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Abstract

The unanticipated arrival of the COVID-19 pandemic has upset thousands of adolescents worldwide, whereas shifts to remote schooling have minimized their access to school-based support. This study focused on three research questions: How do School Counselors (a) evaluate the impact of COVID-19 restrictive measures on adolescents’ mental health? (b) appraise their self-efficacy to help adolescents cope with the challenges? (c) Assess post-pandemic pupil behavior and their self-efficacy beliefs. It aimed to resource creative school-counseling approaches to improve youth resilience. Findings showed that counselors regarded generalized worry, concern about academic studies and job development, and increasing internet use as adolescents’ most important psychological/behavioral issues. Most counselors felt efficient in their professional development, teamwork, cross-cultural sensitivity, leadership, assessment, personal and social growth, and development. Counselors who evaluated pupils as high/medium in generalized anxiety, depressive symptoms, academic/career development, and excessive internet time evaluated themselves significantly higher on all factors of the self-efficacy scale compared to those who assessed students as medium/low on the aforementioned factors, who scored significantly lower in self-efficacy.
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The sudden arrival and rapid spread of the COVID-19 virus have upended the lives of children and adolescents worldwide in 2020 and 2021. According to the United Nations 2030 Agenda, government mandates to contain the virus's spread resulted in school closures that kept 90% of all students out of school, presenting a new social reality. In Greece and Cyprus, the in-school operation of all public and private schools was suspended from March 11, 2020, to May 21, 2020, and from November 16, 2020, to February 8, 2021. Schools switched to remote and hybrid methods and applied synchronous and asynchronous methods for all the teaching and assessment. Adolescents and parents went through hard times during the school closures as they were left to their own devices to manage distance learning with little help and supervision from school authorities (UNESCO, 2020; Courtney et al., 2020). Recent research findings reporting on the pandemic's aftermath on students of all ages raise increasing concerns about mental and behavioral difficulties (Sheasley, 2021). While schools were operating remotely, students had no access to the critical support of school counselors (Meyers, 2020). School counselors have faced many pandemic-related challenges in providing much-needed support and services to students.

At the time of this study, there was still limited research to systematically examine how COVID-19 affected school counselors' ability to help their advisees cope with the new challenges (Strear et al., 2021). According to Savitz-Romer (2021), a binary approach is necessary to comprehend the possibilities and limitations of school counselors' modus operandi during the pandemic, one that considers their experiences and the organizational context that forms the framework of their work. In this study, based on Bandura’s concept of self-efficacy, the school counselor’s self-appraised knowledge and confidence in applying those skills were addressed, which would support their students upon returning to their schools after a long period of remote learning.
The Challenges of Pupils and School Counselors in Times of COVID-19

In Cyprus and Greece, like in many other Western countries, the government-mandated restrictive measures to contain the virus resulted in lengthy school closures and a shift to distance learning. Pupils confronted new and additional challenges regarding accessing school-based resources and support (Meyers, 2020), consequently increasing students’ need to receive support.

Long-term effects on children, adolescents, and youth are shown to be caused by the extreme measures practiced during the Sars-Cov-2 pandemic and the consequent rapid changes to our way of living, as indicated by recent studies. The restrictive measures to contain the spread of the virus, such as the lockdowns and the consequent social isolation that people experienced, led to home, family, and peer-group issues, fear of death and illness, and a feeling of uncertainty.

Adolescents were burdened by new stressors such as the fear of infection, worries about their parents’ work and financial situation, death, and sudden separation from their peers, teachers, and counselors (Wang et al., 2020; Brooks et al., 2020; Jones et al., 2020). Mental health issues such as depression, anxiety, and somatization of symptoms (sleep problems and deprivation) could harm students’ motivation for learning and academic achievement and contribute to school conduct issues (London & Ingram, 2018; Talmus, 2019). Youth Truth conducted a large-scale study in 2021, showing that those pupils who felt more affected by COVID-19 reported having less positive learning and well-being experiences. Studies with European youth confirm these findings, emphasizing that the pandemic primarily affects individuals between 18-30 and children and adolescents. Results by Gómez-Salgado et al. in Spain (2020), Mazza et al. in Italy (2020), Branquino et al. in Portugal (2020), and Hyland in Britain (2020) have all shown a significant negative correlation between lower age and symptoms of anxiety, depression, and psychosomatic disorders. The importance of psychological issues in children and adolescents becomes imminent if one considers the long-term effects of stressful experiences on their later lives (McLaughlin et al., 2010).

Returning to school in September 2021 presented new challenges for adaptation and learning following the prolonged absence of students and faculty from traditional learning/teaching environments. Children and adolescents, especially those in vulnerable groups already experiencing problems in school due to health issues or stressors related or unrelated to the pandemic, needed additional support (Griffith, 2020). Students who suffered significant emotional and physical disengagement also needed more care (Jiao et al., 2020).
School counselors are trained to support and promote adolescents' psychosocial and academic development and prepare them to transition to postsecondary education. However, during the lockdowns and school closures, school counselors were challenged in many ways in performing their work-related duties remotely and as human beings facing challenges in their personal and family lives. Savitz-Romer et al. (2021) reported on data from the Covid-19 National Survey of School Counselors, conducted in the Summer of 2020 with 1,060 participants and eleven follow-up focus groups with 47 survey respondents. Their findings showed that some barriers to school counseling during the pandemic’s peak were bureaucratic, for example, reduced time in students’ schedules for meeting with counselors and missed opportunities for connecting with hard-to-reach students. Amongst the numerous organizational constraints that school counselors encountered while performing their duties was a lack of guidance on remote counseling and a barrage of administrative tasks.

Data from the study by Savitz-Romer and associates showed that in the USA, school counselors were, upon their return to physical presence schooling, able to adapt, for the most part, to the new challenges presented by the COVID-19 pandemic to bypass the constraints and to capitalize on their autonomy (2021). Nevertheless, school counselors need to be trained and access new resources and organizational support to effectively feel ready to support students, especially those impacted the most by the pandemic.

The Construct of Self-efficacy and its Importance for School Counselors

The profession of school Counselor emerged out of the need to provide students with support for their personal, social, academic, and career development (Schmidt, 2008). School counselors have the task of facilitating students’ integration into their community and establishing a positive contribution to the workforce (Gysbers & Henderson, 2006). Even before the onset of the pandemic, emerging social, political, economic, and cultural changes have impacted the role of school counselors by requiring them to address a wide variety of student and societal needs. These included bullying, negative coping skills, and employability in a highly competitive job market, factors that had a potentially negative impact on student success in school (Coleman & Yeh, 2008).

According to Bandura (1995) and Larson & Daniels (1998), self-efficacy is essential to counseling and coping with change. Self-efficacy reflects the person’s belief that he/she can perform those behaviors necessary to achieve specific results (Bandura, 1977, 1986, 1997) and his/her confidence in the ability to control his/her motivation and behavior. Following Bandura's
introduction of the notion of self-efficacy, repeated investigations using a variety of tasks in the 1980s revealed that a person's assessments of his/her potential to accomplish desirable results are strongly tied to successful task performance. When self-efficacy beliefs were low, people exerted less effort for shorter periods and worried more about failing. Self-efficacy is considered essential in any circumstance where people are required to exhibit or accomplish a set of activities to a high level of skill (Barling & Abel, 1983; Lee, 1983; Williams & Watson, 1985).

School counselors must be competent and proficient in responding to their advisees' complex and diverse needs by providing efficient services according to counselors' professional guidelines (American Counselor Association, 2005; ASCA, 2019). Competency entails constant awareness of new scientific proof approaches and ongoing training to enhance abilities and skills. Furthermore, school counselors work hard to remove impediments to all students' accomplishments and growth (ASCA, 2019) while seeking techniques that optimize the growth and achievement of all pupils.

In 2005, Bodenhorn and Skaggs created the SCSE (School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale), giving theory and research on the effects of self-efficacy on school counselor performance a new perspective. Applying Bodenhorn's Scale led to more research on the effects of self-efficacy in school counseling (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005; Bodenhorn et al., 2010). For example, Woods (2009) demonstrated that the length of school counselors' experience increased their self-efficacy. Bodenhorn et al. (2010) demonstrated that the higher the levels of counselors' self-efficacy, the higher their perception of equity within the school. Moreover, Owens et al. (2010) identified a positive correlation between cultural acceptance self-efficacy and school counselors' multicultural competence. Clark's findings (2006) connected school counselors' self-efficacy with the frequency with which they used programmatic service delivery interventions. These and other findings highlight the significance of self-efficacy in school counselors' job performance.

**Purpose and Rationale of the Study**

School counselors' assessment of adolescents' mental and behavioral states following the long school closures during the peak of the COVID-19 pandemic, as well as their self-reported beliefs on their self-efficacy to deal with these new challenges, were investigated in the present study. Three research questions were established to examine how the new pandemic challenges may have affected their self-efficacy beliefs concerning the demographic characteristics of the counselors. It is believed that the findings will shed light on the social circumstances that affect the students' behavior and the counselors' self-efficacy beliefs, enabling us to suggest more...
efficient ways to face difficult and unexpected adolescents’ mental behavior. Resourcing effective and creative school counseling approaches to improve and maintain the psychological resilience of the youth is the aim of this study. Specifically, three research questions were posed:

1. How do middle- and high-school counselors evaluate the after-effects of the COVID-19 restrictive measures on adolescents’ mental and behavioral health, as measured by the Counselor Adolescent COVID-19-Impact Tool?

2. How do middle- and high-school counselors appraise their self-efficacy, as measured by the five-factor School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale?

3. How do counselors’ assessments of pupils’ post-pandemic mental and behavioral states affect their self-efficacy beliefs in the five factors of the Self-Efficacy Scale?

**Method**

**Procedure – Data collection**

A web-based design was used to conduct the survey with school counselors in Cyprus and Greece. An online questionnaire was developed using Google Forms as the survey platform. Instruments included a PIF, the CACIT, and Bodenhorg’s Self-Efficacy Scale. The ethics approval came from the Resilience Research Unit Council of the Department of Psychology and Social Sciences at Frederick University in Cyprus. The survey link was sent directly to members of the Hellenic Society of Counseling and Guidance (ELESYP) and the Cyprus Counseling and Vocational Education Service (YSEA), both of which fall under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, and Youth. The survey was conducted from September 1st to September 30th, 2021. A brief introduction to the study’s scope and objectives, along with instructions on completing the questionnaires and a consent form, were included in our questionnaire. The demographic data were age, gender, educational attainment, counseling specialization, country of residency (Greece/Cyprus), and service delivery area (urban/rural).

The sample was comprised of eighty school counselors \((N = 80, n = 49\) Greek and \(n = 51\) Cypriot), with a gender split of 70% male and 30% female. The largest age group was made up of counselors between the ages of 35 and 54 (63.8%), followed by those aged 35 to 44 (31.3%) and 45 to 54 (32.5%). Younger counselors (age 25–34) comprised 18.8% of the sample, whereas senior counselors (age 55–64) made up 17.5%. As for their educational level, 77.5% had a postgraduate (MA) degree, and 12.5 had a Ph.D. in Counseling. Just 10% of the participants had
only a B.A. degree. Eleven or more years of professional experience were held by half of our subjects (51%), while 11.3% had six to ten years, and 37.5% had five years or less of experience as school counselors.

Measures

School Counselors’ Self-Efficacy Scale (SCSE)

The first questionnaire, the SCSE, comprised role-specific statements asking the respondents how confident they were in carrying out the task mentioned in the affirmations. Participants rated their confidence level on a Likert scale with five possible responses—varying from "Not Confident" to "Highly Confident." According to Mullen (2015) and Hair et al. (2006), both reliability and internal consistency of the total SCSE scale (43 items) were strong (Cronbach's $\alpha = .959$). The five emerging subscales were (i) Individual and Social Development (items 18, 20, 21, 23, 8, 19, 25, 27, 17, 24, 35). (ii) Leadership and Assessment (items 38, 39, 41, 36, 37, 3, 40, 5, 30). (iii) Career and Academic advancement (items 14, 12, 16, 11, 13, 33, 6). (iv) Collaboration (items 32, 2, 9, 10, 1, 7, 4, 43, 34, 42, 15) and finally (e) Cultural Awareness (items 29, 28, 26, 31). Applying Cronbach’s alpha, Bodenhorn et al. (2010) estimated the reliability of the five SCSE subscales as follows: Individual and Social Development (.88), Leadership and assessment (.90), Career and assessment (.84), Collaboration (.82), and Cultural Awareness (.68).

The Counselor Adolescent Covid-Impact Tool (CACIT)

The «Counselor Adolescent Covid-Impact Tool” (CACIT) was designed for the purpose of this study. The instrument comprised seventeen items, each dealing with a distinct aspect of potential psychological anguish. These statements were created by combining relevant literature, the DSM-V (2013), and research findings from several authors who demonstrated that COVID-19-related government curfews resulting in social isolation, domestic problems, and ambiguity could be a source of mental health issues such as anxiety, depression, and sleep loss. These mental states could have adversely affected adolescents’ academic achievement motivation, leading to problematic school behavior patterns (London & Ingram, 2018; Demetriou et al., 2022; Talmus, 2019). Trauma, suicidality, technology addiction, drug and alcohol misuse, family dysfunction, and other mental health concerns have been exacerbated (Gallo, 2017; Hou et al., 2019; Wan, 2020). The school counselors were asked to rate how much they agreed, disapproved, or entirely disagreed with the appearance of behaviors such as generalized fear, anxiety about post-secondary education and career advancement, and the desire to engage in social/peer
interactions, interest to advance school achievements, compulsive behaviors (alcohol, drugs, and internet abuse) in their adolescent advisees. The percentages of agreement or disagreement were used to distinguish adolescents' three most outstanding mental states as reported by their school counselors.

Data analysis

Data was cleaned, coded, and scored using Excel. The reported confidence intervals were 95%. SPSS 25 was used for the analyses. Specifically, descriptive statistics were employed to describe and assess the demographic features of our sample, encompassing the mean, standard deviation, frequencies, and percentages. The p-value (significance level) was set at $p < .05$ to examine the statistically significant differences. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to detect statistically significant differences in the seventeen statements about the counselors' age, educational background, and work experience. The t-test means comparison was used to compare the means between the participant's demographic characteristics (gender, area of practice, urban/rural, country of practice). Furthermore, a Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) and Bartlett's Test were used to assess the adequacy of our sample data for exploratory factor analysis. The KMO test for the CACIT yielded a score of 0.804 ($p < .05$), and for the SCSE, a score of 0.887 ($p < .05$). After the content analysis of the statements loaded to the factor derived from the factor analysis (factors with eigenvalue >1), new variables were conducted, and their means were estimated for further analyses.

Results

Descriptive statistics of the CACIT

The loadings of the statements were all high (above 0.500), indicating that the data fit the expected theoretical model. The content analysis indicated that for the first factor, the items expressed anxiety, the second factor concentrated on social withdrawal, the third on school achievement and addictive behavior, and the fourth on depression and delinquent behaviors. Table 1 shows the loadings of the four factors identified after the exploratory factor analysis, accounting for 67.8% of the overall variance (with eigenvalue >1). Table 2 shows the descriptive statistics for the four factors.
Table 1.
Factor loadings of the item of the CACIT questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Component Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Generalized Anxiety</td>
<td>.650</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Anxiety about academic studies</td>
<td>.906</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Anxiety for career development</td>
<td>.896</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Withdrawal and Loneliness</td>
<td>.607</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sleep disorders</td>
<td>.651</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Decreased interest in socialization</td>
<td>.760</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Decreased interest in outdoor activities</td>
<td>.757</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Decreased Concentration</td>
<td></td>
<td>.608</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Increased Time Spent Online</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.521</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Addictive Behaviors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.529</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Indifference School Achievement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.777</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Decreased Emotional Wellbeing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.612</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Excessive use of Alcohol/Drugs</td>
<td>.677</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Delinquent Behaviors</td>
<td>.639</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Depressive Symptoms</td>
<td>.709</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Suicidal Ideation</td>
<td>.834</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Generalized Fear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.620</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Demetriou et al., 2022.

Table 2.
Descriptive Statistics of the Four Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1 Anxiety Factor</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2 Social Withdrawal Factor</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3 School Achievement/Addictive Behaviors</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4 Depression / Delinquent Behaviors Factor</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 The means for the four factors were as follows: (F1): Anxiety Factor 
   
   \( M = 2.87, SD = 0.81 \), (F2): Social Withdrawal and Loneliness factor 
   
   \( M = 3.29, SD = 0.87 \), (F3): School Achievement and Addictive Behaviors 
   
   \( M = 3.59, SD = 0.78 \), (F4): Depression and Delinquent Behaviors Factor 
   
   \( M = 3.90, SD = 0.85 \) (Demetriou et al., 2022).
Research question 1: How do middle—and high-school counselors evaluate the aftereffects of COVID-19 restrictive measures on their advisees’ mental health?

When addressing the first research question, the answers of the subjects in the seventeen statements of current CACIT questionnaire were grouped as ‘agree’ or ‘agree completely,’ revealing the following tendencies in our sample:

Anxiety Factor (F1): Generalized anxiety was believed to be present by 82.7% of our participants concerning their pupils (item 1), with 83% of the counselors noting heightened anxiety among their advisees regarding their college education (item 2). Furthermore, 79% of the sample observed increased anxiety in their pupils concerning career development (item 3).

Social Withdrawal/Loneliness Factor (F2): An increased withdrawal tendency from peers and family members was reported by more than half of the counselors in the sample (53%) (item 4). Additionally, 43% observed a decrease in adolescents’ interest in outdoor activities (item 7) and general difficulties in sociability (item 6), while 36% noted sleeping pattern disorders among their advisees (item 5).

School Achievement/Addictive Behaviors Factor (F3): 74% of the school counselors considered that the students under their supervision had an increased online presence (item 9), and 56% estimated that adolescents displayed decreased concentration issues (item 8). A tendency towards elevated addictive patterns was perceived by more than half of the counselors (57%) among teenagers (item 10). Furthermore, 48% and 53% of counselors noted increased indifference towards school achievements (item 13) and reduced emotional well-being (item 14) in their students, respectively.

Depression/Delinquent Behavior Factor (F4): A relatively high percentage of counselors (40%) detected in their pupils’ behaviors depressive symptoms and generalized fear reactions (items 15 and 17, respectively). On the other hand, only 21% and 19% of our participants (respectively) believed that their advisees were inclined towards delinquent behaviors or substance abuse (items 12 and 11), and even fewer counselors (11%) claimed that adolescents suffered from suicide ideation (item 16).

Following the government-mandated COVID-19 physical and social restrictive measures and the long school closures, our analysis of the frequencies of the school counselors’ responses on the CACIT showed that they considered the most prominent behavioral and mental issues of their teenage advisees to be generalized anxiety (82.7%), anxiety for academic studies (83%), anxiety...
for career development (79%) and last, but not least, increased time spent online (74%). Comparing the sample's demographics and the counselors' responses to the four-factor statements (t-test, \( p < .05 \)) revealed no statistically significant variations between counselors' gender, professional locations, or ethnicity (Greek/Cypriot). Moreover, a two-way ANOVA study comparing the means of participants’ ages, education, and professional experience revealed no statistically significant differences in their judgment of their adolescent advisees.

**Descriptive statistics of the SCSE**

Factor analysis of the 43 statements of the SCSE questionnaire using the Rotated Component Matrix (Varimax with Kaiser Normalization) indicated five factors. Following their content analysis, they were posed as F1: Individual and Social Development; F2: Leadership and Assessment; F3: Career and Academic Advancement; F4: Collaboration; and finally, F5: Cultural Awareness. Table 3 shows the loadings of the five factors identified after the factor analysis, accounting for 73.66% of the overall variance (eigenvalue >1).

**Table 3.**

*Factor loadings of the items of the SCSE questionnaire*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>F 1</th>
<th>F 2</th>
<th>F 3</th>
<th>F 4</th>
<th>F 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Analyze Data</td>
<td>.588</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Consult and collaborate w/ teachers, admins &amp; parents</td>
<td></td>
<td>.685</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Conduct interventions w/ parents, guardians, and families</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.628</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Teach students time and task management skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.676</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Explain to pupils, parents &amp; teachers learning styles &amp; school performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Deliver age-appropriate programs on the world of work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Implement a program enabling students to reach career decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Model and teach conflict resolution skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Change situations where individuals/groups treat others in disrespectful ways</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Teach students effective communication skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.799</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Follow ethical &amp; legal obligations regarding SC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Guide students in techniques to cope with peer pressure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Adjust communication style according to student’s age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Incorporate students’ developmental stages in the school counseling program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I can communicate with any student in my school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Teach, develop &amp; support students’ coping mechanisms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Counsel effectively students and families from different social/economic statuses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Recognize situations that impact student learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Foster an understanding of the relationship between learning and work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.527</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
29. Understand the experiences of parents and students from different cultural backgrounds  
31. Discuss sexuality & sexual orientation in an age-appropriate manner with students  
32. Speak in front of large audiences (students/parents)  
34. Communicate in writing with staff/parents/community  
35. Help students attain attitudes, behaviors, and skills for successful learning  
36. Select & implement strategies to assess school-wide issues  
37. Promote counseling activities by the total school community  
38. Develop school improvement plans  
39. Identify aptitude, achievement, interest, values, and personality appraisal resources  
40. Implement a preventive approach to student problems  
41. Lead school-wide initiatives focused on promoting a positive learning environment  
42. Consult with external community agencies  
9. Effectively deliver suitable parts of the school counseling program through large group meetings in classrooms  
17. Evaluate commercially prepared materials designed for school counseling  
19. Ensure a safe environment for all students in my school  
30. Help teachers improve their effectiveness w/ students  
33. Use technology to support student success in the learning process  
5. Develop measurable outcomes for a school counseling program  
7. Establish rapport w/ a student for individual counseling  
8. Function successfully as a small group leader  
4. Advocate for self as professional SC  
16. Teach students to apply problem-solving skills  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1 Individual and Social Development</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2 Leadership &amp; Assessment</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3 Career &amp; Academic Advancement</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4 Collaboration</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5 Cultural Awareness</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown in Table 4, the five factors had very high means. Factor 1: *Individual and Social Development* ($M = 4.03$, $SD = 0.69$); Factor 2: *Leadership and Assessment* ($M = 3.82$, $SD = 0.77$); Factor 3: *Career and Academic Advancement* ($M = 3.96$, $SD = 0.72$); Factor 4: *Collaboration* ($M = 3.53$, $SD = 0.58$) and Factor 5: *Cultural Awareness* ($M = 3.88$, $SD = 0.71$).

The t-test ($p < .05$) was used to relate the demographic data of the sample with their responses to the statements of the five factors: Statistically significant differences have not been found between the counselors’ gender and area of service (urban/rural) or between Greek and Cypriot counselors. Additionally, the means of counselors’ age, education, and years of work experience were compared via a two-way ANOVA, revealing no statistically significant differences in their self-efficacy evaluations.

As seen in Table 5, the 2-tailed Pearson correlation analysis revealed that the correlations between the factors were all statistically significant positive correlations ($p < .01$), thus indicating a robust linear relationship between the five factors of the School Counselors’ Self-Efficacy Scale (SCSE).

**Table 5.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>F3</th>
<th>F4</th>
<th>F5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1 Individual / Social Development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2 Leadership/Assessment</td>
<td>.869**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3 Career/ Academic Advancement</td>
<td>.938**</td>
<td>.902**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4 Collaboration</td>
<td>.910**</td>
<td>.918**</td>
<td>.905**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5 Cultural Awareness</td>
<td>.872**</td>
<td>.862**</td>
<td>.854**</td>
<td>.903**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed)

Research Question 2: How do school counselors assess their self-efficacy in the five areas of the School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale (SCSE)?

The frequencies of the counselors’ responses on the SCSE items were used in order to examine the second research question. The subjects’ answers 'generally confident' and 'highly confident' in the forty-three statements of the SCSE scale were grouped. Percentages for these two response categories were added and recorded for each item. Subsequently, the items were regrouped into their factors, and the average percentages for each were calculated. (Table 6)
Table 6.
Average Frequencies in ‘confident’ and ‘highly confident’ responses on the five factors of the SCSE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Average percentage of confident / highly confident responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor 5, Cultural Awareness</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1, Individual and Social Development</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>82.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 4, Collaboration</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2, Leadership and Assessment</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3, Career and Academic Advancement</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor 5 (F5, Cultural Awareness, M=3.88) had, on average, the highest frequencies in ‘generally’ and ‘highly confident’ responses (88.2%), followed by Factor 1 (F1, Individual and Social Development, M = 4.03) (82.3%). Factor 4 (F4 Collaboration, M=3.53), with a confidence level of 75.8%, represented the third factor regarding the participating counselors’ confidence responses. Factor 2 (F2, Leadership and Assessment, M = 3.82) and Factor 3 (F3 Career and Academic Advancement, M = 3.96) occupied the last two positions in our counselors’ confidence levels.

More specifically, out of the forty-three items of the scale, the highest confidence levels of the counselors were concentrated in the following three items (taking into consideration items where the frequencies exceeded 90%): Item 6 (F1), “I can consult/collaborate with parents, guardians, and families,” had the highest percentages of confident/highly confident responses (92.2%). Item 26 (F1), “I can communicate with any student in my school,” item 7 (F4), “I can establish rapport w/ a student for individual counseling,” and item 4 (F5), “Advocate for self as professional SC” came in the counselors’ second place of confidence levels with 91.2% respectively. On the other hand, the lowest confidence levels of the participants were recorded in three items (frequencies <55%): Item 31 (F2), “Discuss sexuality & sexual orientation in an age-appropriate manner with students (53.7%), item 41 (F2) “Lead school-wide initiatives focused on promoting a positive learning environment” (53.7%) and item 17 (F3), “Evaluate commercially prepared materials designed for school counseling” (55%).

The two-tailed t-test revealed no significant statistical differences in the counselors’ responses on the SCSE regarding their gender, area of their school (urban/rural), or country (Greece/Cyprus).
The comparison of means (ANOVA) also revealed no statistically significant differences amongst the participants regarding their age(s), educational levels, or professional experience.

**Research question 3: How do counselors’ assessments of pupils’ post-pandemic mental and behavioral states affect their self-efficacy beliefs in the five factors of the Self-Efficacy Scale?**

Cluster analysis was conducted to divide the sample into two groups: The counselors who identified low (group 1) and high (group 2) anxiety levels of their advisees on the CACIT. It was conducted t-tests to compare the two categories with the five factors of the SCSE. (Table 7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anxiety level of advisees</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1 low</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2 low</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3 low</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4 low</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5 low</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 shows that 60 counselors identified high levels of generalized anxiety in their advisees, whereas 20 regarded that their pupils experienced low anxiety levels. In all cases, the means were too high (> 3.00). However, there were statistically significant differences between the counselors who assessed their students as having ‘high’ or ‘low’ anxiety in all five factors of the SCSE. I.e., all counselors who assessed students as having high anxiety also recorded high scores on all five factors of the self-efficacy scale, thus displaying higher levels of self-efficacy (Table 7). The sixty counselors assessing their pupils as having “high anxiety” had statistically significant higher means (p < .05) in all the five factors of the SCSE compared to the twenty counselors who characterized their advisees as having ‘low anxiety’ after returning to school post-COVID-19 school closures: F5 Cultural Awareness \( F(4,79) = 20.767, \ p = .02; \) F1 Individual and social development \( F(4,79) = 15.98, \ p = .03; \) F4 Collaboration \( F(4,79) = 13.169, \ p = .03; \) F3 Career and academic advancement \( F(4,79) = 8.961, \ p = .04; \) F2 Leadership and assessment \( F(4,79) = 8.243, \ p = .04. \)
Moreover, according to their assessment of pupils' mental and behavioral states on the CACIT questionnaire, cluster analysis was applied to divide the sample into three categories of Depression/Delinquent behaviors. Most of the counselors \( (n = 56) \) posed that their pupils had high depression and tendencies towards delinquent behaviors; 18 counselors evaluated their pupils as medium, and 6 counselors as low in depressive symptoms/delinquent behaviors. The ANOVA test determined statistically significant differences between the three categories (high, medium, low) and the five factors of the Self-Efficiency Scale (SCSE) \( (p < .01) \). Specifically, the means for the two groups with statistically significant differences, derived by the Scheffe analysis were:

- \( \text{F1 (2,79)} = 5.93, \ p < .01 \ M_{\text{high}} = 4.10, M_{\text{low}} = 3.15 \)
- \( \text{F2 (2,79)} = 8.74, \ p < .01 \ M_{\text{high}} = 3.91, M_{\text{low}} = 2.66 \)
- \( \text{F3 (2,79)} = 6.43, \ p < .01 \ M_{\text{high}} = 4.06, M_{\text{low}} = 3.02 \)
- \( \text{F1 (2,79)} = 5.32, \ p < .01 \ M_{\text{high}} = 3.58, M_{\text{low}} = 2.81 \)
- \( \text{F1 (2,79)} = 7.17, \ p < .01 \ M_{\text{high}} = 4.05, M_{\text{low}} = 2.91 \)

These differences were prominent among the counselors who evaluated their students as high or low in generalized anxiety, depressive symptoms/delinquent behaviors, anxiety regarding their studies and careers, and excessive internet time \( (p < .05) \). Similar tendencies were detected in those counselors who assessed their students as having medium to low symptoms in the four factors mentioned earlier in the CACIT assessment questionnaire \( (p < .05) \). In other words, counselors that detected in their advisees high/medium generalized anxiety, depression/delinquent behaviors, career anxiety, and excessive internet use had higher means in all the factors of the SCSE \( (p < .05) \), indicating that the stricter they evaluated their students' post-pandemic mental and emotional states on the CACIT the higher they evaluated their self-efficiency on the SCSE.

**Discussion**

The extended school closures in 2020 and 2021 due to the restrictive measures to prevent the dissemination of the Sars-V-II virus led to increasing concerns about adolescents' mental and behavioral states. Early research showed that the negative experiences of adolescents during the social isolation periods, combined with the lack of access to support mechanisms (school counseling), confronted teenagers with new stressors with detrimental effects on their well-being.
On the other hand, school counselors faced personal and professional challenges during the COVID-19 pandemic when the pupils returned to schools following the end of the social isolation measures. Findings by Serafini et al. (2020) pointed to the fact that restrictive measures (e.g., quarantine and social restrictions) triggered adverse psychological reactions not only during the pandemic but also after the pandemic had passed and the measures had been lifted. The three research questions were answered by the findings in the following manner:

In accordance with the first research question, the 17-item questionnaire CACIT was answered by eighty Greek and Cypriot school counselors. Factor analysis of the counselors' responses identified four factors, namely Anxiety (F1), Social Withdrawal and Loneliness (F2), School achievement/Addictive tendencies (F3), and Depression/Delinquency (F4). Frequency analysis of the responses showed that counselors ranked their advisees' four most prominent mental health issues as generalized anxiety, anxiety about future academic studies, stress about career pursuits, and increased time spent on the internet. Indeed, according to a recent study conducted in Greece (Demetriou et al., 2022; Anastasiou & Duquenne, 2020), confinement has significantly increased the feeling of social isolation for a notable portion of the Greek population: 35%, primarily women, young people under 30 years old, and those on work suspension, experienced not only psychological discomfort but also fear about the future. According to Burrai et al. (2021), research investigating the effects of COVID-19 on teenage mental health marked cases of significant mental/behavioral issues with anxiety, depression, and PTSD as the most prominent. Chevance et al. (2020) noted an upsurge in both pre-existing and non-pre-existing cases of psychopathological disorders in adolescent populations. The first Eurofound e-survey (Living, Working, and Covid-19), which provided a picture of the pandemic's impact on people's lives in E.U. countries, revealed that during the first lockdown in Greece, the public expressed a low sense of well-being (Eurofound, 2020). Notably, only some experienced this feeling in the same way or with the same intensity: Socio-demographic characteristics, economic and working conditions, and residential areas were all factors that explained why certain demographic groups were more likely to experience loneliness and social isolation. A survey published in 2021 by a USA-based non-profit organization, revealed that teenage students identified as their primary obstacles to learning anxiety, stress, and depression, while Yildiz (2021) also claimed that risk factors associated with lockdowns might have led to despair and bad mindsets, which could have given on to collapse and anxiety. The participating counselors identified anxiety about future academic studies and career development as the pandemic's second and third most prominent
psychosocial effects on adolescents. It should be underlined that when this survey was conducted, the unemployment rate in Cyprus for young people aged 15-24 had reached 14.5% (Press and Information Office, C.Y., 2021), while in Greece, unemployment amongst young people had climbed, in November 2021, to a record high of 39.1% (Eurostat, 2021).

Research showed that self-efficacy is crucial to effective teaching, counseling, and adjustment to change (Bandura, 1995; Larson & Daniels, 1998). Data analysis for the second research question, namely counselors’ self-reported assessment of their efficacy, showed that our samples’ general self-efficacy was high. Specifically, it was highest in cultural awareness (F5), followed by individual and social development (F1) and collaboration (F4). Leadership and assessment (F2) and career and academic advancement (F3) were identified as the areas where they felt less competent, occupying the last two positions. The comparison of means among our counselors’ age, education, and years of work experience resulted in no statistically significant differences in their self-efficacy evaluations. High scores in school counselors’ self-efficacy have been reported in studies by Scholz et al. (2002), whose findings showed that counselors reported higher levels of general self-efficacy than the international averages of the general population. Correspondingly, Holcomb-McCoy et al. (2008) findings showed that school counselors tended to report high self-efficacy. In our study, the majority of participants (81.2%) were above 35 years old, and half of these individuals had over eleven years of work experience, potentially contributing to their elevated levels of self-reported self-efficacy.

Concerning the third research question regarding school counselors’ assessments of their self-efficacy in handling pupils’ post-pandemic mental and behavioral states, the predominant trend observed in our findings was as follows: Counselors who detected in their advisees high/medium generalized anxiety, depression/delinquent behaviors, career anxiety, and excessive internet use had higher means in all the factors of the SCSE (p < .05), indicating that the stricter they evaluated their students’ post-pandemic mental and emotional states on the CACIT the higher they evaluated their self-efficiency on the SCSE. Because preserving children’s mental, emotional, and physical well-being is at the heart of the school counselor’s job, these professionals have been at the center of the problem-solving process since the coronavirus emerged and have been multi-tasking throughout the school closures: School counselors attempted to ensure that students had the necessary equipment and internet access; aided parents, older siblings, or grandparents with technical troubleshooting; responded to teacher requests to determine why students were not showing up for online classes. All that while continuing to provide academic advice, emphasizing
Students’ emotional and social development, and providing tailored assistance to children struggling with various personal and school-related issues. Meanwhile, school administrators’ expectations about what constitutes the school counselor job are frequently at odds with counselors’ expectations (Amatea & Clark, 2005; Benigno, 2017), and this issue often reflects uncertainty about what counselors may and should do (Fye et al., 2017; Ruiz et al., 2018). Organizational restrictions such as job ambiguity and overemphasizing administrative obligations (Chandler et al., 2018), as stated by Blake (2020), combined with the corresponding adaptations to new challenges brought about by the pandemic outbreak, may have empowered counselors with a newly-founded autonomy to carry out their jobs by supporting students to the best of their knowledge, skills, and resources (Savitz-Romer et al., 2021). During school closures, counselors acclimated to not receiving direction from their school or district leaders by embracing this autonomy and taking the initiative to carry out their roles the best way they knew. According to Savitz-Romer (ibid.), participants in a study with 1060 school counselors described this as “fending for ourselves” or “coming up with a system that works for us.” Whereas some of the counselors experienced autonomy due to limited guidance, there were a few cases in which counselors described independence because their school leaders trusted in them. This autonomy may have reflected their elevated self-efficacy ratings with students’ post-pandemic behavioral and emotional states. Previous findings demonstrating that school counselors had a beneficial influence on student outcomes, coupled with studies identifying organizational and structural hurdles that impeded counselors’ practices, suggested that when the settings are appropriate, counselors can be effective and can, therefore, feel effective. This pattern is consistent with teacher-focused research, emphasizing that working environments may help or hinder teachers’ efficacy (Johnson et al., 2011).

Limitations and Future Research Suggestions

Certain limitations were identified in this study. First, it was initially a pilot study and thus included a relatively small sample of school counselors from Cyprus and Greece. Two problems with small samples are determining whether the study results are accurate and the inability to reject a false 0 hypothesis (Type II error). The sample size affects the study’s ability to generalize its conclusions. Another significant limitation in generalizing the findings was that the study included only Greek and Cypriot school counselors. This is the only nationality of counselors employed by the respective ministries of education, thus limiting counselors’ ability to communicate with and assess teenagers of other nationalities, especially those belonging to vulnerable social groups,
i.e., refugees, in the school system. Last but not least, the study's main limitation was the low response rate from school counselors. The questionnaire was sent to all counselors through professional associations, but only a few responded. Perhaps, at the time of data collection, in September 2021, when schools reopened after extended closures, counselors were already experiencing burnout from heavy workloads, role confusion, and multitasking.

Further Implications

This study was part of a project that examined how COVID-19 restrictions affected adolescents' mental health (15-17 years old) and how counselors assessed their self-efficacy to help their advisees. As a scientific community, many lessons have been gleaned about the roles of professionals during or after a crisis, even though we are now several years beyond the pandemic. In the aftermath of the pandemic, teenagers who have faced significant disruptions in their daily lives, such as trauma, illness, loss of routine, minimal social contact, and family financial hardships, are still in dire need of social-emotional programs that would support their resilience.

It is believed that a follow-up step should involve implementing an intervention program for counselors, utilizing creative processes and techniques (such as drama or art) to educate them on best practices for addressing teenagers' post-crisis psychosocial issues. The issue is complicated, and it needs the contribution of an interdisciplinary team (e.g., psychologists, creative drama and visual arts teachers, educators, and counselors) to prepare a psychoeducational intervention for adolescent focus groups. After examining the accountability of such types of interventions, researchers can propose specific suggestions about the upgraded role of the experts who are expected to work with adolescents.
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