

Analysis of Guidance and Counseling Students' Ability in Preparing Guidance Reports during Field Experience Program I

Elpiani Rajagukguk^a, Sunaryo A.I^a, Oktamia Karuniaty Sangalang^a

^aUniversitas Palangka Raya, Indonesia

 rajagukgukelpiani@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study was motivated by the difficulties experienced by Guidance and Counseling students participating in Field Experience Program I in preparing guidance reports, particularly in using instruments to identify students' needs and problems and in presenting the results of field experience activities in a systematic report format. This study aims to analyze the ability of Guidance and Counseling students in Field Experience Program I to prepare guidance reports. The study employed a descriptive qualitative approach, involving five seventh semester students from the 2016 cohort as data sources. Data were collected through observation, interviews, and documentation. The data were analyzed through the stages of data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing or verification. The findings indicate that students' ability to prepare guidance reports remains suboptimal. The main difficulties identified include limited understanding of report structure, insufficient use of instruments for identifying students' needs and problems, such as AUM, PTSDL, DCM, questionnaires, sociometry, interviews, anecdotal records, and rating scales, as well as the lack of comprehensive reporting guidelines from the study program and the Field Experience Program implementation unit. In addition, limited time and incomplete student data also became obstacles to preparing comprehensive reports. These findings suggest that students participating in Field Experience Program I require more structured report guidelines, technical training in the use of assessment instruments, and intensive supervision from academic supervisors and mentor teachers. The implications of this study emphasize the importance of providing a complete and standardized guidebook so that students can prepare guidance reports systematically, accurately, and in accordance with established procedures.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 31 March 2026

Accepted 25 May 2026

Published 2 June 2026

KEYWORDS

Field Experience Program I students; guidance and counseling; guidance report; students' needs and problems identification instruments; field experience practice.

Introduction

Field Experience Program I is an important component in developing the initial competencies of Guidance and Counseling students as prospective guidance and counseling teachers or school counselors. Through this program, students are not only required to understand the basic concepts of guidance and counseling, but also to apply professional skills in school contexts. These skills include identifying students' needs, using non test assessment instruments, designing service programs, implementing guidance activities, and documenting the results of these activities in the form of guidance reports. In counselor education, field experience is viewed as an important transitional space that connects academic knowledge with professional skills in real settings. Xiong, Bonner, Travis, Xing, and Zhang (2022) found that practicum experience provides counseling students with opportunities for learning and professional growth through direct engagement with real counseling contexts. Recent counselor education standards also position fieldwork, student assessment, and program evaluation as essential components of academic quality and the professional readiness of prospective counselors (Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs [CACREP], 2024).

In school guidance and counseling services, guidance reports serve an important function as both academic documents and forms of professional accountability. A report does not merely describe activities, but also presents data from the identification of students' needs and problems, instrument analysis, program planning, service implementation, evaluation, and follow up. The Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of Guidance and Counseling in Vocational High Schools emphasize that guidance and counseling services should be managed through the stages of planning, implementation, evaluation, reporting, and program development. These guidelines also identify the preparation of guidance and counseling service reports as one of the competencies that must be mastered by guidance and counseling teachers or counselors (Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Republik Indonesia, 2016). Thus, the ability to prepare guidance reports is an important indicator in assessing the readiness of Guidance and Counseling students in Field Experience Program I to integrate assessment data, student needs, and service procedures into systematic report documents.

A well prepared guidance report must be based on data concerning students' needs. Modern guidance and counseling services emphasize the importance of data informed decision making so that service programs truly correspond to students' needs. The ASCA National Model explains that school counseling programs should be developed based on data informed decision making, delivered systematically to all students, and oriented toward improving student outcomes (American School Counselor Association [ASCA], 2019). Similarly, Romiaty, Apriatama, Pangestie, and Stevandy (2024) found that needs assessment is an important stage in developing accountable guidance and counseling programs because it helps counselors obtain factual data about students' conditions, needs, and problems as a basis for designing service programs. In this context, instruments such as the Problem Checklist and the General Problem Disclosure Tool are used to obtain an overview of students' problems in personal, social, academic, and career domains.

Based on preliminary observations, seventh semester Guidance and Counseling students from the 2016 cohort who participated in Field Experience Program I still experienced several obstacles in preparing guidance reports. These obstacles were mainly related to the use of instruments for identifying students' needs and problems, such as the General Problem Disclosure Tool, Learning Activity and Problem Disclosure Tool, Problem Checklist, student questionnaires, sociometry, information interviews, anecdotal records, and rating scales. Students had not fully been able to process the results of these instruments as a basis for preparing service programs and guidance reports. In addition, students also experienced difficulties in understanding the structure of the report because the reporting guidelines from the study program and the Field Experience Program implementation unit had not been fully

understood or were not yet completely available. This condition indicates that the main issue lies not only in the implementation of Field Experience Program I, but also in students' ability to connect assessment data with the preparation of accurate and accountable guidance reports.

Conceptually, a guidance report for Field Experience Program I should reflect students' ability to carry out professional work stages, starting from identifying students' needs, selecting instruments, collecting data, processing and interpreting data, designing programs, implementing services, and evaluating and reporting the results. Romiaty et al. (2024) emphasize that the needs assessment process in guidance and counseling includes identifying required data, selecting instruments, collecting data, processing data, and analyzing and interpreting the results. When students do not master these stages, guidance reports risk becoming merely administrative documents rather than academic documents that reflect the analytical and professional abilities of prospective guidance and counseling teachers.

Previous studies have mostly discussed the general concepts of guidance and counseling, the objectives of services, and the importance of guidance programs in schools. In contrast, studies that specifically analyze the ability of Guidance and Counseling students in Field Experience Program I to prepare guidance reports based on instruments for identifying students' needs and problems remain limited. In fact, the preparation of guidance reports in Field Experience Program I requires complex competencies because students must integrate assessment data, observation results, student needs analysis, service plans, and activity documentation into a systematic report. Therefore, there is a research gap concerning students' ability to prepare assessment based guidance reports using instruments for identifying students' needs and problems, particularly in the context of Guidance and Counseling students participating in Field Experience Program I.

Based on this gap, the present study is important because it provides a more specific description of the ability of Guidance and Counseling students in Field Experience Program I to prepare guidance reports. This study does not only focus on the administrative completeness of reports, but also on students' ability to understand instruments for identifying students' needs and problems, process assessment data, prepare reports according to the required structure, and identify obstacles encountered during the report preparation process. The findings are expected to serve as a basis for study programs, academic supervisors, mentor teachers, and Field Experience Program implementation units in developing report guidelines that are more complete, operational, and easier for students to use.

Thus, this study aims to analyze the ability of seventh semester Guidance and Counseling students from the 2016 cohort in Field Experience Program I to prepare guidance reports. Specifically, this study seeks to identify the forms of difficulty experienced by students in using instruments for identifying students' needs and problems, understanding report structure, processing student data, and presenting the results of Field Experience Program I activities in guidance reports that align with academic procedures and the practical needs of guidance and counseling services in schools.

Method

This study employed a descriptive qualitative approach with an exploratory orientation. A qualitative approach was selected because this study aimed to gain an in depth understanding of the experiences, abilities, and difficulties of Guidance and Counseling students in Field Experience Program I in preparing guidance reports. Qualitative research allows researchers to explore the meanings of participants' experiences in natural contexts, particularly when the research focus is directed toward processes, perceptions, and interpretations of a phenomenon (Creswell & Poth, 2018). In this study, the phenomenon examined was students' ability to use instruments for identifying students' needs and problems, process student data, understand report structure, and present the results of Field Experience Program I activities in guidance reports.

The research subjects consisted of five Guidance and Counseling students in Field Experience Program I from the seventh semester of the 2016 cohort. The subjects were selected using purposive sampling, namely the selection of informants based on specific criteria relevant to the research objectives. This technique is appropriate in qualitative research when researchers need informants who have direct experience with the phenomenon being studied (Campbell et al., 2020). The criteria for the subjects in this study were students who had participated in Field Experience Program I for guidance activities, used instruments for identifying students' needs and problems, and prepared Field Experience Program I guidance reports. The limited number of subjects was positioned as part of an exploratory study. Therefore, the findings of this study are not intended to be generalized to all Guidance and Counseling students, but to provide an initial description of the forms of ability and difficulty experienced by students in preparing guidance reports.

The data sources in this study consisted of primary and secondary data. Primary data were obtained through interviews with five Guidance and Counseling students in Field Experience Program I, observations of the report preparation process, and field notes related to students' experiences in using instruments and preparing reports. Secondary data were obtained through documentation, such as examples of Field Experience Program I guidance reports, Field Experience Program I guidelines, documents of instruments for identifying students' needs and problems, student data processing results, and other relevant supporting documents. In qualitative research, the use of interviews, observations, and documents helps researchers obtain a more comprehensive understanding of the phenomenon under study because data are collected from various sources and techniques (Moser & Korstjens, 2018).

Data collection techniques included interviews, observation, and documentation. Interviews were used to explore students' experiences related to their understanding of report structure, use of instruments for identifying students' needs and problems, processing of student data, and obstacles encountered during report preparation. Observation was used to examine the process by which students prepared, organized, and compiled report documents. Documentation was used to review report completeness, conformity with report structure, use of instruments, and administrative evidence of Field Experience Program I activities. The combination of these three techniques was used so that the data did not rely solely on students' statements, but could also be compared with documentary evidence and field observations.

Data were analyzed using thematic analysis. Thematic analysis was used because it is appropriate for identifying, organizing, and interpreting patterns of meaning or themes that emerge from qualitative data (Braun & Clarke, 2022). The analysis process was conducted through several stages. First, the researcher read all interview transcripts, observation notes, and report documents to obtain an initial understanding of the data. Second, the researcher conducted initial coding by assigning codes to parts of the data that reflected students' abilities, difficulties, obstacles, and needs in preparing reports. The initial codes included understanding of report structure, use of instruments for identifying students' needs and problems, student data processing, limited availability of guidelines, consultation with academic supervisors and mentor teachers, and time constraints during Field Experience Program I. Third, codes with similar meanings were grouped into thematic categories. Fourth, these categories were developed into the main themes of the study. Fifth, conclusions were drawn based on patterns of findings that appeared consistently across interviews, observations, and documentation.

Based on the thematic coding process, the findings were directed toward several main categories. These categories included students' ability to understand the structure of guidance reports; students' ability to use instruments for identifying students' needs and problems, such as the General Problem Disclosure Tool, Learning Activity and Problem Disclosure Tool, Problem Checklist, student questionnaires, sociometry, information interviews, anecdotal records, and rating scales; students' ability to process and interpret student data as a basis for preparing

service programs; students' obstacles in preparing reports due to limited guidelines; and the forms of supervision needed by students from academic supervisors, mentor teachers, and the study program. This categorization was used so that the findings were not merely descriptive, but also showed patterns of field findings that could be traced from the data.

Data trustworthiness was ensured through technique triangulation, source triangulation, and member checking. Technique triangulation was conducted by comparing interview, observation, and documentation results. Source triangulation was conducted by comparing information from students, report documents, and the Field Experience Program I guidelines used in the study. Member checking was conducted by confirming summaries of interview results with the research subjects to ensure that the researcher's interpretation was consistent with the experiences conveyed by the students. In qualitative research, credibility, dependability, confirmability, and transferability are important aspects for maintaining data trustworthiness (Korstjens & Moser, 2018). Therefore, this study also used field notes, report documents, and documentation results as reference materials to strengthen the data verification process.

The research procedure consisted of the prefield stage, data collection, data analysis, and reporting of findings. In the prefield stage, the researcher determined the research focus, subjects, and data collection guidelines. In the data collection stage, the researcher conducted interviews, observations, and collected Field Experience Program I guidance report documents. In the data analysis stage, the researcher conducted transcription, coding, categorization, theme development, and verification of findings. In the reporting stage, the researcher presented the findings based on the main themes identified, namely the abilities and difficulties of Guidance and Counseling students in Field Experience Program I in preparing guidance reports based on instruments for identifying students' needs and problems.

Results

Difficulties in Understanding the Use of Instruments for Identifying Students' Needs and Problems

The first finding shows that students experienced difficulties in understanding the functions and procedures for using instruments for identifying students' needs and problems. The instruments considered difficult included AUM, PTSDL, DCM, student questionnaires, sociometry, information interviews, anecdotal records, and rating scales. In general, students understood that these instruments had to be used in Field Experience Program I. However, they did not fully understand the differences in function, procedures for use, and ways of interpreting the results of each instrument.

One student stated:

"I know that the report must include instruments such as AUM, DCM, sociometry, and student questionnaires. However, I am still confused about the function of each instrument and when each instrument should be used. In the end, I only followed examples from previous reports." (M1)

Another student expressed a similar difficulty:

"The most difficult part for me was understanding the results of AUM and DCM. After the instruments were distributed to students, I was still unsure how to read the results and connect them with the needs of guidance services." (M2)

These excerpts indicate that students' difficulties were not limited to data collection, but were mainly related to understanding the functions of the instruments and interpreting assessment results. Students tended to be able to carry out technical instructions, such as distributing instruments to students, but they had not fully been able to use the results of these instruments as a basis for developing guidance service programs.

Difficulties in Processing and Interpreting Student Data

The second finding shows that students encountered obstacles in processing instrument data into information that could be used in reports. The data obtained from students were not always analyzed systematically. Several students stated that they had difficulty determining the priority of student problems after the data had been collected.

One student explained:

"The data from students were actually already available, but I was confused about where to start. I did not yet understand how to determine which problems were the most important to be used as the basis for designing services." (M3)

Another student added:

"I could enter the data into the report format, but when I had to explain the meaning of the data, I still found it difficult. I was afraid of misinterpreting students' problems." (M4)

This finding indicates that students' data processing ability still needs to be strengthened. Ideally, a guidance report should not merely present raw data, but should also demonstrate students' ability to classify, analyze, and interpret student data as a basis for designing services. If this stage is not mastered, the report may become only an administrative document and may not reflect an in depth analysis of students' needs.

Difficulties in Organizing the Structure of Guidance Reports

The third finding concerns students' difficulties in organizing the structure of guidance reports. Students admitted that they were still confused about how to arrange report sections, present instrument data, write needs analysis, and connect assessment results with service plans. This difficulty indicates that students had not fully understood the logical flow of a Field Experience Program I guidance report.

One student stated:

"I often feel confused about which part should be written first. Sometimes the instrument data are already available, but I do not know how to arrange them so that the report looks coherent." (M5)

Another student explained:

"I feel that the Field Experience Program I report has so many parts. There are instruments, needs analysis, service implementation plans, services, and appendices. I find it difficult to connect all of them into one complete report." (M1)

This finding shows that students need a more operational understanding of the report preparation process. Report structure is not only related to the order of chapters or sections, but also to the relationship among student data, service needs, guidance programs, service implementation, evaluation, and follow up.

Lack of Clarity in Report Writing Guidelines

The fourth finding shows that the report writing guidelines were not fully understood or were not sufficiently operational for students. Students stated that the available guidelines did not provide detailed explanations on how to process instrument results, how to write needs analysis, and how to prepare the final report systematically. As a result, students relied heavily on previous report examples or oral directions from academic supervisors and mentor teachers.

One student stated:

"The available guidelines do not explain in detail how to organize instrument results into the report. Therefore, I more often looked at examples of reports from senior students." (M2)

Another student added:

“If I only read the guidelines, I still feel confused. Usually, I understand better after asking the academic supervisor or mentor teacher.” (M3)

This finding indicates that report guidelines need to be developed in a more operational manner. Guidelines that are too general may create different interpretations among students. Consequently, the quality of reports may depend heavily on students’ personal experience, previous report examples, and the intensity of consultation.

The Need for Supervision from Academic Supervisors and Mentor Teachers

The fifth finding shows that students greatly needed supervision from academic supervisors and mentor teachers during the report preparation process. Supervision was particularly needed in selecting instruments, processing student data, preparing needs analysis, writing reports, and revising the final document.

One student explained:

“I felt more assisted when my report was reviewed directly by the academic supervisor. From that process, I knew which parts were incomplete and needed to be revised.” (M4)

Another student stated:

“The mentor teacher helped explain the students’ conditions at school, so it was easier for me to understand the data I obtained from the instruments.” (M5)

This finding indicates that students’ ability to prepare reports is not only determined by their mastery of course materials, but also by the quality of supervision during field practice. Intensive supervision helps students understand their mistakes, improve their reports, and connect field data with the needs of guidance services.

Overall, the findings show that Guidance and Counseling students in Field Experience Program I experienced difficulties in preparing guidance reports in three main aspects. The first is the technical and instrumental aspect, namely difficulties in understanding and using instruments for identifying students’ needs and problems. The second is the analytical aspect, namely difficulties in processing, interpreting, and connecting student data with service programs. The third is the structural aspect, namely limitations in guidelines, time, and supervision during report preparation.

Table 1. Summary of Research Findings

Finding Theme	Evidence from the Field	Implications for the Report
Difficulties in understanding instruments for identifying students’ needs and problems	Students were confused about distinguishing the functions of AUM, DCM, sociometry, questionnaires, anecdotal records, and rating scales	Instruments were used administratively, but had not been optimally used as a basis for needs analysis
Difficulties in processing student data	Students had difficulty determining problem priorities and interpreting instrument results	Reports did not yet show an in depth analysis of students’ needs
Difficulties in organizing report structure	Students were confused about arranging report sections and connecting data with services	Reports tended to be less coherent and less analytical
Lack of clarity in guidelines	Students relied on previous report examples and oral directions	Report quality may vary among students

Finding Theme	Evidence from the Field	Implications for the Report
Need for supervision	Students needed guidance from academic supervisors and mentor teachers	Structured supervision is needed to ensure that reports are more systematic and aligned with procedures

Discussion

The findings of this study indicate that the ability of Guidance and Counseling students in Field Experience Program I to prepare guidance reports still needs to be strengthened, particularly in the use of instruments for identifying students' needs and problems, student data processing, report organization, and interpretation of assessment results. These findings confirm that the preparation of Field Experience Program I reports should not be understood merely as an administrative task, but as part of the process of developing the professional competence of prospective guidance and counseling teachers. In counselor education, field experience serves as an important space for connecting academic knowledge, assessment skills, reflective ability, and professional readiness. Xiong et al. (2022) found that practicum experience provides counseling students with opportunities for learning and professional growth through direct engagement with real counseling contexts. This is also consistent with CACREP (2024), which emphasizes that professional practice, including practicum and internship, should provide students with opportunities to develop professional roles and responsibilities in the counseling field.

Students' difficulties in understanding and using instruments for identifying students' needs and problems indicate that needs assessment remains a major weakness in the preparation of Field Experience Program I reports. In school guidance and counseling services, needs assessment is an essential basis for designing programs and services that are appropriate to students' conditions. The ASCA National Model emphasizes that school counseling programs should be developed through data informed decision making, implemented systematically, and directed toward supporting student success (American School Counselor Association [ASCA], 2019). Similarly, Romiaty et al. (2024) emphasize that needs assessment is an important stage in guidance and counseling program planning because it helps counselors obtain factual data about students' conditions, needs, and problems. Therefore, students' ability to use instruments such as AUM, DCM, sociometry, questionnaires, interviews, anecdotal records, and rating scales is an important skill that must be mastered before they prepare service programs and guidance reports.

The finding regarding students' difficulties in processing and interpreting student data shows a gap between data collection and the use of data for service decision making. Students were able to collect data through instruments for identifying students' needs and problems, but they were not yet fully able to transform the data into information that could be used to design service programs. This condition is consistent with the principle of data based school counseling programs, which emphasizes that data should not only be collected, but also analyzed, interpreted, and used as the basis for service planning. The ASCA National Model also emphasizes the importance of using data to identify student needs and measure the effectiveness of school counseling services (ASCA, 2019). Therefore, preparation for Field Experience Program I needs to strengthen students' ability to read instrument results, determine priority needs, and formulate service recommendations based on student data.

Students' difficulties in organizing report structure indicate that they had not fully understood the logical relationship among assessment, planning, implementation, evaluation, and reporting. A Field Experience Program I guidance report should not only contain complete documents, but should also demonstrate the relationship between student needs assessment results and the services designed. If students prepare reports only by following administrative formats without understanding the relationship among components, the report may lose its

academic and professional function. From the perspective of counselor education, field experience should be directed toward developing reflective ability and applying knowledge in real contexts, rather than merely fulfilling practice documents (CACREP, 2024; Xiong et al., 2022).

The finding concerning unclear report writing guidelines indicates the need for more operational standardization of Field Experience Program I guidance report guidelines. Guidelines that are too general may cause students to interpret report formats differently. As a result, report quality may depend heavily on previous report examples, oral instructions from academic supervisors, or students' individual understanding. In the context of quality assurance in counselor education, practice guidelines should provide clear direction regarding competencies, practice stages, assessment forms, report types, and evaluation criteria. CACREP (2024) emphasizes that counselor education programs need to provide academic structures and learning support that help students achieve expected competencies in a measurable manner.

Students' need for supervision from academic supervisors and mentor teachers shows that supervision is an important factor in the success of Field Experience Program I. Students do not only need administrative direction, but also guidance in interpreting student data, designing programs, revising reports, and understanding the context of services in schools. Xiong et al. (2022) found that counseling students' practicum experiences are strongly influenced by supervisory interaction, adaptation to field contexts, and support from the practice environment. Therefore, supervision in Guidance and Counseling Field Experience Program I needs to be conducted continuously from the planning stage to the implementation and reporting stages.

Methodologically, the findings of this study also demonstrate the importance of systematic qualitative data analysis. The use of thematic analysis helped the researcher organize interview, observation, and documentation data into meaningful themes. Braun and Clarke (2022) explain that thematic analysis enables researchers to identify, organize, and interpret patterns of meaning in data systematically and reflectively. In this study, the emerging patterns showed that students' difficulties were not isolated, but interconnected across limited understanding of instruments, data analysis skills, report structure, guidelines, and supervision.

The trustworthiness of the findings should also be understood through the principles of qualitative rigor. Korstjens and Moser (2018) emphasize that the quality of qualitative research should be maintained through credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability. Therefore, the findings regarding students' difficulties need to be supported by data triangulation, namely the comparison of student interviews, observations of the report preparation process, and documentation of Field Experience Program I reports. Through this process, the findings do not rely solely on students' statements, but are also strengthened by documentary evidence and field observations.

Practically, the findings have implications for Guidance and Counseling study programs, academic supervisors, mentor teachers, and Field Experience Program implementation units. Study programs need to provide more detailed report writing guidelines based on instruments for identifying students' needs and problems. These guidelines should include examples of instrument data processing, examples of student needs analysis, examples of the relationship between assessment results and service programs, and report assessment rubrics. Academic supervisors need to provide guidance from the early stage of instrument selection to the final stage of report preparation. Mentor teachers need to help students understand the school context and validate the field data obtained by students. These recommendations are consistent with the principle of developing school counseling programs based on data and student needs as emphasized in the ASCA National Model (ASCA, 2019).

Thus, this discussion affirms that the main issue in preparing Field Experience Program I guidance reports is not merely the completeness of report format, but students' ability to integrate assessment data, student needs analysis, service planning, and reporting of guidance activities. Therefore, improving the quality of Guidance and Counseling Field Experience Program

I reports requires three main strategies: strengthening training in the use of instruments for identifying students' needs and problems, providing more operational report writing guidelines, and implementing structured supervision from academic supervisors and mentor teachers. These three strategies are important so that students' field experience does not only produce administrative documents, but also develops the professional competence of prospective guidance and counseling teachers in conducting assessment, designing services, and documenting service results in an accountable manner.

Conclusion

This study concludes that the ability of Guidance and Counseling students in Field Experience Program I to prepare guidance reports still needs to be strengthened, particularly in the use of instruments for identifying students' needs and problems, student data processing, report organization, and interpretation of assessment results. The findings show that students were generally able to collect data through various instruments, such as AUM, DCM, sociometry, questionnaires, interviews, anecdotal records, and rating scales. However, they still experienced difficulties in understanding the specific functions of each instrument, interpreting the results, determining priority needs, and connecting assessment findings with guidance service planning.

The study also found that students' difficulties were not limited to technical aspects, but also involved analytical and structural dimensions. In the analytical dimension, students had difficulty transforming raw data into meaningful information for service planning. In the structural dimension, students were confused about organizing the report systematically and connecting assessment results, needs analysis, service plans, implementation, evaluation, and follow up. These difficulties were further influenced by the lack of operational report writing guidelines and the limited intensity of supervision during the report preparation process.

The practical implication of this study is that Guidance and Counseling study programs need to provide more structured and operational guidelines for Field Experience Program I reports. These guidelines should include clear report formats, examples of instrument data processing, models of student needs analysis, links between assessment results and service programs, and assessment rubrics. In addition, academic supervisors and mentor teachers need to provide continuous supervision from the planning stage to the final report revision stage.

This study is limited by the small number of participants and its exploratory qualitative design. Therefore, the findings are not intended for broad generalization, but to provide an initial understanding of students' difficulties in preparing guidance reports. Future research is recommended to involve a larger number of participants, compare students from different cohorts or institutions, and examine the effectiveness of structured report writing guidelines and supervision models in improving the quality of Field Experience Program I guidance reports.

Acknowledgment

The authors would like to express their sincere gratitude to Universitas Palangka Raya for its academic support during the preparation of this manuscript. The authors also thank the Guidance and Counseling Study Program, academic supervisors, mentor teachers, and students who provided support and information during the research process. Appreciation is also extended to all parties who contributed non financial support to the completion of this study.

Research Ethics Statement

This study was conducted in accordance with the ethical principles of educational research. The participants were informed about the purpose and procedures of the study, and their participation was voluntary. The identities of all participants were kept confidential, and the data obtained through interviews, observations, and documentation were used only for academic and research purposes. Since this study did not involve clinical intervention or procedures that posed

physical or psychological risk to participants, formal ethical approval was not required. However, the research process was carried out responsibly by maintaining confidentiality, accuracy, and respect for participants' experiences.

Author Contributions

Elpiani Rajagukguk: conceptualization, data collection, field observation, interview implementation, data analysis, and writing of the original draft.

Sunaryo A.I: research methodology, supervision of the research process, validation of data interpretation, and critical review of the manuscript.

Oktamia Karuniaty Sangalang: literature review, data interpretation, manuscript editing, and final revision.

All authors have read and approved the final version of the manuscript.

Funding

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not for profit sectors.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest regarding the research, authorship, and publication of this article.

Artificial Intelligence Use Statement

The authors declare that artificial intelligence, if used, was employed only as a technical support tool for language editing, grammar checking, and improving manuscript readability. All scientific analysis, interpretation of data, arguments, and conclusions remain the full responsibility of the authors.

Data Availability Statement

The data supporting the findings of this study consist of interview results, observation notes, and documentation related to the preparation of guidance reports during Field Experience Program I. The data are not publicly available to protect the confidentiality of the participants. Additional information may be obtained from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

References

- American School Counselor Association. (2019). *The ASCA National Model: A framework for school counseling programs* (4th ed.). American School Counselor Association.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2022). *Thematic analysis: A practical guide*. SAGE Publications.
- Campbell, S., Greenwood, M., Prior, S., Shearer, T., Walkem, K., Young, S., Bywaters, D., & Walker, K. (2020). Purposive sampling: Complex or simple? Research case examples. *Journal of Research in Nursing*, 25(8), 652–661. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1744987120927206>
- Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs. (2024). *2024 CACREP standards*. Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs.
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Republik Indonesia. (2016). *Panduan operasional penyelenggaraan bimbingan dan konseling Sekolah Menengah Kejuruan*. Direktorat Jenderal

Guru dan Tenaga Kependidikan, Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Republik Indonesia.

- Korstjens, I., & Moser, A. (2018). Series: Practical guidance to qualitative research. Part 4: Trustworthiness and publishing. *European Journal of General Practice*, 24(1), 120–124. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13814788.2017.1375092>
- Moser, A., & Korstjens, I. (2018). Series: Practical guidance to qualitative research. Part 3: Sampling, data collection and analysis. *European Journal of General Practice*, 24(1), 9–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13814788.2017.1375091>
- Romiaty, Apriatama, D., Pangestie, E. P., & Stevandy, M. (2024). Development of student needs assessment guidelines in planning guidance and counseling programs. *EDUCATION: Journal of Education Research and Review*, 2(1), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.59397/edu.v2i1.19>
- Xiong, Y., Bonner, M. W., Travis, S. P., Xing, F., & Zhang, Q. (2021). International counseling students' practicum experience in a counseling program in the United States: A phenomenological study. *Journal of International Students*, 12(3), 633–653. <https://doi.org/10.32674/jis.v12i3.3444>