

Article 40

School Counselor Beliefs and Attitudes: A Preliminary Comparative Analysis

Paper based on a program presented at the 2013 Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES) National Conference, October 17, 2013, Denver, CO.

Kevin Wilkerson, Timothy A. Poynton, Rachelle Pérusse, and Jennifer L. Parzych

Wilkerson, Kevin, is an Associate Professor and Co-Director of the School Counseling Program in the Department of Counseling and Human Services at the University of Scranton in Scranton, PA. His research interests are guided by student equity and advocacy issues and include school counselor accountability, professional roles and responsibilities, and comprehensive school counseling program outcome evaluation.

Poynton, Timothy A., is an Associate Professor and Director of the School Counseling Program at Suffolk University in Boston, MA. His research interests are in the realm of issues affecting K-12 students and the school counselors who serve them. Additional research and professional interests include examining instruments designed to measure the attitudes and beliefs of school counselors, technology applications, and issues around the use of online surveys.

Pérusse, Rachelle, is an Associate Professor in the School Counseling Program at the University of Connecticut. She conducts consultations with school districts about the role of school counselors in relation to closing the achievement gap and college opportunity gap, as well as advocating for educational equity. Dr. Pérusse has several articles published about national trends in school counselor education and has co-edited two books.

Parzych, Jennifer L., is a counselor educator within the School of Social and Behavioral Sciences at Mercy College in New York. Her research interests include emphasis on increasing school counseling programming at the elementary level and equity-based college and career readiness.

Abstract

The current study used the School Counseling Program Component Scale (SCPCS) to measure beliefs and attitudes about the ASCA National Model in order to investigate the potential impact that Recognized ASCA Model Program (RAMP) status, graduate preparation, work setting, and years of experience have on school counselors. The study was conducted in Indiana, a state with a high number of RAMP-designated schools. Statistically significant differences were found between the current sample and the original national sample for which the SCPCS was introduced. No statistically significant differences were found in school counselor beliefs based on RAMP status, level of practice, work setting, or years of experience.

The American School Counselor Association (ASCA) first introduced the National Model for School Counseling Programs in 2003 (ASCA, 2003). The model was originally developed and subsequently revised in 2005 and 2012 to focus the school counseling profession on program delivery, accountability, and student outcomes (ASCA, 2005; ASCA, 2012; Chen-Hayes, 2007; Dimmit, Carey, & Hatch, 2007; Poynton & Carey, 2006).

Numerous studies have been conducted since the introduction of the National Model to investigate school counselor beliefs and attitudes about the roles prescribed in the model (Dahir, Burnham, & Stone, 2009; Hatch & Chen-Hayes, 2008; Holcomb-McCoy, Gonzalez, & Johnson, 2009; Pyne, 2011; Scarborough, 2005; Young & Kaffenberger, 2011). Utilizing a variety of district, state, and national sample populations, researchers generally have presented two sets of results: 1) descriptive data about school counselor beliefs and attitudes regarding their roles and responsibilities; and 2) validation findings for newly developed instruments designed to assess beliefs and attitudes. For example, the Assessment of School Counselor Needs for Professional Development (ASCNPD) was designed by Dahir et al. (2009). The authors used the ASCNPD to assess Alabama school counselors' ($n = 1,691$) beliefs and attitudes about their professional development needs in order to more fully implement the elements of the National Model. More salient to the present study, Hatch and Chen-Hayes (2008) surveyed ASCA members to investigate school counselor beliefs and attitudes about the National Model while evaluating the factors and psychometrics of the School Counseling Program Component Scale (SCPCS). The authors received 1,279 responses and identified four factors on the 19-item scale: 1) Use of Data for Program Planning (UDPP); 2) Use of Data for Accountability (UDA); 3) Administrator Support (AS); and 4) Mission, Goals, and Competencies (MGC). At the time of the initial study (data collected in 2002), participants reported that Use of Data for Program Planning and Use of Data for Accountability were less important than Administrator Support (AS) and Mission, Goals, and Competencies (MGC).

Although previous studies have contributed important information about the ways that professional school counselors engage with the National Model, two primary shortcomings to the existing literature on school counselor beliefs and attitudes should be noted. First, no follow-up studies have been published from any of the original analyses that were conducted. The absence of such follow-up makes it difficult to evaluate and discuss longitudinal trends within the profession. Second, researchers appear to have focused primarily on descriptive statistics from each survey. While such information is certainly meaningful, comparative data might increase the understanding of the potential influences of different variables on school counselor beliefs and attitudes. For example, it could be expected that school counselors who have invested the time and effort to earn the Recognized ASCA Model Program (RAMP) designation would rate the importance of items assessing ASCA National Model program components as more important than school counselors who have not achieved RAMP status. One might also expect that school counselors who have graduated from programs accredited by the Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) would rate the importance of items assessing ASCA National Model program components as more important than school counselors who did not graduate from CACREP-accredited

programs, given specific reference in the CACREP (2009) standards stating that a school counselor graduate student: “understands current models of school counseling programs (e.g., American School Counselor Association [ASCA] National Model)” (p. 40); “Knows how to design, implement, manage, and evaluate programs to enhance the academic, career, and personal/social development of students” (p. 41); and “Knows current methods of using data to inform decision making and accountability “ (p. 43). Therefore, the following research questions were posed for the present study:

1. Do school counselors who work in RAMP schools rate the importance of SCPCS items more highly than school counselors who do not?
2. Do school counselors who attended CACREP-accredited preparation programs rate the importance of SCPCS items more highly than school counselors who did not?
3. Do school counselor’s beliefs and attitudes as measured by the SCPCS differ based on their work setting level (elementary, middle, high, varied, or supervisor)?
4. Do school counselor’s beliefs and attitudes as measured by the SCPCS differ based on their work setting location (urban, suburban, rural)?
5. Are beliefs and attitudes associated with a school counselor’s years of experience?
6. How do the beliefs and attitudes for a current sample of school counselors in Indiana compare with a previous national sample?

Methodology

Overview

Two of the authors recently completed a comprehensive comparison study of school-wide student achievement outcomes for schools in Indiana with Recognized ASCA Model Programs versus those without (Wilkerson, Pérusse, & Hughes, 2013). At the time of the previous study (Spring, 2011), the state of Indiana was selected because ASCA reported that more schools had earned RAMP status in Indiana from 2007 to 2010 ($n = 95$) than in any other state. The authors of the present study elected to continue their work with the previous sample by conducting an additional examination of the beliefs and attitudes of the school counselors within those formerly identified schools.

Participants

Indiana lists a total of 1,972 schools in its statewide public school database (Indiana Department of Education, 2011). The specific schools used to access school counselors for this present study originally included RAMP schools ($n = 75$) as well as a sample of non-RAMP control schools ($n = 226$) stratified by work setting level (e.g., elementary, middle, and secondary) and work setting location (e.g. urban, suburban, and rural) for a total of 301 schools. The sampling ratio of one experimental school for every three control schools has been supported in the literature (Rosenbaum, 2010). The current study included one practicing school counselor from each of the 301 different schools that were used in the authors’ previous investigation. Thus, the current sample represents school counselors from 15% of Indiana’s public schools. E-mail addresses were accessed via each school’s Web site. Of the original 301 e-mail participation invitations, 27 were

returned with undeliverable messages resulting in a final sample of 274 possible participants. A total of 87 individuals responded to the survey invitation, representing a 32% response rate.

Of those responding, 26% (n = 23) were elementary school counselors, 24% (n = 21) were middle school counselors, 41% (n = 36) were high school counselors, 5% (n = 4) were employed in a mixed or varied work setting level (e.g., elementary/middle), and 4% (n = 3) indicated that they were supervisors. The majority of the school counselors in this sample (53%) indicated that they worked in a rural school setting (n = 46). The remaining 47% of the respondents worked in suburban schools (n = 29) and urban settings (n = 12). Most respondents (81%) indicated that they were female (n = 70), while 18% stated that they were male (n = 16). One individual did not respond to this particular question. Of the respondents, 95% indicated that they were white (n = 83), one individual, or less than 1% of the sample, responded that he or she was African-American (n = 1), and 4% stated that they were Asian/Pacific Islander (n = 3). Most of the participants (95%) indicated that they had attained master's degrees (n = 83), while the remaining four respondents stated that they had attained either an Educational Specialist degree (n = 3) or a doctorate (n = 1). Of those responding, 28% currently worked in a RAMP school (n = 24) and 72% stated that they were working in a non-RAMP school (n = 63). Thus, RAMP school counselor respondents were represented in roughly the same 1:3 ratio from the overall sample. Many of the respondents (67%) graduated from a CACREP accredited master's degree program (n = 58) and 33% did not (n = 29). Finally, the average length of time in the profession for this sample was 12 years (m = 12.7, SD = 9.1) while the average length of time that each respondent had spent in his or her current school was eight years (m = 8.2, SD = 6.5). However, standard deviations indicate quite a bit of variation on both of these responses.

Procedures

Permission to conduct this study was granted by the Institutional Research Board (IRB) at one of the author's institutions in the spring of 2012. An initial e-mail invitation was sent out to 301 participants on April 10, 2012. The survey invitation was linked directly to the SCPCS and an associated demographics questionnaire. Twenty-seven invitations were returned as undeliverable; additional efforts to secure alternate contact information were unsuccessful. Fifteen individuals responded to the initial invitation. The first invitation was followed by three reminder e-mails, sent on April 16, 2012, May 2, 2012, and May 14, 2012. Thirty-two individuals completed the questionnaire after the first reminder, twenty-three individuals completed the questionnaire after the May 2 reminder, and an additional 17 surveys were completed after the May 14 reminder.

Instrumentation

The School Counseling Program Component Scale (SCPCS) is a 19-question instrument designed to assess school counselor beliefs and attitudes about comprehensive school counseling program roles and responsibilities (Hatch & Chen-Hayes, 2008). Respondents are asked to rate the importance of particular school counseling duties using a five-point Likert scale, and response options for the scale range from 1 (very important) to 3 (moderately important) to 5 (not important). The survey yields an overall score and 4 subscale scores: 1) Use of Data for Program Planning (UDPP); 2) Use of Data for

Accountability (UDA); 3) Administrator Support (AS); and 4) Mission, Goals, and Competencies (MGC). Using a sample of 1,279 professional school counselors, Hatch and Chen-Hayes (2008) investigated the factor structure of the SCPCS as well as the internal consistency for the entire scale and each subscale. The four-factor structure of the instrument was developed using principal components analysis. Hatch and Chen-Hayes note that the original factor analysis did not support the inclusion of one particular item in any of the four subscales. Therefore, while the overall scale has 19 items, only 18 items are used to derive the four different subscale scores. Internal consistencies originally reported for the entire scale ($\alpha = .92$) and each subscale were acceptable: UDDP ($\alpha = .82$); UDA ($\alpha = .80$); AS ($\alpha = .78$); and MGC ($\alpha = .86$). Subscale reliability scores for the current study were also satisfactory: UDPP ($\alpha = .82$); UDA ($\alpha = .84$); AS ($\alpha = .69$); and MGC ($\alpha = .72$).

In addition to the SCPCS, respondents were asked to answer nine demographics items to assess personal characteristics (i.e., highest level of education attained, CACREP accreditation status of their graduate preparation program, gender, ethnicity, years of experience as a school counselor, years of experience working in their current school) and the distinguishing characteristics of the school in which they were employed (i.e., RAMP status, work setting level, and work setting location).

Results

Research Questions 1 through 4

1. Do school counselors who work in RAMP schools rate the importance of SCPCS items more highly than school counselors who do not?
2. Do school counselors who attended CACREP-accredited preparation programs rate the importance of SCPCS items more highly than school counselors who did not?
3. Do school counselor's beliefs and attitudes as measured by the SCPCS differ based on their work setting level (elementary, middle, high, varied, or supervisor)?
4. Do school counselor's beliefs and attitudes as measured by the SCPCS differ based on their work setting location (urban, suburban, rural)?

The first four research questions were answered using similar analyses. Specifically, a one-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was performed to answer research questions one through four using both the SCPCS subscales and the overall scale scores as the dependent variables. Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics associated with each research question.

For question 1, the omnibus MANOVA using RAMP status as the independent variable was not significant, Wilks' $\Lambda(5, 81) = .98$, multivariate $F = .34$, $p = .886$, partial $\eta^2 = .02$. While none of the observed differences comparing RAMP and non-RAMP respondents were statistically significant, the means across all SCPCS subscales and the overall scale score indicates that RAMP respondents rated items as slightly less important than respondents who were not in RAMP schools.

Table 1

Descriptive statistics for SCPCS overall scale and subscale means by RAMP, CACREP, Level of Practice, and Locale. Standard deviation in parentheses.

	UDPP	UDA	AS	MGC	SCPCS
RAMP					
Non-RAMP School (n = 63)	1.78 (.61)	2.04 (.77)	1.78 (.59)	1.99 (.64)	1.88 (.51)
RAMP School (n = 24)	1.83 (.74)	2.15 (.75)	1.89 (.73)	2.18 (.81)	1.99 (.66)
CACREP					
Non-CACREP program (n = 29)	1.79 (.44)	2.15 (.80)	1.95 (.53)	2.12 (.68)	1.97 (.48)
CACREP Program (n = 58)	1.80 (.72)	2.03 (.75)	1.74 (.67)	2.00 (.70)	1.88 (.59)
Work Setting Level					
Elementary (n = 23)	1.87 (.69)	2.20 (.79)	1.88 (.59)	1.97 (.69)	1.97 (.59)
Middle (n = 21)	1.89 (.90)	2.35 (.88)	1.80 (.69)	2.10 (.82)	2.02 (.72)
High (n = 36)	1.69 (.40)	1.88 (.66)	1.78 (.63)	2.02 (.63)	1.81 (.43)
Varied (n = 4)	2.10 (.62)	1.95 (.38)	1.94 (.69)	2.06 (.55)	2.04 (.35)
Supervisor (n = 3)	1.47 (.42)	1.67 (.81)	1.67 (.76)	2.33 (1.04)	1.74 (.64)
Work Setting Location					
Urban (n = 12)	1.73 (.48)	2.01 (.63)	1.65 (.55)	2.02 (.70)	1.84 (.43)
Rural (n = 46)	1.81 (.58)	2.12 (.75)	1.87 (.62)	2.04 (.62)	1.94 (.49)
Suburban (n = 29)	1.81 (.79)	2.03 (.85)	1.79 (.68)	2.04 (.81)	1.91 (.70)
Entire Sample (N = 87)	1.80 (.64)*	2.07 (.76)	1.81 (.63)	2.04 (.69)*	1.91 (.56)
National Sample (N = 1279) ¹	2.17 (.83)*	1.91 (.79)	1.69 (.70)	1.61 (.68)*	NR

1 - As reported in Hatch & Chen-Hayes (2008). *Note.* UDPP = Use of Data for Program Planning; UDA = Use of Data for Accountability; AS = Administrator Support; MGC = Mission, Goals, and Competencies; NR - Not reported; * $p < .01$.

For question 2, the omnibus MANOVA using CACREP graduate program completion as the independent variable was not significant, Wilks' $\Lambda (5, 81) = .95$, multivariate $F = .88$, $p = .496$, partial $\eta^2 = .05$. As shown in Table 1, graduates of CACREP accredited programs rated the overall SCPCS scale score and the UDA, AS, and MGC subscale items as slightly more important than respondents who did not graduate from a CACREP accredited program. On the UDPP subscale, respondents in both groups attained nearly identical mean importance ratings.

For question 3, the omnibus MANOVA using work setting level (elementary, middle, high, varied, or supervisor) as the independent variable was not significant, Wilks' $\Lambda (20, 259.7) = .72$, multivariate $F = 1.34$, $p = .154$, partial $\eta^2 = .08$. The relatively small number of respondents who were supervisors or worked at varied levels hinders the ability to effectively interpret the observed differences, but it is notable that supervisors rated UDPP one standard deviation more important than counselors at the elementary, middle, or varied school levels. The mean scores for the overall scale score and the remaining subscales reveal that supervisors viewed the items as more important than counselors at all levels, with the exception of MGC, where supervisors viewed these items as less important overall (see Table 1). Also, with the exception of the MGC subscale, high school counselors viewed the items in each subscale as more important than counselors who worked at the elementary, middle, or varied levels.

For question 4, the omnibus MANOVA using work setting location (urban, suburban, or rural) as the independent variable was not significant, Wilks' Λ (10, 160) = .95, multivariate F = .45, p = .921, partial η^2 = .03. Inspection of the mean scores presented in Table 1 reveals that counselors in urban settings rated the importance of items in each subscale and the overall scale as more important than counselors in suburban or rural settings.

Research Question 5

To answer question 5, "Are beliefs and attitudes impacted by a school counselor's years of experience?", Pearson product-moment correlations were computed to assess the relationship between the number of years of experience reported by respondents, each SCPCS subscale, and the overall scale mean scores. All of the observed correlation coefficients were in the negative direction, indicating that having more experience is related to higher importance ratings, but none of the correlations were statistically significant. See Table 2 for all observed correlations and associated significance levels.

Table 2

Pearson product-moment correlations between years of experience and the SCPCS subscales and overall scale score. Analysis $N = 85$.

	UDPP	UDA	AS	MGC	SCPCS
<i>r</i>	-.040	-.097	-.116	-.065	-.090
<i>p</i> (two-tailed)	.72	.38	.29	.56	.41

Note. UDPP = Use of Data for Program Planning; UDA = Use of Data for Accountability; AS = Administrator Support; MGC = Mission, Goals, and Competencies.

Research Question 6

To answer question 6, "How do the current (2012) beliefs and attitudes for a sample of school counselors in Indiana compare with a previous national sample?", independent sample t-tests were performed using the mean score from each SCPCS subscale from the entire, current sample and each SCPCS subscale from a former national sample as reported by Hatch and Chen-Hayes (2008). These comparisons are summarized in Table 1. The observed mean difference between samples on the UDPP, $t(1364) = 4.08$, $p < .001$, $d = .22$, and MGC, $t(1364) = 5.70$, $p < .001$, $d = .31$, subscales were statistically significant, while the observed mean difference between samples on the UDA, $t(1364) = 1.83$, $p = .067$, $d = .10$, and AS, $t(1364) = 1.56$, $p = .120$, $d = .08$, subscales were not statistically significant.

Discussion

Statistical Significance

Statistical analysis comparing the previous national sample (Hatch & Chen-Hayes, 2008) of school counselors with the current sample of Indiana school counselors resulted in statistically significant differences between the two groups on two of the SCPCS subscales. The national sample held comparatively stronger beliefs about the importance of the "Mission, Goals and Competencies" (MGC) subscale, and the Indiana sample reported stronger beliefs about the importance of the "Use of Data for Program

Planning” (UDPP) subscale. These results are interesting given ASCA’s efforts during the past 10 years. The MGC subscale represents school counselor beliefs about the underpinnings or foundation of a comprehensive school counseling program. Ten years ago, when the National Model was first released, ASCA suggested that this was the starting point for developing a comprehensive school counseling program. At the time of the initial Hatch and Chen-Hayes survey (data collected in 2002, published in 2008), school counselor respondents held stronger beliefs about the relative importance of this subscale in comparison to the more data-focused subscales (UDPP and UDA). This is meaningful in that discussions about the use of data were relatively new for the profession at that time.

It is reasonable to contend that the next step in the development of a comprehensive program after Mission, Goals, and Competencies is to proceed to data-based decision making in order to guide program development that is linked to school-specific needs. This particular stage in the development of a comprehensive program parallels the “Use of Data for Program Planning” (UDPP) subscale of the SCPCS. Subsequent to data-driven decision making and responsive programming, the next step would be to generate accountability data to determine the impact of programs that have been put in place. In terms of the SCPCS, the subscale that would correspond with efforts in these areas would be the “Use of Data for Accountability” (UDA) subscale. In the present study, school counselors in Indiana held stronger beliefs about the “Use of Data for Program Planning” (UDPP) subscale than did school counselors in the previous sample. This finding may represent positive movement within the school counseling profession away from the beginning, foundational elements of comprehensive school counseling towards stronger beliefs and attitudes about the importance of using data to drive programming efforts. However, the fact that there were no statistically significant differences between the two groups in beliefs and attitudes about using data for accountability (or outcomes) may suggest that school counselors have yet to begin the process that would differentiate themselves further from their colleagues 10 years ago. Future research might focus on path analysis or structural equation modeling to specify the relationships among the subscales on the SCPCS. It could be that there is a developmental pathway through these subscales that would illuminate how school counselors’ beliefs and attitudes change and grow over time.

Descriptive Results and Future Research

Overall, the present study found no statistically significant results for research questions 1 through 5. While these findings may be due to the overall small sample size and unequal cell *n*’s in the tests of between-subjects effects, the exploratory nature of this study and the authors’ findings still warrant discussion to guide further research and inquiry. For research question 1, where it was posited that counselors in RAMP schools would rate the importance of SCPCS items more highly than counselors in non-RAMP schools, the observed data indicates the opposite; that is, counselors in RAMP schools rated the importance of the SCPCS items as less important than counselors from non-RAMP schools. This counter-intuitive finding may be due to the increased familiarity among RAMP respondents with the concepts assessed by the SCPCS items, or may reflect trends in the larger population of school counselors in Indiana. Further research

assessing the beliefs and attitudes of counselors in RAMP schools compared to non-RAMP schools is needed.

In the current study, findings regarding the influence of CACREP-accredited graduate preparation programs on the perceived importance of SCPCS items revealed data in the expected direction for the overall scale and each subscale except UDPP. The CACREP Standards outline minimum expectations for the preparation of school counselors which may provide a level of consistency that may not be as easily achieved in school counselor preparation programs that are not CACREP-accredited. This possible lack of consistency among non-CACREP-accredited programs could make comparisons between the two groups difficult. The variability in graduate preparation experienced by counselors attending non-CACREP-accredited programs could potentially influence their beliefs and attitudes as practicing counselors. Such variability includes the number of credit hours required, field experiences, curriculum, and the professional identity of faculty. Future research assessing the potential influence of graduate preparation on school counselor beliefs and attitudes could be strengthened by eliciting more information (e.g., types of courses taken, length and nature of field-based experiences) from respondents who earned their degrees from non-CACREP-accredited preparation programs.

Wilkerson et al. (2013) recently reported that students attending Indiana RAMP schools outperformed students in comparison schools on state standardized tests in Math and English Language Arts (ELA). Although these school-wide performance results were noted at the elementary, middle, and secondary school levels, statistically significant differences were only identified at the elementary school level. Findings in the current study examining the beliefs and attitudes of school counselors at the elementary, middle, and high school levels revealed a tendency among high school counselors to rate the perceived importance of the SCPCS items as slightly more important than middle or elementary level counselors. While none of the findings were statistically significant, it is interesting to note the apparent discrepancy between the beliefs and attitudes of school counselors and actual student outcomes as reported by Wilkerson et al. (2013). Although secondary school counselors in the present study generally held stronger beliefs and attitudes about the importance of the SCPCS items, it does not appear that such beliefs and attitudes, as measured by the SCPCS, translated into more differentiated student outcomes at the secondary level. It may be that school counselors in elementary schools have more influence over school-wide achievement outcomes than secondary school counselors due to more frequent involvement in classroom guidance and prevention programming, or that these particular SCPCS items do not correlate with school-wide achievement scores. Based on the present data, examining the extent to which school counselor beliefs and attitudes are associated with improved student outcomes appears to be an important line of inquiry.

Research question 3 included findings from three respondents who identified themselves as school counseling supervisors. These supervisors rated the importance of items on the UDPP, UDA, and AS subscales about one-half a standard deviation more important than counselors working at other levels. The data across these subscales showed that supervisors consistently rated items as more important. Interestingly, the average importance rating the MGC subscale for supervisors was about one-fourth a standard deviation lower than counselors operating at other levels. Given the importance

of supervisors in supporting and guiding comprehensive school counseling programs, future research might involve more counselors in supervisory roles to better assess differences in beliefs and attitudes that may exist between school counselors and school counseling supervisors.

Research question 4 assessed any differences among the SCPCS scale and subscales based on work setting location (urban, suburban, or rural) and revealed that the overall tendency is for counselors in urban settings to rate the importance of items as more important than counselors in rural and suburban settings. Differences on the MGC subscale were negligible, while the largest difference was observed between urban and rural counselors on the AS subscale. Previous research investigating school counselor beliefs and attitudes using the SCPCS (Hatch & Chen-Hayes, 2008) and the Data Beliefs and Practices Survey (DBAPS; Young & Kaffenberger, 2011) has not reported differences based on work setting location. Since professional development provided to counselors is often provided on a district-specific or local level, future research investigating similarities and differences among counselors working in urban, suburban, and rural settings could usefully inform the nature of professional development offered.

The present findings regarding relationships between years of experience and the SCPCS subscales revealed very small correlations between the SCPCS overall scale and subscales and years of experience. Future research studies may consider collecting demographic data regarding years of experience as a continuous variable by asking respondents to provide their actual number of years of experience (as opposed to asking respondents to select their experience level from within predefined year ranges) to facilitate the calculation of correlation coefficients.

Strengths and Limitations

The present study includes several strengths and limitations that may inform interpretation of the current findings and future research. Strengths include: the use of a research design that facilitates comparisons between different groups (e.g., RAMP and non-RAMP, CACREP and non-CACREP, etc.) using statistical tests, as opposed to purely descriptive statistics; use of the SCPCS as employed by Hatch and Chen-Hayes (2008) without modification to facilitate comparisons of beliefs and attitudes across studies; and the sampling method, which restricted the sample to one state, thereby controlling for the variability that often exists across states due to unique state-level policies, procedures, and practices. Limitations of the current study include: a modest response rate, indicating that the current sample may not be representative of all Indiana school counselors; and a relatively small, homogeneous sample.

Implications and Conclusion

In light of the non-significant findings for five out of the six research questions posed herein, it is difficult to form definitive conclusions from the current study. However, the following points may be relevant. First, additional comparison research is indicated in order to determine whether different variables have an impact on school counselor beliefs and attitudes. Although some results in the present study ran contrary to expected directions and others were more aligned with expectations, no observed differences between participants within the current sample reached statistical significance. Second, replication studies using school counselor surveys and instruments

that are already in existence (Clemens, Carey, & Harrington, 2010; Dahir et al., 2009; Hatch & Chen-Hayes, 2008; Pyne, 2011) could promote a much needed conversation about longitudinal data that might be emerging within the profession. It would be helpful to determine the extent to which the efforts of the past 10 years have impacted the beliefs and attitudes of practicing professionals. Third, the use of increasingly sophisticated statistical analysis may help determine whether or not there is a consistent developmental path followed by school counselors who implement the ASCA National Model. For example, it may be that school counselor beliefs and attitudes about the use of data for program planning and accountability get stronger as educational reform efforts continue to emphasize these elements at every level. Finally, during the past 10 years, a number of investigations have focused on school counselor beliefs and attitudes with the underlying assumption that dispositions may impact whether school counselors commit themselves to developing data-driven comprehensive school counseling programs. While this line of inquiry may help us to understand the extent to which school counselors believe in such actions, it may be more important to determine the extent to which such actions impact student outcomes. Ultimately, beliefs and attitudes may not be the most important factor. Rather, if further investigation indicates that students benefit from a fully implemented comprehensive school counseling program, then school counselors may decide, or be directed, to move their programming efforts in that direction regardless of their beliefs and attitudes.

References

- American School Counselor Association. (2003). *The ASCA National Model: A framework for school counseling programs*. Alexandria, VA: Author.
- American School Counselor Association. (2005). *American School Counselor Association National Model: A framework for school counseling programs* (2nd ed.). Alexandria, VA: Author.
- American School Counselor Association. (2012). *American School Counselor Association National Model: A framework for school counseling programs* (3rd ed.). Alexandria, VA: Author.
- CACREP (2009). Standards for Accreditation. Retrieved from <http://www.cacrep.org/doc/2009%20Standards%20with%20cover.pdf>
- Chen-Hayes, S. F. (2007). The ACCESS questionnaire: Assessing school counseling programs and interventions to ensure equity and success for every student. *Counseling and Human Development*, 6, 1-11.
- Clemens, E. V., Carey, J. C., & Harrington, K. M. (2010). The school counseling program implementation survey: Initial instrument development and exploratory factor analysis. *Professional School Counseling*, 14(2), 125-134.
- Dahir, C. A., Burnham, J. J., & Stone, C. (2009). Listen to the voices: School counselors and comprehensive school counseling programs. *Professional School Counseling*, 12(3), 182-192.
- Dimmitt, C., Carey, J. C., & Hatch, T. (2007). *Evidence-based school counseling: Making a difference with data-driven practices*. New York, NY: Corwin Press.

- Hatch, T., & Chen-Hayes, S. F. (2008). School counselor beliefs about ASCA national model school counseling program components using the SCPCS. *Professional School Counseling, 12*(1), 34-42.
- Holcomb-McCoy, C., Gonzalez, I., & Johnson, G. (2009). School counselor dispositions as predictors of data usage. *Professional School Counseling, 12*(5), 343-351.
- Indiana Department of Education (2011). *Reports page*. Retrieved from <http://www.doe.in.gov/data/reports.html>.
- Poynton, T., & Carey, J. C. (2006). An integrative model and data-based decision making for school counseling. *Professional School Counseling, 10*, 121-130.
- Pyne J. R. (2011). Comprehensive school counseling programs, job satisfaction, and the ASCA National Model. *Professional School Counseling, 15*(2), 88-97.
- Rosenbaum, P. R. (2010). *Design of observational studies*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Scarborough, J. L. (2005). The School Counselor Activity Rating Scale: An instrument for gathering process data. *Professional School Counseling, 8*, 274-283.
- Wilkerson, K., Pérusse, R., & Hughes, A. (2013). Comprehensive school counseling programs and student achievement outcomes: A comparative analysis of RAMP versus non-RAMP schools. *Professional School Counseling, 16*(3), 172-184.
- Young, A., & Kaffenberger, C. (2011). The beliefs and practices of school counselors who use data to implement comprehensive school counseling programs. *Professional School Counseling, 15*(2), 67-76.

Note: This paper is part of the annual VISTAS project sponsored by the American Counseling Association. Find more information on the project at: http://counselingoutfitters.com/vistas/VISTAS_Home.htm