Abstract

The school counseling profession has taken an intentional approach to establishing appropriate counselor roles. Research has resulted in the creation of numerous instruments designed to investigate school counselors’ beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors related to comprehensive program delivery. The authors conducted a literature review and identified 10 assessments that were developed from 2005 to 2011 following the introduction of the ASCA National Model (2003). An overview of the assessments, along with the strengths and weaknesses of each instrument, is presented. An examination of the instruments leads to specific suggestions that may inform and guide future inquiry for school counseling researchers.
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According to Gysbers (2010), school counseling is presently a profession searching for an identity more closely aligned with current educational trends. Although school counselors have existed since the early 1900s, their role as integral educational partners has progressed over the decades. From a strict vocational focus, to an increased involvement in mental health issues, to answering the call for a sequential developmental guidance curriculum, and finally to a focus on comprehensive programming, the profession has evolved from a somewhat limited set of prescribed roles and responsibilities to a more systematic model of comprehensive service delivery for all students (Gysbers, 2010).

Since the establishment of the American School Counseling Association (ASCA) National Model (2003), the school counseling profession has adopted a more intentional approach to classifying the appropriate roles of school counselors. According to ASCA, school counselors are “vital members of the education team. . . [who] help all students in the areas of academic achievement, personal/social development and career development, ensuring today’s students become the productive, well-adjusted adults of tomorrow” (ASCA, 2009, para. 4). ASCA states further that school counselors “design and deliver comprehensive school counseling programs [CSCPs] that promote student achievement. These programs are comprehensive in scope, preventive in design, and developmental in nature” (ASCA, 2012, p. xii). Likewise, The Education Trust, an organization devoted to promoting achievement among all students, states that school counselors must:

. . . foster educational equity, access, and academic success in a rigorous curriculum to ensure that all students graduate from high school ready to succeed in college and careers.

The trained school counselor must be an assertive advocate creating opportunities for all students to pursue dreams of high aspirations. (The Education Trust, 2009, para. 4)

Finally, school counselors adhere to professional ethics (ASCA, 2010), student standards (ASCA, 2004a), and accountability practices (Dahir & Stone, 2003) to guide their work in developing, implementing, and assessing their programs.

Professional frameworks, such as the ASCA National Model (2012), and counselor preparation accrediting bodies, such as the Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP; 2009), have posited that strengthening a connection between comprehensive school counseling programs and academic student outcomes is a powerful method for underscoring the school counselor’s role, an assertion also supported by research (Dimmitt, Carey, McGannon, & Henningson, 2005). To support this line of inquiry, investigators with a school counseling-focused research agenda have developed an abundance of instruments that assess counselor’s beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors regarding comprehensive program delivery. However, although reviews of such measures exist, they have yet to be compared and critiqued together to inform future research. Thus, the purpose of this literature review is to provide readers with a chronological overview of existing school counseling program instruments designed to explore beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors regarding various aspects of comprehensive program delivery.
Role Ambiguity

Despite sustained efforts to clarify the role of the school counselor, ambiguity remains both inside (Studer & Allton, 1996) and outside of the profession (Lieberman, 2004; Zalaquett, 2005). Within the school counseling profession, role ambiguity is associated with the lack of clear information surrounding the responsibilities expected from school counselors in their actual jobs (Wilkerson & Bellini, 2006). This confusion results in fairly consistent negative outcomes for school counselors and for school counseling programs. For example, a national study of high school counselors revealed a very high correlation between role conflict and role ambiguity; specifically, as time spent on non-counseling duties increased, time devoted to appropriate responsibilities as outlined by the ASCA National Model decreased ($r = -.617$, $p < .01$; Cervoni & DeLucia-Waack, 2011). In a state-level investigation designed to assess levels of professional satisfaction and frustration, Arizona school counselors ($N = 155$) indicated that their greatest satisfaction was associated with directly serving students and that their biggest frustration was being “overwhelmed by duties” (Kolodinsky, Draves, Schroder, Lindsay, & Zlatev, 2009, p. 197). Results from a study of elementary, middle, and high school counselors found that over 50% of participants ($n = 382$) spent 10 or more hours per week engaged in activities unrelated to their professional training (Moyer, 2011). Not surprisingly, the study also indicated that as the number of hours spent performing non-counseling duties increased, so, too, did symptoms of burnout, a finding that is consistent with other research (Wilkerson & Bellini, 2006). Likewise, Chandler, Burnham, and Dahir (2008) described the common practices of 1,244 Alabama school counselors as involving high levels of non-counseling responsibilities, including coordination of statewide assessments and student and master scheduling. Finally, a study of Florida school counselors ($N = 1,280$) found that participants who engaged in duties that were connected to their training were significantly more satisfied and committed to their careers than those engaged with inappropriate duties (Baggerly, 2006).

Perhaps the most devastating effect of role ambiguity within the school counseling profession is a decrease in the amount of time that school counselors can devote to comprehensive programming and evaluating the impacts of school counselor-led, fully implemented programs. With educational reform measures such as No Child Left Behind (NCLB; U.S. Department of Education, 2001) and Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP; U.S. Department of Education, 2009) placing increased pressure on all educators to demonstrate measurable differences in student achievement, it is not surprising that the profession has increased efforts to support school counselors in meeting these mandates (Sink, 2009).

Outside of the profession, the impact of educational partners’ perceptions of the role of the school counselor is also substantial. School counselors who work in buildings where their positions are misunderstood and/or undervalued are at a greater risk of being assigned non-counseling duties (e.g., registering students, clerical duties, test coordination, and disciplining students; ASCA, 2012). An increase in performing these non-counseling tasks could contribute to counselors being less satisfied with their work over time (DeMato & Curcio, 2004). Principals in particular play a considerable role in either supporting or impeding comprehensive programming efforts. In a study of recently employed school counselors, 39% of participants reported a supportive administration as
being helpful in making the transition to comprehensive program delivery (Studer, Diambra, Breckner, & Heidel, 2011).

**Comprehensive School Counseling Programs: Assessment Instruments**

Based on the challenges above, a critical first step to strengthening the appropriate role of the school counselor includes an examination of key aspects of school counselors’ perceptions and choices related to their current programs. Therefore, it is not surprising that a number of instruments have emerged over the past decade designed to investigate school counselors’ beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors regarding their changing roles, appropriate responsibilities, and comprehensive program management (Clemens, Carey, & Harrington, 2010; Dahir, Burnham, & Stone, 2009; Hatch & Chen-Hayes, 2008; Pyne, 2011). In general, the developers of these instruments have sought to: 1) determine the degree to which school counselors believe they can complete the tasks associated with a comprehensive program (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005); 2) compare time spent in actual versus preferred activities (Scarborough, 2005); 3) ascertain school counselors’ readiness for establishing and maintaining a comprehensive program along with understanding the various levels of implementation and the key elements of focus (Clemens et al., 2010; Dahir et al., 2009; Pyne, 2011); and 4) evaluate the beliefs and practices of school counselors heavily engaged in data collection (Young & Kaffenberger, 2011).

The abundance of similar measures now available to researchers and practitioners alike presents certain challenges. For example, very few instruments have been used (or empirically validated) more than once. More importantly, no one has undertaken the task of consolidating this emerging body of work and critically analyzing trends related to school counselor roles. Based on these challenges, school counselor educators and researchers, as well as practicing professionals, may benefit from an overview of existing instruments to help them determine which ones might best be utilized to assist with their research and/or program evaluation and development questions. Therefore, the descriptions below include 10 instruments selected because of their focus on school counselors’ beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors regarding comprehensive program delivery. The instruments were identified through search engines PsychInfo and ProQuest using key word terms such as comprehensive school counseling programs, and school counselor beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors. Peer reviewed journals with a focus on the school counseling profession were targeted. Dissertations were excluded. All references from selected articles were cross-referenced to identify additional studies related to this topic. Key components of each measure will be presented and subsequently discussed. Conclusions will then be drawn to guide future research and practice.

**Overview of Instruments**

**School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale (SCSES)**

Developed in 2005 by Bodenhorn and Skaggs, the School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale (SCSES) was created to assess school counselors’ beliefs about their abilities to successfully perform the duties associated with their current roles. At the time of the SCSES’s creation, the school counseling profession was beginning to stress the importance of assessing the impact of school counseling programs on student outcomes
(ASCA, 2005; Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005), but no reliable measure existed for evaluating the self-efficacy of school counselors to conduct this work. Scores on the SCSES reflect school counselors’ beliefs that they can achieve results in this new professional climate. The SCSES was designed to evaluate the profession’s transition into transformed roles, as well as “provide insight into the relative success of practicing school counseling” (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005, p. 15). Surveys were sent to 582 attendees of the 2000 American School Counseling Association conference. Two hundred twenty six surveys were returned, resulting in a 39% response rate. Items were taken from the National Standards for School Counseling Programs (Campbell & Dahir, 1997) and training standards established by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP, 2001). The 43 items were divided among five psychometrically sound subscales: Personal and Social Development ($\alpha = .91$), Leadership and Assessment ($\alpha = .90$), Career and Academic Development ($\alpha = .85$), Collaboration ($\alpha = .87$), and Cultural Acceptance ($\alpha = .72$) and scored using a 5-point Likert scale (1 = not confident to 5 = confident). Google Scholar indicates that this article has been cited by others 38 times. In 2003, a dissertation research study replicated the psychometric properties of the SCSES by investigating a sample of 83 practicing school counselors (O’Bannon, 2003).

**School Counselor Activity Rating Scale (SCARS)**

The School Counselor Activity Rating Scale (SCARS; Scarborough, 2005) compares how school counselors actually spend their time as opposed to how they prefer to spend their time. Although activity scales existed at the time of the SCARS’ creation, none accounted for the amount of time spent in various activities or described the types of activities school counselors engaged in on a regular basis. Based on process data, the SCARS aimed to provide counselors with a tool to help them account for time spent in counseling versus non-counseling activities as well as provide a rich description of actual practice. Results of the SCARS were intended to be shared with stakeholders to demonstrate effectiveness and advocate for appropriate role definition. Respondents in the validation study of professionals randomly selected for participation ($N = 600$) in two Southern states included 361 elementary, middle, and high school counselors (60% response rate). The SCARS consists of 50 items categorized into four factors (Counseling, Coordination, Consultation, and Curriculum) which were further divided into two subscales (Actual and Preferred). Scoring of the “actual” performance subscale includes a 5-point verbal frequency scale (1 = never do this activity to 5 = routinely do this activity) while the “preferred” performance subscale also includes a 5-point rating scale (1 = would prefer never to do this activity to 5 = would prefer to routinely do this activity). Cronbach’s reliability estimates included: Counseling .85 (Actual) and .83 (Preferred); Coordination .84 (Actual) and .85 (Preferred); Consultation .75 (Actual) and .77 (Preferred); and Curriculum .93 (Actual) and .99 (Preferred). Google Scholar indicates that this article has been referenced in others’ work 47 times. To date, no replication studies have been conducted on this measure.

**Survey of Comprehensive School Counseling Programs (SCSCP)**

Lapan, Gysbers, and Kayson (2006) developed the SCSCP to: 1) assess the level of implementation of a comprehensive school counseling program; and 2) determine the
amount of time spent on appropriate service delivery versus non-counseling tasks. Six hundred and seventeen school counselors and 141 school administrator respondents from Missouri rated their level of comprehensive program implementation on a 54-item survey instrument using a 7-point rating scale (0 = not implemented to 7 = fully implemented). Subscales included Individual Planning, Responsive Services, Management, Evaluation, Guidance Curriculum, and Foundation. Cronbach’s alphas indicated satisfactory subscale reliabilities ranging from .88 to .96. Google Scholar indicates that this publication has been cited nine times. No replication studies have been conducted using this measure.

School Counseling Program Component Scale (SCPCS)

Based on the assertion that a person’s convictions influence his/her decision to act, Hatch and Chen-Hayes developed the School Counseling Program Component Scale (SCPCS; 2008) to help explain school counselors’ beliefs regarding the importance of selected components of the ASCA National Model. Three thousand ASCA members were invited to complete an 18-item survey. From this population, 1,279 surveys were returned, yielding a response rate of 43%. The scale was designed to evaluate the importance of crucial factors associated with the ASCA National Model. Using a 5-point Likert scale for each question ranging from 1 = very important to 5 = not important, the instrument produced an overall scale score along with four factor scores: 1) Use of Data for Program Planning; 2) Use of Data for Accountability; 3) Administrator Support; and 4) Mission Goals, and Competencies. The overall scale and each individual factor yielded strong reliability scores: Overall Scale (α = .92); Use of Data for Program Planning (α = .92); Use of Data for Accountability (α = .82); Administrator Support (α = .80); and Mission Goals, and Competencies. (α = .78). Google Scholar indicates that this publication has been cited 15 times by others. To date, no replication studies have been published.

School Counseling Program Evaluation Scale (SCoPES)

The authors developed the School Counseling Program Evaluation Scale (SCoPES; Whiston & Aricak, 2008) to address the lack of psychometrically sound measures that assess the effectiveness of school counseling programs. Administered to 529 high school students in Texas and Connecticut, the SCoPES used a 5-point Likert scale (1 = all of the time to 5 = never) to measure the frequency of standards-based activity in each of the three developmental areas that correspond with the ASCA National Standards (Academic Development, Career Development, and Personal/Social Development). This reliable, 64-item instrument (α = .97) contains three psychometrically sound subscales: 1) Academic Development (α = .93); 2) Career Development (α = .94); and 3) Personal/Social Development (α = .91) that, when used with other outcome measures, gives practitioners a tool to evaluate the effectiveness of both individual interventions and overall programs. The SCoPES publication has been cited by others eight times as reported by Google Scholar. It has yet to be further validated in a replication study.

Assessment of School Counselor Needs for Professional Development (ASCNPD)

To evaluate school counselors’ readiness to deliver comprehensive programs based on the ASCA National Model (ASCA, 2005) and to identify priorities for
professional development, Dahir et al. (2009) created the Assessment of School Counselor Needs for Professional Development (ASCNPD) survey. The survey was sent to 1,691 school counselors employed at Alabama public schools, and the 1,244 that were returned yielded a response rate of 74%. The 56-item ASCNPD measured readiness and progress toward comprehensive program delivery using 6 subscales with reliabilities ranging from .91 to .69: School Counseling Priorities ($\alpha = .91$); School Setting Perceptions ($\alpha = .91$), Personal/Social Development ($\alpha = .86$); Career and Postsecondary Development ($\alpha = .81$); Academic Development ($\alpha = .76$); and Program Management ($\alpha = .69$). This article has been cited by others 29 times (Google Scholar). A replication study by Burnham, Dahir, Stone, and Hooper (2008) explored the instrument’s factor construction and concluded that the six-factor structure was the best fit.

**School Counselor Attribute and Data Usage Survey (SCADUS)**

Holcomb-McCoy, Gonzales, and Johnston (2009) developed the School Counseling Attribute and Data Usage Survey (SCADUS) to explore why some school counselors use data to evaluate program effectiveness while others do not. The purpose of the SCADUS was to determine whether selected school counselor dispositions (i.e., “patterns of behaviors that are exhibited frequently and intentionally in the absence of coercion,” p. 344) predicted level of data usage in school counseling programs. Six hundred and ninety-three school counselors in two large school districts in Washington, D.C., were invited to complete the survey via e-mail. To increase response rates, the SCADUS was distributed to an additional 100 random ASCA members from Maryland and Virginia. A total of 130 questionnaires were returned, representing a 16% response rate. The SCADUS is a 52-item instrument. Each subscale is scored using Likert rating scales with varying point ranges (from 5 to 9 points). The overall scale reliability was .88 and included four subscales: 1) General Self-Efficacy ($\alpha = .85$); 2) Counselor Self-Efficacy ($\alpha = .84$); 3) Counselor Use of Data ($\alpha = .83$); and 4) Openness to Change ($\alpha = .61$). This publication has been cited seven times by others (Google Scholar). No replication studies have been conducted on this measure.

**School Counseling Program Implementation Survey (SCPIS)**

The School Counseling Program Implementation Survey (SCPIS; Clemens et al., 2010) is intended to measure the organization of, and variability within, school counseling programs. Specifically, scores on the SCPIS gauge the extent to which characteristics of the ASCA National Model are being implemented. Users can determine what aspects of the school counseling program are successfully in place as well as which are missing. The measure was distributed electronically to 580 school counselors in three Southeastern states and one Midwestern state during two data collection periods. Three hundred and forty one school counselors responded resulting in a response rate of 59%. The SCPIS consists of 17 4-point Likert scale items (1 = not present to 4 = fully implemented) with higher scores indicating greater degrees of National Model implementation. The initial exploratory factor analysis indicated that a two- and three-factor model existed. The two-factor model explained 47% of the variance and included ASCA National Model Program Implementation ($\alpha = .87$) and School Counselors Use of Computer Software ($\alpha = .83$). The three-factor model explained 54% of the variance and included both factors in the two-factor model as well as an additional School Counseling
Services factor ($\alpha = .81$). The authors argued that the three-factor model allows users to distinguish between more distinct aspects of the program, whereas the two-factor model encourages a more holistic approach to program evaluation. Google Scholar indicated that this publication has been cited eight times by others. To date, no replication studies have been conducted using this measure.

**Data Beliefs and Practices Survey (DBAPS)**

Adapting items from a previously piloted instrument (Data, Beliefs, and Practices Survey; DBAPS), Young and Kaffenberger (2011) studied recipients of the Recognized ASCA Model Program (RAMP) award to determine how this unique group of school counselors used data to inform decisions related to their programs. This award recognizes programs that demonstrate excellence through strong adherence to the ASCA National Model. Specifically, the authors were interested in describing participants’ motivation to use data to monitor student progress, address achievement gaps, and promote their role and function. One hundred and fourteen out of 231 surveyed individuals from RAMP schools across the country responded to the authors’ request for participation representing a 49% response rate. This is a 20-item instrument. Questions 1–13 assess counselors’ perceptions of data practices using a 7-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree). Questions 14–18 ask participants to check items associated with data training and data sharing practices. The final two questions assess participants’ motivation to use data and their understanding of the purposes of using data. The subscale represented by questions 1–13 has strong psychometric properties ($\alpha = .93$). Google Scholar indicated that the DBAPS study has been cited 4 times. The instrument not yet been further validated through a replication study.

**Comprehensive School Counseling Implementation Measure (CSCIM)**

The Comprehensive School Counseling Implementation Measure (CSCIM; Pyne, 2011) was designed to identify the key elements of a comprehensive program. From a random sample of 110 school districts in the state of Michigan, 351 secondary school counselor contacts were obtained. Of these, 117 responded yielding a response rate of 33%. Based on the program audit worksheet found in the ASCA National Model Workbook (2004b), the CSCIM contains 18, 5-point Likert scale items that yield 4 different subscales: 1) Program Structure and Philosophy ($\alpha = .96$); 2) Assessment and Benchmarks ($\alpha = .76$); 3) Counselor and Student Development ($\alpha = .62$); and 4) Referral and Orientation ($\alpha = .50$). The four different factors explained 53.1% of the variance in participants’ level of comprehensive program implementation. In its validation study, the CSCIM was administered with a job satisfaction scale to explore the relationship between career fulfillment and more fully established school counseling programs. The results indicated a moderate to strong correlation ($p = .56$) between the two variables. One item addressing level of administrator support was the strongest predictor of job satisfaction. The CSCIM has been cited one time by others (Google Scholar). The psychometric properties of the CSCIM have not yet been validated through a replication study.
Discussion and Implications

A table presenting key information from each of the study overviews above is offered here to guide the following discussion (See Table 1). Two key points can be drawn. First, when conducting future studies about school counselor beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors, researchers may want to consider using already existing surveys instead of developing additional instruments. The authors identified 10 different assessments that were developed between 2005 and 2011 to investigate school counselor beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors regarding comprehensive school counseling programs. This represents a mean production rate of roughly 1.6 new instruments per year during this 6-year period, so a case could be made that a solid foundation of surveys now exists to guide future inquiry of this type. Bolstering this point further, with the exception of the SCoPES (Whiston & Aricak, 2008), which was used with students, and the SCSCP (Lapan et al., 2006), which was administered to both school counselors and school administrators, eight out of the 10 instruments were designed exclusively for use with school counselors. Thus, it may not be pragmatic to continue to develop additional surveys of this type when existing instruments already present investigators with a host of readily available options to consider.

When making decisions about which instrument(s) to utilize, researchers may want to consider some of the following information. All of the instruments appear to have sound psychometric properties with reported alpha reliabilities on overall scales ranging from .88 (Holcomb-McCoy et al., 2009) to .97 (Whiston & Aricak, 2008) and subscale reliabilities ranging from a low of .50 on the “Referral and Orientation” factor in the CSCIM (Pyne, 2011) to .99 on the “Curriculum-Preferred” factor in the SCARS (Scarborough, 2005). This suggests that existing instruments are worthy of consideration for use in subsequent studies based on their basic, initial psychometric properties.

An additional selection element for investigators to consider could also be the number of times a particular study has been cited. Dahir et al.’s ASCNPD article (2009) has been cited 29 times, representing an annual citation rate of approximately 7.25 times per year since its publication. This annual citation rate is followed by Scarborough’s SCARS article (2005) which, although it has been cited most frequently (47 times), has averaged approximately 6.1 citations per year since publication. Bodenhorn and Skaggs’ SCSES article (2005), with 38 citations since publication, represents a mean of approximately 3.6 citations per year. Although “times cited” should not be the exclusive factor in determining whether or not to utilize a particular instrument, the number of citations (and the calculated annual citation rate) could be viewed as a useful indicator about the merits or utility of a particular piece of scholarship within the profession’s literature.

Yet another component to consider when selecting an already existing instrument for use might be an examination of each study’s sample population. For the current review, seven out of 10 studies focused on state-level populations while three utilized national samples. Researchers may want to consider augmenting the data on existing surveys by conducting additional studies with new randomized sample populations at both the state and national levels. Finally, future investigators may wish to consider reported response rates when selecting a particular instrument for use. For the 10 studies outlined here, response rates ranged from a low of 16% (Holcomb-McCoy et al., 2009) to
a high of 74% (Dahir et al., 2009). Two additional investigations yielded response rates that were also considerably above 50%: the response rate for the SCARS investigation was 60% (Scarborough, 2005) while the response rate for the SCPIIS study was 59% (Clemens et al., 2010).

A second point that emerges for consideration from the present review has to do with how investigators might direct future inquiry. At the minimum, additional replication studies may be warranted. Based on the fact that only the Bodenhorn and Skaggs (2005) and the Dahir et al. (2009) studies appear to have been replicated, it would seem important to conduct additional investigations using large, random samples in order to evaluate further the psychometric properties of each instrument. Studies of this nature would allow future investigators to make more informed decisions about which instruments to use based on more complete psychometric information. A natural offshoot of such replication studies would be a recommendation for researchers to use these existing instruments to conduct longitudinal studies. Each one of the studies reviewed here presents results from investigations that occurred at a single point in time. Additional studies could be developed to examine the impact of interventions (e.g., professional development workshops for school counselors) by using these instruments as pre- and post-assessments. Similarly, examining populations at different points in time might also allow investigators to draw small conclusions about the long-term effects of the ASCA National Model on school counselor beliefs from the time of its inception in 2003 to now. Such comparisons would help the profession to begin measuring the influence of the model on professionals’ belief systems during the past decade. Although it takes more time to conduct longitudinal research, such comparisons over time might be of greater value to the profession than the development of additional instruments designed to evaluate elements that have already been investigated.

To extend these potential lines of inquiry one step further, the 10 studies conducted since 2005 represent the perceptions of over 5,000 respondents ($N = 5,099$) about the various aspects of comprehensive school counseling. This assembled pool of respondent data seems ripe for research questions using more advanced statistical analyses (e.g., meta-analysis, path analysis, etc.).

Finally, all of the developed surveys outlined herein were designed to investigate beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors about comprehensive school counseling and programming. However, to bring the school counseling profession even closer to definitively establishing the appropriate role of the school counselor, an empirically validated connection between school counseling programs and student outcomes must be established. Fortunately, another line of scholarship exists that seeks to examine this critical relationship (Carey, Harrington, Martin, & Hoffman, 2012; Dimmit & Wilkerson, 2012; Lapan, Gysbers, & Kayson, 2007; Lapan, Gysbers, & Petroski, 2001; Sink & Stroh, 2003; Steen & Kaffenberger, 2007; Ward, 2009; Wilkerson, Pérusse, & Hughes, 2013). Those interested in continuing to examine school counselor beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors may wish to ask questions that bring these two lines of inquiry closer together. For example, studies designed to analyze possible relationships between beliefs and student outcomes might be useful. With so much emphasis in the profession over the past 10 years placed on the presumption that beliefs might impact behaviors and actions, it would be useful to quantify these relationships and investigate the extent to which
changes in school counselor beliefs and behaviors might actually be tied to improved outcomes for students.

Conclusion

The purpose of the present literature review was to provide readers with a chronological overview of existing school counseling instruments designed to explore beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors regarding various aspects of comprehensive program delivery. The authors identified 10 different instruments that were developed between 2005 and 2011 to examine these elements.

The importance of exploring this line of inquiry is underscored in several seminal documents and research. First, a Delphi study conducted by Dimmitt et al. (2005) revealed that the most critical research question facing the profession was how to determine which school counseling interventions make the biggest impact on academic achievement outcomes. Also revealed as important was the task of identifying and documenting the impact of comprehensive school counseling programs on student outcomes. Likewise, CACREP’s 2009 Standards (CACREP, 2009) advocate for counselor training programs to teach the importance of connecting program activities to student outcomes. For example, Research and Evaluation standards indicate that trainees are to learn “basic strategies for evaluating counseling outcomes in school counseling (e.g., behavioral observations, program evaluation; I.3., CACREP, 2009, p. 43) and to develop “measureable outcomes for school counseling programs, activities, interventions, and experiences” (J.2., CACREP, 2009, p. 43). Additionally, the ASCA School Counselor Competencies underscore the importance of analyzing and interpreting “process, perception, and outcome data” (V: Accountability; B: Abilities and Skills; 1g, ASCA, 2012, p. 158) as well as using “data to demonstrate the value the school counseling program adds to student achievement” (V: Accountability; B Abilities and Skills, 1k, ASCA, 2012, p. 158). Finally, the ASCA Ethical Standards for School Counselors states that school counselors must “assess the effectiveness of their program in having an impact on students’ academic, career, and personal/social development through accountability measures especially examining efforts to close achievement, opportunity, and attainment gaps” (ASCA, 2010, p. 3). Thus, it is paramount to maintain the concept that ultimately school counselors and school counseling programs are about improving outcomes for students. That being the case, school counseling research should be dedicated to this critical line of inquiry.

With the introduction of the ASCA National Model (2003), numerous investigations emerged that were designed to examine school counselor beliefs during a dramatic decade of change within the profession. This research led to the development of a number of potentially useful instruments. However, as discipline-based advocates and scholars, researchers with a school counseling-focused research agenda may now have an obligation to assess more than just beliefs and behaviors and to expand the literature connecting school counseling programs to student outcomes. Failing to design studies that take into account such outcome variables may fall short of this important responsibility. It is clear that in order for researchers to continue to support the profession’s efforts to tie school counseling programming efforts to student achievement outcomes, strategic thinking about future research directions must take place. No longer
can instruments be used to simply assess school counselor beliefs and behaviors. Rather, existing instruments must be further validated and intentionally connected to questions that seek to investigate the links among beliefs, actions, and student outcomes through thoughtful research design. A unified approach to furthering the profession’s research agenda in a way that integrates these multiple elements must be established in order to continue moving the profession forward to a greater understanding of the role of the school counselor. The authors hope that the present contribution will be used to support and guide a next decade of inquiry.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Publication Date</th>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Subscales and Reliability</th>
<th>Times cited</th>
<th>Replication Studies</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
<th>Survey Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bodenhorn and Skaggs</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale (SCSES)</td>
<td>Personal and Social Development ($\alpha = .91$), Leadership and Assessment ($\alpha = .90$), Career and Academic Development ($\alpha = .85$), Collaboration ($\alpha = .87$), Cultural Acceptance ($\alpha = .72$)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>School Counselors (ASCA Members)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarborough</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>School Counselor Activity Rating Scale (SCARS)</td>
<td>Counseling Actual ($\alpha = .85$) and Preferred ($\alpha = .83$); Coordination Actual ($\alpha = .84$) and Preferred ($\alpha = .85$), Consultation Actual ($\alpha = .75$) and Preferred ($\alpha = .77$), Curriculum Actual ($\alpha = .93$) and Preferred ($\alpha = .99$)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>School Counselors (2 Southern states)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lapan, Gysbers, and Kayson</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Survey of Comprehensive School Counseling Programs (SCSCP)</td>
<td>Individual Planning, Responsive Services, Management, Evaluation, Guidance Curriculum, and Foundation ($\alpha$ range from .88 to .96)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>School Counselors and Administrators (Missouri)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatch and Chen-Hayes</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>School Counseling Program Component Scale (SCPCS)</td>
<td>Use of Data for Program Planning ($\alpha = .92$), Use of Data for Accountability ($\alpha = .82$), Administrator Support ($\alpha = .80$), Mission, Goals, and Competencies ($\alpha = .78$), Overall ($\alpha = .92$)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>1,279</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>School Counselors (ASCA Members)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiston and Aricak</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>School Counseling Program Evaluation Scale (SCoPES)</td>
<td>Academic Development ($\alpha = .93$), Career Development ($\alpha = .94$), and Personal-Social Development ($\alpha = .91$), Overall ($\alpha = .97$)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Students (Texas and Connecticut)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dahir, Burnham, and Stone</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Assessment of School Counselor Needs for Professional Development (ASCNPD)</td>
<td>School Counseling Priorities ($\alpha = .91$), School Setting Perceptions ($\alpha = .91$), Personal/Social Development ($\alpha = .86$), Career and Postsecondary Development ($\alpha = .81$), Academic Development ($\alpha = .76$), and Program Management ($\alpha = .69$)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,691</td>
<td>1,244</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>School Counselors (Alabama)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holcomb-McCoy, Gonzales, and Johnston</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>School Counselor Attribute and Data Usage Survey (SCADUS)</td>
<td>General Self-Efficacy ($\alpha = .85$), Counselor Self-Efficacy ($\alpha = .84$), Counselor Use of Data ($\alpha = .83$), Openness to Change ($\alpha = .61$), Overall ($\alpha = .85$)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>School Counselors (D.C., Maryland, and Virginia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Publication Date</td>
<td>Instrument</td>
<td>Subscales and Reliability</td>
<td>Times cited</td>
<td>Replication Studies</td>
<td>Sample Respondents</td>
<td>Response Rate</td>
<td>Survey Population</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemens, Carey, and Harrington</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>School Counseling Program Implementation Survey (SCPIS)</td>
<td>ASCA National Model Program Implementation ($\alpha = .87$), School Counselors Use of Computer Software ($\alpha = .83$), School Counseling Services ($\alpha = .81$)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>59% School Counselors (4 states- 3 Southeastern and 1 Midwestern)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young and Kaffenberger</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Data Beliefs and Practices Survey (DBAPS)</td>
<td>Perceptions of Data Practices and Uses ($\alpha = .93$)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>49% School Counselors (RAMP SC’s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyne</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Comprehensive School Counseling Implementation Measure (CSCIM)</td>
<td>Program Structure and Philosophy ($\alpha = .96$), Assessment and Benchmarks ($\alpha = .76$), Counselor and Student Development ($\alpha = .62$), Referral and Orientation ($\alpha = .50$)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>33% School Counselors (Michigan)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^1$NR = Not Reported