# A self-report assessment of the measures of school counselors' dimensions

By
**Yousef Salem Aljohani**
**Taibah University**

# A self-report assessment of the measures of school counselors' dimensions

**Abstract**:

The role of the school counselor in the Saudi context is not clear. This study aimed to address the need to develop an assessment tool to contain school counselors' identified duties and responsibilities in the Saudi context. This self-report is built upon five elements: Counseling ethics, school counselors' characteristics, responsibilities, competence, and adherence to the legal code of ethics. In addition, information was gathered to extract the characteristics of the dimensions of school counselors from a questionnaire survey. Findings show that the reliability coefficient was comparable to stability in both methods (Alpha, Hash-half), and the validity's correlation was at a significant level. Finally, limitations and recommendations in this study are discussed to improve further research studying the role of school counselors in the Saudi context.

**Keywords**: School counselor / Saudi school/ school counselor dimensions

**Introduction**:

The role of a school counselor across Asia, specifically Saudi Arabia, is ambiguous as it is a new element within many of the education environments. Furthermore, their role is questioned as they undertake a wide variation of tasks and hold responsibility in many different areas. These tasks encompass the welfare of children such as their growth in regard to education, life ambitions, employment opportunities, individual development and societal understanding. The school counselor must understand how to motivate the children and change their attitudes, norms and values to ensure they can improve themselves. They must also ease children into the education

system and help them enjoy the school environment. (Willys, 2017).

The school counselor  must oversee the children's educational, employment, individual and social journey as each element is important in a young adult's life (Supriyanto et al.,2019). While there are varying opinions on  the importance of counselor  many bodies such as the education system, teachers, guardians and the pupils themselves, they are there to expand the student's experience. (Aluede, , & Adubale, 2020).

A study uncovered the majority of students regarded the school and one to one counselling services to be valuable in improving the experience of the pupil (Joy , Hesson , & Harris, 2011). The 56% and 72.9% stated that when psychological upheaval, anxiousness and disharmony in the family arise, the help of a school counselor  was beneficial to them. Furthermore, the atmosphere of a group session gave them perspective and understanding of their peers as individuals. (Joy , Hesson , & Harris, 2011) The long-term effects of counselling have been suggested to improve people's relationships, connection with themselves, wellbeing and school achievements (D'Agostino , Schirripa , & Salvati, 2022). This highlights how valuable the counselor  are in the individual development of students, their life ambitions, their choices and their abilities to communicate and connect with others.

It is indicated that when the counselor s draw up courses of improvement for problems such as addiction, abuse, falling behind academically and lack of social peers they are able to actively change the student's attitude towards the education system. (Galassi, 2017). They may do this by providing exercises that calm the student and help them understand and overcome their difficulties. (Galassi, 2017). Counselor s will take precautions to eliminate any forms of violence and promote social harmony by inviting students to events and interventions.

They will be forthcoming in the understanding of difficult topics such as suicide , abuse and increase their awreaneses about important topic in their age (DeKruyf , Auger, & Trice-Black, 2013).

School counselor s have been known to offer their services not just to the pupils, but to the entirety of the faculty as well as undertaking their own research to improve their conducts. Moreover, they are involved in promoting their profession and the school. The counselor s may often find themselves as the mediator between teachers and pupils, pupils and the school and the school and the families. (Daniels, 2013). They also help the students and families adjust to the education environment, so they get as much out of their experience as personally possible. (Low, 2014).

The school counselor s must guide the students in an path for their future career plans so that they can achieve the grades required of their goals. (Amoah, Kwofie, & Kwofie, 2015).

Thus, while the opinions of the school counselor s in Saudi Arabia have been examined, it still shows a lack of understanding as to what the counselor s do and how they conduct themselves in regard to the students' lives. (Alghamdi , & Riddick, 2011).

This self-report is built upon five elements within school counselling duties and responsibilities that have been studied from academic resources. These dimensions are counselling ethics, the school counselor s' characteristics, responsibilities, competence, and adherence to the legal code of ethics. The self-report assessment aims to help individuals determine if counselling at school is suitable for them. Also, it will allow private and public schools to the recruitment process by identifying qualified candidates who fit the school counselor role. To the best of the researcher's knowledge, this assessment tool is the first in the Saudi context to investigate the school

counselor's dimensions and help build a self-repost assessment based on these dimensions.

**The present study:**

Currently there are no measures of counselor s' role within school counselling setting in the Saudi context. This study addresses the need to develop an assessment tool to contain the extent of identified duties and responsibilities for school counselors in the Saudi context. Such an assessment tool might be used to reckon trainees in their placement to assess their school counselling skills. Also, it helps to identify in their early career positions requirements for further competence development, which could be targeted through extra training, along with further research that explores the school counselor dimensions and other factors such as work competencies and coping with burnout.

**Method**:

Participant

The sample that the researcher relied on to extract the characteristics of the dimensions of the self-report assessment of school counselor s amounted to 140 students from the Department of Psychology, where the initial sample included 100 students.

**Result**:

The sample that the researcher relied on to extract the characteristics of the dimensions of the self-report assessment of school counselor s amounted to 140 students from the Department of Psychology, where the initial scale included one 100 students.

Recruitment of the initial sample organized at the department of psychology, students in theri first year. Students answered a hard copy form the assessment. As a result , the initial sample was 100 individuals (100 hard copy), all were fisrt

year psychology students bachelor dgree from the researcher's university. The final sample were 140 students the Department of Psychology in their fist year.

The purpose of the initial study:

1) To know about clarity of the questions of the self-report assessment of school counselor s' dimensions.

2) Adjust the time commensurate with the questions by finding the average time from the first delivery to the last student who finishes the self-report assessment.

3) Calculating the validity and reliability.

The reliability coefficient was calculated by two methods, the alpha coefficient and the hash-half. Table (1) shows the stability coefficients.

| Stability statistics table (1) | |
|---|---|
| Cronbach's alpha | Number of paragraphs |
| .643 | 54 |

| Hemispheric Statisticians (1) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Cronbach's Alpha | Part 1 | Value | .516 |
| | | N of Items | 27[a] |
| | Part 2 | Value | .432 |
| | | N of Items | 27[b] |
| | Total N of Items | | 54 |
| Correlation Between Forms | | | .462 |
| Spearman-Brown Coefficient | Equal Length | | .632 |
| | Unequal Length | | .632 |
| Guttman Split-Half Coefficient | | | .628 |
| a. The items are: x1, x2, x3, x4, x5, x6, x7, x8, x9, x10, x11, x12, x13, x14, x15, x16, x17, x18, x19, x20, x21, x22, x23, x24, x25, x26, x27. | | | |
| b. The items are: x28, x29, x30, x31, x32, x33, x34, x35, x36, x37, x38, x39, x40, x41, x42, x43, x44, x45, x46, x47, x48, x49, x50, x51, x52, x53, x54. | | | |

The tables show that the scale has good and comparable stability coefficients in both methods.

❖ **Validity:**

The validity of the of the self-report assessment of school counselor s' dimensions is the foundation and most important property that the assessment should have, and the researcher will take a number of actions to verify the validity of the tool

**Verification of Descriptive validity:**

To ascertain descriptive validity, the researcher hired a group of specialists to determine how the test vocabulary matched the behavior to be measured.

a) **Inter-rater reliability**

The researcher, with the help of a number of **inter-raters**(6), presented the assessment items to them and the extent of the agreement of the assessment's questions with the dimensions identified by the researcher.

b) **Internal Consistency Validity**

The researcher found the item correlation coefficient with the overall score by the Pearson correlation coefficient, which is evidence of the validity of the test content. Table (2)

Item relationship with overall degree Pearson correlation coefficient table (2)

| Total grade | item | Total grade | item | Total grade | item |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ٢٧.** | 15 | .17 | 8 | .09 | 1 |
| ٢٠.* | 16 | ٢٩.** | 9 | .09 | 2 |
| ٥٣.** | 17 | ٠١. | 10 | .31** | 3 |
| ٠٧.* | 18 | ٣٩.** | 11 | .00- | 4 |
| ٢٥.* | 19 | ٣٣.** | 12 | .23* | 5 |
| ٣٣.** | 20 | ٤٢.** | 13 | .33** | 6 |
| ٠٥.- | 21 | ٠٦. | 14 | -.07 | 7 |

Link at level

| Total grade | item | Total grade | item | Total grade | item | Total grade | item | Total grade | item |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| -.11 | **49** | *.23 | **42** | **.33 | **35** | .12 | **28** | -.05 | 21 |
| .18 | **50** | .07 | **43** | **.44 | **36** | **.30 | **29** | **.51 | 22 |
| *.24 | **51** | .12 | **44** | .06 | **37** | **.34 | **30** | **.31 | 23 |
| .06 | **52** | .06 | **45** | *.22 | **38** | *.21 | **31** | *.22 | 24 |
| **-.38 | **53** | .14 | **46** | ,08 | **39** | *.25 | **32** | **.29 | 25 |
| **.48 | **54** | **.40 | **47** | **.39 | **40** | *.25 | **33** | **.27 | 26 |
| | | **.36 | **48** | **.31 | **41** | *.24 | **34** | **.42 | 27 |

Reference 01.
* Correlation at significance level 05.

As can be seen from the two tables above, most lexical correlation coefficients and overall score ranged from 20-40, which are weak to acceptable correlation coefficients.

The highest degree of engagement for item 17 and the lowest degree of association for item 16.

Eighteen paragraphs that are not linked at an acceptable level of significance are (1.2-4.7-8-10-14-21-28-37-39-43-44-45-46-49-50-52). Eighteen paragraphs.

❖ **Factorial Analysis of the assessment initial study:**

Factorial analysis was performed to see how the questions items were and the factors by which they were formed.

Factorial transposing shows that the value of compilations for questions vocabulary is greater than 65. And above the vocabulary is 87. It is an acceptable indicator of the questions' structural truthiness, and for the factors that result from factorial analysis, it is as follows:

| Total explained ratio | interpreted ratio | Latent root | agents |
|---|---|---|---|
| 9.19 | 9.19 | 4.96 | **1** |
| 17.88 | 8.68 | 4.69 | **2** |
| 24.34 | 6.46 | 3.48 | **3** |
| 29.83 | 5.49 | 2.96 | **4** |
| 34.71 | 4.88 | 2.63 | **5** |
| 39.13 | 4.41 | 2.38 | **6** |
| 43.44 | 4.31 | 2.32 | **7** |
| 47.17 | 3.72 | 2.01 | **8** |
| 50.68 | 3.50 | 1.89 | **9** |
| 54.09 | 3.37 | 1.82 | **10** |
| 57.14 | 3.08 | 1.66 | **11** |
| 60.16 | 3.02 | 1.63 | **12** |
| 62.98 | 2.82 | 1.52 | **13** |
| 65.49 | 2.50 | 1.35 | **14** |
| 67.91 | 2.41 | 1.30 | **15** |
| 70.91 | 2.28 | 1.23 | **16** |
| 72.35 | 2.16 | 1.17 | **17** |
| 74.42 | 2.06 | 1.11 | **18** |
| 76.37 | 1.94 | 1.05 | **19** |

A look at the table above shows that the number of factors (19) is one factor and the root of each of them is more than one whole. These factors together account for 76.37% of the total variance, which is a reasonable proportion to take. Factors 2 and 3 had the largest number of consistent items and the factor 18 had no items.

The second factor is called the professional characteristics of the guide and the third factor is saturated by a number of items reflecting the ethics of the student guide; the highest value factor of the underlying root is the first and lowest is the nineteenth; and the lowest value factor is the following, according to the Guilford test:

| Number of saturated items | agents |
|---|---|
| 6 | **1** |
| 11 | **2** |
| 13 | **3** |
| 7 | **4** |
| 5 | **5** |
| 5 | **6** |
| 4 | **7** |
| 3 | **8** |
| 3 | **9** |
| 2 | **10** |
| 3 | **11** |
| 3 | **12** |
| 2 | **13** |
| 3 | **14** |
| 2 | **15** |
| 1 | **16** |
| 1 | **17** |
| 0 | **18** |
| 2 | **19** |

At the time of the global analysis after the Farimax rotation, the aggregate results were:

| Total explained ratio | interpreted ratio | Latent root | Agents |
|---|---|---|---|
| 5.62 | 5.62 | 3.03 | **1** |
| 10.76 | 5.13 | 2.77 | **2** |
| 15.70 | 4.94 | 2.66 | **3** |
| 30.50 | 4.79 | 2.59 | **4** |
| 25.10 | 4.60 | 2.48 | **5** |
| 29.59 | 4.48 | 2.40 | **6** |
| 33.66 | 4.07 | 2.20 | **7** |

| 37.61 | 3.94 | 2.21 | **8** |
|---|---|---|---|
| 41.54 | 3.93 | 2.21 | **9** |
| 45.35 | 3.80 | 2.05 | **10** |
| 49.15 | 3.79 | 2.05 | **11** |
| 52.93 | 3.78 | 2.04 | **12** |
| 56.45 | 3.52 | 1.90 | **13** |
| 59.95 | 3.50 | 1.89 | **14** |
| 63.42 | 3.46 | 1.87 | **15** |
| 66.75 | 3.33 | 1.80 | **16** |
| 70.07 | 3.32 | 1.79 | **17** |
| 73.28 | 3.20 | 1.73 | **18** |
| 76.37 | 3.08 | 1.66 | **19** |

A look at the table above shows that the number of factors (19) is a factor and the root of each of them is more than one whole according to Kaiser's parameter. These factors together account for 76.37% of the total variance This is an acceptable ratio that can be taken. After rounding, the situation changed where the first factor became the most saturated factor of the number of items (7)

Work-six can be called guidance prohibitions, and workers one and two are imbued with items relating to the professional characteristics and practical tasks of a student mentor.

In terms of the value of the potential root, the first factor was the largest proportion of the potential root and, in terms of terms saturated, it saturated as follows, according to the Guilford test:

| Number of saturated items | agents |
|---|---|
| 7 | **1** |
| 6 | **2** |
| 3 | **3** |
| 4 | **4** |

| | |
|---|---|
| 4 | **5** |
| 6 | **6** |
| 3 | **7** |
| 5 | **8** |
| 4 | **9** |
| 2 | **10** |
| 3 | **11** |
| 3 | **12** |
| 5 | **13** |
| 3 | **14** |
| 5 | **15** |
| 2 | **16** |
| 2 | **17** |
| 1 | **18** |
| 2 | **19** |

After calculating initial validity and reliability and analyzing the factorial validity of the assessment. The researcher omitted items that were not substantially related to overall grade, and applied them to the final sample to calculate validity and reliability.

❖ **Reliability of the assessment:**

The reliability coefficient was calculated from two methods: alpha coefficient and half-division.

Table 3 shows the persistence coefficients:

| Stability statistics Table (3) alpha stability coefficient | |
|---|---|
| Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
| .722 | 36 |

| Stability statistics of halves | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Cronbach's Alpha | Part 1 | Value | .594 |
| | | N of Items | 18[a] |
| | Part 2 | Value | .473 |
| | | N of Items | 18[b] |
| | Total N of Items | | 36 |
| Correlation Between Forms | | | .650 |
| Spearman-Brown Coefficient | Equal Length | | .788 |
| | Unequal Length | | .788 |
| Guttman Split-Half Coefficient | | | .785 |
| a. The items are: x3, x6, x8, x9, x11, x12, x13, x15, x16, x17, x19, x20, x22, x23, x25, x26, x27, x29. | | | |
| b. The items are: x30, x31, x32, x33, x35, x36, x39, x40, x41, x42, x43, x44, x45, x46, x47, x48, x53, x54. | | | |

As can be seen from the table above, the reliability coefficient in the final sample has increased to alpha 72. In half-hemispheres through the Spearman-Brown correction equation it is 78. This ratio is good.

❖ **Validity of the assessment:**
**Verification of Descriptive validity**

To ascertain descriptive validity, the researcher hired a group of specialists to determine how the assessment vocabulary matched the behavior to be measured.

a) **Inter-rater reliability:**

The researcher, with the help of a number of **inter-raters**(6), presented the assessment items to them and the extent of the agreement of the assessment's questions with the dimensions identified by the researcher.

b) **Internal Consistency Validity:**

The researcher found the item correlation coefficient with the overall score by the Pearson correlation coefficient, which is evidence of the validity of the test content. Table (4)

** Correlation at signaling level 01. Table 4
* Correlation at significance level 05.

| Total grade | items | Total grade | items | Total grade | items | Total grade | items | Total grade | items |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| .28 | **5** | **.44 | **4** | .28 | **3** | .27 | **2** | **.53 | **1** |
| **.67 | **10** | *.36 | **9** | .26 | **8** | **.52 | **7** | .30 | **6** |
| -.03 | **15** | *.34 | **14** | .25 | **13** | *.33 | **12** | **.40 | **11** |
| **.42 | **20** | **.43 | **19** | **.40 | **18** | .12 | **17** | .18 | **16** |
| .19 | **25** | **.63 | **24** | *.39 | **23** | **.45 | **22** | --.04 | **21** |
| .18 | **30** | .01 | **٢٩** | **.43 | **28** | .16 | **27** | .31 | **26** |
| .28 | **35** | .14 | **٣٤** | .08 | **33** | .14 | **32** | .08 | **31** |
| | | | | | | | | **.70 | **36** |

As can be seen from the table, a number of items are not associated with the overall score according to Spearman's correlation coefficient. The researcher attributes this to the examiners' inaccuracy in answering the assessment's questions because there were final exams during the application of the study . Correlation coefficients ranged from 40-70 and are considered acceptable correlation coefficients.

❖ **Factorial Analysis of the assessment:**

The factor analysis was conducted to find out how the items of the assessment are and the factors through which it is formed.

It is clear from the factorial analysis that the value of the questions of the assessment is more than 67, and the highest is 90. It is a good indicator that indicates the structural validity of the assessment, and for the factors that resulted from the factor analysis, they are as follows:

| Total explained ratio | interpreted ratio | Latent root | Agents |
|---|---|---|---|
| 14.84 | 14.84 | 5.34 | **1** |
| 24.59 | 9.74 | 3.50 | **2** |
| 32.23 | 7.53 | 2.71 | **3** |
| 39.19 | 7.06 | 2.54 | **4** |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 45.91 | 6.71 | 2.41 | **5** |
| 51.79 | 5.88 | 2.11 | **6** |
| 57.25 | 5.46 | 1.96 | **7** |
| 62.50 | 5.24 | 1.88 | **8** |
| 66.76 | 4.26 | 1.53 | **9** |
| 72.83 | 4.05 | 1.46 | **10** |
| 74.13 | 3.31 | 1.19 | **11** |
| 77.15 | 3.01 | 1.08 | **12** |
| 79.97 | 2.82 | 1.01 | **13** |

Looking at the previous table, it is clear that the number of factors is (13) and that the root of each of them exceeds the correct one according to the Kaiser criterion, and these factors together explain the rate of 79.97% of the total variance and this is an excellent percentage that can be taken into account, and the first factor explained the rate of 14.84% from the phenomenon, which is a high percentage, as its latent root was 5.43 and the number of items that were saturated with it was sixteen items.

The first factor had the largest number of saturated items, and the researcher can name the first factor the guiding characteristics and skills, but in terms of the highest value factors for the latent root is the first factor, and the least of them is the thirteenth factor.

As for the items being saturated with factors, they were saturated as follows, according to Guilford's test:

| Number of saturated items | agents |
|---|---|
| 16 | **1** |
| 8 | **2** |
| 7 | **3** |
| 6 | **4** |
| 7 | **5** |
| 5 | **6** |
| 2 | **7** |

| | |
|---|---|
| 8 | **8** |
| 2 | **9** |
| 1 | **10** |
| 3 | **11** |
| 2 | **12** |
| 1 | **13** |

And when factor analysis was performed after rotation using the Garimax method, the results were as follows:

| Total explained ratio | interpreted ratio | Latent root | agents |
|---|---|---|---|
| 10.20 | 10.20 | 3.67 | **1** |
| 18.00 | 7.80 | 2.80 | **2** |
| 25.19 | 7.18 | 2.58 | **3** |
| 31.77 | 6.58 | 2.37 | **4** |
| 38.29 | 6.52 | 2.34 | **5** |
| 44.16 | 5.86 | 2.11 | **6** |
| 49.92 | 5.76 | 2.07 | **7** |
| 55.53 | 5.60 | 2.01 | **8** |
| 61.05 | 5.52 | 1.98 | **9** |
| 66.52 | 5.47 | 1.97 | **10** |
| 71.51 | 4.98 | 1.79 | **11** |
| 76.16 | 4.65 | 1.67 | **12** |
| 79.97 | 3.80 | 1.38 | **13** |

Looking at the previous table, it becomes clear that the number of factors is (13) and that the root of each of them is more than the correct one according to the Kaiser criterion, and these factors together explain 79.97% of the total variance and this is an excellent percentage that can be taken into account, and the situation after rotation did not differ much from what before it for the items and their saturation on the factors, as the items that were saturated on the first factor decreased before the

rotation, and the first factor is still the most saturated factor for the items on it (12)

In terms of the value of the latent root, the first factor reached the largest percentage in the latent root and, as for the items being saturated with the factors, they were saturated as follows, according to the Guilford test:

| Number of saturated items | agents |
|---|---|
| 12 | **1** |
| 7 | **2** |
| 6 | **3** |
| 4 | **4** |
| 4 | **5** |
| 4 | **6** |
| 5 | **7** |
| 4 | **8** |
| 4 | **9** |
| 2 | **10** |
| 2 | **11** |
| 2 | **12** |
| 1 | **13** |

**Discussion:**

The present study aimed to develop and validate a self-report measure of the school counselor's role in the Saudi context in five dimensions. These dimensions are counselling ethics, the school counselor s' characteristics, responsibilities, competence, and adherence to the legal code of ethics. This study's counselling ethics and competencies were built based on American School Counselor Association (ASCA)(2022). at the same time, the legal aspects and responsibilities were made based upon previous research in the Saudi contecxt (Alghamdi, & Riddick, 2011) along with adherence to guidance at the Saudi ministry for education.

This study might give insight into the ethics, legal matters, and characteristics of the role of school counselor s by identifying the interventions' factors contained in items related to the Saudi context. Still, the researcher could not distinguish cross-culture differences or local culture differences. Given the school counselor s work with a wide range of population groups, presenting issues, theoretical approaches, and modes of delivery, each of which necessitates a unique set of intervention skills (Roth and Fonagy, 2005), it is natural that "Intervention" would have multiple subdimensions that could be difficult to differentiate.

**Limitations:**

Several points should be made about the validity and extrapolation of our findings. First, in order to reduce respondent burden and increase response rate in the initial sample, only bachelors first year students' data were collected. More detailed demographic information would be desirable in future research.

Further testing on these subscales (and all subscales) with independent samples would be required to confirm and validate the study findings. The researcher could expect progressive differentiation of the various aspects of the assessment result with increased experience and knowledge among school couslloers. The researcher also suggests additional psychometric testing to investigate other potential areas of the sample's bias (e.g., gender, cultural differences, level of education, and other countries in the MENA region) to validate and refine the scale using independent and larger samples.

The sample was not designed to represent all types of school counselor s in Saudi Arabia, nor other Arabic-speaking countries, nor did it include school counselor s who have experience and have a license. As a result, confirmation can not be made regarding differences in training programs or the

experience level (differences between students (students who study psychology) and registered counselor s).

**Conclusion**:

The researcher's goal was to develop a self-report assessment to help individuals determine if counselling at school is suitable for the them  and help administration (private and public schools) to recruit eligible candidates for the school counselor  role. The psychometric properties of this study appear to be favorable to the sample.

Future researchers might use this study for educational goals to assess psychological students who discipline in school settings from their placement time to their early career period. In addition, it has the potential to address some of the gaps in the mental health sector in Saudi concept and address ethical and legal competencies among practitioners.

## References:

Alghamdi, N. G., & Riddick, B. (2011). Principals' perceptions of the school counselor role in Saudi Arabia. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling*, *33*(4), 347-360.

Aluede, O., & Adubale, A. A. (2020). School-Based Counselor s' Role as Perceived by Nigerian Counselor s. *Journal of School-Based Counseling Policy and Evaluation*, *2*(1), 56-62.

American School Counselor Association (ASCA). (2022). Ethical standards for school counselors. *The school counselor*.

Amoah, S. A., Kwofie, I., & Kwofie, F. A. A. (2015). The School Counselor and Students' Career Choice in High School: The Assessor's Perspective in a Ghanaian Case. *Journal of Education and Practice*, *6*(23), 57-65.

D'Agostino, A., Schirripa Spagnolo, F., & Salvati, N. (2022). Studying the relationship between anxiety and school achievement: evidence from PISA data. *Statistical Methods & Applications*, *31*(1), 1-20.

Daniels, D. (2013). The role of school counselor s in supporting teaching and learning in schools of skills in the Western Cape.

DeKruyf, L., Auger, R. W., & Trice-Black, S. (2013). The role of school counselors in meeting students' mental health needs: Examining issues of professional identity. *Professional School Counseling*, *16*(5), 2156759X0001600502.

Galassi, J. P. (2017). *Strengths-based school counseling: Promoting student development and achievement*. Routledge.

Joy, R. M., Hesson, J., & Harris, G. (2011). Pre-Service Teacher Perceptions of School Counselor Responsibilites. *Canadian Journal of Counselling and Psychotherapy*, *45*(4).

Low, P. K. (2014). Looking in from the outside: Community counselor s' opinions and attitudes to school counselling in Singapore. *Pastoral Care in Education*, *32*(4), 295-305.

Roth, A. and Fonagy, P. (2005), What Works for Whom: A Critical Review of Psychotherapy Research, Guilford Press, New York, NY

Supriyanto, G., Widiaty, I., Abdullah, A. G., & Yustiana, Y. R. (2019, December). Application expert system career guidance for students. In *Journal of Physics: Conference Series* (Vol. 1402, No. 6, p. 066031). IOP Publishing.

Willys, W. I. L. L. I. A. M. (2017). Factors that influence students' perception of counselor s' roles and functions in institutions of higher learning: A case of universities and colleges in Mount Kenya East region. *Unpublished master's thesis). University of Nairobi, Nairobi, Kenya*.