

A SURVEY OF COUNSELOR ROLE AS PERCEIVED  
BY ADMINISTRATORS, FACULTY, STUDENTS,  
AND COUNSELORS IN SELECTED PUBLIC  
TWO YEAR COLLEGES IN OKLAHOMA

By

ROGER H. FRENCH

Bachelor of Science in Education  
Emporia State University  
Emporia, Kansas  
1965

Master of Science  
Emporia State University  
Emporia, Kansas  
1970

Submitted to the Faculty of the  
Graduate College of the  
Oklahoma State University  
in partial fulfillment of  
the requirements for  
the Degree of  
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION  
May, 1979

Thesis  
1979 D  
F 875 S  
cop. 2



A SURVEY OF COUNSELOR ROLE AS PERCEIVED  
BY ADMINISTRATORS, FACULTY, STUDENTS,  
AND COUNSELORS IN SELECTED PUBLIC  
TWO YEAR COLLEGES IN OKLAHOMA

Thesis Approved:

*Wm D Ewens*

Thesis Adviser

*John M. Dillard*

*Frank E. Van Rouboud*

*David J. Seim*

*James Y. Gault Gault*

*Norman D. Hurdman*  
Dean of the Graduate College

1032752

## PREFACE

The purpose of this study was to identify and describe counselor role, as perceived by selected publics in four public two-year colleges in Oklahoma. A 120-item questionnaire was used in the collection of the data. Analysis of the data consisted of a univariate frequency distribution within respondent groups and the application of the chi-square statistic to three of the respondent groups, referencing the rural-urban variable.

I would like to express my appreciation to my chairman, Dr. William P. Ewens, whose patience and faith in me helped make this study possible. Appreciation must also be expressed to Dr. David Perrin, whose encouragement was a guiding force during all my doctoral work. I would also like to thank the other helpful members of my committee, Dr. Frank McFarland, Dr. John Dillard, and Dr. James Yelvington, for their guidance and assistance in the completion of this study.

A heartfelt thanks goes to the members of the counseling staff at OUHSC for their support, and especially to Jim Dearer, for his support, encouragement, and for just being a good friend.

A special thanks goes to Charlotte, my wife, and Andrea, my daughter, whose understanding and sacrifice helped make the completion of this study possible.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. THE PROBLEM . . . . .	1
Introduction . . . . .	1
Statement of the Problem . . . . .	3
Purpose of the Study . . . . .	4
Need for the Study . . . . .	4
Definitions. . . . .	5
Summary. . . . .	5
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE. . . . .	6
Introduction . . . . .	6
Summary. . . . .	18
III. METHODOLOGY . . . . .	20
Introduction . . . . .	20
Design . . . . .	20
Instrumentation. . . . .	21
Population and Data Collection . . . . .	22
Definition . . . . .	24
Analysis of the Data . . . . .	24
Limitations. . . . .	24
Summary. . . . .	24
IV. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA. . . . .	25
Introduction . . . . .	25
Description of the Subjects. . . . .	26
Presentation of the Data . . . . .	26
Summary. . . . .	53
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	54
Summary of the Major Findings. . . . .	54
Implications . . . . .	62
Conclusions and Recommendations. . . . .	63
A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY. . . . .	65

	Page
APPENDIXES . . . . .	68
APPENDIX A - COVER LETTER . . . . .	69
APPENDIX B - SURVEY INSTRUMENT. . . . .	71
APPENDIX C - OKLAHOMA'S PUBLIC TWO-YEAR COLLEGES . . . . .	80

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Frequency Distribution by Percentages and Chi-Square Data for the Indicated Respondent Groups for the Student Recruitment Area. . . . .	27
II. Frequency Distribution by Percentages and Chi-Square Data for the Indicated Respondent Groups for the Individual Student Interviewing Area . . . . .	29
III. Frequency Distribution by Percentages and Chi-Square Data for the Indicated Respondent Groups for the Consultant to Faculty and Administration Area. . . . .	31
IV. Frequency Distribution by Percentages and Chi-Square Data for the Indicated Respondent Groups for the Testing Area . . . . .	33
V. Frequency Distribution by Percentages and Chi-Square Data for the Indicated Respondent Groups for the Group Work with Students Area. . . . .	35
VI. Frequency Distribution by Percentages and Chi-Square Data for the Indicated Respondent Groups for the Financial Aid Area . . . . .	37
VII. Frequency Distribution by Percentages and Chi-Square Data for the Indicated Respondent Groups for the Student Placement Area. . . . .	40
VIII. Frequency Distribution by Percentages and Chi-Square Data for the Indicated Respondent Groups for the Articulation with Colleges and Universities Area. . . . .	42



Table	Page
IX. Frequency Distribution by Percentages and Chi-Square Data for the Indicated Respondent Groups for the Maintaining Student Records Area . . . . .	45
X. Frequency Distribution by Percentages and Chi-Square Data for the Indicated Respondent Groups for the Institutional Research Area. . . . .	47
XI. Frequency Distribution by Percentages and Chi-Square Data for the Indicated Respondent Groups for the In-Service Training Area . . . . .	50
XII. Frequency Distribution by Percentages and Chi-Square Data for the Indicated Respondent Groups for the Community Relations Area . . . . .	52

## CHAPTER I

### THE PROBLEM

#### Introduction

The two-year college has experienced a phenomenal growth since the 1960's. Nationally, these colleges opened at the rate of one per week during that decade (Medsker and Tillery, 1971). By 1968, two-year colleges enrolled approximately one-third of all undergraduate students in the United States and projections indicate that by 1980, one-half of all undergraduate students will be enrolled in the two-year colleges (Medsker and Tillery, 1971).

The state of Oklahoma has experienced similar development in the two-year college. Enrollment percentages for undergraduate students grew from 11.7% in 1968 (Medsker and Tillery, 1971) to 33% in 1977. Growth has also been evidenced in the creation of three new two-year colleges. These colleges were opened in Oklahoma City, Midwest City, and Tulsa. Presently, the Tulsa college is opening a second campus. Oklahoma's public two-year colleges enroll over 36,000 students (American Association of Community and Junior Colleges Directory, 1978).

The fourteen public two-year colleges (see Appendix C) are located in both rural and urban areas and serve a most diverse student body. This diverse student body, which is a distinctive characteristic of the two-year college (Medsker and Tillery, 1971), places a responsibility upon each institution to meet a wide array of student needs. This factor, as much as any other, has led to the development of a comprehensive student services program, of which counseling is an essential aspect (Monroe, 1972).

The comprehensive nature of the two-year college, as well as its flexibility in dealing with students, has made it a most popular and effective institution for the delivery of educational programs. The following statement by Williamson (1949) regarding a holistic philosophy in dealing with students, typifies the philosophy that has become synonymous with two-year college student personnel programs and, specifically, counseling.

The realization of this objective--the full maturing of each student--cannot be attained without interest in and integrated efforts toward the development of each and every facet of his personality and potentialities. His deepening understanding of his world is not sacrificed to his emotional maturing. His physical well-being does not become a limited end in itself. His maturing sense of values, social and spiritual, is not sacrificed to his understanding of the world of man and nature. His need for developing a sound philosophy of life to serve as the norm for his actions now and in adult life is not neglected in the college's emphasis on his need for intellectual and professional competence.

Rather, are all known aspects of the personality of each student viewed by the education and personnel worker as an integrated whole--as a human personality living, working, and growing in a democratic society of other human personalities (p. 2)?

### Statement of the Problem

Since guidance and counseling will continue to grow in importance as a prime factor in meeting student needs in the two-year college (Medsker and Tillery, 1971), it is of value to study the role of counselors in selected two-year colleges in Oklahoma. This information is not currently available regarding Oklahoma's two-year colleges. As Leonard Goodman suggests (Goodman, Beard, and Martin, 1975), the literature available regarding the role of the two-year college counselors appears to be reports of opinion rather than research-based studies. With the increasing emphasis and importance of the two-year college in Oklahoma, there needs to be available representative information regarding the role of the counselors in these colleges.

As the two-year college evolves and attempts to meet the needs of the people it serves, an understanding of counselor role would be of value to those involved in the training of counselors. Those individual counselors considering the two-year college as a possible work environment, could also profit from data regarding counselor role.

### Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose of this study is to identify and describe the role of the two-year college counselor in four public two-year colleges in Oklahoma. Counselor role, as perceived by administrators, students, faculty, and counselors in these two-year colleges, is the focus of this study.

### Need for the Study

With the growth of the student body in Oklahoma's two-year colleges and the increasing demand of the public for educational accountability, data regarding counselor role would be of value in many ways. First, the institutions involved in the study would be able to see the relationship of the counselor to significant components of the institution. Second, the data obtained could provide valuable information to counselor training programs as to the kinds of skills and knowledge necessary to function as a counselor in the two-year college. Third, data from this study could be utilized in the development of new institutions and the reorganization of existing programs. Fourth, the data obtained through this study could be used for the development of a role model to allow for more consistent and effective means of meeting both institutional and student needs.

## Definitions

Two-Year College - A public institution offering post-secondary instruction in general studies and/or occupational education at the lower division receiving some form of state support.

Rural - A community that is not within the standard metropolitan statistical area.

Urban - A community that is within the standard metropolitan statistical area.

## Summary

In Chapter I a statement of introduction and of the problem and purpose of the study and the need for the study were presented.

Chapter II is a review of selected literature related to the role of counselors in the two-year college across the country.

Included in Chapter III are sections on the design of the study, instrumentation, population and data collection, and analysis of data.

The presentation and analysis of data are presented in Chapter IV.

In Chapter V, major findings and implications of the study are presented.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

#### Introduction

In reviewing the literature related to the perceived role of the two-year college counselor, it becomes evident that few studies have been conducted with as diverse a respondent group as this proposed study. With respect to the state of Oklahoma, no such study has been conducted. Many studies have been conducted in which particular aspects of counselor role were investigated as well as perceived role of the counselor by one or more groups (i.e., student personnel administrators, counselors, etc.). However, only a few studies have been done in which the perceptions of presidents, vice-presidents, faculty, students, and counselors were considered.

The literature reviewed in this chapter was selected to provide an overview of the studies that have been done in the area and to provide data from past studies which are similar in content to the present study.

Alexander (1973) investigated the role conceptions of counselors in Illinois community colleges and those personal and situational variables related to their

divergent definitions of role. The personal variables included age, sex, completed course work, and commitment to the profession, while situational variables included size of institution, role ambiguity, job satisfaction, and adequacy of staff relationships. A 50 item Q-sort of counselor tasks was administered to 64 counselors which were randomly selected from 12 community colleges in Illinois. Analysis of the data was carried out by correlating each area of student personnel service (personal counseling, vocational counseling, group counseling, educational counseling, consulting, testing, administration, financial aid and placement, admission, registration, record keeping, and student activities) with each of the two sets of variables. AOV was computed between mean rankings of each of the 10 areas, when counselors were divided on the basis of either situational or personal variables. Results of the study indicate that sex and age (personal variables) were not significantly related to role conception. Situational variables not significantly related to role conception were size of institution, role ambiguity, job satisfaction, and adequacy of staff relationships.

In 1976 Crosby investigated and compared perceptions of chief student personnel administrators and counselors concerning actual and ideal roles of counselors and analyzed demographic data related to perception of counselor role. Fifty-seven deans and 140 counselors participated



in the study. Data were collected via a mailed questionnaire. Since the questionnaire was developed by the researcher, construct and content validity were established as well as reliability, with reliability coefficients ranging from .721 to .903. Results of the study indicated administrators rank counselors higher in role involvement than counselors themselves; both groups ranked counselor function in the same order of importance. Administrators emphasized organizational aspects of the counselor role while counselors stressed the performance of professional type of activities. Other implications resulting from the study were: The need for a statewide staff development program, administrators, and counselors felt that counselors should perform more of the ideal function rather than actual function, counselor education programs should provide more training in community orientation programs, group process, and counselors should accept more professional responsibilities (Crosby, 1976).

In a 1968 study, DeVolder proposed to define and appraise counselor function in selected two-year colleges in Iowa. This was accomplished through a determination of how students and counselors perceived counselor functions and the degree to which these perceptions differed. The investigator developed two instruments to use in the study. One instrument, the Criteria Selection Form (CSF), was administered to 304 students and their counselors and

the Community College Counselor Function Inventory (CCCFI) was administered to 75 students and their counselors. On the basis of this study, DeVolder concluded that students and counselors do not agree on which counselor functions are most important. Counselors were more interested in personal counseling activities, while students identified occupational educational activities more frequently than counselors. Based upon this study, student needs were being met to a relatively high degree and counselors were involved in tasks which they felt were not important, yet considered important to students. The investigator concluded that if counselors are going to be effective in meeting student needs, they must communicate to the student their perception of their role (DeVolder, 1968).

The purpose of a study by Falek (1971) was to define the community college counselor's function in Pennsylvania two-year colleges, utilizing the Delphi technique. The anonymous response opinion, iteration and control of feedback, and the statistical group response were used, along with a questionnaire to gather data. Fourteen two-year colleges took part in the study which included 21 administrators, 17 faculty, and 13 students. The Pearson product-moment-correlation was the statistic used to treat the data. The investigator concluded that for a valid survey, all members of the college community should take part. As a result of the study, several recommendations were

made: 1) Colleges in Pennsylvania and other states begin to implement the 14 counselor functions developed as a result of the study, 2) Counselors should be prepared better to deal with real needs, and 3) Consideration should be given to the list of counselor functions as developed by the Delphi technique by those who plan and develop programs in two-year colleges.

In 1971, Forsythe carried out a study which was designed to identify differences which exist between desired counselor activity and actual counselor activity and to determine whether differences exist between student and counselor perception of actual and desired counselor activity in Tennessee community colleges. Data were collected through the use of a survey questionnaire administered to a random sample of students at each two year college. Counselors, directors of counseling, and deans of students were administered a similar questionnaire. T-ratios for each sub-scale were utilized to deal with differences between group means. Many interesting conclusions were drawn from this study; however, the most significant, in relation to the present study, was the revelation that counselors were widely separated in their perception of counselor activity, both within the institutions and between the institutions (Forsythe, 1971).

The purpose of a study conducted by Giampocarò (1970) was to examine counselor function in 100 randomly selected

institutions in the continental United States. Seventy colleges participated and results were obtained from 65 presidents, 62 deans, and 218 counselors. Ideal and actual functions were examined regarding 10 specific variables and one non-specific variable. Presidents' preferred, deans' preferred, and counselors' actual and ideal functions were examined. Linear regression was utilized while 105 T-tests and 396 F-ratios were performed. As a result of the study, the investigator concluded that there is more role consensus than lack of consensus among the participants of this study.

Presidents and deans were very close in their opinions of the amount of time counselors should spend on various activities. Counselors' actual and ideal functions differed to a much greater extent than presidents', deans', and counselors' preferred functions (p. 67).

Hackney (1975) carried out a study in which he proposed to identify any perceptual discrepancies which existed between counselors and administrators with respect to emphasis on counselor function. A secondary purpose was to ascertain the appropriateness of counselors carrying out these functions.

A survey questionnaire developed by the Michigan Department of Education was utilized for collection of the data. The questionnaire consisted of 35 counseling functions. Administrators and counselors from 8 of the 29 community colleges in Michigan participated in the study.

Responses on each of the 35 functions were analyzed with respect to counselors' and administrators' responses to each of the 35 questions. Analysis and discussion was presented with respect to counselors' and administrators' view of counseling functions, taking administrators as a composite group. Administrators saw a need for more emphasis being placed on community liaison activity and less on personal counseling, while counselors were more interested in activity which involved direct contact with students (Hackney, 1975). Findings revealed significant differences with respect to counselor function between counselors and administrators. The researcher suggests that if students are to be adequately served, perceptions of counselors and administrators on the provision of those services must be reasonably congruent (Hackney, 1975).

Hartzke (1973) investigated students' and counselors' perceptions of community college counselors' roles on three levels: actual 1972-73, ideal 1972-73, and ideal 1980. A 90 item questionnaire was sent to 14 campuses (11 colleges) to be filled out by all counselors and a random sample of students. Thirteen categories of counselor function were presented, yielding 13 dependent variables for analysis. Mean scores for each of the thirteen scales at each of three levels was calculated for each respondent; these scores were converted to T-scores, giving

39 standardized scores per subject. Analysis included a 3x2 MANOVA (level by status), 3x2 MANOVA for counselor return (levels by sex), and 3x2x3x3 MANOVA for student return (levels by sex, ethnic group, and by program goal). Profile analysis techniques were used in determining significance at the .05 level and the Scheffé method used for multiple comparisons as appropriate. The results would suggest that students and counselors exhibited different role expectations with regard to ideal 1980 and actual 1972-73, while agreeing on ideal 1972-73. Also, college transfer students were in close agreement on significant variables regardless of sex or ethnic group.

In a 1969 study, Herrick investigated the relationship of perceptual differences between two year college administrators and counselors toward the counselor role. The secondary purpose was to identify the effect of demographic characteristics of participants upon the perception of counselor commitment. Data gathered for the study came from 50 counselors and 49 administrators. A questionnaire was administered to both groups as well as an experimental questionnaire. The results of the study indicated that it is possible to rank areas of commitment to counselor role. A significant difference in the perception of counselor role existed between administrators and counselors (Herrick, 1969). Administrators indicated the establishment of staff relationships most important, while

counselors saw service to individual students as most important. A number of variables were found to relate to perceived counselor role. They included advanced degree, the number of graduate hours, and the number of years that the college had been in operation. Also, administrators with teaching experience and counselors had similar perceptions of counselor role.

Lindstrom (1970) proposed to assess identifying characteristics of two-year college counselors and to analyze role perceptions of these counselors. The influence of the following variables was examined and 11 null hypotheses were developed concerning their relationship to counselors' role perception. The institutional variables, size, and control were considered while the personal variables to be considered were sex, educational background, prior experience in counseling and teaching, and present counseling and teaching experience. Of the 229 colleges selected via random sampling, 207 responded, yielding 505 usable questionnaires out of 547 returned. The Counselor Perception Scale (CPS) was utilized to collect the data for the study. The instrument (CPS), which was developed by the researcher, contained 50 statements of counselor function. The scale provided 10 sub-scale scores and 8 full scale scores. The data were analyzed using a descriptive analysis detailing counselor characteristics, and null hypotheses were tested using analysis of variance techniques. The study revealed that counselors generally agree

on ideal role. Variables that had significant influence on perception of counselor role involved control and size of college and previous counseling experience. While the findings indicated general agreement on ideal role, some difference did occur with respect to the importance of some counselor functions. Also, the type and size of the college the counselor is employed in does have a relationship to role perception.

In a 1968 study, Mastin proposed to investigate the perceptions of counselor role as viewed by directors of student services and counselors in public two-year colleges in Illinois and Missouri. The Q-sort technique was composed, based on a model developed by an authority in the field and consisted of task-descriptions related to basic functions of student personnel work. Two sorts were completed by the test population. The results of the study indicated that junior college counselors and deans of students tend to perceive a positive and substantial relationship between the actual and ideal role of the junior college counselor. A positive, but limited, relationship between dean and counselor perception of counselor ideal role was evidenced and the same was true of the actual role. However, counselors perceived greater similarity between ideal and actual role than did their supervisors.

The purpose of a study by Osorno (1972) was to identify how administrators, counselors, and instructors



perceived counselor functions in Iowa vocational-technical schools and community colleges. Perceptions of current functions, future functions, and whether counselor time should be required on certain counselor tasks were studied. A secondary purpose was to determine whether a positive relationship existed between seven descriptive variables and perceptions of the groups studied. Data was obtained by a survey instrument which involved 21 basic counselor functions (re: Carnegie Study, 1965) and 52 commonly performed counselor tasks. Participants included 304 instructors, 85 administrators, and 76 counselors. Statistical methods utilized in this study included the use of the Pearson product moment correlation to test for positive relationships between certain variables. Frequency counts and percentages were used to identify functions which were endorsed by a majority of administrators, counselors, and instructors. Means, standard deviation, and single classification analysis of variance "f" tests were computed to test whether observed extreme deviations between the groups studied were too large to be accounted for by chance. Conclusions resulting from this study indicated that instructors and administrators feel that counselors should be involved in more functions than they presently are. The descriptive variables, responsibilities of position, institution enrollment, and institution offerings, had the highest overall effect on the perception

of counselor function. Counselors in the schools studied are involved in a variety of activities, of which counseling is only a part.

A study by Probinsky (1974) was undertaken to investigate the perceptions of students with regard to actual and desired emphasis placed on counselor functions by counselors. Students involved in the study were from three community colleges in the Appalachian region and consisted of terminal, transfer, male, female, freshman, and sophomore groupings. Students were administered a 30 item questionnaire in which they were asked to indicate how they perceived emphasis placed on the 30 items by counselors and what emphasis they desired on each item. The 30 items of the questionnaire were categorized into eight functions. The mean difference scores between desired and actual emphasis on the eight functions were the criteria used in the analysis. A least square analysis of variance was used to test for significant differences and confidence intervals around the mean difference scores were calculated. The findings indicated that transfer and terminal students believe more investigation needs to be carried out regarding emphasis of counseling function by counselors. Sex and class in the community college (variable) appeared to have no significance with respect to emphasis placed by counselors or students on counselors' actual or desired role.

The purpose of a study by Widerman (1974) was to determine if significant differences existed between counselors and students with respect to counselor role and functions. The participants for the study came from two urban and two suburban community colleges. The counseling appropriateness checklist and the ranking of counselor functions were instruments chosen for use in this study. Statistical procedures utilized in this study were the Spearman rank-order correlation coefficient and the Hypothesis Test for Differences in Proportion. Results of this study revealed that significant difference exists between student and counselor with respect to counselor role and function (Widerman, 1974). The greatest difference exists in the area of personal counseling and the appropriateness of students discussing personal problems with counselors. Differences between rural and urban students were not significant at the .05 level of significance. Likewise, differences between male-female students and male-female counselors were not significant.

#### Summary

As can be seen from the literature review in this chapter, studies dealing with perceived counselor role or function have typically been limited to the view of one, two, and in some cases three populations. Although

there appears to be similarity between the studies reviewed, a great diversity exists with respect to the results. Variables that affect perceived role in one state or area of the country do not necessarily have the same effect elsewhere.

With reference to the present study, the findings of Crosby (1976) would suggest information regarding counselor role would be of value in the development of a statewide in-service training program. DeVolder (1968) concluded that if counselors are going to adequately meet student needs, counselors need to know how they are perceived by students. Forsythe (1971) found counselors widely separate in their view of counselor role, while Hackney (1975) concluded that if institutions are going to meet student needs, administrators and counselors must be reasonably congruent in their perceptions of counselor role. Lindstrom (1970) found that the type and size of institution does have a relationship to role perception. The studies sited in this chapter are offered as supportive rationale for the present study. Chapter III will outline the methods and procedure proposed for use in collecting and treating data regarding perceived counselor role.

## CHAPTER III

### METHODOLOGY

#### Introduction

The purpose of this study is to identify and describe counselor role in the public two year college in Oklahoma. Counselor role as perceived by presidents, vice-presidents, deans of students, students, faculty, and counselors will be the focus of this study. This chapter includes the following sections: 1) Design, 2) Instrumentation, 3) Population and Data Collection, and 4) Analysis of Data.

#### Design

This study is descriptive research of the survey type. Descriptive research attempts to describe the characteristics of individuals, groups, or situations by drawing inferences from data primarily with an informative rather than heuristic purpose (Ballard, 1973). The utilization of a survey provides for the collection of detailed and factual information that describes existing phenomena (Isaac, 1971). In the proposed study, the investigator wishes to determine the role of two-year college counselors in four selected two year colleges in Oklahoma as

perceived by selected individuals and groups within these two year colleges.

### Instrumentation

For the purposes of this study, the investigator utilized a 120 item questionnaire (Appendix B). The questionnaire, along with an OpScan form, will allow for the use of data processing for tabulation and analysis of the data.

The instrument used in this study was developed by the Michigan Department of Education and consists of 120 items, which are divided into 12 components. The 12 components are: student recruitment, individual student interviewing, consultant to faculty and administration, testing, group work with students, financial aid, student placement, articulation with colleges and universities, maintaining student records, institutional research, in-service training, and community relations. Each of the twelve components consists of 10 statements of task regarding a particular aspect of counselor function. To determine if the letter of explanation (instructions) was appropriately worded for the student population, the instrument was administered to 40 two-year college students. Based on the response of this group of students, no changes were made.

In completing the questionnaire, the subjects were asked to read each statement and to respond either yes or

no as to whether or not they perceived counselors performing the task in question. Sample items were given in the instructions and cover letter.

### Population and Data Collection

The population surveyed included:

1. One hundred randomly selected students from two rural and two urban two-year colleges (total of 400).
2. The presidents, vice-presidents of student development, and vice-presidents of instructional affairs from the two urban and two rural colleges (total of 12).
3. A random sample of 25 faculty from each of the four colleges (total of 100).
4. All the counselors from the four above mentioned colleges (total of 16).
5. The presidents and vice-presidents of student development of the 10 remaining public two-year colleges were also asked to participate in the study. This was done in order to increase the number of administrators in the study.

The following techniques were employed in the collection of the data:

1. The investigator visited with the presidents and vice-presidents for student development on each of the campuses to be studied. An explanation was given of the project as well as a review of the test instrument to be used.

2. At the beginning of the 1978 fall session, a list of currently enrolled students was obtained from each of the institutions. A list of the full time faculty was also obtained at this time.

3. A random number generation was utilized to randomly select 100 students and 25 faculty from each of the four schools which would participate in the study.

4. A packet of materials was prepared which included a cover letter and instructions, the questionnaire, an Opscan form, and, where appropriate, a stamped self-addressed envelope. The materials were mailed to all selected students and the administrators, counselors, and faculty materials were mailed to the liaison person on each campus.

5. The liaison person at each institution was responsible to see that faculty, administrators, and counselors received the instrument. On three of the campuses, a "drop box" was placed in the learning resources center for the collection of the completed questionnaires. The completed questionnaires were collected by the liaison person on a daily basis and picked up by the investigator at the end of each week. Subjects on the fourth campus returned the completed questionnaires via a stamped self-addressed envelope, which was enclosed in the original mailed document. The presidents and vice-presidents of the 10 remaining colleges had self-addressed, stamped envelopes for returning completed questionnaires.



## Analysis of the Data

The analysis of data includes a univariate frequent distribution, within respondent groups. Percentage distributions are presented in both tabular and descriptive form. The chi-square statistic is used to compare responses on each item by administrators, faculty, and students on the rural urban variable.

### Limitations

There is one limitation which the investigator believes should be pointed out: when conducting descriptive research, one always runs the risk of receiving biased results due to the loss of information from individuals who have not responded.

### Summary

Chapter III included a section on the design of the study, instrumentation, population and data collection, and the analysis of data. Also included was a statement of limitation. Chapter IV will include the analysis of data with tabular and descriptive presentation of the data.

## CHAPTER IV

### ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

#### Introduction

The analysis of data is presented in Chapter IV. The first section of the chapter contains a description of subjects. The second section of the chapter consists of 12 tables; one table for each of the components of the survey instrument; student recruitment, individual student interviewing, consultant to faculty and administration, testing, group work with students, financial aid, student placement, articulation with colleges and universities, maintaining student records, institutional research, in-service training, and community relations. Each table contains a univariate frequency distribution within groups, by percentages, for the four respondent groups. The percentages for the responses total 100. The "N" for each group is also provided. The 12 individual tables also contain the  $\chi^2$  statistic, and a probability figure for the variable "locale," for administrators, faculty, and students. Those tasks on which each group could not agree (percentages falling in the middle 20%) are highlighted, as well as chi-square at the .05 level. The description of each

table is accomplished by first presenting the frequency distribution portion of the table and then the chi-square portion.

#### Description of the Subjects

The instrument was mailed to 28 administrators, 100 faculty, 400 students, and 16 counselors. Responses were received from 21 administrators (75%), 68 faculty (68%), 118 students (30%), and 12 counselors (80%). Of the administrators responding, six were from urban colleges, and 15 were from rural colleges. Of the faculty responding, 35 were from rural colleges and 33 were from urban colleges. Rural students numbered 53, while urban students numbered 65. The counselor response was eight from urban colleges and four from rural colleges.

#### Presentation of the Data

Within the "Student Recruitment" area (Table I), all four respondent groups perceived conducting individual interviews with high school students about their coming to college (1), talking to student groups in high schools about their coming to college (2), talking with school counselors regarding prospective students (3), and participating in college day-night programs (4), as tasks counselors perform. They also perceived talking with parents of prospective students (9), and talking with community clubs

TABLE I  
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION BY PERCENTAGES AND  
 CHI-SQUARE DATA FOR THE INDICATED RE-  
 SPONDENT GROUPS FOR THE STUDENT  
 RECRUITMENT AREA

Counselor Task	Admin. N=21	Faculty N=68	Students N=118	Couns. N=12	Admin. N=21		Faculty N=68		Students N=118	
	% yes	% yes	% yes	% yes	$\chi^2$	p	$\chi^2$	p	$\chi^2$	p
1	81.0	78.3	82.2	75.0	0.19	.66	1.01	.31	4.59	.03 <sup>a</sup>
2	85.7	87.5	75.4	91.7	0.24	.62	0.96	.33	6.60	.01 <sup>a</sup>
3	85.7	89.9	72.9	75.0	0.24	.62	1.24	.26	0.46	.50
4	95.2	92.8	83.1	83.3	0.24	.63	0.16	.69	0.99	.32
5 <sup>b</sup>	52.4	62.3	64.4	50.0	0.12	.73	1.42	.23	0.11	.74
6 <sup>b</sup>	66.7	85.5	80.5	58.3	0.26	.61	0.61	.43	2.42	.12
7 <sup>b</sup>	14.3	33.3	44.1	33.3	0.24	.62	0.06	.93	0.02	.89
8 <sup>b</sup>	47.6	55.1	55.1	41.7	0.39	.53	3.02	.08	1.09	.30
9	90.5	62.3	67.8	75.0	0.14	.91	1.42	.23	1.48	.22
10	85.7	65.2	66.1	91.7	0.79	.37	0.10	.74	2.41	.12

<sup>a</sup>p  $\leq$  .05.

<sup>b</sup>One or more groups fell in the middle 20%.

and groups about college (10), as appropriate counselor tasks. With respect to preparing and distributing descriptive material publicizing the college (5) and handling inquiries about college (6), the administration nor the counselors could agree on this task, while faculty and students did perceive this as a task counselors perform. Administrators, faculty, and counselors did not perceive task (7), prepare news releases about attending college, as a task counselors perform, and students were not able to agree on this task. Talking with employers about employees coming to college (8), was a task on which none of the groups could agree.

With respect to the chi-square portion of Table I, both rural and urban students perceived task (1) as a task counselors perform; however, rural students placed a greater degree of emphasis on this task than did urban students. The opposite was true with task (2) in that the urban students placed a greater degree of emphasis on this task than did the rural students.

As is shown in Table II, "Individual Student Interviewing," all four respondent groups perceived counseling with students having academic achievement problems (11), counseling with students who are undecided about a vocation (12), counseling with students who see their problems as personal (13), interpreting test results in a counseling interview (14), and counseling with students having

TABLE II  
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION BY PERCENTAGES AND  
 CHI-SQUARE DATA FOR THE INDICATED RE-  
 SPONDENT GROUPS FOR THE INDIVIDUAL  
 STUDENT INTERVIEWING AREA

Counselor Task	Admin. N=21	Faculty N=68	Students N=118	Couns. N=12	Admin. N=21		Faculty N=68		Students N=118	
	% yes	% yes	% yes	% yes	$\chi^2$	p	$\chi^2$	p	$\chi^2$	p
11	100.0	88.4	90.7	100.0	--	--	0.44	.51	0.001	.97
12	100.0	89.9	83.9	91.7	--	--	1.63	.20	1.54	.21
13	100.0	85.5	68.6	100.0	--	--	0.34	.55	0.06	.81
14	95.2	91.3	82.2	91.7	0.24	.63	0.87	.35	0.48	.49
15	71.4	73.9	83.8	100.0	0.05	.89	1.55	.21	0.05	.82
16	100.0	15.9	27.1	8.3	--	--	3.08	.08	1.19	.27
17	100.0	79.7	70.3	100.0	--	--	5.18	.02 <sup>a</sup>	0.01	.90
18	100.0	95.5	83.1	100.0	--	--	2.96	.08	2.06	.14
19	95.2	89.9	84.7	100.0	0.24	.63	1.24	.26	0.002	.96
20	100.0	94.2	82.9	100.0	--	--	0.004	.95	0.91	.33

<sup>a</sup>p  $\leq$  .05.

financial problems (15), as tasks counselors perform. They also perceived arranging for referral of students having severe emotional problems (17), counseling with students who are undecided about major and/or college (18), counseling with students withdrawing from college (19), and helping students plan a class schedule or their college program (20), as appropriate counselor tasks. Faculty, students, and counselors did not perceive conducting psychotherapy with students having severe emotional problems (16) as a task counselors perform, while administrators did perceive this as a counselor task.

With reference to the chi-square portion of Table II, both rural and urban faculty perceived task (17) as a task counselors perform, with the urban faculty placing a greater degree of emphasis on the task than did rural faculty.

Within the area "Consultant to Faculty and Administration" (Table III), the four respondent groups perceived discussing student problems with administrators (21), discussing student problems with faculty (22), interpreting information concerning students to faculty members (24), advising faculty members about working with students having physical or mental health problems (25), serving on faculty committees (26), making periodical reports with faculty on typical student problems (28), and serving as a counselor consultant to a department or division of the

TABLE III  
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION BY PERCENTAGES AND  
 CHI-SQUARE DATA FOR THE INDICATED RE-  
 SPONDENT GROUPS FOR THE CONSULTANT  
 TO FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATION  
 AREA

Counselor Task	Admin. N=21	Faculty N=68	Students N=118	Couns. N=12	Admin. N=21		Faculty N=68		Students N=118	
	% yes	% yes	% yes	% yes	$\chi^2$	p	$\chi^2$	p	$\chi^2$	p
21	76.2	88.4	76.5	91.7	0.01	.94	2.01	.17	9.54	.002 <sup>a</sup>
22	90.5	84.4	76.5	100.0	0.01	.91	8.55	.004 <sup>a</sup>	0.00	.99
23 <sup>b</sup>	52.4	59.9	55.7	75.0	0.39	.53	0.19	.67	4.51	.03 <sup>a</sup>
24	71.4	82.6	73.0	83.0	0.53	.82	0.56	.45	1.89	.19
25	80.9	81.2	81.7	91.7	0.19	.66	4.17	.04 <sup>a</sup>	0.67	.41
26	85.7	88.4	65.8	91.7	0.24	.62	0.01	.93	1.59	.21
27 <sup>b</sup>	47.6	50.7	47.0	50.0	0.39	.53	7.12	.008 <sup>a</sup>	0.29	.59
28	76.2	69.6	75.9	83.3	1.48	.22	0.82	.36	1.14	.28
29	66.5	69.6	74.4	83.3	2.36	.12	6.28	.01 <sup>a</sup>	13.64	.0002 <sup>a</sup>
30 <sup>b</sup>	23.8	26.1	40.2	83.3	0.01	.94	0.48	.49	0.18	.67

<sup>a</sup> $p \leq .05$ .

<sup>b</sup>One or more groups fell in the middle 20%.



college (29), as tasks counselors perform. Counselors perceived reporting reasons for student absences (23) as a task they perform, while administrators, faculty, and students could not agree. Task (27), confer with faculty who have problems, was not agreed upon by any of the respondent groups. Administrators, faculty, and students did not perceive conferring with administrators who have problems (30) as a task counselors perform, while counselors did perceive this as a task they perform.

As can be seen in the chi-square portion of Table III, both rural and urban faculty perceived tasks 22, 25, and 27 as being performed by counselors; however, urban faculty placed a greater degree of emphasis on this task than did the urban student. Rural students perceived task (23) as an appropriate counselor task, while urban students were split in reference to this task. On task (29), urban students placed a greater degree of emphasis on this task than did the rural student.

In the "Testing" area (Table IV), all four respondent groups perceived maintaining a test file and order needed tests (31), administer and/or interpret interest test to students (32), administer and/or interpret group aptitude tests to students (33), administer and/or interpret individual aptitude tests to students (34), administer and/or interpret educational diagnostic tests, and conduct in-service training for faculty advisors on the use of test

TABLE IV  
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION BY PERCENTAGES AND  
 CHI-SQUARE DATA FOR THE INDICATED  
 RESPONDENT GROUPS FOR THE  
 TESTING AREA

Counselor Task	Admin. N=21	Faculty N=68	Students N=118	Couns. N=12	Admin. N=21		Faculty N=68		Students N=118	
	% yes	% yes	% yes	% yes	$\chi^2$	p	$\chi^2$	p	$\chi^2$	p
31	80.9	84.1	67.5	100.0	2.79	.09	0.05	.82	1.32	.25
32	90.5	85.5	65.0	100.0	0.01	.91	0.62	.43	0.75	.39
33	85.7	73.9	73.5	100.0	0.24	.62	0.02	.88	0.56	.45
34	95.2	88.4	74.4	100.0	0.24	.63	0.71	.40	0.20	.89
35	90.5	87.0	70.7	100.0	0.01	.91	1.37	.24	0.26	.61
36 <sup>b</sup>	76.2	56.5	54.7	91.7	0.01	.93	3.02	.08	0.91	.34
37 <sup>b</sup>	80.9	60.9	46.2	100.0	0.19	.66	0.29	.58	0.56	.46
38 <sup>b</sup>	57.1	65.2	53.8	83.3	3.54	.06	2.90	.08	3.42	.06
39 <sup>b</sup>	57.1	44.9	53.9	75.0	0.82	.34	1.54	.21	2.33	.13
40	68.4	63.8	62.9	75.0	--	.13 <sup>a</sup>	0.004	.95	1.44	.23

<sup>a</sup>Fisher Exact Test used for calculation.

<sup>b</sup>One or more groups fell in the middle 20%.

results (40), as tasks counselors perform. Counselors and administrators perceived counselors administering and/or interpreting projective personality tests (36) as a counselor task. Faculty and students could not agree on this task. Administrators, faculty, and counselors perceived administering and/or interpreting personality inventories (37) as a counselor task, while students were not able to agree on this task. Counselors perceived scoring projective personality tests (39) as a task they perform, while administrators, faculty, and students could not agree.

Within the area of "Group Work with Students" (Table V) the four respondent groups perceived counseling with small groups of students who are vocationally undecided (41), counseling with small groups of students having study problems (42), conducting small group orientation for new students (45), conducting large group orientation for new students (46), conducting group guidance for small groups of students on academic probation (48), and conducting groups in educational, vocational, or personal exploration (49), as tasks counselors perform. Task (44), counsel with small groups of students having severe emotional problems, was not perceived as a task counselors perform by the four respondent groups. All four respondent groups could not agree with reference to counselors conducting group guidance for large groups of students on

TABLE V  
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION BY PERCENTAGES AND  
 CHI-SQUARE DATA FOR THE INDICATED RE-  
 SPONDENT GROUPS FOR THE GROUP  
 WORK WITH STUDENTS AREA

Counselor Task	Admin. N=21	Faculty N=68	Students N=118	Couns. N=12	Admin. N=21		Faculty N=68		Students N=118	
	% yes	% yes	% yes	% yes	$\chi^2$	p	$\chi^2$	p	$\chi^2$	p
41	95.2	76.8	77.1	100.0	0.24	.63	0.19	.66	0.25	.62
42	85.7	72.5	66.9	100.0	0.24	.63	1.44	.23	1.88	.17
43 <sup>b</sup>	71.4	63.8	54.2	100.0	3.65	.06	0.33	.57	1.94	.16
44	19.1	20.3	39.0	25.0	0.19	.66	1.75	.08	5.79	.02 <sup>a</sup>
45	85.7	81.2	71.2	83.3	0.24	.62	4.17	.04 <sup>a</sup>	0.27	.60
46	85.7	69.6	65.3	100.0	0.24	.62	0.01	.92	0.03	.87
47 <sup>b</sup>	47.6	47.8	58.5	58.3	0.12	.72	4.72	.03 <sup>a</sup>	0.56	.45
48	66.7	62.3	61.9	75.0	0.26	.61	7.87	.01 <sup>a</sup>	3.33	.06
49	85.7	68.1	69.5	75.0	0.24	.62	5.88	.01 <sup>a</sup>	0.11	.73
50 <sup>b</sup>	52.4	52.2	69.5	75.0	0.39	.53	8.53	.003 <sup>a</sup>	2.37	.12

<sup>a</sup>p  $\leq$  .05.

<sup>b</sup>One or more groups fell in the middle 20%.

academic probation (47). Students and counselors did perceive task (50), conduct group counseling for under-achievers, as a task counselors perform, while faculty and administrators could not agree. Administrators, faculty, and counselors did perceive counseling with small groups of students having personal-social problems (43), while students were not able to agree.

With respect to the chi-square portion of Table V, urban faculty placed a greater degree of emphasis on task (45) than did rural faculty. Rural faculty did not perceive task (47) as being performed by counselors, while urban faculty did perceive it as a counselor task. Urban faculty did perceive task (48) as a task counselors perform, while rural faculty were split in their responses. Rural faculty were also split in their responses regarding task (49), while urban faculty perceived this as a counselor task. Urban faculty perceived task (50) as a task counselors perform, while rural faculty did not. Rural students were split in their responses regarding task (44), while urban students did not perceive this as an appropriate counselor task.

As is shown in Table VI, administrators, faculty, and students perceive serving on college committees for scholarships, grants and loans (51) as a task counselors perform. Regarding task (52), help select recipients for financial aid, administrators and counselors do not perceive this as a task counselors perform, while faculty and

TABLE VI  
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION BY PERCENTAGES AND  
 CHI-SQUARE DATA FOR THE INDICATED RE-  
 SPONDENT GROUPS FOR THE FINANCIAL  
 AID AREA

Counselor Task	Admin.	Faculty	Students	Couns.	Admin.		Faculty		Students	
	N=21 % yes	N=68 % yes	N=118 % yes	N=12 % yes	$\chi^2$	p	$\chi^2$	p	$\chi^2$	p
51 <sup>b</sup>	76.2	73.9	61.0	58.3	1.48	.22	0.48	.49	2.71	.09
52 <sup>b</sup>	28.6	63.8	63.6	41.6	0.05	.82	2.08	.15	0.07	.79
53 <sup>b</sup>	33.3	58.0	72.9	33.3	2.36	.12	0.89	.34	3.71	.05 <sup>a</sup>
54 <sup>b</sup>	61.9	66.7	62.0	50.0	1.46	.23	0.18	.68	4.56	.03 <sup>a</sup>
55 <sup>b</sup>	9.5	49.3	53.0	25.0	0.01	.91	2.14	.14	0.91	.34
56 <sup>b</sup>	71.4	73.9	61.9	58.3	0.05	.82	0.02	.89	3.33	.06
57 <sup>b</sup>	23.8	58.0	54.2	25.0	1.11	.29	2.82	.09	2.50	.11
58 <sup>b</sup>	9.5	42.0	60.2	25.0	0.01	.91	0.001	.97	1.38	.23
59 <sup>b</sup>	4.8	46.4	52.5	8.3	0.24	.63	2.94	.09	0.47	.49
60 <sup>b</sup>	23.8	52.2	62.7	16.7	0.01	.93	0.55	.46	0.08	.77

<sup>a</sup>p  $\leq$  .05.

<sup>b</sup>One or more groups fell in the middle 20%.

students do. Task (53), interview students who need financial aid, was not perceived as a counselor task by administrators and counselors, while faculty do not agree and students did perceive this as an appropriate counselor task. Administrators, faculty, and students perceive interviewing students who have financial aid concerning their academic progress (54) as a counselor task, while counselors cannot agree. Administrators and counselors do not perceive counselors maintaining records of students on financial aid (55), while faculty and students were unable to agree. Counselors could not agree on task (56), talk to high school parents and counselors about financial aid (59), while the remaining three respondent groups did perceive this as a counselor task. Counselors and administrators did not perceive getting students for work study programs (57) as a task counselors perform, and faculty and students were not able to agree on this task. Administrators, counselors, and faculty did not perceive supervising students on work study programs (58) as a task counselors perform, while students did perceive this as an appropriate counselor task. Faculty and students were not able to agree with respect to counselors making reports on financial aid nominees and recipients (59), while administrators and counselors did not perceive this as a task counselors perform. Students perceived conferring with donors of scholarships and grants to students

(60) as a task counselors perform, while administrators and counselors did not perceive this as a counselor task. Faculty were not able to agree on this task.

Regarding the chi-square portion of Table VI, both rural and urban faculty perceive tasks 53 and 54 as counselor tasks, although greater emphasis was placed on both tasks by urban students.

In the area of "Student Placement" (Table VII), faculty and students perceive handling inquiries from prospective employers of students (61) as a task counselors perform, while counselors do not perceive this as a task they perform and administrators were not in agreement. Maintaining bulletin boards with job information (62) is not perceived by counselors as a task they perform. Administrators and students are not able to agree in reference to this task, while faculty do perceive this as a counselor task. Administrators and counselors cannot agree on task (63), providing current information to students concerning available work in the community, while faculty and students do perceive this as a counselor task. Faculty perceive working with college departments to place graduates (64) as a counselor task, while the other three respondent groups do not agree on this task. Administrators, faculty, and students perceive talking to students about applying for a job (65) as a counselor task, while counselors are not in agreement on this task. All four



TABLE VII  
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION BY PERCENTAGES AND  
 CHI-SQUARE DATA FOR THE INDICATED RE-  
 SPONDENT GROUPS FOR THE STUDENT  
 PLACEMENT AREA

Counselor Task	Admin.	Faculty	Students	Couns.	Admin.	Faculty	Students
	N=21 % yes	N=68 % yes	N=118 % yes	N=12 % yes	N=21 $\chi^2$ p	N=68 $\chi^2$ p	N=118 $\chi^2$ p
61 <sup>b</sup>	42.9	62.3	68.7	33.3	1.09 .30	11.94 .005 <sup>a</sup>	0.68 .41
62 <sup>b</sup>	57.1	68.1	58.3	25.0	3.54 .06	9.30 .002 <sup>a</sup>	0.43 .51
63 <sup>b</sup>	57.1	66.7	73.0	58.3	3.54 .06	7.62 .006 <sup>a</sup>	0.10 .75
64 <sup>b</sup>	47.6	52.2	73.0	41.7	1.72 .12	0.07 .78	0.28 .59
65 <sup>b</sup>	61.9	62.3	73.9	58.3	1.46 .23	0.004 .95	2.49 .11
66	66.7	65.2	60.7	83.3	0.26 .61	0.47 .49	0.30 .58
67 <sup>b</sup>	38.1	42.0	43.1	50.0	0.61 .43	6.19 .01 <sup>a</sup>	2.26 .13
68 <sup>b</sup>	28.6	36.2	54.7	66.7	1.68 .19	0.19 .66	15.24 .0001 <sup>a</sup>
69 <sup>b</sup>	23.8	31.9	37.6	41.7	0.01 .94	0.12 .72	0.36 .55
70 <sup>b</sup>	42.9	50.7	54.3	66.7	1.09 .29	1.47 .26	1.93 .16

<sup>a</sup> $p \leq .05$ .

<sup>b</sup>One or more groups fell in the middle 20%.

respondent groups perceive writing student recommendations to employers (66) as a counselor task. Administrators do not perceive setting up interviews for students with employers (67) as a counselor task, while the three remaining groups are unable to agree on this task. Administrators and faculty do not perceive bringing employers to campus for tours or take students on tour of plants or businesses (68) as a counselor task, while students are not in agreement and counselors do perceive this as a task they perform. Administrators, faculty, and students do not perceive maintaining student employment records (69) as a task counselors perform, while counselors are not able to agree on this task. Counselors perceive working with employment security office in placement of students (70) as a task they perform, while the remaining three respondent groups were not able to agree on this task.

Referring to the chi-square portion of Table VII, rural faculty perceived task 61, 62, and 63 as tasks counselors perform, while the urban faculty were split in their responses. Rural faculty perceived task (67) as a counselor task, while urban faculty did not. Rural students did not perceive task (68) as a counselor task, while urban students did.

As is shown in Table VIII, "Articulation with Colleges and Universities," all four respondent groups perceive helping students with plans to meet requirements

TABLE VIII  
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION BY PERCENTAGES AND  
 CHI-SQUARE DATA FOR THE INDICATED RE-  
 SPONDENT GROUPS FOR THE ARTICULA-  
 TION WITH COLLEGES AND  
 UNIVERSITIES AREA

Counselor Task	Admin. N=21	Faculty N=68	Students N=118	Couns. N=12	Admin. N=21		Faculty N=68		Students N=118	
	% yes	% yes	% yes	% yes	$\chi^2$	p	$\chi^2$	p	$\chi^2$	p
71	95.2	97.1	89.7	100.0	0.24	.63	2.18	.14	0.04	.84
72	95.2	88.4	82.1	75.0	0.24	.63	2.54	.11	1.28	.26
73	61.9	75.4	38.5	75.0	0.05	.83	1.59	.21	0.59	.44
74	80.9	75.4	65.0	75.0	0.19	.66	0.18	.67	0.008	.93
75 <sup>b</sup>	52.4	69.6	59.0	66.7	0.12	.73	0.39	.53	0.003	.96
76	85.7	87.0	75.2	83.3	0.79	.37	3.55	.06	0.15	.70
77 <sup>b</sup>	57.1	59.4	48.7	41.7	3.54	.06	1.41	.23	0.39	.53
78 <sup>b</sup>	66.7	63.8	49.1	33.3	0.26	.61	1.15	.28	0.29	.59
79	80.9	78.3	60.7	75.0	0.19	.66	1.78	.18	4.78	.03 <sup>a</sup>
80	89.5	82.5	74.1	100.0	--	.51 <sup>c</sup>	0.27	.60	2.67	.10

<sup>a</sup> $p \leq .05$ .

<sup>b</sup>One or more groups fell in the middle 20%.

<sup>c</sup>Fisher Exact Test used for calculation.

(71), arranging for senior college advisers to come to campus to talk with students contemplating transfer (72), write recommendations for college transfer students (74), conferring with students before they transfer to senior college (76), serve on committees on articulation between junior and senior college (79), and working with faculty advisers and college departments toward clarity and understanding of transfer requirements (80), as tasks counselors perform. Administrators, faculty, and counselors perceive attending follow-up conferences on senior campuses and talking with former students (73), as a task counselors perform, while students do not perceive this as a counselor task. Faculty and counselors perceive completing curriculum guides for students transferring to senior colleges (75) as a task counselors perform, while administrators and students are not in agreement on this task. All four respondent groups were unable to agree on task (77), reviewing academic reports with students who have transferred to senior college, as to whether it was a task counselors perform. Faculty and administrators perceive reporting to faculty on progress of students who have transferred to senior colleges (78), as a task counselors perform. Students are unable to agree on this task and counselors do not perceive it as a task they perform.

Referring to the chi-square portion of Table VIII, urban students perceived counselors performing task (79), while rural students were split in their responses.

Within the area of "Maintaining Student Records" (Table IX), counselors and administrators do not perceive helping maintain student cumulative record file for general use (81) as a task counselors perform, while faculty and students do perceive it to be a task counselors perform. Students were not able to agree on task (82), maintaining a personal and confidential file on case notes of counselees, while the remaining three respondent groups did perceive this as a counselor task. Students did not perceive writing anecdotal notes on cumulative records on record jackets after a student interview (83) as a counselor task, while the remaining respondent groups could not agree on this task. Task (84), evaluating personnel records and making evaluation, was not perceived by administrators as a counselor task. The three remaining respondent groups were not able to agree on this task. The same was true for task (85), writing appraisals of students' chances of success, with administrators not perceiving this as a counselor task, while the remaining groups could not agree. Faculty and counselors did not perceive writing out case histories on students upon request of faculty and with permission of the student (86) as a counselor task, while administrators and students were not

TABLE IX  
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION BY PERCENTAGES AND  
 CHI-SQUARE DATA FOR THE INDICATED RE-  
 SPONDENT GROUPS FOR THE MAINTAINING  
 STUDENT RECORDS AREA

Counselor Task	Admin. N=21	Faculty N=68	Students N=118	Couns. N=12	Admin. N=21		Faculty N=68		Students N=118	
	% yes	% yes	% yes	% yes	$\chi^2$	p	$\chi^2$	p	$\chi^2$	p
81	33.3	60.9	62.7	25.0	0.26	.61	1.71	.19	0.73	.39
82 <sup>b</sup>	61.9	66.2	48.3	66.7	1.46	.23	4.96	.03 <sup>a</sup>	0.93	.34
83 <sup>b</sup>	52.4	47.1	35.6	58.3	0.39	.53	5.38	.02 <sup>a</sup>	0.11	.74
84 <sup>b</sup>	19.1	57.4	52.5	41.7	0.19	.66	0.36	.56	0.47	.49
85 <sup>b</sup>	28.6	47.1	42.4	50.0	0.05	.82	0.13	.72	1.76	.18
86 <sup>b</sup>	42.9	36.2	49.2	25.0	0.004	.94	0.004	.95	5.01	.03 <sup>a</sup>
87	14.3	19.1	25.4	33.3	0.79	.37	0.06	.80	5.52	.02 <sup>a</sup>
88	80.9	75.4	70.3	66.7	0.19	.66	3.31	.07	0.09	.77
89 <sup>b</sup>	66.7	67.6	57.6	83.3	2.36	.12	2.18	.14	0.30	.59
90 <sup>b</sup>	57.1	71.0	57.6	83.3	0.004	.94	9.23	.002 <sup>a</sup>	0.30	.59

<sup>a</sup> $p \leq .05$ .

<sup>b</sup>One or more groups fell in the middle 20%.

able to agree on this task. All four respondent groups did not perceive making tapes of student interviews (87) as a task counselors perform. Task (88), helping establish policy on the confidentiality of student records, was perceived by all respondent groups as a task counselors perform. Students could not agree on task (89), helping establish policy on the destroying of personnel records, while administrators, faculty, and counselors did perceive this as a counselor task. Faculty and counselors perceived maintaining a file of students who use the counseling service (90) as a counselor task, while administrators and students could not agree.

Regarding the chi-square portion of Table IX, rural faculty did not perceive task (82) as a counselor task, while urban faculty were split. Urban faculty did perceive task (83) as a counselor task, while rural faculty did not. Rural faculty were split regarding task (90), while urban faculty did not perceive this as an appropriate counselor task. Rural students did not perceive task (86) as a counselor task, while urban students did perceive it as an appropriate task. Both groups of students did perceive task (87) as a counselor task, although a higher proportion of urban students were to the negative side.

As is shown in Table X, "Institutional Research," counselors and administrators perceive conducting a study

TABLE X  
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION BY PERCENTAGES AND  
 CHI-SQUARE DATA FOR THE INDICATED RE-  
 SPONDENT GROUPS FOR THE INSTITU-  
 TIONAL RESEARCH AREA

Counselor Task	Admin. N=21	Faculty N=68	Students N=118	Couns. N=12	Admin. N=21		Faculty N=68		Students N=118	
	% yes	% yes	% yes	% yes	$\chi^2$	p	$\chi^2$	p	$\chi^2$	p
91 <sup>b</sup>	61.9	42.0	50.4	75.0	1.46	.23	0.61	.43	7.22	.007 <sup>a</sup>
92 <sup>b</sup>	76.2	47.8	73.5	83.3	1.48	.22	2.94	.09	4.85	.03 <sup>a</sup>
93	71.4	73.9	72.7	75.0	0.70	.40	0.06	.69	2.49	.11
94 <sup>b</sup>	57.1	62.3	47.0	58.3	0.82	.36	0.04	.85	0.34	.56
95 <sup>b</sup>	71.4	63.8	42.7	83.3	3.64	.06	0.004	.95	0.21	.65
96 <sup>b</sup>	52.4	52.2	57.6	83.3	0.12	.73	5.86	.01 <sup>a</sup>	7.98	.005 <sup>a</sup>
97 <sup>b</sup>	33.3	42.0	40.7	50.0	2.36	.12	1.63	.20	0.93	.33
98 <sup>b</sup>	33.3	39.1	67.8	58.3	0.26	.61	0.89	.35	2.43	.12
99 <sup>b</sup>	42.9	37.7	51.7	66.7	1.09	.30	0.45	.49	0.27	.60
100 <sup>b</sup>	42.9	34.8	44.9	58.3	0.004	.94	0.47	.49	0.19	.66

<sup>a</sup>p  $\leq$  .05.

<sup>b</sup>One or more groups fell in the middle 20%.



of student characteristics (91) as a task counselors perform, while faculty and students are not able to agree. Faculty were not able to agree on task (92), conducting a study to identify common student problems, while the remaining three respondent groups did perceive this as a task counselors perform. All four groups perceived conducting a study of the guidance and counseling program (93) as a task counselors perform. Faculty perceived conducting a follow-up study of graduates (94) as a counselor task, while the remaining three respondent groups were not able to agree. Students did not perceive conducting a study of drop-outs (95) as a task counselors perform, while administrators, faculty, and students did. Counselors perceived developing local norms for standardized tests (96) as a task they performed, while the three remaining respondent groups were not able to agree on this task. Administrators did not perceive conducting a follow-up study of students placed in jobs in the community (97) as a task counselors perform, while faculty, students, and counselors were not able to agree on this task. Students perceived conducting a study of student use of college resources (98) as a counselor task, while counselors could not agree and administrators and faculty did not perceive this to be a task counselors perform. Counselors perceived conducting and reporting on an experimental project or program within the college as an appropriate counselor task; however,

faculty did not perceive this as a counselor task, while students and administrators were not able to agree. Faculty did not perceive conducting a study of a specific sub-group of students (100) as an appropriate counselor task, while the three remaining respondent groups were not able to agree on this task.

With reference to the chi-square portion of Table X, rural faculty perceived task (96) as a task counselors perform, while urban faculty did not. Rural students did not perceive tasks (91) and (96) as tasks counselors perform, while urban students perceived both tasks as being performed by counselors. Both groups of students perceived task (92) as an appropriate counselor task, although urban students placed a greater degree of emphasis on this task.

In the area of "In-Service Training" (Table XI), all respondent groups perceive all ten tasks as appropriate counselor tasks. See Appendix B for a list of these tasks.

With reference to the chi-square portion of Table XI, rural faculty places a greater degree of emphasis on task (104) than the urban faculty, while on task (109), the urban faculty placed a greater degree of emphasis than did the rural faculty. Tasks (102) and (103) were perceived by rural and urban students as tasks counselors perform, with the greater emphasis being placed on these tasks by the urban student.

TABLE XI  
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION BY PERCENTAGES AND  
 CHI-SQUARE DATA FOR THE INDICATED RE-  
 SPONDENT GROUPS FOR THE IN-SERVICE  
 TRAINING AREA

Counselor Area	Admin. N=21	Faculty N=68	Student N=118	Couns. N=12	Admin. N=21		Faculty N=68		Students N=118	
	% yes	% yes	% yes	% yes	$\chi^2$	p	$\chi^2$	p	$\chi^2$	p
101	95.2	88.4	81.7	75.0	0.24	.63	0.71	.40	0.67	.41
102	95.2	76.8	79.1	75.0	0.24	.63	0.19	.66	4.05	.04 <sup>a</sup>
103	95.2	63.8	74.8	83.3	0.24	.62	0.33	.57	4.93	.03 <sup>a</sup>
104	95.2	87.9	83.5	100.0	0.24	.62	4.32	.04 <sup>a</sup>	1.69	.19
105	100.0	89.9	77.2	100.0	--	--	0.23	.63	2.62	.11
106	95.2	82.4	74.4	100.0	0.24	.62	0.003	.95	0.08	.78
107	95.2	80.9	77.8	83.3	0.24	.62	0.75	.37	1.20	.27
108	90.6	60.3	76.1	66.7	0.14	.91	1.31	.25	0.06	.81
109	90.5	73.5	70.9	75.0	0.14	.91	4.54	.03 <sup>a</sup>	1.63	.20
110	95.2	85.3	78.6	83.3	0.24	.62	0.16	.68	0.16	.69

<sup>a</sup>p  $\leq$  .05.

As is shown in Table XII, "Community Relations," all four respondent groups perceive interpreting counseling programs through speeches to groups in the community (111), acting as a host for visiting groups interested in college (118), maintaining work relationships with other community counseling agencies in the community (119), and serving on civic committees and groups studying youths (120), as tasks counselors perform. Faculty and students could not agree on task (112), serve as test service for not-in-school adults, while counselors did perceive this as a task they perform, and administrators did not perceive this as an appropriate task. Faculty and counselors perceived conducting educational and/or vocational counseling interviews with not-in-school adults (113) as a counselor task, while administrators and students were not able to agree. Faculty and students were not able to agree on task (114), conduct personal counseling interviews with not-in-school adults, while counselors perceived this as an appropriate task and administrators did not perceive this as an appropriate task. Regarding conducting psychotherapy interviews with not-in-school adults (115), faculty and students did not perceive this as a task counselors perform, while administrators did perceive it as an appropriate counselor task and counselors could not agree with respect to this task. Counselors perceived teaching courses in education, vocation, or personal exploration for not-in-school adults (116) and acting as a

TABLE XII

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION BY PERCENTAGES AND  
 CHI-SQUARE DATA FOR THE INDICATED RE-  
 SPONDENT GROUPS FOR THE COMMUNITY  
 RELATIONS AREA

Counselor Task	Admin. N=21	Faculty N=68	Students N=118	Couns. N=12	Admin. N=21		Faculty N=68		Students N=118	
	% yes	% yes	% yes	% yes	$\chi^2$	p	$\chi^2$	p	$\chi^2$	p
111	85.7	75.4	70.9	91.7	0.24	.62	0.49	.48	2.34	.09
112 <sup>b</sup>	38.1	55.1	52.2	83.3	3.15	.07	0.22	.64	0.12	.73
113 <sup>b</sup>	52.4	69.6	55.6	75.0	0.12	.73	2.81	.09	0.002	.95
114 <sup>b</sup>	28.6	50.7	55.6	75.0	1.68	.19	7.12	.007 <sup>a</sup>	0.11	.74
115 <sup>b</sup>	100.0	24.6	39.7	50.0	--	--	5.90	.02 <sup>a</sup>	4.88	.03 <sup>a</sup>
116 <sup>b</sup>	47.6	46.4	47.9	91.7	0.12	.73	3.71	.05 <sup>a</sup>	2.34	.13
117 <sup>b</sup>	52.4	52.2	59.0	75.0	2.52	.11	0.95	.33	1.59	.21
118	76.2	81.2	76.1	100.0	0.01	.93	2.76	.10	1.24	.27
119	95.2	85.5	80.3	91.7	0.24	.63	0.01	.91	7.32	.007 <sup>a</sup>
120	90.5	76.8	64.7	83.3	0.01	.91	0.01	.91	0.15	.70

<sup>a</sup> $p \leq .05$ .

<sup>b</sup>One or more groups fell in the middle 20%.

consultant in K-12 counseling programs (117) as tasks they perform, while the remaining three respondent groups could not agree regarding these tasks.

With reference to the chi-square portion of Table XII, rural faculty did not perceive task (114) as a counselor task, while urban faculty did perceive this as a task counselors perform. Regarding task (115), rural faculty placed a greater degree of emphasis on the negative side of the question than did the urban faculty. Urban students did not perceive task (115) as a counselor task, while rural students were split in their responses. Both rural and urban students perceived task (119) as a counselor task, although urban students placed a greater degree of emphasis on the task.

#### Summary

Chapter IV contains an introductory section, a section on the description of subjects, and the presentation of the 12 components of the survey instrument in tabular and descriptive form. Chapter V will consist of a summary of major findings, implications, recommendations, and conclusions.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS

#### Introduction

Chapter V includes sections on the summary of major findings, conclusions and implications of the study, and recommendations for future research.

The primary purpose of this study was to identify and describe the role of counselors of four selected Oklahoma two-year colleges as perceived by administrators, faculty, students, and counselors of these four schools. A questionnaire (see Appendix B), which consists of 120 statements of counselor tasks, was utilized to collect the data. The treatment of data was accomplished in two ways. First, a univariate frequency distribution within respondent groups was developed. Secondly, the chi-square statistic was applied to data from the administrative, faculty, and student groups with reference to the variable, locale (rural-urban).

#### Summary of the Major Findings

As can be seen in the frequency distribution portions of the 12 tables, administrators were able to agree on 95 of the 120 statements of counselor tasks, while faculty

agreed on 92 of the task statements. Students were able to agree on only 82 of the tasks and counselors agreed on 97 of the 120 statements of counselor tasks. On 24 of the tasks counselors were in total agreement (100%), administrators had total agreement on nine of the tasks, while the student and faculty groups did not indicate total agreement on any of the 120 tasks.

Of the 95 tasks on which administrators agreed, 20 were not perceived as appropriate tasks. They include numbers 7, 30, 44, 52, 53, 55, 57, 58, 59, 60, 67, 68, 69, 84, 85, 87, 97, 98, 112, and 114. These numbers appear to fall at random among the areas of the questionnaire except in the areas of "Financial Aid," "Student Placement," and "Maintaining Student Records." The response in the financial aid area may be due to the fact that the colleges participating in the study had a specific financial office and therefore the counselors may only be involved minimally in the financial aid operation.

Faculty agreed on 92 of the counselor tasks, and of that number 12 were not perceived as tasks counselors perform. They include numbers 7, 16, 30, 44, 68, 69, 86, 87, 98, 99, 100, and 115. Like the administrative group, the numbers appear to fall at random among the areas of the questionnaire, except in the area of "Institutional Research." This occurrence may be a result of the fact that these tasks are carried out by the office of the president



of the Dean or Vice-President for academic affairs on the respective campuses.

Of the 82 tasks on which students agreed, seven were not perceived as tasks counselors perform. They include 16, 44, 69, 73, 83, 87, and 115. These numbers appear to fall at random among the areas of the questionnaire. Counselors agreed on 97 of the 120 tasks and of those 97, 15 were not perceived as appropriate counselor tasks. These include numbers 7, 16, 44, 53, 55, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 78, 81, 86, and 87. The numbers appear to fall at random among the areas of the questionnaire, with exception of the "Financial Aid" area. As in the administrative area, this response may be due to the existence of financial aid offices on the campuses which participated in the study.

In summarizing the chi-square data for the faculty group, the investigator wishes to address the 22 tasks which were significant at the .05 level on the rural-urban locale.

Regarding tasks 17, 22, 25, and 29, both rural and urban faculty perceived counselors performing these tasks, with the urban faculty placing a greater degree of emphasis on these tasks than did the rural faculty. Task 47 was perceived by urban faculty as a task counselors perform while rural faculty did not perceive it as a counselor task. This difference may be due to the fact that on the smaller rural campus the student prefers to work with a counselor

in a one-to-one relationship, while on the urban campus groups are an acceptable format for academic counseling. Tasks 48 and 49 were perceived by urban faculty as tasks counselors perform, while rural faculty were split. These differences may be due to an emphasis of the group process on the urban campus which does not exist on rural campuses. Urban faculty perceived task 50 as a counselor task, while rural faculty did not. This again may be due to a greater emphasis placed on the group process by urban faculty. Tasks 61-63 were perceived by rural faculty as appropriate counselor tasks, while the urban faculty were split in their responses. This difference may be due to the fact that urban campuses have placement offices which are responsible for these tasks, while the smaller rural campuses do not and counselors are more involved in placement tasks. Task 67 was perceived by urban faculty as a task counselors do not perform, while the rural faculty were split in their responses. Urban faculty perceived task 82 as a task performed by counselors, while the rural faculty were split in their responses. This may be due in part to the fact that the larger urban campuses are more formalized in their counseling operation than the rural counseling operation. The responses on tasks 83 and 90 may also be due to a more formalized counseling operation. Rural faculty perceived task 96 as an appropriate counselor task, while the urban group did not. Regarding tasks 104 and 109, both rural

and urban faculty perceived these as appropriate counseling tasks. Urban faculty perceived counselors performing task 114, while rural faculty did not perceive this as an appropriate counselor task. This difference may be due to the fact that urban campuses tend to be more accessible to the not-in-school adult. Rural and urban faculty did not perceive task 115 as an appropriate counselor task.

In summarizing the chi-square data for the student group the investigator will discuss the 19 tasks which were significant at the .05 level on the rural-urban variable.

Both rural and urban students perceived tasks 1, 2, and 21 as appropriate counselor tasks, with rural students placing a greater degree of emphasis on tasks 1 and 21 and urban students placing a greater degree of emphasis on task 2. Rural students perceived counselors performing task 23, while urban students were split in their responses. This difference may be due to the fact that rural students perceive two-year college counselors performing similar tasks as those in the secondary schools, in which this task is typically performed by counselors. Both groups of students perceived task 29 as being performed by counselors, although urban students placed a greater degree of emphasis on this task. This situation may exist as a result of rural campuses not having enough counselors to perform this task, while urban campuses have a sufficient

number of counselors to assign one to each department. Urban students did not perceive counselors performing task 44, while rural students were split in their responses. These responses may be due to the fact that urban students perceive a wide array of community agencies performing this task, while the rural student may not. Both groups of students perceive counselors performing tasks 53 and 54. Urban students did perceive task 68 as a task counselors perform, while rural students did not. This could be due in part to the fact that in the urban setting more business and industry is available for this kind of activity. Urban students perceived task 79 as a task counselors perform, while rural students were split in their responses. Task 86 was perceived by urban students as an appropriate counselor task, while rural students did not perceive it as a task counselors perform. These differences may be due to a more formalized counseling operation on the urban campuses, whereas on the rural campus this information may be exchanged verbally. Neither group of students perceived task 87 as a task counselors perform. Urban students perceived task 91 as an appropriate counselor task, while rural students did not perceive it to be a counselor task. This difference may be due to the fact that this task is carried out in a specialized office on the urban campus and by counselors on the smaller rural campus. Both groups of students perceive task 92 as an appropriate counselor task. This may be due to the fact

that students perceive counselors as being concerned with student problems and therefore conduct studies to identify and work for the resolution of said problems. Task 96 was perceived by urban students as a task counselors perform, while rural students did not perceive this as an appropriate counselor task. This may be due in part to the fact that fewer rural students are used in the establishment of norms than urban students. Both groups of students perceived tasks 102 and 103 as tasks counselors perform. Urban students did not perceive counselors performing task 115, while rural students were split in their responses. This may be due to the fact that in the urban setting more community agencies are available to deal with the non-in-school adult, while in the rural area the counselor assumes the role of some community support services. Both groups of students perceived task 119 as an appropriate counselor task. More emphasis was placed on this task by the urban student than the rural student, which may be the result of the fact that the urban setting has a greater number of community counseling agencies than are found in the rural setting.

When the chi-square statistic was applied to the administrative group at the .05 level of significance on the rural-urban variable, no significant differences were found, indicating no relationship between locale and administrative perception of counselor role.

In summary, it appears that the four respondent groups perceive the counselor performing significant numbers of tasks in each of the 12 components of the survey instrument. Of the 120 tasks administrators perceived counselors performing 63% of the tasks, faculty perceived counselors performing 66% of the tasks, students 63%, and counselors 68% of the tasks. Of the four respondent groups, the student group was not able to agree on 32% of the tasks. These 38 tasks clustered in four areas: Testing, Maintaining Student Records, Institutional Research, and Community Relations. The administrative group could not agree on 20% of the tasks. These 25 tasks fell into two clusters: one cluster in the Student Placement Area and one in the Institutional Research Area. Faculty were not able to agree on 23% of the tasks. These 28 tasks clustered in three areas: Financial Aid, Institutional Research, and Community Relations. Counselors were not able to agree on 18% of the 120 counselor tasks. These 23 tasks appeared to fall at random with only one cluster appearing in the student placement area. While there were 22 tasks from the faculty group which were significant at the .05 level, on the variable locale, and 19 tasks from the student group significant at the .05 level, it can be said that there is no relationship between locale and student and faculty perception of counselor role. The same holds true for the administrative group.

## Implications

The findings of this survey have led the investigator to the following implicatory positions. First, it appears that counselors need to further clarify their role with all phases of the institution. This is substantiated by the fact that each group of respondents could not agree within itself on their perceptions of particular counselor tasks. A second implication involves communication between administrators and counselors. In discussions with counselors the idea that administrators don't understand the role of the counselor is often heard. Based on the findings of this study, the administrator and counselor perceived the counselor role with a great deal of contiguity, suggesting that administrators do indeed understand what counselors do. A dialogue regarding these findings could be of value in bringing administrators and counselors together on this issue. A third concern the investigator holds revolves around the fact that only administrators perceived counselors performing psychotherapy interviews, while the three remaining respondent groups did not perceive the counselor performing this task. This may have occurred because administrators have a broader definition of counseling, or use the terms psychotherapy and counseling as one and the same. This situation also could be better served through a dialogue between administrators and counselors. The fact that the rural-urban variable did not significantly

counseling as one and the same. This situation also could be better served through a dialogue between administrators and counselors. The fact that the rural-urban variable did not significantly affect the administrators' perception of the counselor role would suggest administrators, both rural and urban, may have some common influence which allowed for their contiguity of perception regarding this variable, and if this influence could be identified it could be of value in opening up a dialogue between counselors and administrators.

#### Conclusions and Recommendations

Results of this study indicate that administrators, faculty, students, and counselors who participated in the study hold similar perceptions of counselor role as determined by their responses on the 120 statements of counselor task. It was further evidenced that the geographic setting (rural or urban) in which the colleges are located had no significant effect on the perception of counselor role for any group. Although all respondent groups varied to some degree as to their perception of particular tasks, the respondent groups did appear to have some consistency as to what counselors are perceived as doing.

It was the intent of the investigator to provide information regarding perceived counselor role, to a wide array of individuals involved in the training, hiring, and



supervision of counselors in and for the two year college. The investigator also hoped to provide information for the counselor trainee who might be considering the two year college as a prospective place of employment. The investigator believes that this study may be used as a basis for future research in the area of counseling and the two year college. Couched in this belief the following recommendations for future research are offered:

1. Conduct a study to identify actual counselor function, using the 120 statements of counselor tasks, and carry out a comparative analysis of the response regarding perception from the current study and response regarding actual function.

2. Conduct a study of administrators, educational and experiential backgrounds, and attitudes toward the two year college counselor.

3. Conduct a study of actual counselor function, utilizing the clientele of two year college counseling centers.

4. Conduct more detailed research into those tasks which fell into the middle 20% for each respondent group.

## A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alexander, Charles A. "The Role Conception of Counselors in Illinois Public Community Colleges." (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Northern Illinois University, 1973.)
- American Association of Community and Junior Colleges: 1978. Junior College Directory, Washington, D.C., 1978.
- Ballard, James B. "The Role and Function of Public Junior Colleges in Oklahoma as Perceived by Citizens, Students, Faculty, Administrators, and Trustees." (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1973.)
- Crosby, John A. "A Study of Chief Student Personnel Administrators and Counselor Perceptions of Counselor Roles in the Community College System of North Carolina." (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1976.)
- Devolder, John P. "Definition and Appraisal of Counselor Function in Selected Iowa Community Colleges." (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of South Dakota, 1968.)
- Falek, Ira J. "Community College Counselor Functions as Designed by the Delphi Technique." Dissertation Abstracts, Volume 32, Part 6 (1972), p. 6126A.
- Forsythe, Jack N. "Student and Counselor Perception of Counselor Function in Tennessee Community Colleges." (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Florida, 1971.)
- Giamnocaro, Joseph P. "Role of the Counselor in the Community College." (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Virginia, 1970.)
- Goodman, Leonard H., Richard L. Beard, and Carol L. Martin. "Counseling Services in the Two Year College: A Southeastern Survey." NASPA Journal, Volume 5, No. 12 (Spring, 1975), pp. 241-248.

- Hackney, Larry H. "Administrator and Counselor Perceptions of Counselor Functions in Community Colleges." (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertaion, University of Michigan, 1975.)
- Hartzke, Joan E. "Counselors and Student Perception of Community College Counseling Staff Role in the State of Colorado." (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Colorado, 1973.)
- Herrick, George W. "A Study of the Perception of Counselor Role in Two Year Colleges in New York State." Dissertation Abstracts, Volume 30, Part 2 (1969), p. 1822A.
- Hughes, Don. "What Do Counselors Do?" NASPA Journal, Volume 14, No. 2 (Fall, 1976), pp. 29-34.
- Isaac, Stephen and William B. Mitchael. Handbook in Research and Evaluation. San Diego: Edits Publisher, 1971, p. 18.
- Lindstrom, Allen R. "Identifying Characteristics and Role Perceptions of Two Year College Counselors." Dissertation Abstracts, Volume 31, Part 11 (1970), p. 4778A.
- Mastin, Thomas N. "The Role and Function of the Junior College Counselor." (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, St. Louis University, 1968.)
- Medsker, Leland L. The Junior College: Progress and Prospect. New York: McGraw-Hill Publishers, 1960.
- Medsker, Leland L. and Dale Tellery. Breaking the Access Barriers. New York: McGraw-Hill Publishers, 1971.
- Miller, Theodore K. and Judith S. Prince. The Future of Student Affairs. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1977.
- Monroe, Charles R. Profile of the Community College. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1972.
- O'Banion, Terry. "Purpose of College and University Student Personnel Work." NASPA Journal, Volume 8, No. 3 (January, 1971), pp. 206-212.
- Osorno, Anthony W. "Differentiated Perceptions of Counselor Functions in Iowa Area Vocational-Technical Schools and Community Colleges." (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Iowa State University, 1972.)

- Probinsky, Jean G. "Student Perceptions of Counseling Function at Selected Community Colleges in the Appalachian Region of Southwest Virginia." (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1974.)
- Thornton, James W. The Community Junior College. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1972.
- Warnath, Charles F. and Associates. New Directions for College Counselors. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1973.
- Wideman, Gary M. "A Comparative Study of Urban and Suburban Community College Students and Counselors in Regard to Counselors' Roles and Functions." (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, The American University, 1974.)
- Williamson, E. G. Student Personnel Services in Colleges and Universities. New York: McGraw-Hill Publishers, 1961.
- Williamson, E. G. et al. "The Student Personnel Point of View." Student Personnel Work, American Council of Education Studies, Ser. 6, Volume 13, No. 13, Washington, D.C., September, 1949, p. 2.
- Raines, M. "Junior College Student Personnel Programs: Appraisal and Development." AACJC supported by Carnegie Study in New York, 1966.
- Roueche, John C., George L. Baker III, and Richard L. Brownell. "Accountability and the Community College." AACJC. Washington, D.C., 1972.
- Young, Jerry W. and Kenneth A. Harris. "A Community College Model for Counseling." Journal of College Student Personnel, Volume 18, No. 2 (March, 1977), pp. 133-137.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

COVER LETTER

To Whom It May Concern:

You have been selected to participate in a study of counseling in the two year college. Your assistance in this project is of great importance.

The brief questionnaire enclosed (10 to 12 minutes completion time) is the basis of the study. It consists of a list of activities that counselors around the country have indicated are the kinds of tasks they perform.

The questionnaire (statement of counselor activities) is accompanied by an opscan form to record your responses. The responses will be either #1 yes or #2 no. Please use a pencil to record your responses. Read each statement carefully, keeping in mind that you are being asked to identify counselor role as you perceive it to be. By the corresponding number on the opscan form, mark #1 if your response is yes, you perceive the counselor performing this task; or mark #2 no, you do not perceive the counselor performing this task. Continue through the entire questionnaire following this pattern.

The opscan form has space provided for a wide array of data; however, the only data that you need to supply is in response to the items on the questionnaire. This data will be used in a statistical form only. (Do not put your name on the opscan form.)

Note the asterisk at the bottom of this page; it indicates where you are to return the completed opscan form. Please return within seven days if possible.

Your assistance and cooperation in this project are greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Roger H. French

APPENDIX B  
SURVEY INSTRUMENT



### Student Recruitment

1. Conduct individual interviews with high school students about their coming to college.
2. Talk to student groups in high schools about their coming to college.
3. Talk with high school counselors regarding prospective students.
4. Participate in "College Night" or "College Day" or campus visitation for students interested in college.
5. Prepare and distribute descriptive material publicizing the college.
6. Handle inquiries about attending college.
7. Prepare news releases about attending college.
8. Talk with employers about employees coming to college.
9. Talk with parents of prospective students.
10. Talk to community clubs and groups about college.

### Individual Student Interviewing

11. Counsel with students having academic achievement problems.
12. Counsel with students who are undecided about a vocation.
13. Counsel with students who see their problems as "personal."
14. Interpret test results in a counseling interview.
15. Counsel with students having financial problems.
16. Conduct psychotherapy with students having severe emotional problems.
17. Arrange for referral of students having severe emotional problems.

### Individual Student Interviewing (Cont.)

18. Counsel with students who are undecided about major and/or college.
19. Counsel with students withdrawing from college.
20. Help students plan a class schedule or their college program.

### Consultant to Faculty and Administration

21. Discuss student problems with administrators.
22. Discuss student problems with faculty members.
23. Report reasons for student absence to faculty.
24. Interpret information concerning students to faculty members.
25. Advise faculty members about working with a student having a physical or mental health problem.
26. Serve on faculty committees.
27. Confer with faculty who have problems.
28. Make periodical reports with faculty on typical student problems.
29. Serve as counselor consultant to a department or division of the college.
30. Confer with administrators who have problems.

### Testing

31. Maintain a testing file and order needed tests.
32. Administer and/or interpret interest tests to students.
33. Administer and/or interpret group aptitude tests to students.
34. Administer and/or interpret individual aptitude tests to students.

Testing (Cont.)

35. Administer and/or interpret educational diagnostic tests.
36. Administer and/or interpret projective personality tests.
37. Administer and/or interpret personality inventories.
38. Score paper and pencil group tests.
39. Score projective personality tests.
40. Conduct in-service training for faculty advisers on the use of test results.

Group Work with Students

41. Counsel with small groups of students who are vocationally undecided.
42. Counsel with small groups of students having study problems.
43. Counsel with small groups of students having personal-social problems.
44. Counsel with small groups of students having severe emotional problems.
45. Conduct small group orientation for new students.
46. Conduct large group orientation for new students.
47. Conduct group guidance for large groups of students on academic probation.
48. Conduct group guidance for small groups of students on academic probation.
49. Conduct groups in educational, vocational, or personal exploration.
50. Conduct group counseling for under-achievers.

### Financial Aid

51. Serve on college committee for scholarships, grants, or loans.
52. Help select recipients of financial aid.
53. Interview students who need financial aid.
54. Interview students who have received financial aid concerning their academic progress.
55. Maintain records of students on financial aid.
56. Talk to high school counselors and parents about financial aid.
57. Get students for work-study programs.
58. Supervise students on work-study programs.
59. Make reports on financial aid nominees and recipients.
60. Confer with donors of scholarships and grants to students.

### Student Placement

61. Handle inquiries from prospective employers of students.
62. Maintain bulletin boards with job information.
63. Provide current information to students concerning work available in the community.
64. Work with college departments to help place graduates.
65. Talk to students about applying for a job.
66. Write student recommendation to employers.
67. Set up interviews for students with employers.
68. Bring employers to campus for tours or take students on tour of plants or businesses.

### Student Placement (Cont.)

69. Maintain student employment records.
70. Work with employment security office in placement of students.

### Articulation with Colleges and Universities

71. Help students with plans to meet requirements.
72. Arrange for senior college advisers to come to campus to talk with students contemplating transfer.
73. Attach follow-up conference on senior campus and talk with former students.
74. Write recommendations for college transfer students.
75. Complete curricular guides for students transferring to senior colleges.
76. Confer with students before they transfer to senior colleges.
77. Review academic reports with students who have transferred to senior colleges.
78. Report to faculty on progress of students who have transferred to senior colleges.
79. Serve on committee on articulation between junior and senior colleges.
80. Work with faculty advisers and college departments toward clarify and understanding of transfer requirements.

### Maintaining Student Records

81. Help maintain a student cumulative record file for general use.
82. Maintain a personal and confidential file of case notes on counselees.

### Maintaining Student Records (Cont.)

83. Write anecdotal notes on cumulative record on record jacket after a student interview.
84. Evaluate personnel records and make recommendations.
85. Write appraisals of students' chances of success.
86. Write out case histories on student upon request of faculty and with permission of student.
87. Make tapes of student interviews.
88. Help establish policy on the confidentiality of student records.
89. Help establish policy on the destroying of personnel records and/or case notes and/or tapes.
90. Maintain a file of students who use counseling service.

### Institutional Research

91. Conduct a study of student characteristics.
92. Conduct a study to identify common student problems.
93. Conduct a study of the guidance and counseling program.
94. Conduct a follow-up study of graduates.
95. Conduct a follow-up study of drop-outs.
96. Develop local norms of standardized tests.
97. Conduct a follow-up study of students placed in jobs in the community.
98. Conduct a study of student use of college resources.
99. Conduct and report on an experimental project or program within the college.
100. Conduct a study of a specific sub-group of students.

### In-Service Training

101. Attend staff meetings on staff procedure and policy.
102. Attend staff training sessions led by an outside expert.
103. Attend staff training sessions led by a staff member.
104. Attend workshops related to guidance and counseling as staff representative.
105. Attend state-level professional conferences.
106. Attend national-level professional conferences.
107. Take course work related to guidance and counseling.
108. Supervise counseling interns from senior colleges.
109. Conduct training sessions for fellow staff members.
110. Attend local or community professional conferences.

### Community Relations

111. Interpret counseling program through speeches to groups in the community.
112. Serve as testing service for not-in-school adults.
113. Conduct educational and/or vocational counseling interviews with not-in-school adults.
114. Conduct personal counseling interviews with not-in-school adults.
115. Conduct psychotherapy interviews with not-in-school adults.
116. Teach courses in education, vocation, or personal exploration for not-in-school adults.

Community Relations (Cont.)

117. Act as a consultant in K-12 counseling programs.
118. Act as a host for visiting groups interested in college.
119. Maintain work relationship with other counseling agencies in the community.
120. Serve on civic committees and groups studying youth.



APPENDIX C

OKLAHOMA'S PUBLIC TWO-YEAR COLLEGES

Carl Albert Junior College  
Poteau, Oklahoma 74953

Claremore Junior College  
Claremore, Oklahoma 74017

Connors State College  
Warner, Oklahoma 74469

Eastern Oklahoma State College  
Wilburton, Oklahoma 74578

El Reno Junior College  
El Reno, Oklahoma 73036

Murray State College  
Tishomingo, Oklahoma 73460

Northeastern Oklahoma A & M  
College  
Miami, Oklahoma 74354

Northern Oklahoma College  
Tonkawa, Oklahoma 74653

Oscar Rose Junior College  
Midwest City, Oklahoma  
73110

Sayre Junior College  
Sayre, Oklahoma 73662

Seminole Junior College  
Seminole, Oklahoma 74868

South Oklahoma City  
Junior College  
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma  
73159

Tulsa Junior College  
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74119

Western Oklahoma State  
College  
Altus, Oklahoma 73521

VITA<sup>2</sup>

Roger H. French

Candidate for the Degree of  
Doctor of Education

**Thesis:** A SURVEY OF COUNSELOR ROLE AS PERCEIVED  
BY ADMINISTRATORS, FACULTY, STUDENTS,  
AND COUNSELORS IN SELECTED PUBLIC TWO-  
YEAR COLLEGES IN OKLAHOMA

**Major Field:** Student Personnel and Guidance

**Biographical:**

**Personal Data:** Born in Great Bend, Kansas, December  
7, 1941, the son of Harry and Ruth L. French;  
married Charlotte Mullin in November, 1972.

**Education:** Graduated from Ellinwood High School,  
Ellinwood, Kansas, in 1960; received Associate  
of Arts degree from Hutchinson Junior College  
in 1962; received Bachelor of Science in Edu-  
cation degree from Emporia State University  
with a major in Health and Physical Education  
in 1965; received Master of Science degree  
from Emporia State University with a major in  
Counseling in 1970; completed requirements for  
Doctor of Education degree at Oklahoma State  
University in May, 1979.

**Professional Experience:** St. Joseph, Missouri Pub-  
lic Schools, seventh and eighth grade science  
and physical education, 1965; Ellis Public  
Schools, Ellis, Kansas, Science Teacher and  
Coach, grades eight through twelve, 1965-67;  
Westwood View School, Westwood, Kansas, Direc-  
tor of Physical Education, 1967-69; El Paso  
Community College, Colorado Springs, Colorado,  
Counselor, 1970-74; Denton State School, Denton,

Texas, Psychometrist, 1974-75; University of Oklahoma Health Science Center, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, Senior Counselor, to present.

Professional Organizations: American Personnel and Guidance Association, Phi Delta Kappa, National Education Association.