

School Guidance and Counseling in an International Context: A Reaction Paper

Patrick S. Y. Lau

The Chinese University of Hong Kong

Suk-Chun Fung

The Hong Kong Institute of Education

This article discusses three articles on the development of school guidance and counseling in an international context. The development of school guidance work as well as issues that arose in two Asian countries, Japan and South Korea, are presented by Yagi (2008) and Lee and Yang (2008) whereas Gysbers (2008) presents the rationale, practice, and results of the implementation of individual student planning in the United States. An overview of the articles suggests that there is continuous development in the positive, strength-based approach to school counseling in place of the traditional deficit and remedial approach. The issue of resources which include human resources, financial resources, and political resources (Gysbers & Henderson, 2006) is also discussed because of its importance and relevance to the development of school guidance and counseling in recent decades.

The preparation of this article was partly funded by the Hong Kong Research Grant Council (HKU 7453/06H). Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Patrick S. Y. Lau, Department of Educational Psychology, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shatin, N.T., Hong Kong, China. E-mail: patricklau@cuhk.edu.hk

This article attempts to discuss the three articles on the development of school counseling in an international context. Yagi (2008) and Lee and Yang (2008) review the development of school counseling in two Asian countries, Japan and South Korea. Gysbers (2008) presents the rationale, practice, and results of the implementation of individual student planning in the United States. In this article, we support a positive and strength-based orientation to school counseling. Such an orientation can provide school counselors, educators, parents, and students with a focus on human strengths rather than deficits. In South Korea, the introduction of school counselors marked a step forward in the development of school counseling. Schools now could design, implement, and evaluate preventive interventions by professional counselors. In Japan, the introduction of school social worker gave rise to the discussion of licensure restructuring of school counselors. It provides a good opportunity to change the traditional deficit focus of counseling in Japan to a strength-based approach. The United States, contrary to the two Asian countries, could be regarded as a forerunner in the development of strength-based counseling in schools. The implementation and documentation of individual student planning signifies a step forward in the realm of school counseling.

In reviewing the development of school counseling in the United States, South Korea, and Japan, it is encouraging to see that there is continuous development in the positive, strength-based approach to school counseling. In this article, we attempt to look at the three articles written by Gysbers (2008), Lee and Yang (2008) and Yagi (2008) respectively. Then an integrated discussion on the trend of the development of school counseling in an international context is followed. This article concludes by discussing the issue of resources which include human resources, financial resources, and political resources (Gysbers & Henderson, 2006) in terms of their importance and relevance to the development of school guidance and counseling in recent decades.

Individual Student Planning in the United States

Gysbers (2008) asserted that comprehensive guidance and counseling programs are rapidly replacing the traditional position-service orientation in the United States. The past sophisticated program components have been translating into practical and workable programs in schools (Gysbers, 2001). At the same time, literature on the rationale and framework of comprehensive guidance and counseling programs are increasing. However, the implementation of individual student planning, which is one of the four program components of a comprehensive guidance program, is rarely documented. How could the good wishes of “helping all students become the persons they are capable of becoming” (Gysbers & Henderson, 2001, p. 251) be achieved in schools? This important question remains unanswered until Gysbers described in detail how individual student planning is implemented in the United States. Gysbers’ article not only supplements the literature of individual student planning in comprehensive guidance programs, but also substantiates the literature of the development of strength-based counseling in school contexts.

According to Gysbers and Henderson (2001), individual student planning aims to assist students to develop, analyze, evaluate, and carry out their educational, occupational, and personal goals and plans. It assumes that every individual possesses his or her potentials and strengths for positive and healthy development. “Individual appraisal,” “individual advisement,” and “transition planning” are three main strategies involved in individual student planning. By definition, “individual appraisal” refers to the process of helping students assess and interpret their abilities, interests, skills, and achievements by using test information and other data (Cobia & Henderson, 2003). “Individual advisement” refers to the process of helping students plan for and realize their goals by using self-appraisal information and personal-social, academic,

career and labor marketing information (Cobia & Henderson, 2003). By “transition planning,” Gysbers (2008) means “School counselors ... help students make the transition from school to work or to additional education and training” (p. 124).

These three strategies are important because students could prepare better for the future if they can understand themselves in wider and more objective perspectives. Zimmerman, Bandura, and Martinez-Pons (1992) stressed the importance of self-efficacy. They stated that “perceived self-efficacy influences the level of goal challenge people set for themselves, the amount of effort they mobilize, and their persistence in the face of difficulties” (p. 664). Similarly, according to social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1986), goals specify the requirements for personal success, enhancing one’s cognitive and affective responses to performance accomplishments. Here, however, one may ask: how could this program component of individual student planning be translated into workable program activities in the school context? In his article, Gysbers (2008) presented four examples to illustrate what individual student planning could look like in action. For example, time is provided for regular individual work with students as well as group sessions focusing on individual student planning. It is undoubtedly true that the setting of time schedule for individual student planning is a major concern of school counselors and other educational personnel. The Student Education and Occupation Plan (SEOP) of the Granite School District in Utah provides a “3 × 4 plan” while the Navigation 101 of Franklin Pierce School District in Washington provides time schedule for group planning. Students benefited by meeting school counselors on an individual basis plus group sessions to explore and evaluate their academic, career, and personal/social development.

Other than these, students could benefit from other positive impacts of individual student planning. Goal setting is one of the examples.

When students are aided to set goals, hope is instilled in them. As Smith (2006) stated, “hope is a cornerstone of strength-based counseling because hope is a buffer against mental illness” (p. 42). Besides, the sense of purpose could also be strengthened in the process of setting personal goals. In the study of Zimmerman et al. (1992), self-efficacy and goals in combination contribute to subsequent academic attainments. The researchers found that students who perceived themselves as capable of regulating their own activities strategically are more confident in mastering academic subjects and attaining better academic performance. Similarly, Gysbers (2008) presented the results of implementing individual student planning from some empirical work. In several recent studies, students are found to attain academic success through individual student planning.

Gysbers (2008) also emphasized that individual student planning does not stand alone. Rather, it is an integral part of the whole comprehensive guidance and counseling program. Guidance curriculum and individual student planning should be supporting each other, helping students formulate their future planning by understanding more about themselves and acquiring life skills that are essential for functional living and work.

Although some successful experiences of implementing individual student planning in the United States are reported by Gysbers (2008), the challenges and limitations of the implementation can be elaborated more. For example, the SEOP “3 × 4 plan” (three individual planning meetings with each student and four classroom guidance activities) turned out to have the result of “95% of the students met at least once with their school counselor” (Gysbers, 2008, p. 130). The high percentage of 95% may pose a challenge financially because to do so involves a great sum of money. Financial issues as such could have better been addressed so that school guidance program administrators

could understand, predict, and deal with some possible problems that may surface during the course.

On the other hand, the proposal of time allocation for individual student planning by Gysbers and Henderson (2006) deserves accreditation because it exemplifies the integration of theory and practice. They suggested that 5–10% of total counselor time could be spent on individual student planning in elementary schools whereas 15–25% on junior high school and 25–35% on high school. Such distributions do not only allow flexibility on the counselors' part and comprehensive guidance programs overall, they also take into consideration the growing needs of students for individual planning in different areas as they mature in age. In sum, the suggestions are practical and useful enough for school counselors to carry out individual student planning in real school contexts.

School Counseling in South Korea

The development of school counseling in South Korea seems to be quite rapid these years, as reflected by the growing number of school counselors. While it is encouraging that full-time school counselor positions were established in the schools in 2005 and that setting up a tenure system provides better job security for school counselors, their work environment, however, was found to be quite undesirable. For example, training for counseling personnel did not seem to be sufficient enough. Teachers and school administrators might lack a comprehensive understanding of counseling knowledge. Besides, heavy workload, role ambiguity, and lack of coordination among school staff caused more difficulties to the school counseling professionals. As guidance and counseling is still seen as ancillary-support service in South Korea, school counselors, therefore, are placed mainly in remedial-reactive roles. Guidance and counseling work, as a result, is not the mainstream in the realm of education.

Throughout the article of Lee and Yang (2008), the urge for a paradigm shift in guidance and counseling from a remedial approach to a preventive and strength-based orientation is apparent. In discussing the school counseling model issues in South Korea, Lee and Yang pointed out that the remedial model raises questions about effectiveness and fairness. It is true that the problem-based model of school counseling focuses on giving assistance to students who have psychological and behavioral problems. The majority of students who do not exhibit problems, therefore, are not benefited from the counseling service. This is certainly not fair and effective. According to Lee and Yang, “effectiveness” should be viewed from a school-based perspective. In addition, if we adopt a student-based perspective and emphasize problem prevention, guidance and counseling programs would be even more comprehensive. As reported by Kolbe, Collins, and Cortese (1997), lifestyle and addictive behaviors (e.g., lack of physical exercise, tobacco use) that begin early in life could lead to major, costly health problems in adults. Therefore, early preventive interventions with children and youth are very much needed.

In fact, the idea of “prevention” is not new. It was the theme of the American Psychological Association Convention in 1998. Romano and Hage (2000) stated that prevention could be conceptualized from wellness, well-being, health promotion, and resilience perspectives. Following their idea, schools in South Korea could adopt the comprehensive guidance program model that emphasizes preventive and developmental programs in schools. Building skills and assets of students that promote positive human development could be a right direction in the development of school counseling in South Korea.

Current Development in School Counseling in Japan

Yagi (2008) pointed out that a clinical model is now adopted in school counseling in Japan. School counselors in Japan are licensed

clinical psychologists who have received professional training in handling case work, particularly clinical cases. This, however, may pose some problems because these school counselors would use psychotherapy to work with students with behavioral and/or emotional problems. This deficit focus may prevent school counselors and other school personnel from viewing students in a positive light (Benard, 1991; Epstein, Rudolph, & Epstein, 2000). Moreover, school counselors do not have any internship in a school setting when they are being trained. This is definitely an undesirable scene in the development of school guidance and counseling. For children and youth, school is their key micro-system (Bronfenbrenner, 1979). Counselors could not know students well and carry out their counseling work effectively if they do not have a good understanding of the school context and cultures. Third, school counselors stay only for eight hours or even less in a school every week. Students and teachers would not have enough opportunity to contact the school counselors. On the one hand, they are experts; on the other hand, they are strangers to the school. With such time constraint, school counselors are unable to establish good and trusting relationship with people in the schools. A likely consequence is that school counseling does not develop favorably enough in Japan.

In spite of the challenges facing school counselors in Japan, it is good to see that school counselors could work closely with teachers to promote students' psychological health and mental well-being alike when they have gained more experience. Yagi (2008) reviewed the related documents and summarized that "School counselors now play integral and vital roles in counseling students and parents, providing consultation to parents and teachers, and lending support to a healthy school climate" (p. 145). This quotation implies a change in school counseling work in Japan which is similar to the situation in South Korea. The traditional focus on problems and pathology should shift to a model that stresses strengths and assets. This echoes Seligman's (1998)

assertion that “Psychology is not just the study of weakness and damage, it is also the study of strength and virtue. Treatment is not just fixing what is broken, it is nurturing what is best within ourselves” (para. 5).

Some strengths are observed in school counseling in Japan, especially in the realm of human resources. According to Yagi (2008), several pupil personnel are collaborating in the school context. They are: (a) a homeroom teacher who is to provide frontline guidance and counseling to students on issues related to their academic, personal, and social development; (b) a number of teachers-in-charge of different specific guidance areas who are to assist classroom teachers with students’ discipline and educational life, personal and social problems, and difficulties in academic studies; and (c) school nurses who are to provide health services as well as psychological treatment to students. These school personnel are all key allies to the school counselors.

To develop a positive and strength-based model in school counseling in Japan such as the comprehensive guidance program model, manpower must be one of the major concerns to truly address the needs of all students. In this regard, the strength in human resources appears to be a favorable factor in the midst of changes in school counseling in Japan. With the introduction of the comprehensive guidance program model, the role of each personnel could be clearer. For example, teachers are mainly program deliverer whereas school counselors are primarily involved in the design, implementation, and evaluation of the programs. In recent years, it is encouraging that the guidance role of class teachers is being recognized in Japan. Both pre-service and in-service class teachers are receiving training in the area of guidance and counseling. As class teachers are primary caretakers of children and youth, they could be the right persons to deliver strength-based programs to students. They could also be good partners of school counselors to implement individual student planning with students.

The Trend of the Development of School Counseling in an International Context

Based on a review of the three articles on school counseling in the United States, South Korea, and Japan, some observations can be made about the trend of the development of school counseling in an international context. These observations include: (a) from non-professionals to professionals; (b) from position to program; and (c) from a remedial orientation to a preventive and developmental orientation.

From Non-professionals to Professionals

In Japan and South Korea, the requirements for school counseling personnel have become more stringent. These two countries have been striving for the establishment of formal positions of professionally trained school counseling and guidance personnel for years. For example, in South Korea, school counselors were initially disciplinary guidance teachers. Although their title was changed to career counseling teachers in 1990, their roles were more or less the same. They were even given teaching assignments like other regular teachers. Worse still, senior teachers could apply for counseling teacher positions after they have taken two to three related courses. The lack of understanding of the nature of counseling and related job skills made them unprepared for the work as school counseling professionals. Fortunately, in 2004, the need for full-time specialist in guidance and counseling was advocated. In 2005, more than 300 full-time, registered school counselors were appointed in schools. These counselors are more professional as they were trained formally as “professional school counseling teachers,” having the skills and expertise to carry out guidance and counseling in the school context. This is a positive change from non-professionals to professionals in the development of school counseling in South Korea.

In Japan, guidance and counseling in schools were initially taken up by clinical psychologists. However, as they did not receive internship

training in schools, they lacked understanding of the school personnel and cultures. In recent years, they have to receive training to earn enough credits to keep up their credentials as school counselors. This is a positive move because guidance work is handled by experts who are familiar with the school context. In addition to clinical psychologists, class teachers are important personnel in guidance work because pre-service and in-service training is given to them. They may study student cases, refer problem cases to guidance teachers, and learn how to counsel from their peers. In 2008, social workers were introduced to schools to assist guidance and counseling work. These show that Japan is undergoing a struggle as to who is the best professional to carry out guidance and counseling work in schools.

As for the United States, Gysbers (2008) has described the recent development of individual student planning in his article. He emphasized that individual student planning is not only collection of students' records, be they hard or soft copies. Rather, students need to be contacted either on an individual or a group level on which they can share their needs and goals with the school counselor. Although Gysbers did not explicitly state the need for more professional school personnel, the practice he described can show that school counseling work is carried out by trained, qualified professionals well-informed of the counseling practice and ethics in the United States.

From Position to Program

Gysbers (2008) posited that to make school guidance work effective, emphasis should be placed on the implementation of school guidance as a program on the whole rather than the sheer establishment of the school counselor position. In the 1970s and 1980s, three models of school counseling and guidance work that shared the same emphasis were devised (Gysbers, 2001). In one of the models, Myrick (1997) delineated the characteristics of developmental guidance and counseling work.

They included: (a) provision of programs for all students; (b) guidance curriculum be organized, planned, sequential and flexible; (c) all school personnel be involved.

The second model, developed by Johnson and Johnson (1991) in the 1980s, emphasized the development of students' competency. The acquisition of competencies by all students was the major concern.

The third model, developed by Gysbers and Moore (1981) in the 1970s, was a comprehensive guidance program model. It consisted of an organizational structure which includes content (competencies), organizational framework (structural components and program components), and resources (human, financial, and political). In practice, different time compositions should be allocated to the four program components (i.e., guidance curriculum, individual student planning, responsive services, and system support) according to students' levels and their developmental needs.

In sum, the three models provide us with some perspectives on the reorientation of school guidance and counseling from a problem-based approach to a strength-based approach, from a remedial mode to a preventive and developmental mode, from position to program, as well as from a single focus on responsive services to a comprehensive focus on guidance curriculum, individual student planning, responsive services, and system support.

With these in mind, we can evaluate the positions of school counselors and the implementation of school guidance work as a program in both Japan and South Korea. From the articles, we see that the school guidance position was established in Japan in 1995, 10 years earlier than that of South Korea. However, as school counselors are clinical psychologists who mainly deliver responsive services in schools, it can be anticipated that this approach could only cater for the needs

of a few students whereas a broad range of developmental, experiential, and transitional issues of other children and youth is not addressed.

While school personnel are providing different services to students in the areas of educational, personal and social, career as well as physical issues, the effectiveness of the services, however, is quite limited because there is a lack of cooperation and collaboration among the colleagues. With the setup of the guidance curriculum, what they are doing now could become more organized, planned and sequentially preventive programs. It is encouraging that schools in Japan receive community support as well. The setup of the school counselor system and the collaboration with the Chambers of Commerce and Industry, school boards of education, the community support teams and non-profit-making organizations that work with children and youth plus law enforcement are evidence of system supports as well as financial and political resources. These could be favorable conditions to implement comprehensive and integrative guidance program in schools in Japan.

As for South Korea, the position of school counselors was established in 2005. School counselors' training and role identity issues are still the main concerns at the moment. As stated by Lee and Yang (2008), South Korea can follow the example of the United States to put stronger emphasis on the development of school guidance work as a program in the long run. Adopting the model of comprehensive school guidance program can be an appropriate and feasible direction to develop school counseling work in South Korea.

From a Remedial Orientation to a Preventive and Developmental Orientation

According to Yagi (2008) and Lee and Yang (2008), school counseling and guidance work seems to be moving from a remedial orientation to one that emphasizes more on the strengths of students in

both Japan and South Korea. This is like the development of school guidance in the United States, where emphasis was first put in resolving students' career-related issues and other learning and behavioral problems, then later to guidance activities which are more preventive and developmental in nature that emphasize students' strengths and assets.

In the United States, the Comprehensive Developmental Program approach began to emerge to respond to the call for a reorientation. What began with the appointment of teachers to the position of vocational counselor has become a program. This framework has become the major structure of organizing and managing guidance in the schools of the United States (Gysbers, 2001). The level of implementation of guidance programs varies from one school to another. Among the four program components, individual student planning seems to be the most difficult to be implemented. It is because there is a great demand on human resources to carry out effective individual student planning. Although literature on individual student planning is not very substantial in the field of school counseling, Gysbers's (2008) article does provide us with some updated and valuable information on the implementation of individual student planning in the United States.

At present, individual student planning exemplifies an integration of theory and practice, as demonstrated by the four examples quoted in the article. Gysbers (2008) described a number of recent studies which indicate substantial impact on students' success in schools through individual student planning. In sum, Gysbers acknowledged the positive impacts of the comprehensive guidance program on the whole and individual student planning activities in particular, which could help students identify their endowed talents and capabilities, striving to make the most of these to live a meaningful and rewarding life.

There is continuous development in the guidance curriculum. Gysbers

(2001) described that guidance curriculum typically consists of competencies and structured activities which span systematically from kindergarten to Grade 12. In recent years, different systemic and integrative models for the implementation of school-based prevention programs have been devised. One of these conceptual frameworks is “Developmental-Contextualism” (Walsh, Galassi, Murphy, & Park-Taylor, 2002). According to this perspective, both the personal and contextual aspects of the person-environment relationship are considered in school guidance programs because “Within this newer perspective, a developing person not only affects his or her contexts, but the context also affects the person’s course of development” (Walsh et al., 2002, p. 686).

Besides individual student planning and the guidance curriculum, responsive service is another core component of the comprehensive guidance program (Gysbers & Henderson, 2001). As Seligman (1998) suggested, approaches to helping people have been changing. There is also a trend to conduct diagnostic activities and personal counseling with a positive, strength-based orientation. Morrison, Brown, D’Incau, O’Farrell, and Furlong (2006) stated “A focus on strengths represents a different perspective on how to conceptualize student adaptation to school” (p. 20). Morrison et al. presented an interview format to organize and collect information about students’ strengths and protective factors in their personal and contextual domains. Student, parents, and teachers are all informants. They will be asked interview questions in the five areas of “Individual Assets,” “Family Assets,” “Peer Assets,” “Classroom Assets,” and “School Assets.” Questions like “Do you have any ideas about what you want to be when you grow up?” (for students), “How do you participate in or help at your child’s school?” (for parents) or “What are the rules and procedures in class? How do the rules help students to learn?” (for teachers) will be asked. By collecting information about family, peer, classroom, and school

assets, school counselors could form a picture of the availability of protective factors that can become the basis for developing interventions.

Other than this, different strength-based counseling models have appeared. As Seligman (1998) stated, “Treatment is not just fixing what is broken, it is nurturing what is best within ourselves” (para. 5). Carl Rogers, the founder of Person-Centered Therapy, had a strikingly different view on the development of persons and the role of counseling and psychotherapy. Rogers paid attention to human strengths rather than pathologies, to human assets rather than liabilities, to human potential rather than limitations (see Lopez et al., 2006). Recently, Smith (2006) proposed and outlined ten stages of strength-based counseling to illustrate how the approach may be implemented. The ten stages are: (a) creating the therapeutic alliance; (b) identifying strengths; (c) assessing presenting problems; (d) encouraging and instilling hope; (e) framing solutions; (f) building strength and competence; (g) empowering; (h) changing; (i) building resilience; and (j) evaluating and terminating. Overall speaking, in providing responsive service and designing guidance activities, there is an obvious move from a remedial to a preventive, strength-based orientation.

From the above discussion, we have traced the general trend of the development of school counseling in an international context. From the beginning, school counseling work was taken up by the appointed teachers on top of their regular duties. Then, full-time positions of school counselors were introduced in the schools. This is a move from non-professionals to professionals. Thereafter, there was a further move from position to program where the focus on the counseling personnel was shifted to implementing guidance activities as a program. There is also a move from the remedial approach of school counseling to a preventive, strength-based orientation that sees the importance of developing students’ potentials and assets in order to live a more fulfilling life.

The Need for Resources: A Concluding Remark

Gysbers and Henderson (2006) delineated three major characteristics of school counseling and guidance. Firstly, guidance is a program, meaning that guidance activities should be well-planned, structured, and systematically implemented. Secondly, guidance programs should be developmental and comprehensive. The programs, when designed, should take into consideration the developmental needs of students at different stages of their lives. The content across levels should be progressive in nature. Moreover, the program should be broad enough to touch upon important issues that students could be facing in the course of development. Lastly, guidance program should feature a team-approach, meaning that teachers do not design and carry out guidance activities by their own. Rather, teachers should work collaboratively as a team to formulate and conduct the activities.

Based on the description above, school counseling and guidance programs in the United States, South Korea, and Japan do manifest the three characteristics. However, in delivering the programs, resources may be one of the key issues to consider. Gysbers and Henderson (2006) proposed that resources for school counseling and guidance work include human resources, financial resources, and political resources. Such a perspective can be helpful to evaluate and develop school counseling work further in the three countries.

First of all, the need for human resources suggests that schools need more professional school guidance personnel. This not only means that more manpower be allocated to schools to carry out guidance duties and activities, but also entails that these people should receive appropriate and professional training before they become qualified guidance teachers. For teachers without prior training, on-the-job training could be provided to familiarize them with the knowledge and skills needed for the job as guidance teachers. Such training and certification issues

are important to the success of school counseling work, as advocated earlier in this article that guidance teachers should change from non-professionals to professionals. This is exactly an issue facing South Korea and Japan for the time being.

Apart from human resources, financial resources are another important criterion for effective school counseling work. For example, individual student planning, as a focus in Gysbers's (2008) article, requires teachers not only to keep hard and soft copies of students' records, but also to meet students individually or in group meetings to discuss students' transition planning for their attainment of personal and career goals. These meetings which involve consultation with school guidance teachers or counselors could be expensive and imply a lot of money. Besides this expenditure, other school counseling work such as guidance curriculum, responsive services, and system support also need financial resources to sustain and implement. No matter how developed guidance programs are, as in the case of the United States, or how progressively developing they are, as in the cases of South Korea and Japan, financial resources should remain a key factor for the successful development of school guidance work. Although large expenses are anticipated, it is worthwhile to spend money on counseling programs and work because early intervention or more desirably, prevention, can enhance the overall well-being of the student cohorts, which is beneficial to the population's health and productivity in the long run. This is the reason why we are arguing for a change from the remedial approach to the one that emphasizes development and prevention.

Last but not least, political resources are needed for school counseling and guidance programs. On the school policy level, political resources imply clear support from the upper management in the schools such as the school supervisors or head teachers. Their support could be shown

in the clear role descriptions of school guidance workers, which could help to avoid role ambiguity of these personnel. This role ambiguity issue is what South Korea is facing. Besides, support from the senior management of schools is important because it can help to focus school guidance work on the program itself as well as the position of guidance workers. This is in line with our earlier proposition that school guidance and counseling should shift from mere positions to programs, with concrete rationale and contents.

On the other hand, on the government policy level, political resources of school guidance work could be policies devised by the local education department. The 1963 Educational Act and the 1997 Elementary and Secondary Education Act from the Ministry of Education in South Korea (Lee & Yang, 2008), as well as the school counselor system introduced by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology in Japan (Yagi, 2008) are good examples of political resources given from the governmental level.

Recognizing the importance of government support, educators and school counseling personnel could try to solicit help and support from the government or make use of existing policies and resources to develop school guidance work. To take Hong Kong as an example, the New Senior Secondary Education curriculum in 2009 can be an opportunity to enhance school guidance and counseling work because when the new curriculum is implemented, all secondary schools are to keep students' portfolios in their three years of senior secondary education. This requirement is favorable to school counseling because such records enable teachers to assist students to formulate their transition plans and attain their personal career goals, which is similar to individual student planning, a key element of comprehensive guidance program as posited by Gysbers (2008).

Conclusively speaking, whereas different countries or regions face different problems or limitations in developing school guidance programs, one important issue we have to resolve is resources allocation which include human, financial, and political resources. Other than this, however, the government bodies and school administrators should be convinced of the rationale behind the school guidance and counseling work in the first place as the mindset and values could influence subsequent decisions to be made and actions to be taken.

References

- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Benard, B. (1991). *Fostering resiliency in kids: Protective factors in the family, school, and community*. Portland, OR: Western Center for Drug-Free Schools and Communities.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Cobia, D. C., & Henderson, D. A. (2003). *Handbook of school counseling*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill.
- Epstein, M. H., Rudolph, S., & Epstein, A. A. (2000). Using strength-based assessment in transition planning. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 32(6), 50–54.
- Gysbers, N. C. (2001). School guidance and counseling in the 21st century: Remember the past into the future. *Professional School Counseling*, 5(2), 96–105.
- Gysbers, N. C. (2008). Individual student planning in the United States: Rationale, practices, and results. *Asian Journal of Counselling*, 15(2), 117–139.
- Gysbers, N. C., & Henderson, P. (2001). Comprehensive guidance and counseling programs: A rich history and a bright future. *Professional School Counseling*, 4(4), 246–256.

- Gysbers, N. C., & Henderson, P. (2006). *Developing and managing your school guidance and counseling program* (4th ed.). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.
- Gysbers, N. C., & Moore, E. J. (1981). *Improving guidance programs*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Johnson, S. K., & Johnson, C. D. (1991). The new guidance: A systems approach to pupil personnel programs. *CACD Journal, 11*, 5–14.
- Kolbe, L. J., Collins, J., & Cortese, P. (1997). Building the capacity of schools to improve the health of the nation: A call for assistance from psychologists. *American Psychologist, 52*(3), 256–265.
- Lee, S. M., & Yang, E. (2008). School counseling in South Korea: Historical development, current status, and prospects. *Asian Journal of Counselling, 15*(2), 157–181.
- Lopez, S. J., Magyar-Moe, J. L., Petersen, S. E., Ryder, J. A., Krieshok, T. S., O’Byrne, K. K., et al. (2006). Counseling psychology’s focus on positive aspects of human functioning. *The Counseling Psychologist, 34*(2), 205–227.
- Morrison, G. M., Brown, M., D’Incau, B., O’Farrell, S. L., & Furlong, M. J. (2006). Understanding resilience in educational trajectories: Implications for protective possibilities. *Psychology in the Schools, 43*(1), 19–31.
- Myrick, R. D. (1997). *Developmental guidance and counseling: A practical approach* (3rd ed.). Minneapolis, MN: Educational Media Corporation.
- Romano, J. L., & Hage, S. M. (2000). Prevention and counseling psychology: Revitalizing commitments for the 21st century. *The Counseling Psychologist, 28*(6), 733–763.
- Seligman, M. E. P. (1998). Building human strength: Psychology’s forgotten mission. *APA Monitor on Psychology, 29*(1). Retrieved February 28, 2009, from <http://www.apa.org/monitor/jan98/pres.html>
- Smith, E. J. (2006). The strength-based counseling model. *The Counseling Psychologist, 34*(1), 13–79.
- Walsh, M. E., Galassi, J. P., Murphy, J. A., & Park-Taylor, J. (2002). A conceptual framework for counseling psychologists in schools. *The Counseling Psychologist, 30*(5), 682–704.

Yagi, D. T. (2008). Current developments in school counseling in Japan. *Asian Journal of Counselling, 15*(2), 141–155.

Zimmerman, B. J., Bandura, A., & Martinez-Pons, M. (1992). Self-motivation for academic attainment: The role of self-efficacy beliefs and personal goal setting. *American Educational Research Journal, 29*(3), 663–676.

學校輔導與諮商工作在不同國家的狀況：回應文章

本文討論了三篇有關學校輔導與諮商工作在不同國家的發展狀況的文章。Yagi (2008) 與 Lee & Yang (2008) 分別指出兩個亞洲國家（日本和南韓）學校諮商工作和有關課題的發展，而 Gysbers (2008) 則發表了在美國實施「學生生涯規劃」的理念、實際運作方式和成效。綜覽各篇文章，我們發現學校輔導與諮商工作正從傳統的虧缺與治療模式持續向正面的、以能力為基礎的模式發展。此外，基於近數十年學校輔導與諮商的發展情況，可見資源是十分重要的問題，故此本文對人力資源、經濟資源和政策資源 (Gysbers & Henderson, 2006) 的課題亦有作出討論。