

Helping Academic Development of Low Socioeconomic Status Students: The Role of School Counselors in Korea

Sang-Min Lee

Korea University

Kumlan Yu

University of Arkansas

Sang-Hee Lee

Kwangwoon University

Given the advent of current national education reforms emphasizing educational equality, the present study identified the factors influencing low socioeconomic status (SES) students' academic development, thereby revealing areas for support and intervention by school counselors in Korea. In 1997, the revised elementary and secondary education act led to a training system for registered counseling teachers. To date, about 20,000 registered counseling teachers were trained and certified by the Ministry of Education and Human Resources Development in Korea. Although the current educational policy increased the quantity of school counseling services, current school counseling members have little knowledge of how to address and intervene in the academic problems of low-SES students because school counseling training is traditionally focused on career and

personal/social issues. This article discussed a theoretical foundation based on the status-attainment model for understanding the low-SES students' academic development. Grounded on the status-attainment model, three major factors (i.e., student, family, and school) related to academic success and failure of low-SES students were identified. Finally, the authors provided five practical guidelines that school counselors can use to work with this low-SES student population.

Considering the Korean education system, which emphasizes students' academic achievement, there is an unquestionable need for all educators to use their competence, knowledge, and skills to become educational professionals who can contribute to the objectives of current public education, and help build safe and sound schools for all students. Historically, educational policy in Korea has been strongly oriented toward increasing the quantity of education available, rather than improving equality of opportunity across social groups (Cheng, 1992). Whereas the Swedish government has paid attention to the reduction of social differentials in educational opportunity, the Korean government has adopted the efficiency-oriented educational policies that make the Korean case the prototype of the expansion model (Hout & Dohan, 1996). Over the past few decades, no explicit effort to reduce social differentials in educational opportunity has been implemented (Chang, 2000). These characteristics of the Korean educational policy have an important implication for educational inequality. To compensate this educational inequality, one of the main goals of current public education in Korea is to help serve all students by decreasing the gap between low-SES students (students at poverty level) and other student groups (Presidential Committee on Social Inclusion, 2005). Like other educators, role designation for Korean school counselors should be defined to successfully support this new national educational goal.

Chang (2004) found that low-SES academically able students are less likely than their high-SES counterparts to attend colleges and universities directly after high school. According to the Korea Labor Institute (2004), the percentage of low-SES students who received the lowest quartile score in the college entry test (13.5%) is much higher than the percentage of the high-SES group (2.5%). Conversely, the percentage of low-SES students who received a high quartile score in the college entry test (16.5%) is much lower than the percentage of the high-SES group (29.8%). This discrepancy has received attention from policy makers in Korea, and one of the current national educational goals is to increase the participation of low-SES students in higher education.

Although the current national educational goal emphasizes low-SES students' academic development, school counselors have little knowledge of how to address and intervene in the academic problems of low-SES students. After reviewing several previous studies, Kim (2001) stated that there are few research related to academic counseling issues in Korea. Traditionally, school counseling training is focused on mental health issues (Lee & Ahn, 2003) and career guidance issues (Myrick, 2003). This has provided sufficient skill development for school counselors to help children with personal, social, and career problems. However, it falls devastatingly short of helping students' academic development in schools (Martin, 2002). For example, few counseling programs require focus on academic counseling course in their curriculum (Kim, 1998). Whereas a family counseling class is required in the curriculum for training the registered counseling teachers, academic counseling is not even listed in regular courses.

Along with the national educational goals, finding sustainable and systematic ways to motivate low-SES students to achieve academic success should be a major task facing school practitioners, including

school counselors. Dimmitt (2003) said: “when school counselors deliberately make the effort to create proactive interventions to mediate the issue of academic achievement, they are faced with a dizzying array of possible places to intervene” (p. 341). In an effort to better understand the context-specific factors impacting academic failure in a school setting, school counselors need to know the most salient factors for these low-SES students.

For school counselors, identifying the factors that interfere with academic success is a fundamental step in the process of selecting interventions. The best way to gain an accurate picture of interfering factors is from reliable research findings. Concrete information about why low-SES students are failing gives school counselors valuable knowledge to advocate for programs and interventions that may be effective. With reliable research results, school counselors can make informed decisions about what interventions are needed, what they are doing that makes a difference, and how to best serve low-SES students. Additional research is needed to generate greater understanding about why so many low-SES students are failing to attain academic achievement during and after high school. This process is as important as the product. School counselors and counselor educators together must think about which type of research would best determine the factors that hinder or improve academic success.

The purpose of this article is to identify factors influencing on the low-SES students’ academic development, thereby revealing areas for support and intervention by school counselors and counselor educators, as well as policy makers, parents, and other social service personnel. First, this article discusses a theoretical base for understanding the academic development of young people from low-SES backgrounds. Second, the article identifies multiple factors that are related to academic success and failure of low-SES students. Finally, it provides

the practical guideline for school counselors to work with the low-SES students.

Theoretical Framework

Many theoretical frameworks have been employed in an effort to cast light on the critical factors and social processes through which a high school student succeeded and/or failed academically (e.g., Brint & Karabel, 1989; Hossler & Stage, 1992; Karen, 1991; Manski & Wise, 1983; McDonough, 1997; Orfield, 1992). Within this extensive literature, much of the research on academic development and degree attainment can be summarized as falling into two broad categories: the economic model and the status-attainment model (Plank & Jordan, 2001).

The economic model assumes that students aim primarily to maximize their utility and minimize risk. That is, students weigh the relative costs and benefits of the academic achievement process. Because this model focuses on financial considerations and cost-benefit processes, they illuminate an interactive process between social constructs and variables measuring individual characteristics. In the economic model, according to Plank and Jordan (2001), it is largely assumed that the decision-making processes are rational and purposive, and that individuals will do what is in their best interest. Unlike the economic model, the status-attainment model often rejects the assumption of students and families as rational decision-makers (Plank & Jordan, 2001). The status-attainment model focuses on how processes such as individual characteristics, family functioning, social network, and schooling conditions influence educational attainment (Hossler, Schmit, & Vesper, 1999).

The present article also needs to employ a conceptual theory-oriented framework in an effort to cast light on the critical factors and

social processes affecting low-SES students' academic development. The theoretical framework for this article is based on Sewell, Hauser, and Featherman's (1976) research, which emphasized the effect of significant others (e.g., family and school) as well as the effect of the student himself or herself for explaining academic achievement. The guiding theoretical model, status-attainment theory, has existed for several years, and is well supported by research (Kao & Tienda, 1998; Smith-Maddox, 1999; Trusty, 2002).

The idea of status attainment was begun by social mobility theorists (e.g., Marxian and Weberian) (Blau & Duncan, 1967). Generally, social mobility refers to movement up (upward social mobility) or down (downward social mobility) in a system of social stratification (Dahrendorf, 1959). The study of social stratification and social mobility had passed through different phases during the 20th century. Before 1940, European scholars mainly studied social structure and relationships among groups in the society. After World War II, American theoretical and empirical contributions to social mobility research increased significantly. Even though initial American research dealt with issues of class, status, and power (Bendix & Lipset, 1953), Blau and Duncan led social mobility research away from the work being done in Europe.

Initial work of Blau and Duncan's (1967) status-attainment theory examined the linkage between fathers' and sons' occupations. Blau and Duncan assumed that understanding of social stratification in modern society is best promoted by the systematic investigation of occupational status and mobility. Rather than asking what influence a variable exerts on upward mobility, Blau and Duncan asked what influence it exerts on occupational achievement, and how it modifies the effect of social origins on these achievements. Unlike previous studies (which involved only one predicting variable), Blau and Duncan wanted to investigate

the simultaneous influence of several factors on occupational achievement and mobility. That is, Blau and Duncan examined the patterns of occupational mobility that were affected by multiple factors. Finally, Blau and Duncan identified education as a pivotal mediating variable, explaining the linkage of fathers' education and occupation and sons' occupational attainment. Subsequent studies in the status-attainment tradition have investigated the ways in which gender, race, ethnicity, community size, and features of the family of origin (such as its intact character, the number of siblings, and birth order) influence the process of stratification (see Kerckhoff, 1995, for a review).

Even though status attainment research traces its historical roots to the seminal work of Blau and Duncan (1967), a major development in this model was the work of Sewell et al. (1976). The original model was transformed from one that included only behaviors to one that included a combination of behaviors and attitudes. Sewell et al. added achievement-related psychological variables to the model of educational and occupational attainment (Haas & Falk, 1981). Their revised model included academic ability, aspiration and performance, and encouragement of educational goals by significant others (such as friends, parents, and school personnel).

Using Sewell et al.'s (1976) status-attainment model, Kao and Tienda (1988) explained how educational aspirations are shaped, and reported how those aspirations led to educational attainment. Smith-Maddox (1999) also examined the effect of social networks and resources on academic achievement of African Americans using the status-attainment model. Trusty (2002) also developed a guiding model of educational expectations with African Americans, which is also based on the status-attainment model.

Because status attainment research focuses mainly on more industrialized and Western societies, there have been a number of

criticisms of the cross-cultural validity of the status-attainment model (Hazelrigg & Gamier, 1976; Treiman, 1970). For example, earlier studies suggest significant differences exist in the model parameters of less developed or developing nations (Brinton, 1989; Hazelrigg & Gamier, 1976; Lipset & Bendix, 1959). Because Korea is considered among the high-income countries of the world, several researchers (Hong, 1983; Kim & Kim, 1999; Oh & Gu, 1999) found little variation in the status-attainment process between Korea and other industrialized countries. Kim and Kim (1999) concluded that generic conditions of industrialization explain the uniformity of mobility. In fact, there were a number of studies examining status attainment and the relationship to education in Korea (Jang, 2000; Kang, 1988; Kim & Kim, 1999). The findings were consistent with those in Blau and Duncan's (1967) original research.

The Multiple Factors Impacting Low-SES Students'

Academic Achievement

Academic success is an output of multiple factors. Psychological, educational, and sociological studies have identified multiple factors (classroom, teacher, school, family, and community) that are related to academic success (Marchant, Paulson, & Rothlisberg, 2001). Consistent with Sewell et al.'s (1976) framework, three primary areas (related to low-SES students' academic development) have been identified from this theory framework: student, family, and school.

Student Factors

Academic success and failure have been linked to some intrinsic factors of students (e.g., IQ, learning disabilities such as dyslexia, mental and behavioral disorder such as attention-deficit disorder). Finding these intrinsic factors allow school practitioners to focus on the

problem within the student, rather than other factors such as the environmental factors (Dimmitt, 2003).

Another focus of research is the effect of self-perception variables such as educational expectation. The literature on status attainment (e.g., Kao & Tienda, 1998) has explained how educational expectations are shaped and reported how those expectations lead to academic achievement. According to Trusty (2000), however, many students with high aspirations and expectations did not indicate plans for college preparatory course work in high school. Thus, their goals and behavior appear inconsistent. Trusty described this inconsistent paradox as follows: low-SES students have positive attitudes and beliefs about education, but have demonstrated low achievement. If concrete attitudes (objective realities) are assessed, however, Mickelson (1990) stated, this attitude-achievement incongruity disappears. Lee (2004) reported that at least low-SES students who have high educational achievement have relatively stable educational aspirations throughout their high school years.

Another important self-perception variable is self-concept. According to the Morris Rosenberg Foundation (2005), self-concept is a positive or negative orientation toward oneself; an overall evaluation of one's worth or value. Self-concept can be viewed as both a trait and a state. Trait self-concept would consist of a person's general feelings about themselves, whereas state self-concept would consist of a person's feelings about themselves in the moment.

The major antecedents of an individual's self-concept include reinforcements, evaluation by significant others, and attributions of his or her own behavior (Muhammad, 1993). It is also recognized that an individual's SES greatly affects the self-concept in general (Rosenberg, 1979). As SES represents differential prestige, respect, possessions, and power in society, it is arguable that SES plays an important role in

shaping the individual's views of self (Rosenberg, 1979). Several studies (Coopersmith, 1967; Purkey, 1970; Wylie, 1979) reported that the student's positive self-concept might be the foundation for educational progress.

Several studies that are based on status-attainment theory reported that student's school behavior is also an important variable in predicting educational achievement (Anderson & Keith, 1997; Trusty, 2002). According to Wong (1990), school behavior is characterized as particular ways a student behaves, acts, functions, or reacts while at school.

A number of research studies have indicated that students who show problem behavior do worse on academic achievement tests than those who do not (Glavin & Annesley, 1971; Graubard, 1964; Schroeder, 1965). Low-SES children frequently live in highly stressful and disadvantaged environments characterized by multiple risk factors leading to psychosocial adjustment problems; these factors includes high rates of poverty, exposure to violence, and substance abuse. As a consequence of these environmental conditions, generalizations about students' school behaviors from other samples (e.g., middle and high socioeconomic class) to high-risk low-SES children living in adverse conditions is probably inappropriate (Jones & Forehand, 2003). According to Lee (2004), school behavior is one of the most important factors explaining the academic performance of low-SES students. Thus, school counselors should determine which school behaviors of students need to be considered to help in assessing the effectiveness of school-based prevention and intervention efforts aimed at children at risk.

Family Factors

Family variables appear to play a crucial role for predicting the level of academic success for an individual. Several researchers reported that

parental involvement in school (e.g., attending general meetings or school events and volunteering at school) was significantly associated with their children's academic achievement (Coleman, 1987a; Dix, 1993; Eccles, 1993). The literature on the relationship between parental involvement and student achievement is extensive (for reviews, see Thorkildsen & Stein, 1998).

Researchers have reported the association of many different types of parenting behaviors with positive student outcomes. These include high expectations and aspirations, parent-teacher communications, participation in school events or activities, parental assistance at home, participation in and discussion about learning activities, participation in school-level governing or decision-making roles, and strong parental social networks or social capital (Desimone, 1999).

Although there is no doubt about family influence on children's academic characteristics, there seems to be a general belief that these characteristics are more relevant in shaping certain academic attitudes, academic self-concept, academic beliefs, and academic competence (García Bacete, 1998; González-Pienda et al., 2002; Wigfield & Eccles, 1992). Therefore, the relationship between parental involvement and children's academic learning and achievement is indirect, rather than direct (Anderson & Keith, 1997; González-Pienda et al., 2002). That is, the benefits of parental involvement include indirect effects on other variables in the status-attainment model. For example, high parental expectations and home-based involvement increases students' involvement in high school, and home-based involvement decreases behavioral problems in high school. These, in turn, result in higher educational attainment.

Despite the sizable amount of research relating parental involvement to student academic achievement, Desimone (1999) stated that

researchers do not have a clear understanding of how patterns and effects of parental involvement differ across different SES groups. According to Desimone, several scholars (Coleman, 1987b; Comer & Haynes, 1991; Powell, 1991) have hypothesized that students from low-income families in inner cities may be more positively affected by certain types of parental involvement (e.g., attending school events and volunteering at school) than other students and that particular parental actions (e.g., encouraging children to complete homework) may increase the disadvantage that low-SES students experience compared with middle- and high-SES students. On the other hand, some researchers (Devaney, Ellwood, & Love, 1997; Lewit, Terman, & Behrman, 1997) have hypothesized that the role of parental involvement in explaining academic outcomes for low-SES children may be significantly less than that of their peers, who do not have as many negative environmental influences — the multitude of risk factors that influence the lives of children in poverty, including health, safety, and housing.

Therefore, researchers should examine the relationship between student achievement and parental involvement within a certain cultural context. For instance, Stevenson, Chen, and Uttal (1990) found that low-SES parents, more than middle- and high-SES parents, perceive homework as a means of improving children's education. This result suggests that low-SES parents may be more likely to become involved in or to encourage their child's homework completion. According to Watkins (1997), low-SES parents have been less likely to help their children at home, although these parents may be more likely than other parents to understand the importance of such involvement. He stated that low-SES parents might be frustrated because they want to help their children but do not have the skills they deem necessary to be effective.

The results of strong effects of low-SES African American parents' expectations and involvement on students academic development led

Trusty (2002) to conclude that school counselors should encourage and support an early and active parental role in educating their children. School counselors are in an advantageous position for educating low-SES parents on the benefits of high expectations and involvement at home and at the school. Trusty stated that:

Regarding home-based involvement, counselors and educators should help parents develop frequent, positive communication with children about their education. Parents' involvement with the school also seems important. Counselors and educators should examine school policies, procedures, and practices to ensure that parents are comfortable in becoming involved in school-based organizations. (p. 343)

School Factors

Educational research has identified several school factors that influence academic success and failure. These factors include positive school climate (Beck & Murphy, 1996), teacher-student relationship (McEvoy & Welker, 2000), adequate financial resources (Myrick, 2003), smaller classrooms and smaller school size (Blatchford, Bassett, Goldstein, & Martin, 2003), and skill and knowledge of teachers (Darling-Hammond, 2000). Although several studies identified important school factors that influence student's academic achievement, few researchers focused on low-SES groups.

Stanton-Salazar and Dornbusch (1995) found that students with higher SES are more likely to report having social capital in the form of guidance and support for advanced schooling than are students from lower-SES backgrounds. Low-SES students continue to leave school prior to graduation in alarming proportions, not because they are unable to succeed, but because they are under challenge academically and are placed disproportionately in special education and low-level, remedial classes (Martin, 2002). Martin states:

In multiple ways, too many school administrators, teachers, and school counselors demonstrate by their actions that they hold low expectations for these students. Added to this conundrum is the fact that low-SES students often see no connection between what is being taught in school and a better future for themselves. (p. 149)

In some schools, however, low-SES students are succeeding at high levels. What makes this difference? According to Martin (2002), these are schools where all students are held to high academic standards, pushed to stretch and achieve, and given support throughout this process. In these schools there are significant school personnel who believe that low-SES students can succeed and who, through advocacy and action, create conditions to support this belief.

Plank and Jordan (2001) found specific aspects of advocacy and action that are often absent for low-SES high school graduates. Conversely, when these aspects of information, guidance, and action are present, they identified that students' likelihood of post-secondary enrollment is increased. Receiving guidance and help at one's high school, visiting post-secondary educational institutions during the high school years, exploring financial aid opportunities, and completing formal applications for admission and financial aid were found to be important steps in the transition to post-secondary educational institutions.

School counselors are in a critical position to focus on issues, strategies, and interventions that will provide this information, guidance, and action to low-SES students. According to Whiston and Sexton's (1998) review of school counseling outcome research, there are few research studies reporting that students are more academically successful in schools as a result of school counseling. On the other hand,

they described that there are several research studies reporting that students are negatively impacted as a result of the lack of supportive school counselor behaviors. For example, Schneider and Stevenson (1999) found that students who have a high school counselor who did not support them in planning for their futures underestimated the amount of education they would need to realize their occupational aspirations. Blustein, Phillips, Jobin-Davis, Finkelberg, and Roarke (1997) found similar results when examining the low satisfaction of recent high school graduates who had negative experiences with high school counselors.

Issues of equity, access, and supporting conditions for students' academic development come to rest at the school counselor's desk in the form of data about students' performance, family conditions, and reports of school behaviors (Martin, 2002). Therefore, school counselors who have served as record keepers of student data in schools are ideally positioned to use these data to advocate for traditionally underserved low-SES students. However, most school counselors are not prepared to provide such leadership (Myrick, 2003).

Bemak (2000) suggested that by revising school counselors' position descriptions to include the advancement of students' academic achievement, the highly publicized performance gap between low-income, disadvantaged pupils and other student groups would diminish. In fact, if school counselors could simply provide low-SES students the same quantity and quality of information and guidance often received by their more affluent peers, and encourage more adolescents to complete the preparatory actions that are consistent with their stated educational goals, students could expect to see a weakening relationship between low SES and low educational attainment (Plank & Jordan, 2001).

Practical Guidelines for School Counselors Working with Low-SES Students

Historically and now, school counselors have focused on students' academic achievement/success as well as on personal/social and career development (Gysbers, 2001; Myrick, 2003; Wittmer, 2000). Given the advent of current national education reforms that emphasize educational equality, school counselors need to explore particularly how to close the academic achievement gap between poor students and other counterparts. That is, school counselors need to serve as student advocates, school leaders, and empirical researchers rather than mental health providers to show where the gaps exist, and to demonstrate adequate yearly progress in enhancing achievement and closing the gap. School counselors, for better intervention, need to be aware of factors affecting the academic performance of low-SES students. School counselors also need to avoid the deficit model and quit trying to fix a few kids while not having time for the majority (Martin, 2002).

In this section, the article presents the practical guidelines for school counselors for working with low-SES students. In working with low-SES students to close the academic achievement gap, first of all, school counselors need to be student advocates for all students in meeting high standards. To be advocates, school counselors need to believe and behave as if they expect all students, especially poor students, achieve at a high level. When school counselors work with school personnel, community and parents, they should ensure that all programs and supports should be offered to contribute to academic success for all students (Bemak & Chung, 2005; House & Hayes, 2002). For example, school counselors could work with low-SES students to remove their academic barriers by providing guidance programs such as "how to succeed in school." Also, school counselors could teach students and their families how to access support systems for academic success by

informing students and parents about tutoring and academic enrichment opportunities.

In helping students enhance their self-concept, which is one of the student factors influencing academic achievement, Hattie (2002) stated that providing feedback focusing on issues related to self-strategies that students use in their learning, approach to learning, and reaction to success can be powerful, because teachers interact with their students everyday in every lesson. Thus, school counselors could provide a psycho-educational conference for teachers to help them understand the relationship between the feedback and learning cycle and the feedback mechanism. Through the conference, teachers could actually practice how to use feedback to enhance students' self-concept. Also, school counselors could be involved in an active guidance program to help students enhance self-concept.

School counselors need to be a leading figure in the development, coordination, and implementation of school-wide support systems designed to improve, by working with teachers and other personnel, the learning success for students who are experiencing difficulty. Also, working with administrators, counselors should provide ongoing support for classroom teachers to become sensitive and competent educators who hold their students to high standards (House & Hayes, 2002). For example, school counselors could provide a conference focused on the understanding of learning styles and development of low-SES students, and could have a consultation meeting with teachers about students' classroom behaviors and learning difficulties faced on regular basis. Above all, school counselors need to represent themselves as counselors in developing relationship with teachers and other school personnel.

Secondly, besides individual and small group counseling approach, school counselors need to design and provide a classroom guidance

curriculum on student achievement. For example, low-SES students could benefit from a “how to succeed in school” guidance curriculum that involves study skills (e.g., self-assessment, organization, and planning), positive attitudes and behaviors toward school and learning, test-taking strategies, effective writing, and homework completion skills (Sink & Stroh, 2003). These guidance programs could be helpful for students to enhance their positive school behaviors. Along with providing these services, it is important to empower students to become self-regulated learners. To do so, school counselors need to develop guidance curriculum units that promote students’ use of effective learning strategies within the context of specific courses (Lapan, Kardash, & Turner, 2002).

For the students with behavioral problems in school, the mini-SARB (School Attendance and Review Board) and a school-level discipline committee would be helpful (Morrison, Olivos, Dominguez, Gomez, & Lena, 1993). The team intervention includes the principal, referring teacher, resource specialist, school psychologist, counselor, other specialists who are working with the student, the parents, and the student. The mini-SARB highlights students’ positive characteristics, uses future-oriented and presuppositional language, and makes an action plan for solving the problem. Meetings are scheduled to monitor the students’ progress, to reinforce the parents, teachers, and students in solving the problem, and to modify objectives and interventions. By using family systems approaches, this could provide an effective intervention to resolve school behavior problems and to build collaborative relationships between home and school (see Morrison et al., 1993, for a review).

Thirdly, in order to foster parental involvement, school counselors need to provide leadership for developing mechanisms and support structure to support collaboration among members of team intervention.

Sharing and transferring knowledge across all members of the team enables the group to create a more comprehensive solution to the academic problem of low-SES students. For example, school counselors could develop family-centered programs such as family centers, parent education programs, and family outreach programs for encouraging parental involvement. For the “hard-to-reach” parents, school counselors may arrange parent workshops at nearby places in the community; home visiting would also be a powerful channel for connecting with families. Also, school counselors may provide a family welcoming area in the school, where parents could come to meet with other parents, find parent resources, and have parent group meetings. In doing so, school counselors must have effective communication, problem-solving, and conflict resolution skills, as well as an understanding of team dynamics as facilitators (Bryan, 2005). These could help parents get involved in students’ academic performance.

Also, a regular meeting with low-SES parents to enhance their involvement could be effective. The so-called “monthly parent nights,” a parent education program, could provide a learning opportunity to parents for issues related to low-SES students (Conroy & Mayer, 1994). Through assessing parents’ needs, school counselors make a yearly plan for parents based on the topics they are interested in. Before each meeting, an invitation letter would be sent to parents and free child care services would be arranged by the staff of the school system. Parents have the opportunities to discuss individual issues with each other, to get written information, and to read books about parenting. This approach would be used for low-SES parents who concern about their children’s academic problems or developmental behaviors.

Finally, school counselors are in the best position to assess the school data for identifying systemic barriers to academic success for every student (House & Hayes, 2002). School counselors need to collect

critical data about student placements, and academic success and failure of all students. By getting specific data from teachers, parents, students and the community, they need to serve as conductors and transmitters of information to promote school-wide success for all students. Therefore, school counselors need to actively monitor the progress of low-SES students in all courses, provide assistance and interventions as needed, and even change the systems if necessary (Carey, Dimmitt, & House, 2003; House & Hayes, 2002). School counselors also need to use Internet data (e.g., scholarships, loans, and grant for colleges, as well as occupation information and career trends) to help low-SES students explore colleges and careers (Van Horn & Myrick, 2001). Using listserves, chat rooms, e-mail, computer bulletin board, and Web sites, networking among school counselors in similar school system (e.g., Elementary, Middle and High school) could be helpful to share information, experiences, and recommendations about counseling resources (Van Horn & Myrick, 2001). Also, school counselors could develop their own data set for low-SES students. Students' learning progress on every class, their demographic information such as family composition and economic status, their career plan, and their behaviors could be an example of the data set. By using these data, school counselors could find places to intervene with low-SES students.

Conclusion

In 1997, the revised elementary and secondary education act of Korea (Ministry of Education, 1999) led to a training system for registered counseling teachers. To date, about 20,000 registered counseling teachers were trained and certified by the Ministry of Education and Human Resources Development. However, many registered counseling teachers were not appointed as school counselors due to lower rates of certified classroom teachers (84%). The Ministry of Education and Human Resources Development has recognized this

problem and has developed plans to single out 308 registered counseling teachers as itinerant counseling teachers who will be assigned to each school board. In addition, given the advent of the “no violence in school act of 2004,” two major school-based mental health service programs were initiated. Whereas the Korean Association of School Social Work Practitioners arranged school social workers in 48 pilot schools, the Korean Youth Counseling Institute, with the support from the Ministry of Culture and Tourism, selected school-based youth counselors for 9 pilot schools.

The current nature of the Korean school counseling system requires school counselors to be aware of the differences among school counseling members (e.g., itinerant counseling teachers, school youth counselors, and school social workers). At the same time, rather than working alone in this system, each school’s counseling members function as a multidisciplinary team to provide a framework for meeting the needs of students. This team concept assures the likelihood of having the expertise of available disciplines to address the diversity of issues and needs presented by individual students. For example, the registered counseling teacher as educational specialist directly implements effective academic counseling interventions for low-SES students, whereas the school social worker conducts home visits to determine the physical needs of low-SES students (e.g., assistance for furnishing clothing, food, and transportation). As mental health professionals, school youth counselors also contribute knowledge of counseling theory and practice to the multidisciplinary team and provide expertise and direction on understanding developmental issues, needs, and cultural considerations of low-SES students.

Developing and implementing a team approach to service delivery may be a time-consuming task. However, serving on multidisciplinary teams is an integral part of school counseling services for students

(Wittmer, 2000). The diversity of knowledge and perspectives among various professionals could promote the efficient and effective delivery of services. The increased potential of such a holistic approach will enhance the school counselor's ability to address the developmental needs of students and to become more proactive in working with the various helping professionals.

Finally, it was the authors' intention to promote increased discussion, practice, and research for training school counselors to work with low-SES students in schools. Several issues raised by this article warrant further investigation. Some critical areas for research and practice include the following: (1) Additional empirical research is needed to investigate the validity of the practical guidelines suggested by this article. (2) As we explore appropriate educational interventions for low-SES students, eventually, future researchers need to develop delivery models of comprehensive guidance service toward enhancing the learning and development of low-SES students as well as all students in schools at every educational level. (3) While the model presented here was designed specifically to address low-SES students as a group, it will be important to determine if the interventions suggested here also applies to subgroups of the low-SES population.

References

- Anderson, E. S., & Keith, T. Z. (1997). A longitudinal test of a model of academic success for at-risk high school students. *Journal of Educational Research, 90*(5), 259–268.
- Beck, L. G., & Murphy, J. (1996). *The four imperatives of a successful school*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Bemak, F. (2000). Transforming the role of the counselor to provide leadership in educational reform through collaboration. *Professional School Counseling, 3*(5), 323–331.
- Bemak, F., & Chung, R. C. Y. (2005). Advocacy as a critical role for

- urban school counselors: Working toward equity and social justice. *Professional School Counseling*, 8(3), 196–202.
- Bendix, R., & Lipset, S. M. (Eds.). (1953). *Class, status, and power: A reader in social stratification*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Blatchford, P., Bassett, P., Goldstein, H., & Martin, C. (2003). Are class size differences related to pupils' educational progress and classroom processes? Findings from the Institute of Education Class Size Study of Children Aged 5–7 Years. *British Educational Research Journal*, 29(5), 709–730.
- Blau, P. M., & Duncan, O. D. (1967). *The American occupational structure*. New York: Wiley.
- Blustein, D. L., Phillips, S. D., Jobin-Davis, K., Finkelberg, S. L., & Roarke, A. E. (1997). A theory-building investigation of the school-to-work transition. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 25(3), 364–402.
- Brint, S., & Karabel, J. (1989). *The diverted dream: Community colleges and the promise of educational opportunity in America, 1900–1985*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Brinton, M. C. (1989). Gender stratification in contemporary urban Japan. *American Sociological Review*, 54(4), 549–564.
- Bryan, J. (2005). Fostering educational resilience and achievement in urban schools through school-family-community partnerships. *Professional School Counseling*, 8(3), 219–227.
- Carey, J., Dimmitt, C., & House, R. (2003). *School counselors using data*. Amherst, MA: School Counseling Leadership Institute.
- Chang, S. S. (2000). Kyoyuk gyhoi-ui boolpyungdung [Inequality of educational opportunity: Effects of family background on educational attainment]. *Korean Journal of Sociology*, 34(3), 671–708.
- Chang, S. S. (2004). Hocklyuk seongchwi-ui gaegubbyul, seongbyul chai [The gap of academic achievement by social stratification and gender]. *Korean Journal of Sociology*, 38(1), 51–75.
- Cheng, T. J. (1992). Dilemmas and choices in educational policies: The case of South Korea and Taiwan. *Studies in Comparative International Development*, 27(4), 54–79.

- Coleman, J. S. (1987a). Families and schools. *Educational Researcher*, 16(6), 32–38.
- Coleman, J. S. (1987b). Social capital and the development of youth. *Momentum*, 18(4), 6–8.
- Comer, J. P., & Haynes, N. M. (1991). Parent involvement in schools: An ecological approach. *Elementary School Journal*, 91(3), 271–277.
- Conroy, E., & Mayer, S. (1994). Strategies for consulting with parents. *Elementary School Guidance and Counseling*, 29(1), 60–66.
- Coopersmith, S. (1967). *The antecedents of self-esteem*. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman.
- Dahrendorf, R. (1959). *Class and conflict in industrial society*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). Teacher quality and student achievement: A review of state policy evidence. *Educational Policy Analysis Archives*, 8(1). Retrieved June 3, 2005, from <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v8n1/>
- Desimone, L. (1999). Linking parent involvement with student achievement: Do race and income matter? *Journal of Educational Research*, 93(1), 11–30.
- Devaney, B. L., Ellwood, M. R., & Love, J. M. (1997). Programs that mitigate the effects of poverty on children. *The Future of Children*, 7(2), 88–112.
- Dimmitt, C. (2003). Transforming school counseling practice through collaboration and the use of data: A study of academic failure in high school. *Professional School Counseling*, 6(5), 340–349.
- Dix, T. (1993). Attributing dispositions to children: An interactional analysis of attribution in socialization. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 19(5), 633–643.
- Eccles, J. (1993). School and family effects on the ontogeny of children's interests, self-perceptions, and activity choices. In J. Jacobs (Ed.), *Nebraska symposium on motivation: Vol. 40. Developmental perspectives on motivation* (pp. 145–208). Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
- García Bacete, F. J. (1998). Aproximación conceptual a las relaciones escuela-familia [A conceptual approach to the relations between school and family]. *Bordón*, 50(1), 23–34.

- Glavin, J. P., & Annesley, F. R. (1971). Reading and arithmetic correlates of conduct-problem and withdrawn children. *Journal of Special Education*, 5(3), 213–219.
- González-Pienda, J. A., Núñez, J. C., González-Pumariega, S., Alvarez, L., Rocés, C., & García, M. (2002). A structural equation model of parental involvement, motivational and aptitudinal characteristics, and academic achievement. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 70(3), 257–287.
- Graubard, P. (1964). The extent of academic retardation in residential treatment center. *Journal of Educational Research*, 58(2), 78–80.
- 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.
- Haas, D. F., & Falk, W. W. (1981). Theory and method in status attainment research. *Symbolic Interaction*, 64(1), 59–73.
- Hattie, J. (2002, August). Why is it so difficult to enhance self-concept in the classroom: The power of feedback in the self-concept-achievement relationship. *Self-Concept Research: Driving International Research Agendas*, 1–17.
- Hazelrigg, L. E., & Gamier, M. A. (1976). Occupational mobility in industrial societies: A comparative analysis of differential access to occupational ranks in seventeen countries. *American Sociological Review*, 41(3), 498–511.
- Hong, D. S. (1983). Hanguok sahoi gyechung yeongu-lul wihan yaebijeok gochal [Considerations for a Korean social class study]. In Hanguok sahoi gwahak yeonguhwoi (Ed.), *Hanguok sahoi-ui jeontong-gwa byunhwa* (pp. 22–35). Seoul, Korea: Bubmoonsa.
- Hossler, D., Schmit, J., & Vesper, N. (1999). *Going to college: How social, economic, and educational factors influence the decisions students make*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Hossler, D., & Stage, F. K. (1992). Family and high school experience influences on the postsecondary educational plans of ninth-grade students:

- A structural model of predispositions to college. *American Educational Research Journal*, 29(2), 425–451.
- House, R. M., & Hayes, R. L. (2002). School counselors: Becoming key players in school reform. *Professional School Counseling*, 5(4), 249–256.
- Hout, M., & Dohan, D. P. (1996). Two paths to educational opportunity: Class and educational selection in Sweden and the United States. In R. Erikson & J. O. Jonsson (Eds.), *Can education be equalized? The Swedish case in comparative perspective* (pp. 207–231). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Jang, S. S. (2000). Kyoyook gyhoi-ui bulpyungdung: Gajok baegyung-yi hocklyeok sunghyang-e michi-nun yunghyang [Inequality of educational opportunity: The effect of family background on academic achievement]. *Hanguk Sahwoihak*, 34(3), 671–708.
- Jones, D. J., & Forehand, G. (2003). The stability of child problem behaviors: A longitudinal analysis of inner-city African American children. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 12(2), 215–227.
- Kang, H. D. (1988). *Hanguk-ui sahoi yidong-kwa hakyo kyoyook-ui hyogwa* [Social mobility and its effect on school education in Korea]. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Korea University, Korea.
- Kao, G., & Tienda, M. (1998). Educational aspirations of minority youth. *American Journal of Education*, 106(3), 349–384.
- Karen, D. (1991). The politics of class, race, and gender: Access to higher education in the United States, 1960–1986. *American Journal of Education*, 99(2), 208–237.
- Kerckhoff, A. C. (1995). Institutional arrangements and stratification processes in industrial societies. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 21, 323–347.
- Kim, K. H. (1998). *Sangdam symlihak* [Counseling psychology]. Seoul, Korea: Hakji Sa.
- Kim, K. H. (2001). *Sangdam yeongu bangbublon* [Counseling research method]. Seoul, Korea: Hakji Sa.
- Kim, Y. H., & Kim, B. K. (1999). Hanguk sanubhwa gwajung-eseoui gyoyook-gwa sahoi gyechung yidong [Education and social class

- mobility during industrialization in Korea]. *Kyoyookhak Yeongu*, 37(1), 155–172.
- Korea Labor Institute. (2004). *Nodong panel bunseok* [Analyzing labor panel]. Seoul, Korea: Author.
- Lapan, R. T., Kardash, C. M., & Turner, S. (2002). Empowering students to become self-regulated learners. *Professional School Counseling*, 5(4), 257–266.
- Lee, S. M. (2004). *A databased model to predict postsecondary educational attainment of low socioeconomic status students*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, U.S.
- Lee, S. M., & Ahn, S. H. (2003). Hakyoo sangdamja muot-ul haeya hanunga? [What should a school counselor do?] *The Korean Journal of Counseling*, 4(2), 281–293.
- Lewit, E. M., Terman, D. L., & Behrman, R. E. (1997). Children and poverty: Analysis and recommendations. *The Future of Children*, 7(2), 4–24.
- Lipset, S. M., & Bendix, R. (1959). *Social mobility in industrial society*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Manski, C. F., & Wise, D. A. (1983). *College choice in America*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Marchant, G. J., Paulson, S. E., & Rothlisberg, B. A. (2001). Relations of middle school students' perceptions of family and school contexts with academic achievement. *Psychology in the Schools*, 38(6), 505–519.
- Martin, P. J. (2002). Transforming school counseling: A national perspective. *Theory into Practice*, 41(3), 148–153.
- McDonough, P. M. (1997). *Choosing colleges: How social class and schools structure opportunity*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- McEvoy, A., & Welker, R. (2000). Antisocial behavior, academic failure, and school climate: A critical review. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, 8(3), 130–140.
- Mickelson, R. A. (1990). The attitude-achievement paradox among Black adolescents. *Sociology of Education*, 63(1), 44–61.

- Ministry of Education. (1999). *Cho joongdung kyoyukbub sihanglyung* [The revised elementary and secondary education act]. Retrieved June 5, 2005, from the Ministry of Government Legislation Web site: <http://www.klaw.go.kr/>
- Morris Rosenberg Foundation. (2005). *The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale*. Retrieved February 6, 2006, from the University of Maryland Web site: http://www.bsos.umd.edu/socy/grad/socpsy_rosenberg.html
- Morrison, J. A., Olivos, K., Dominguez, G., Gomez, D., & Lena, D. (1993). The application of family systems approaches to school behavior problems on a school-level discipline board: An outcome study. *Elementary School Guidance & Counseling, 27*(4), 258–272.
- Muhammad, M. (1993). Relationships of some personality variables to academic attainment of secondary school pupils. *Educational Psychology, 13*(1), 11–18.
- Myrick, R. D. (2003). *Developmental guidance and counseling: A practical approach* (4th ed.). Minneapolis, MN: Educational Media.
- Oh, S. S., & Gu, B. D. (1999). Meta bunseok-ul tonghan hangookhyung hakubseongchi gwanlun byunin-ui tamsaek [A study on factors related to academic achievement by using meta analysis in Korea]. *Kyoyookhak Yeongu, 37*(4), 99–122.
- Orfield, G. (1992). Money, equity, and college access. *Harvard Educational Review, 62*(3), 337–372.
- Plank, S. B., & Jordan, W. J. (2001). Effects of information, guidance, and actions on post-secondary destinations: A study of talent loss. *American Educational Research Journal, 38*(4), 947–979.
- Powell, D. R. (1991). How schools support families: Critical policy tensions. *Elementary School Journal, 91*(3), 307–319.
- Presidential Committee on Social Inclusion. (2005). *Daetonglyung jamoon binboogyukcha chabyeol sijung wiwonhoi* [Presidential Committee on Social Inclusion]. Retrieved May 5, 2005, from <http://pcsi.go.kr/publish/main.asp>

- Purkey, W. W. (1970). *Self-concept and school achievement*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Rosenberg, M. (1979). *Conceiving the self*. New York: Basic Books.
- Schneider, B., & Stevenson, D. (1999). *The ambitious generation: America's teenagers motivated but directionless*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Schroeder, L. B. (1965). A study of the relationship between five descriptive categories of emotional disturbance and reading and arithmetic achievement. *Exceptional Children*, 32(2), 111–112.
- Sewell, W. H., Hauser, R. M., & Featherman, D. L. (Eds.). (1976). *Schooling and achievement in American society*. New York: Academic Press.
- Sink, C. A., & Stroh, H. R. (2003). Raising achievement test scores of early elementary school students through comprehensive school counseling programs. *Professional School Counseling*, 6(5), 350–364.
- Smith-Maddox, R. (1999). The social networks and resources of African American eighth graders: Evidence from the National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988. *Adolescence*, 34(133), 169–183.
- Stanton-Salazar, R. D., & Dornbusch, S. M. (1995). Social capital and the reproduction of inequality: Information networks among Mexican-origin high school students. *Sociology of Education*, 68(2), 116–135.
- Stevenson, H. W., Chen, C., & Uttal, D. H. (1990). Beliefs and achievement: A study of Black, White, and Hispanic children. *Child Development*, 61(2), 508–523.
- Thorkildsen, R., & Stein, M. R. S. (1998). Is parent involvement related to student achievement? Exploring the evidence. *Research Bulletin*, 22, 17–20.
- Treiman, D. J. (1970). Industrialization and social stratification. In E. O. Laumann (Ed.), *Social stratification: Research and theory for the 1970s* (pp. 207–234). Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill.
- Trusty, J. (2000). High educational expectations and low achievement: Stability of educational goals across adolescence. *Journal of Educational Research*, 93(6), 356–365.

- Trusty, J. (2002). African Americans' educational expectations: Longitudinal causal models for women and men. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 80*(3), 332–345.
- Van Horn, S. M., & Myrick, R. D. (2001). Computer technology and the 21st century school counselor. *Professional School Counseling, 5*(2), 124–130.
- Watkins, T. J. (1997). Teacher communications, child achievement, and parent traits in parent involvement models. *Journal of Educational Research, 91*(1), 3–14.
- Whiston, S. C., & Sexton, T. L. (1998). A review of school counseling outcome research: Implications for practice. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 76*(4), 412–426.
- Wigfield, A., & Eccles, J. S. (1992). The development of achievement task values: A theoretical analysis. *Developmental Review, 12*(3), 265–310.
- Wittmer, J. (2000). *Managing your school counseling program: K-12 developmental strategies* (2nd ed.). Minneapolis, MN: Educational Media.
- Wong, M. G. (1990). The education of White, Chinese, Filipino, and Japanese students: A look at “high school and beyond”. *Sociological Perspectives, 33*(3), 355–374.
- Wylie, R. C. (1979). *The self-concept: Theory and research on selected topics*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

幫助低收入家庭學生的學業發展：韓國學校諮商師的作用

由於韓國當前的全國教育改革強調教育平等，本文指出了影響低收入家庭學生學業發展的種種因素，從而揭示了韓國學校諮商師對學生可作的支持和介入服務。1997年，韓國通過了小學和中學教育法案（修訂），註冊諮商教師培訓系統應運而生。目前，韓國的教育和人力資源發展部已培訓了大約二萬名註冊諮商教師並發給證書。雖然目前的教育方針使得學校諮商服務的數量急劇增加，但是由於傳統的學校諮商師培訓仍然以處理職業、個人和社會問題為主，所以目前的學校諮商師對於如何處理低收入家庭學生的學業問題仍然知之甚少。為了理解低收入家庭學生的學業發展，本文以「身分獲得模型」為基礎做了一些理論研究。基於該模型，本文指出了影響學業成敗的三個主要因素，即學生、家庭和學校。最後，作者為學校諮商師提供了可以應用於低收入家庭學生的五項實用指導原則。