measured by the SCPIS, but caution should be used in interpreting these findings, as inferential analysis could not be made.

This study was designed so that school counseling intern students at the end of their internship completed the SCPIS. This may be considered a limitation. The process of internship is designed for full immersion, and for a 360-degree perspective, yet it may have been possible that the interns’ reporting on the SCPIS was not reflective of the actual site. This limitation is discussed further in the future research section.

The demographic questionnaire was designed as a cross-sectional instrument, not identifying building level. Different results may have occurred by categorizing building and grade levels of the site internships.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

Several lines of future research can be developed from the results of this study. The author recommends a follow up study with wider participant pool and broader geographical sampling. This study could validate the initial findings and provide answers to the conflicting findings of the two sample studies. In addition, a larger sample that yields the same results could be generalized.

The findings of this study suggest that the subscales of the SCPIS do not have a predictive relationship with the SCSES. Yet, the SCPIS as a whole does have a small predictive relationship with school counseling interns’ self-efficacy. Further investigation into this question would be recommended. The counseling interns at the site completed the SCPIS. A good validation to this study would be to have the site
supervisors complete the SCPIS as well, and run statistical analysis for similar and different reporting.

As this study was conducted at the end of the interns’ graduate work, prior to graduation, the results of the SCSES provide a snapshot of students’ self-efficacy upon completion of the program. The researcher is interested if the findings of this study have carried over into practice. Does placement at a more fully implemented school counseling program impact practice? A follow up longitudinal study evaluating school counseling students’ self-efficacy and the degree to which they implement a comprehensive model program would be beneficial to the continued study of counselor training.

This study found a majority of sites had implemented the ASCA National Model as measured by the SCPIS, but caution is warranted as inferential analysis were unable to be made. Replication studies are warranted to confirm and validate the findings of this study. Moreover, prescriptive studies focusing on grade level sites may draw different results.

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to explore the relationship between the level of implementation of comprehensive programing at the internship site and school counseling students’ self-efficacy. More specifically, this study evaluated and focused on analyzing the strength of program implementation as a predictor of school counseling students’ self-efficacy. No previous studies have evaluated this relationship; therefore this study provides and contributes a first step toward understanding the importance
comprehensive counseling program has in the internship phase of school counselor education.

The findings of this study suggested a trend that school counseling students who reported being at a site with higher levels of program implementation, had a small tendency towards higher self-efficacy. In addition, this study found that the majority of sites had some degree of comprehensive programing present, and the majority of sites were either partially or fully implemented. Although further research is needed to validate these findings, it appears that the level of implementation of comprehensive school counseling programs impacts the training of school counseling students as measured by self-efficacy within this sample.
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Bowling Green State University
Cleveland State University
Duquesne University
Eastern Kentucky University
Edinboro University of Pennsylvania
Heidelberg University
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Consent Form

Informed Consent Form
Kent State University
Informed Consent to Participate in a Research Study
Study Title: The ASCA National Model at the Internship Site as a Predictor of School Counselor Interns' Self-Efficacy

Principal Investigator: Robert Gilbert

You are being invited to participate in a research study. This consent form will provide you with information on the research project, what you will need to do, and the associated risks and benefits of the research. Your participation is voluntary. Please read this form carefully. It is important that you ask questions and fully understand the research in order to make an informed consent. You are encouraged to keep a copy of this document for your own records.

Purpose
The purpose of the present study was to investigate ASCA Comprehensive Programming at the internship site of school counselor training and the relationship it may have to an intern's self-efficacy. Specifically,
a) What is the relationship between scores of ASCA program implementation as measured by the School Counseling Program Implementation Survey (SCPIS; Elsner & Casey, 2005) and school counseling intern's self-efficacy as measured by the School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale (SCSES; Bodenhorn, 2001), b) Which of these factors predict the variance in a student's self-efficacy upon completion of the internship: Programmatic orientation, school counselors use of software to manage data, school counseling services, prior professional K-12 experience, prior teaching experience, prior clinical mental experience, and c) What percentage of school counseling interns are placed at more fully implemented ASCA sites?

Procedure:
Participation in this study is completely voluntary. You have the right to withdraw at anytime or refuse to answer any questions. Your decision to withdraw from the study or refusal to answer questions will not result in a loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. Participation in the study typically takes 15-20 minutes and is strictly anonymous. You will begin by answering a series of survey questions including the: (a) demographic questionnaire, (b) the School Counselor Program Implementation Survey (SCPIS), (c) the School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale (SCSES).

Benefit:
There are no direct benefits to you. However, it is hoped that through your participation, you will have an opportunity to reflect on possible experiences within your school counseling internship experience. Additionally, your participation in this study will add to the counseling literature to better understand the relationship of ASCA model implementation at the internship site and self-efficacy.

Risks/Discomfort:
There are no anticipated risks beyond those encountered in everyday life.

Privacy and Confidentiality
All data obtained from participants will be kept confidential and will only be reported in an aggregate format (by reporting only combined results and never reporting individual ones). No one other than the primary investigator will have access to the data. This is a
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confidential survey. All data will be uploaded into SPSS programming and will be stored on a password and firewall-protected computer. Once the primary investigator has uploaded the survey data, the forms will be destroyed.

Compensation
it is optional to enter the raffle drawing for a chance to win a Visa gift card for $50. Your entry is entirely separate from your research data. Also, it is not necessary to complete the research study to participate in the raffle drawing. To enter the drawing, please detach the form at the bottom of this sheet and turn into the P.I. Random selection will be conducted at the end of data collection. If you have been selected, you will be notified through email with directions on how to access the gift card.

Voluntary Participation
Taking part in this research study is entirely up to you. You may choose not to participate or you may discontinue your participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

Contact Information
If you have any questions or concerns about this research, you may contact the primary investigator (Robert Gilbert) at (330-310-0564), (rgilbert@kent.edu). Or you may contact his dissertation advisors (Dr. Betsy Page) at (330-672-0696, bpage@kent.edu) or (Dr. Rainey) at (330-672-0697, jreney@kent.edu). This project has been approved by the Kent State University Institutional Review Board (pending). If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant or complaints about the research, you may call the IRB at 330-672-2704.

I have read, understood, the above consent form and desire of my own free will to participate in this study. I understand I am entitled to a copy of this form and may request one.

Please circle:
Yes
No

By providing the following information you may elect to enter into a chance to win a 50.00 Visa gift card.

First Name:

Email Address:

Phone number:

This information will be used for sole purpose of drawing a winner, and will be destroyed immediately after the winner has been drawn.
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EMAIL TO UNIVERSITY PROGRAM DIRECTORS
Hello,

My name is Robert Gilbert. I am a licensed and practicing school counselor in the State of Ohio and a Doctoral Candidate at Kent State University. I am in the data collection stage of my dissertation, which is investigating if there are variables at internship sites that may predict school counselor intern’s self-efficacy. I am requesting permission to ask the students in your school counseling internship class to participate in this study. This study has been approved by the Kent State Institutional Review Board. My dissertation is being chaired by Dr. Steve Rainey and Dr. Betsy Page.

I would be willing to come to your class and explain my study and pass out the instruments and consent forms. This would take approximately 20 minutes. Please let me know if you would be willing for me to ask your students to participate in this research. I am happy to answer any additional questions you may have.

Best regards, Rob Gilbert
Doctoral Candidate
Practicing Middle School Counselor
330-310-0564
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### The School Counseling Program Implementation Survey

Please rate each statement below in terms of the degree to which it is currently implemented in your School’s School Counseling program. Circle your response using the following Rating Scale:

*1 = Not Present; 2 = Development in Progress; 3 = Partly Implemented; 4 = Fully Implemented*

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A written mission statement exists and is used as a foundation by all counselors.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Services are organized so that all students are well served and have access to them.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The program operates from a plan for closing the achievement gap for minority and</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lower income students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The program has a set of clear measurable student learning objectives and goals are</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>established for academics, social/personal skills, and career development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Needs Assessments are completed regularly and guide program planning.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>All students receive classroom guidance lessons designed to promote academic,</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>social/personal, and career development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The program ensures that all students have academic plans that include testing,</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>individual advisement, long-term planning, and placement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The program has an effective referral and follow-up system for handling student</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>crises.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>School counselors use student performance data to decide how to meet student needs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>School counselors analyze student data by ethnicity, gender, and socioeconomic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>level to identify interventions to close achievement gaps.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>School counselor job descriptions match actual duties.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>School counselors spend at least 80% of their time in activities that directly benefit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>The school counseling program includes interventions designed to improve the</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>school’s ability to educate all students to high standards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>An annual review is conducted to get information for improving next year’s programs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>School counselors use computer software to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>access student data</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>analyze student data</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>use data for school improvement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16. The school counseling program has the resources to allow counselors to complete appropriate professional development activities.

17. School counseling priorities are represented on curriculum and education committees.

18. School counselors communicate with parents to coordinate student achievement and gain feedback for program improvement.
APPENDIX F

THE SCHOOL COUNSELOR SELF-EFFICACY SCALE (SCSE)
Appendix F

The School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale (SCSE)

Below is a list of activities representing many school counselor responsibilities. Indicate your confidence in your current ability to perform each activity with recent immigrant students by circling the appropriate answer next to each item according to the scale defined below. Please answer each item based on one current school, and based on how you feel now, not on your anticipated (or previous) ability or school(s). Remember, this is not a test and there are no right answers.

Use the following scale:

1 = not confident, 2 = slightly confident, 3 = moderately confident, 4 = generally confident, 5 = highly confident.

Please circle the number that best represents your response for each item.

1. Advocate for integration of student academic, career, and personal development into the mission of my school. 1 2 3 4 5

2. Recognize situations that impact (both negatively and positively) student learning and achievement. 1 2 3 4 5

3. Analyze data to identify patterns of achievement and behavior that contribute to school success 1 2 3 4 5

4. Advocate for myself as a professional school counselor and articulate the purposes and goals of school counseling. 1 2 3 4 5
Appendix G

Demographic Questionnaire

1. Gender:
   a. Female
   b. Male
   c. Transgender

2. What is your age?
   a. 22–25
   b. 26–31
   c. 32–37
   d. 37 and older

3. Do you have teaching experience?
   a. Yes
   b. No

4. Do you have professional K–12 experience (aide, paraprofessional, substitute teaching, etc.)
   a. Yes
   b. No

5. Do you have experience as a clinical mental health counselor?
   a. Yes
   b. No

6. What was your undergraduate GPA?
   a. 1.5–2.0
   b. 2.1–2.5
   c. 2.6–3.0
   d. 3.1–3.5
   e. 3.6 or higher

7. Is your undergraduate in psychology related field?
   a. Yes
   b. No

8. What is your graduate GPA?
   a. 1.5–2.0
   b. 2.1–2.5
   c. 2.6–3.0
   d. 3.1–3.5
   e. 3.6 or higher
APPENDIX H

FLOW CHART OF STAKEHOLDERS AND ORGANIZATIONS INFLUENCING SCHOOL COUNSELORS
Appendix H

Flow Chart of Stake Holders and Organizations Influencing School Counselors
APPENDIX I

LIST OF ACRONYMS FOUND WITHIN “THE ASCA NATIONAL MODEL AT THE INTERNSHIP SITE AS A PREDICTOR OF SCHOOL COUNSELOR INTERNS’ SELF-EFFICACY IN NORTH EAST OHIO”
APPENDIX I

List of Acronyms Found Within “The ASCA National Model at the Internship Site as A Predictor of School Counselor Interns’ Self-Efficacy in North East Ohio”

A.C.A.: American Counseling Association
A.C.E.S.: Association for Counselors Educators and Supervision.
A.S.C.A.: American School Counseling Association
C.A.C.R.E.P.: Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs.
N.C.L.B.: No Child Left Behind
S.C.P.I.S: School Counselor Program Implementation Survey
S.C.S.E.S.: School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale
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