
Accountability Practice Based On Define Component Among Guidance And Counseling Teachers In Students At Risk Of Dropping Out Intervention Program

Nurulaini Moshidi¹, Ahmad Jazimin Jusoh²

¹*Jabatan Ilmu Pendidikan, Institut Pendidikan Guru Kampus Tengku
Ampuan Afzan*

²*Jabatan Bimbingan dan Kaunseling, Fakulti Pembangunan Manusia,
Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris*

Email : ¹n_nurulaini@yahoo.com, ²jazimin@fpm.upsi.edu.my

ABSTRACT

Students at risk of dropping out intervention program (PIMBC) are an initiative of the Ministry of Education Malaysia (MOE) in addressing the issue of students at risk of dropout. Guidance and Counseling Teachers (GBK) are responsible for planning and implementing this program. Therefore, GBK accountability practices through the define component should be identified in the implementation of PIMBC to achieve program effectiveness. A survey study used to review the level of accountability practices based on gender, duration of service and school location. This study involved 395 GBK people who teach in national secondary schools. Descriptive analysis and inference analysis involving t-test and One-way ANOVA test is used in data analysis. The findings of the study showed that the mean for the define component was 4.03 while the t-test showed that there was a significant difference between the genders. On the other hand, for the duration of service and school location analyzed using one-way ANOVA showed no significant difference. The define component is the basis for GBK in program implementation and is able to influence efforts to achieve the program objectives.

Keywords: *Accountability, Guidance and Counseling Teacher, Students at Risk of Dropping out Intervention Program, Define*

1. INTRODUCTION

The Ministry of Education Malaysia [MOE] (2018) is committed to addressing the issue of students at risk of dropping out by introducing the Student at Risk of Dropping out Intervention Program (PIMBC). Based on a study by the Education Policy Planning and Research Division (BPPDP), KPM (2016) found that a total of 9386 high school students is at high risk of dropping out of the school system and this covers 4.3% of all students in secondary school. This indicates the need for effective intervention to address this issue. Thus, KPM (2018) enforced the Guidelines for Managing Students at Risk of Dropout in

Schools (GPMBC) on 1 June 2018 to help the school manage and conduct intervention programs.

Students at risk of dropping out are defined as students who are in the education system (schooled) but show a high probability of leaving the system before the end of the education period (KPM, 2018). The goal of GPMBC is to ensure that all students remain in the school system until the end of primary and secondary education. GBK has been given the responsibility to plan and implement intervention programs for students at risk of dropout as appropriate based on their respective schools. This proves that GBK plays an important role in the context of national education, especially in the aspect of helping to build student personality.

In meeting this need, it is important that GBK has accountability in the implementation of PIMBC. Currently, school counselors are required to show accountability in the implementation of school counseling programs that are able to help students as well as enhance the professional identity of school counselors (Erford, 2015; Putri, Neviyarni, Ahmad & Syukur, 2018). Therefore, accountability among GBK especially in the implementation of PIMBC should be identified so that the responsibilities given as planners and implementers in PIMBC can be borne further to ensure that the goals of PIMBC are achieved.

2. PROBLEM STATEMENT

Accountability in guidance and counseling services becomes significant in the era of evidence-based practice (Erford, 2015; Studer, 2015; Young & Kaffenberger, 2015). It becomes part of the inevitable demands and needs especially in the implementation of guidance and counseling programs (Gysbers, 2004; Furqon & Aip Badrujaman, 2014). Essentially, the practice of accountability has been discussed for decades especially among school counselors (Baker, 2012; Gysbers, 2004).

In Malaysia, school guidance and counseling services have existed since the 1960s (KPM, 2015). However, there are still problems associated with guidance and counseling services such as not yet showing excellence (Abdul Malek, Nor Junainah & Azizah, 2013); some GBK also do not perform their duties and services effectively (Tengku Elmi Azlina & Noriah, 2014); and lack of studies related to program effectiveness (Fauziah Hanim, Nurul 'Ain & Nazariah, 2015). In fact, guidance and counseling services can be beneficial in helping the school improve school excellence (Tengku Elmi Azlina & Noriah, 2014). This is also supported by Salina and Khairul Azmi (2018) who explained that guidance and counseling services are very beneficial especially to students. GBK has been given the trust and responsibility to plan and implement PIMBC in an effort to address student dropouts in schools to remain in the education system (KPM, 2019).

Therefore, studies related to GBK accountability in the implementation of the program should be conducted. This is because, the implementation of the accountability process is able to help school counselors show how students benefit from the counseling program through the definition of program goals; combine data at the level of manage and deliver; as well as assessing data at the final stage of the program (Studer, 2015; ASCA, 2012). In addition, White (2007) explains that accountability practices are key in determining the effectiveness of school counseling programs. This is because the implementation of accountability is able to help GBK to provide answers to the benefits gained by students in the program participated through the goal define (Studer, 2015; ASCA, 2012).

The define component is an element that needs to be emphasized and linked in implementing intervention programs (Studer, 2015; ASCA, 2012) to ensure accountability practices are implemented carefully to achieve program effectiveness Mizan Adiliah, 2006). In the context of this study, the define component is a step to connect PIMBC with the goals outlined by KPM (2018) and school goals. This means how the program can support the mission of PIMBC and impact on student achievement (Ziomek-Daigle, 2016). Thus, the research question in this discussion is:

1. Is there a significant difference among GBK accountability practices towards the define component in the implementation of PIMBC based on demographic factors?

3. METHODOLOGY

This study is a quantitative study using the survey method. This selection is suitable for comprehensive information and the use of large sample sizes (Chua, 2014). Researchers used a questionnaire to identify the define component in the implementation of PIMBC among GBK in secondary schools. This study was conducted on GBK who teach in national secondary schools throughout Malaysia except the Federal Territory of Labuan and Putrajaya. A total of 395 GBK people were involved in this study and the sample size was determined based on the sample size determinants of Krejcie and Morgan (1970).

This study uses self-constructed instruments by the researcher as well as modified from existing questionnaires. This questionnaire is divided into two parts, namely: Part I: Demographic Information; and Part II: Identify GBK accountability in the implementation of PIMBC based on the define component. The questionnaire instrument used by the researcher was using a five-point Likert scale and was analyzed using SPSS software version 23.0.

Researchers have obtained the validity and reliability of this questionnaire before conducting field research. Face validity was obtained through five GBK people. Muijs (2011) explained that their feedback was acceptable because the study respondents are involved in this population. Amendments were made based on comments received from GBK involved in terms of layout from questionnaires, sentence structure and spelling errors. After that, the content validity was carried out by involving seven experts from various fields related to this study. These findings were analyzed using Content Validity Index (CVI) and obtained S-CVI/Ave value 0.97 while S-CVI/UA was 0.85. Both of these values are accepted based on the CVI value accepted for six to eight experts is ≥ 0.83 (Lynn, 1986). Next, the validity of the construct was carried out involving 100 respondents and the sample size was sufficient (Hair, Black, Babin & Anderson, 2010). Exploration Factor Analysis (EFA) was conducted to confirm all the components found in this questionnaire. Preliminary Analysis obtained a KMO value of .781 while Bartlett's Test of Sphericity 0.00, which is a significant value and less than .05. Based on item analysis by component, all items are retained. Furthermore, reliability is also obtained with the overall value of Cronbach's Alpha is .973 which is at a very high level (Creswell, 2014; Mohd Majid, 2009).

4. FINDINGS

Descriptive Analysis of Define Components

Table 1 show the mean scores and standard deviations for each found in this definition component. The results of the study showed that all items, namely the nine items, recorded a mean interpretation at a high level (mean 4.03, sp; .64). Item A.1.7 - refer to the Code of

Ethics for Guidance and Counseling Services as a consideration in carrying out duties (mean 4.25; sp .747) while item A.1.4 - using the flow chart of managing students at risk of dropping out provided by the MOE get the lowest mean score of 3.87 (sp .866).

Table 1
Mean Score Item for Define Component (Step 1: Mission)

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation
A.1.1 adapt PIMBC goals to school needs.	4.13	.773
A.1.2 designing PIMBC.	4.01	.784
A.1.3 implement PIMBC.	3.96	.818
A.1.4 using the flow chart of managing students at risk of dropping out provided by the MOE.	3.87	.866
A.1.5 put the issue of students at risk of dropping out as the main focus in conducting counseling sessions.	3.93	.855
A.1.6 implement PIMBC in a focused counseling program.	3.96	.845
A.1.7 refer to the Code of Ethics for Guidance and Counseling Services as a consideration in carrying out duties.	4.25	.747
A.1.8 refer to the Guidelines for Student at Risk of Dropping Out.	4.15	.757
A.1.9 refer to the Prevention and Intervention Management Manual for Dropouts: Highlight Self-Excellence (SUDI 2.0).	4.04	.819

Inference Analysis for Define Components

Inference analysis in this study involved t-test and One-way ANOVA test. Findings are classified according to objectives and detailed according to research hypotheses.

Ho1 There is no significant difference in the define component based on gender.

Table 2 shows the results of t-test differences in the define components based on the gender of the respondents. It was found that there was a significant difference in the define component between male respondents compared to female respondents $t(393) = .227, p < 0.5$. Thus, the Ho1 hypothesis stating that there was no significant difference in the define component based on gender, was rejected. The findings also show that the define component for male respondents (mean = 2.19 and standard deviation = 0.880) is higher than female respondents (mean = 2.17 and standard deviation = 0.776).

Table 2
Difference Define Components Based on Gender

Domain	Gender	N	Mean	SP	dk	t
Define	Male	96	2.19	0.880	393	0.227*
	Female	299	2.17	0.776		

* $p < 0.5$

Ho2 There is no significant difference in the define component based on the duration of service.

Table 3 shows the results of One-way ANOVA of differences in the define component based on the duration of service. The findings found that there was no significant difference in the define component based on the duration of service which is $F(2, 392) = 1.518, p > 0.001$. Therefore, the Ho2 hypothesis stating that there is no significant difference in the define component based on the duration of service, is accepted.

Table 3
Difference Define Components Based on the Duration of Service

Variable	Source	Total Squared	dk	Mean Squared	F
Define	Between Group	1.947	2	0.973	1.518
	In Group	251.264	392	0.641	

** $p < 0.001$

Ho3 There was no significant difference in the define component based on school location.

Table 4 shows that there is no significant difference in the define component based on school location which is $F(2, 392) = 1.371, p > 0.001$. Therefore, the Ho3 hypothesis stating that there is no significant difference in the define component based on school location, is accepted.

Table 4
Differences of Define Components Based on School Location

Variable	Source	Total Squared	dk	Mean Squared	F
Define	Between Group	1.759	2	0.88	1.371
	In Group	251.451	392	0.641	

** $p < 0.001$

5. DISCUSSION

The define component is the first component in looking at GBK accountability practices in the implementation of PIMBC. The main aspect of this component is related to the guidelines that need to be known and followed by GBK before the implementation of PIMBC. In the context of this study, the define component refers to the goal of PIMBC linked to the school's mission in dealing with dropout students guided by the Code of Ethics for Guidance and Counseling Services (KPM, 2015), GPMBC (KPM, 2018) and the Prevention and Intervention Management Manual for Dropouts: Highlight Self-Excellence (SUDI 2.0) (KPM, 2019).

GBK's understanding of relating the guidelines provided helps GBK to build a mission that is in line between the PIMBC mission and the school mission. This is important so that the program conducted can have an impact on student success (Ziomek-Daigle, 2016). Based on

the findings of the study obtained shows that GBK has implemented PIMBC by linking the goals of PIMBC with the needs of students in schools. At the same time, GBK has ensured that the initial steps of the implementation of PIMBC are carried out in a structured, systematic and effective manner to stay focused and on track (Putri et al., 2018). If GBK does not refer to and understand the guidelines required in implementing the program then it is difficult for GBK to carry out its duties responsibly.

Based on the findings of the study, there are significant differences between male and female GBK. Male GBK acquires higher define component accountability practices than female GBK. As Bandura (1996) study states that the accountability practice is related to self-efficacy that is seriousness in planning, strategizing and performing tasks efficiently. This is in line with the study of Aida Nubailah Noor, Salleh Amat and Abu Yazid Abu Bakar (2018) who showed that male GBK self-efficacy is higher self-efficacy than female GBK.

In terms of the service period, no significant differences were shown. This, in contrast to the study of Bakar, Mohamed and Zakaria (2011) which shows that senior counselors have a more positive work value than new counselors. However, these findings show that GBK's ability to understand the guidelines and making references in the implementation of PIMBC has nothing to do with the GBK service period. The same goes for school locations whether urban, rural or rural. No significant differences were noted. In line with the study of Bakar et al. (2011) who found that the work value of GBK is not influenced by the place of service of the GBK.

Sabella and Booker (2003) state that school counseling programs are part of the school's mission to assist in the development of students. Therefore, define component is very important to use so that each of the school counselors is able to adapt their counseling program to meet the needs of specific students in their school (Erford, 2015). The findings of this study are also in line with the Manchelah (2017) study related to GBK can produce program planning in line with the mission and objectives of the school. This define component is important because without a clear mission based on the needs of the students themselves it is difficult for GBK to provide the needs of the program as well as the programs implemented less give the expected impact (Manchelah, 2017).

6 . CONCLUSION

GBK is able to assist in reducing dropout rates (White & Kelly, 2010) by designing intervention programs from an early stage that is to link program goals with student needs. This process is in fact part of the accountability practices that at once become GBK more efficient and can improve student outcomes (Paolini, 2015). It is also explained in Badrujaman (2011) that accountability is a situation where GBK is able to explain the process of implementation of a program and the results achieved in the program it manages. Therefore, this issue needs to be studied as efforts to reduce the risk of dropouts are dependent on the implementation of effective programs involving accountability strategies (Wehrman, Williams, Field & Schroeder, 2010). If the problem of students at risk of dropping out is carried out without effective strategies a negative impact both short-term and long-term period (Battin-Pearson et al., 2000; De Witte et al., 2013; Wilkins & Bost, 2015; Adelman & Székely, 2016; Lovelace, Reschly & Appleton, 2017; Ripamonti, 2017; Blazer & Hernandez, 2018; KPM, 2018; Tabuchi et al., 2018).

7. REFERENCE

- [1] Abdul Malek Abdul Rahman, Nor Junainah Mohd Isa & Azizah Atan (2013). A Guidance and Counseling Model Practiced Within Malaysian Schools. *International Journal of Education and Research*, Vol. 1 No. 4 April 2013.
- [2] Adelman, M. & Székely, M. (2016). School Dropout in Central America: An Overview of Trends, Causes, Consequences and Promising Interventions. *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 7561*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.
- [3] Aida Nubailah Noor, Salleh Amat & Abu Yazid Abu Bakar (2018). Efikasi Kendiri Kaunseling dan Kecekapan Kaunseling Pelbagai Budaya dalam Kalangan Guru Bimbingan dan Kaunseling Sekolah Menengah di Malaysia. *Jurnal Psikoedukasi dan Konseling*, 2(2), 14-21.
- [4] American School Counselor Association (2012). *ASCA National Model: A framework for school counseling programs* (3rd ed.). Alexandria, VA: Author.
- [5] American School Counselor Association (2019). *ASCA National Model*. Diperoleh daripada <https://www.schoolcounselor.org/school-counselors-members/asca-national-model>.
- [6] Badrujaman, A. (2011). *Evaluasi Program Bimbingan dan Kaunseling*. Jakarta: PT Indeks.
- [7] Bahagian Perancangan dan Penyelidikan Dasar Pendidikan, Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia (2016). *Perangkaan Pendidikan Malaysia 2016*. Penerbitan Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia.
- [8] Bakar, A. R., Mohamed, S., & Zakaria, N. S. (2011). Work Values of Malaysian School Counselors: It's Implication on School Counseling. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 7, 456-461.
- [9] Baker, S. B. (2012). *A new view of evidence-based practice. Counseling Today*. Alexandria, VA: American Counselor Association.
- [10] Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84 (2), 191-215.
- [11] Battin-Pearson, S., Newcomb, M., Abbott, R., Hill, K., Catalano, R., & Hawkins, J. (2000). Predictors of early high school dropout: A test of five theories. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 92(3), 568-582. doi: 10.1037//0022-0663.92.3.568
- [12] Blazer, C. & Hernandez, G. V. (2018). Student Dropout: Risk Factors, Impact of Prevention Programs, and Effective Strategies. *Research Services, Miami-Dade County Public Schools, Research Brief. Volume 1708*. Diperoleh daripada <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED587683>
- [13] Budenz, D. C. (2012). *Accountability practices of pennsylvania school counselors* (Order No. 3515463). Diperoleh daripada <https://search-proquest-com.ezpustaka2.upsi.edu.my/docview/1022083671?accountid=13155>
- [14] Chua, Y. P. (2014). *Kaedah dan Statistik Penyelidikan Buku 1* (Edisi ketiga). Kuala Lumpur: McGraw-Hill.
- [15] Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.
- [16] De Witte, K., Cabus, S., Thyssen, G., Groot, W. & Van den Brink, H. M. (2013). A critical review of the literature on school dropout. *Educational Research Review*, 10, 13–28. doi:10.1016/j.edurev.2013.05.002

- [17] Edwards, L. (2009). *Accountability practices of school counselors* (Order No. 3365533). Diperoleh daripada <https://search-proquest.com.ezpustaka2.upsi.edu.my/docview/304829820?accountid=13155>
- [18] Erford, B. T. (2015). *Transforming the school counseling profession* (4th ed.). Boston: Pearson.
- [19] Fauziah Hanim Jalal, Nurul'Ain Daud & Nazariah Abd Samad (2015). Kesan Program Pembangunan Sahsiah Terhadap Pembentukan Karakter Pelajar. *Jurnal Bitara Edisi Khas, Vol. 8*.
- [20] Furqon & Badrujaman, A. (2011). *Model Evaluasi Layanan Dasar Berorientasi Akuntabilitas*. Jakarta: PT Indeks.
- [21] Gysbers, N. C. (2004). Comprehensive Guidance and Counseling Programs: The Evolution of Accountability. *Professional School Counseling, 8*, 1–14.
- [22] Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J. & Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate Data Analysis* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- [23] Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia (2015). *Panduan Pelaksanaan Perkhidmatan Bimbingan dan Kaunseling Di Sekolah Rendah dan Menengah* (Keempat). Putrajaya, Malaysia: Bahagian Pengurusan Sekolah Harian, Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia.
- [24] Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia (2018). Bilangan 4 Tahun 2018. Garis panduan mengurus murid berisiko cicir di sekolah. Diperolehi <https://www.moe.gov.my/images/KPM/ZOOupload/SPI%20BIL%204%20TAHUN%202018-1.pdf>.
- [25] Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia (2019). *Manual Pengurusan Pencegahan dan Intervensi Murid Berisiko Cicir: SUDI 2.0*. Kuala Lumpur: Bahagian Pengurusan Sekolah Harian, KPM.
- [26] Krejcie, R.V. & Morgan, D.W. (1970). *Determining sample size for research activities*. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 30*, 607-610.
- [27] Lovelace, M. D., Reschly, A. L. & Appleton, J. J. (2017). Beyond School Records: The Value of Cognitive and Affective Engagement in Predicting Dropout and On-Time Graduation. *Professional School Counseling, 21*(1), 1096–2409–21.1. doi:10.5330/1096-2409-21.1.70
- [28] Lynn, M. R. (1986). Determination and Quantification of Content Validity. *Nursing Research, 35*(6), 382–385. <http://doi.org/10.1097/00006199-198611000-00017>
- [29] Mad Islaihi Sabdari (2016). *Kompetensi Guru Bimbingan dan Kaunseling Berpandukan Model Pengurusan Perkhidmatan Bimbingan dan Kaunseling Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia*. Tesis Sarjana tidak diterbitkan. Tanjong Malim: Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris.
- [30] Mancheloh, N. (2017) *Keberkesanan perkhidmatan bimbingan dan kaunseling sekolah menengah di Malaysia*. Tesis PhD tidak diterbitkan. Kuala Lumpur: Universiti Malaya.
- [31] Mizan Adiliah Ahmad Ibrahim (2006). *Pelaksanaan perkhidmatan bimbingan dan kaunseling di sekolah*. Shah Alam: Cerdik Publications.
- [32] Mohd Majid Konting (2009). *Kaedah penyelidikan pendidikan*. Edisi Kelapan. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- [33] Muijs, D. (2011). *Doing Quantitative Research in Education with SPSS* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications Ltd: London.
- [34] Pallant, J. (2010). *SPSS survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS* (4th Ed.). Maidenhead: Open University Press/McGraw-Hill.

- [35] Paolini, A. C. (2015). Impact of accountability measures on perceived counselor self-efficacy and student outcomes. Diperoleh daripada https://www.counseling.org/docs/default-source/vistas/impact-of-accountability-measures-on-perceived-counselor-self-efficacy-and-student-outcomes.pdf?sfvrsn=16417f2c_8
- [36] Putri, M. A., Neviyarni, N., Ahmad, R. & Syukur, Y. (2018). Guidance and Counseling in School Accountability. *ENLIGHTEN (Jurnal Bimbingan Dan Konseling Islam)*, 1(2), 108-117. <https://doi.org/10.32505/enlighten.v1i2.731>
- [37] Ripamonti, E. (2017). Risk Factors for Dropping out of High School: A Review of Contemporary, International Empirical Research. *Adolescent Research Review*, 3(3), 321-338. doi: 10.1007/s40894-017-0075-y
- [38] Robinson, S. B. & Leornard, K. F. (2019). *Designing quality survey questions*. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- [39] Sabella, R. & Booker, B. (2003). Using technology to promote your guidance and counseling program among stakeholders. *Professional School Counseling*, 6(3), 206-214.
- [40] Stone, C. B., & Dahir, C. A. (2007). *School Counselor Accountability: A MEASURE of Student Success*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Merrill Prentice Hall.
- [41] Studer, J. R. (2015). *The essential school counselor in a changing society*. Los Angeles: SAGE.
- [42] Tabuchi, T., Fujihara, S., Shinozaki, T., & Fukuhara, H. (2018). Determinants of High-School Dropout: A Longitudinal Study in a Deprived Area of Japan. *Journal of Epidemiology*. doi:10.2188/jea.je20170163
- [43] Tengku Elmi Azlina Tengku Muda & Noriah Mohd Ishak (2014). Kepimpinan Ketua Guru Bimbingan dan Kaunseling: Implikasi kepada Peningkatan Keberkesanan Perkhidmatan Bimbingan dan Kaunseling Sekolah Menengah. *International Research Management and Innovation Conference, Kuala Lumpur*, 469-488.
- [44] Topdemir, C. M. (2010). *School counselor accountability practices: A national study* (Order No. 3432669). Diperoleh daripada <https://search-proquest.com.ezpustaka2.upsi.edu.my/docview/822142567?accountid=13155>
- [45] Wehrman, J. D., Williams, R., Field, J. & Schroeder, S. D. (2010). Accountability through documentation: What are best practices for school counselors? *Journal of School Counseling*, 8(38), 1-23.
- [46] White, F. A. (2007). The professional school counselor's challenge: Accountability. *Journal of Professional Counseling: Practice, Theory & Research*, 3, 62-70.
- [47] White, S. & Kelly, F. (2010). The School Counselor's Role in School Dropout Prevention. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 88(2), 227-235. doi: 10.1002/j.1556-6678.2010.tb00014.
- [48] Wilkins, J. & Bost, L. W. (2015). Dropout Prevention in Middle and High Schools. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, 51(5), 267-275. doi:10.1177/1053451215606697
- [49] Young, A. & Kaffenberger, C. (2015). School Counseling Professional Development: Assessing the use of Data to Inform School Counseling Services. *Professional School Counseling*, 19(1), 1096-2409-19.1. doi:10.5330/1096-2409-19.1.46
- [50] Ziomek-Daigle, J. (2016). *School Counseling Classroom Guidance: Prevention, Accountability and Outcomes*. Los Angeles London: SAGE.